

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Tuesday, March 18, 1969

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions
 Reading and Receiving Petitions
 Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q. C. (Attorney-General) (Fort Garry): The First Report of the Special Committee consisting of the entire membership of the House to deal with Bill 22.

MR. CLERK: Your Special Committee consisting of the entire membership of the House, beg leave to present the following as their First Report.

Your committee met Tuesday, March 18, 1969, and appointed Honourable Mr. Lyon as Chairman. The quorum was set at ten members. Briefs were presented by:

1. The Board of Trustees of the Winnipeg School Division No. 1.
2. Mr. Jim Smith.
3. Manitoba Association of School Trustees.
4. Frank Taylor, Mayor of the Town of Rivers.
5. Labour Election Committee.
6. Manitoba Teachers Society.
7. Manitoba Federation of Labour.

Your committee has considered Bill No. 22, an Act to amend The Public Schools Act, and has agreed to report the same without amendment, all of which is respectfully submitted.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer, that the report of the committee be received.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, in spite of the very short notice that had been given to the public to appear before the committee, it was most useful and interesting this morning to see the facts and figures that were brought out at the committee hearing as to the trends in education costs and what is really happening in the Province of Manitoba in this area. It was unfortunate that the Minister appeared to be unable to give us information as to the basis for his calculations and why the government had chosen the change from 35-65 to 30-70. When the questions were asked of him at the beginning of the committee hearing, it seemed that the government has no idea of really what was happening to costs in education in the Province of Manitoba, and that apparently the figure had been, shall we say, picked out of the air, or chosen out of a hat, on no particular base.

We subsequently found out that the figure for 1967, at least was available. It is, I will admit, in the annual report. The Minister apparently did not have it at hand when the question was asked. We find that in that year the Foundation levy still left some \$16 million that had to be raised by special levy locally. Since then, every indication is that there has been a very substantial and continuing increase in the costs. The Minister stated that he did not have yet the -- didn't think he might have the audited reports for 1968. If those are not available, surely at least the estimates are available. Someone must have a figure as to what the estimated costs of the school programs in the divisions within the Foundation structure must have been in the course of that year. How else could the Minister tell us that in his view 55 percent of the costs would now be covered by the province unless he has made some calculations? And yet those calculations were not available to the members of the committee, Mr. Speaker.

But the information given to us by the School Division of Winnipeg - and I thank them for giving us a very comprehensive report; I'm sure we would have had more reports from other parts of the province had there been more time for the school districts to prepare them and appear before us - the indications in the City of Winnipeg report are very clear, that there's been a steady, continuing increase in the costs of education and that the provincial share of those costs is less now, even under the proposed 30-70, than it was two years ago when the original Foundation Program was established. And so, not only is the government not keeping pace with the increase in education costs in its grants, it has actually fallen behind, Mr. Speaker. The result is that the load has gone on more and more on the local taxpayer.

It is evident from the calculations that have been made so far that the 30-70 will not reverse that trend sufficiently, and that this year the local taxpayers will once again be faced with

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd) an increase in their real property tax for education purposes. And so it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the whole base of the Foundation Program, the whole purpose for which it was brought in in the first place, to relieve the local taxpayer and shift more of the burden on to the consolidated funds and the resources of the province, really has been eroded away, and we're heading in the opposite direction. The proposal of the Minister simply does not go far enough to correct that situation. Again, we do not have figures for the whole of the province but from what we have been able to gather this is the case. We had the mayor of one of the small towns in Manitoba tell us that in his case the special levy, the increase will be substantially more than the decrease in the Foundation, that their total increase for education, therefore, at the local level will be up. The City of Winnipeg figures are certainly very clear in that regard where the special levy has moved, Mr. Speaker, in the period of just three years, from 1967 when it was 9.1 mills; 1968 - 12.9 mills; 1969 - 17.3 mills; and that's after taking into consideration the proposed change to 30-70 - 17.3 mills the proposed special levy this year. Since 1967, in those three years, almost 100 percent increase, from 9.1 to 17.3.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that cannot be considered in any way a shift of the load away from the local taxpayer. It's the very reverse, and the present proposal simply does not go far enough to make this shift, and that, Mr. Speaker, had been the original claimed intention of the government but it simply has not followed through, and it is not satisfactory now to merely come forward with the limited amount of assistance that the government is proposing.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Member for Lakeside, that the Report of the Committee be not now received with respect to Bill 22, but that the Bill be referred back to the special committee of all the members for further immediate consideration and, in particular, to consider the advisability of changing the percentage grant formula from the proposed 70 percent payable from the Consolidated Fund and 30 percent payable from the Foundation levy, to read 80 percent and 20 percent respectively in the current calendar year, and 90 percent and 10 percent respectively in the calendar year 1970, and 100 percent from the Consolidated Fund in the calendar year 1971 and thereafter.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. DONALD W. CRAIK (Minister of Youth and Education) (St. Vital): Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Leader of the Opposition has brought up several points here, I think, that have to be commented on fairly directly. First of all, he made reference to a statement which I am attributed with, saying that it covered 55 percent of total costs. I think that this figure was drawn from a statement this morning that I would hope that when the information is in on the 1969 budgets, which we do not have at the present time and will not have for some time yet, that the changes that we have made would bring us into a proportion that would indicate that the province was carrying approximately 55 percent of the total costs of the public schools education in Manitoba. I did not state that we were aiming exactly at 55 percent. I said that it would be my thought and hope that we would be in this range when all the budgets were in. We do not know exactly what the amounts of monies are going to be that are levied for by the individual school divisions and school districts, therefore we cannot tell, nor can anyone else tell at this point, what proportions are going to be paid by the Provincial Government.

Now, with respect to the Honourable Leader of the Opposition's statement that he could not gain information regarding the proportions of the budgets that were paid for in 1968 or 1969, or information involving total budgets, I indicated at the meeting this morning that I would attempt to provide as good information as possible before the Bill went through the House here for its third reading, and this I will still hope to do. I would point out, though, as further remarks here, that it's not a case of comparing two identical items, because in 1967 we had 29 unitary divisions, in 1968 we had 40, and in 1969 we'll hopefully have 44. So we're comparing apples and oranges in these cases, and it is not easy to make a direct comparison in order to get a good relative amount, because the numbers of unitary divisions are changing and have been changing over the last three years, from 29 to 40, hopefully to 44.

The other item I would like to comment on is that he's indicated that he would like to know the total percentage that the government is increasing, or what percentage they're aiming for. I would point out that the amounts that the Foundation Program was increased by was \$5.8 million. However, the Honourable Leader of the Opposition has before him in his estimate book the amounts of money that are being increased in public schools education. These amounts, as

(MR. CRAIK cont'd) he can see, are going from \$71,323,000 to \$81,020,000 - an increase there of nearly \$10 million, or a percentage increase of the order of 11 to 12 percent. Now, this is a significant increase in monies to public schools education and this is shown in the estimates, so there's no problem in him arriving at a proportionate increase of the province into general to the public school education system. As he goes back to last year's estimate book, he will find the same shorts of amounts of money increase that are being put into education. I would point out that the over-all education budget shows that increases to the universities, for instance, are up about 20 percent - 19.8 percent.

The total budget for all education is 39.6 percent of the total expenditures of the Province of Manitoba. There is absolutely no question that the Province of Manitoba is doing its share in the field of education and is doing its share in the field of financing public schools education. The control of the special levy is in the hands of the school boards. We will attempt to keep pace and keep up our proportion of those costs as far as is within our capability, and have done so. This year, as the Honourable Leader of the Opposition heard the school trustees say this morning in their presentation, representative of all of the school boards of the 40 unitary divisions and the other non-unitary divisions, that this is probably the most equitable way of increasing the Provincial Government's support for public school education. That is, to change the proportions on the financing of the Foundation levy. And that is exactly what we've done.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party) (Radisson): Mr. Speaker, may I first of all indicate support for the amendment proposed by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition, but may I also suggest that in my opinion it does not go far enough, and it does not meet with the general consensus of opinion as expressed by the delegations as it appeared before the committee this morning, because the majority of those who did appear before the committee suggested that 100 percent of the Foundation grant, or Foundation formula, should be undertaken by the government now, not three years hence. But may I at the offset say how worthwhile it was for this House in its wisdom to adopt a suggestion, made by myself on behalf of our party, to have the matter discussed outside of the House, because had that not been done I'm sure that the representatives of the various areas that were there this morning would not have been heard and this government would have rammed through what they had in their mind - and it can be that eventually, because of their majority, that this will be done in any case.

But I think that it is interesting to observe some of the suggestions made this morning, and to me the principal suggestion made this morning was one that my party have been advocating for years and only recently has the party to my right - the Liberal Party of Manitoba - joined us in our plea to have the costs of education removed from the local property owner. I recall years ago we had proposed resolutions to this effect without the support of my honourable friends, whether they were on this side of the House or that side of the House. The process of education sometimes takes a long time, Mr. Speaker, but anyway we welcome the objective of the mover of this resolution today. But I suggest it is not enough to suggest that there is the possibility, by adopting this resolution, that for the year 1971 that 100 percent of the Foundation program will be absorbed by the province, because if one takes a look at the content of the Foundation program, 100 percent by the Provincial Government two or three years hence would still leave onerous burdens upon the local taxpayer due to the increased costs in education that everybody recognizes will happen. Our Foundation grant today is based on a salary schedule of 1967. Since that time there have been at least two increases in teachers' salaries that the grant content says remains the same, and unless the formula for arriving at the grant is not changed, even the acceptance by the provincial authority of 100 percent will mean little gain in the over-all analysis insofar as the local property holder is concerned.

This government has announced in the Throne Speech that it is giving consideration or will be giving consideration to having the Public School Finance Board take over the direction of practically all aspects of education in the Province of Manitoba. One of the delegates that appeared before the committee this morning suggested that this might be worthwhile in order to curtail educational costs, but as one listened one could not help but come to the conclusion that the adoption of such a policy would turn the clock back on education to what it was not so long ago in the Province of Manitoba, and I suggest we cannot turn the clock back. One of the delegates that appeared before the committee this morning suggested that the financial encouragement to teachers to undertake additional courses should not be rewarded financially, that the

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) . . . incentive should not be there. I reject this completely as an indicator of turning the clock back. But every delegation that appeared before the committee suggested that the basis of the cost, the payment of the cost of education, should be on the ability to pay. One of the honourable members of this House asked almost every delegate that appeared before the committee for alternative plans and methods other than the property tax for the payment of education and, if I recall correctly, in every instance it was a method based on ability to pay, and I say, Mr. Speaker, that even if this resolution is approved, and that by 1971 the government of this province accepts 100 percent responsibility for the Foundation program, if it's on the basis of the same formula as we have today, it will represent a lessening percentage contribution of the provincial authority to education, because costs, as is well recognized by all, will continue to go up.

So I say, Mr. Speaker, we will accept the proposition of my honourable friend the Leader of the Liberal Party. I think his endeavours are well. I repeat once again that I am glad that belatedly the Liberal Party of Manitoba recognizes that some of the burdens on the local taxpayer must be eased, and I'm happy that they do so now despite the fact that they had the opportunity for some years and years to do just that, but I do suggest that if this motion is adopted and the bill is reconsidered in committee, that we also undertake a consideration of the basis of the Foundation grant as well, to take into recognition increased costs of salaries, increased costs of administration and supplies as well, because only unless and until we change the grant formula basis the percentage contribution really doesn't mean too much, and in saying this I recognize that the Honourable Minister of Education and the Provincial Treasurer have indicated that there will be approximately a \$5.1 million additional contribution from provincial sources to education, but if one takes a look at the expanding educational system that we have in Manitoba, the expanding costs of education, the provincial contribution of \$5.1 million is insignificant by comparison with the costs that will have to be borne by the local taxpayer, particularly those on fixed and low incomes.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, unless someone else wishes to speak, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Inkster, that debate be adjourned.

MR. EDWARD I. DOW (Turtle Mountain): Mr. Speaker, if I may, I'd like to speak on this resolution at this time.

MR. SPEAKER: Proceed.

MR. DOW: Ever since the committee on the financial recommendations of the Michener Commission brought down his recommendations here some few years ago, this government has been following partly his recommendations that we should have a mill rate to take care of the Foundation grant, we should have a special mill rate or the monies required over and above the Foundation grant. But the third recommendation in line with this is the fact that Michener also recommended that every two or three years that this program should be reviewed by committees of various groups like municipal trustees and legislative people to come up, with a current program that was adaptable to the current time, and this is why one of the reasons that I would uphold my leader's resolution is the fact that he is suggesting here in effect that we do have a partial review anyway, and I think a very responsible attitude to approaching the solution of 100 percent of the Foundation grant being carried by the Provincial Government. In my observations and talks, and I think recommendations made by them to the Cabinet, to this government, that sooner or later, the sooner the better, that the province take over 100 percent of the Foundation grants, and I believe, from the information that we received this morning from various committees, they recommend today that we do this, and I agree that our leader has brought in a resolution that I think has some merit of responsibility in that we approach this 100 percent grant in stages, and I think that definitely it is going to show a reduction on real property; we know that it's needed, particularly with the people of fixed income and the old age pensioners, to retain these properties; and I think this is one resolution that I would like to see go back to the committee for an intensive study with the objective of arriving at the percentage of the Foundation grant to be paid by this government.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. JAMES COWAN, Q.C. (Winnipeg Centre): Would the honourable member permit a question? Would the honourable member tell us how the Liberals would propose that the additional money would be raised by the province?

MR. DOW: Certainly. Mr. Chairman, I think we have been on record for a long time that the ability to pay should come into this question, and this is one of the reasons and one of the reasons why, in taking it over stages, we can achieve this. There is no problem to say that we can't pay. The Provincial Government have the largest foundation of a structure to get money from, and why force it on to the real property owner, the taxpayer, the municipal people who have only one source of revenue? I think this is the responsibility of this Legislative Assembly to arrive at that.

MR. COWAN: Do you propose that the income tax be increased?

MR. DOW: If that's the only way, yes.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the Minister of Education.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I was wondering if the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain would permit another question. He's made reference to the Michener Commission report. Does he recall the mill rate that was recommended by Michener in the report?

MR. DOW: I believe it was 13 -- basically; to start with.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member from Emerson.

MR. JOHN P. TANCHAK (Emerson): Thank you. I, for one, cannot see where the government got this five percent increase, or changing the contribution, the provincial contribution, from 65 to 70 percent. To me it seems that the decision to increase that was not based on reality. It seems to me that it has just been taken out of the dark; guesswork. It's just simply a stab in the dark, because although the government and the Premier of the Province of Manitoba says he's trying to hold the line and he's warning the municipalities that they should hold the line in taxation, I cannot see, for one, how the different municipalities could hold the line when the five percent proposed here, or the change from 65 to 75 percent in grants, will not take care even of this year's inflationary trend. We know that the province's revenues are more buoyant than the revenues that the municipality derives -- or the sources that the municipality derives its revenue from. It's fixed on assessment, while the province, if our economy is more buoyant, the province's revenues increase. People might buy more gasoline, buy more goods, sales tax, gasoline, more cars and so on, so how could the school boards or the municipalities hold the line? And I feel that the resolution proposed by my leader is in order and it's a reasonable one, because at least an extra five percent, changing it from 65 to 80 percent, at least would take care of the extra expenses that the municipalities have to take care of this year, but the former, if you leave it at 65 it simply does not do it.

The Honourable Minister of Education seems to be very happy that the Manitoba Association of School Trustees endorsed this contribution of the Province of Manitoba, and you'll probably remember that I asked the gentleman, Mr. . . . I think it was -- (Interjection) -- yes, I am getting misled; it was Anderson. I asked him whether it wasn't a fact that half a loaf was better than none, and he did say "yes" and that was the way I felt that he felt about it, that it's better to get something than have nothing.

Now if we read this, in the second paragraph, it says: "While many trustees will feel that more might have been done," -- they feel that more might have been done, and again: "while noting that the province's share of the total cost of education will remain much the same as before and that the new formula will not result in an over-all reduction in property taxes" -- it will not result in an over-all reduction in property taxes -- and then he continues: "Trustees will appreciate the measure of relief that is being provided." Sure, we all appreciate the relief being provided. Half a loaf is better than none, and that's the consensus of this brief.

Then again, if we look at what the Manitoba Teachers Society had to say, what do they say here? "We are concerned that even though the province is increasing its support of the Foundation Program that the increase may not bring the province's support of the total cost of education back to at least the level of 53 percent that was established in 1967." So, in other words, they also agree indirectly with this resolution because this increase will not bring it back even to when the Foundation program started.

Then if we go farther on and read the presentation made by the Board of Trustees of Winnipeg School Division No. 1, what do they say in the last paragraph? "It is the opinion of the trustees of the Winnipeg School Division No. 1 that it is an absolute necessity to increase the provincial contribution to education beyond that proposed in Bill 22." They agree with that, beyond that; "and to transfer the load from the real property taxpayer of the City of Winnipeg." So they all agree with us. Maybe some of them didn't come out as directly as others but I don't think that there is one of those presentations would disagree with us, and I am sure that the whole

(MR. TANCHAK cont'd) . . . province feels the same way, maybe with the exception of the government; they may not feel the same way. I think it is quite a reasonable request that we do it in stages and I may say the government, although in a niggardly fashion, started it this year only by five percent and we've asked them to increase it by ten, and maybe that's the right approach. Do it in steps. And that's what was mentioned or suggested in the committee today. Do it in steps. In three years we'll reach the ultimate objective, and I hope that the Minister considers this very seriously and I hope that he accepts this resolution.

MR. SPEAKER: We're dealing with the motion of the Honourable Member for Rhineland, seconded by the Honourable Member for Inkster.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motion
Introduction of Bills
Orders of the Day

HON. WALTER WEIR (Premier) (Minnedosa): Mr. Speaker, before we approach the Orders of the Day I might just take a moment and advise the House that it is with great regret that we formally received notification of the death of one of Manitoba's most illustrious servants, the Honourable John Bracken. Mr. Bracken had the longest tenure of any Premier in the Province of Manitoba for over twenty years, from August of 1922 until January of 1943. He was elected to the Legislature in 1922 representing The Pas constituency. Outside of acknowledging it at this time and expressing our regrets to the family, we'll have an opportunity at a later date to present the traditional message of condolence, but I thought with the death occurring this morning that it would be a good opportunity to recognize it in this form and we will have an opportunity at a later date of proposing our traditional motion.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I thank the Minister for informing the House and I recognize that there will be a formal motion at a later date. I will reserve my main comments for then. I want to associate my group, obviously, with his statement of regret on this occasion. He was indeed an outstanding Manitoban.

MR. PAULLEY: May I add the same, Mr. Speaker, and it will be our intention to pay a formal tribute to the late Honourable John Bracken at the appropriate time.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I would also like to associate myself with the remarks made by the Honourable the First Minister at this time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. BEN HANUSCHAK (Burrows): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Honourable the Minister of Labour. Is it his intention or has he initiated an investigation into the fire on the site of The Pas bridge?

HON. CHARLES H. WITNEY (Minister of Labour) (Flin Flon): Mr. Speaker, yes, there is a gas inspector has gone to The Pas. He's there now. A fire inspector has gone and the Workmen's Compensation Board have sent a man across from Gillam. They are on the site at the present time.

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

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my question to the Honourable the Minister of Health. Is it the intention, Mr. Minister, to require the hospitals to continue with the operation of the out-patient department after April 1st when Medicare comes in?

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Health and Social Services) (Gimli): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would expect that in every way. I just wondered what the honourable member was thinking of.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I'm thinking, first of all, that if it is the intention of the Minister to have hospitals continue with the operation of these out-patient departments, my next question was to be: when will the Minister forward his directive and information to the hospitals to enable them to be ready for April 1st?

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, I believe the honourable member is referring to a most important aspect of the negotiations with respect to the University people for the continued preservation of the teaching in our outdoor facilities, and I believe that -- the matter just really crystallized in the last couple of days, that this is one of the big problems in bringing in this huge program and I intend to bring -- put it this way -- a measure before you that will assure this preservation of our teaching facilities.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, a subsequent question. Is it the intention, then, of the

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd) . . . government and the Minister to propose an amendment that might make it possible for doctors opting out, ordinarily opting out, to be considered as working within the plan when dealing with the out-patient department and teaching hospitals.

MR. JOHNSON: This could well be, Mr. Speaker. I'm not trying to be evasive. I just want to have the measure before you as shortly as possible.

MR. DESJARDINS: This will be my last question, Mr. Speaker. The only reason why I mentioned this today is because April 1st is coming fairly soon and I hope that we will have something soon.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

MR. SAMUEL USKIW (Brokenhead): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister of Agriculture can tell us what is happening on the wheat scene today? Has he been in touch with his Ottawa people on the whole question of wheat prices?

HON. J. DOUGLAS WATT (Minister of Agriculture) (Arthur): Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm really not in a position to say what the wheat situation is today or to indicate any more to the House than what they know themselves at the moment. The wheat situation is deplorable in Canada right now. My honourable friend is quite aware of that, as I am. But insofar as Ottawa is concerned, I've had a lengthy discussion of the situation with Mr. Pepin and he doesn't know any more what's going to happen than I do. He has indicated to me, and this is the position I take, that it may be the lesser of the two evils, the step that the Federal Government have taken in respect to the sale of our wheat. We hope that it will turn out for the best for farmers of Western Canada but I should indicate here, Mr. Speaker, that in my opinion that our grain could be sold for less today than what it has been sold in the past and still not reduce the net gain to the farmers of Western Canada, because we have been holding in store wheat for as much as from one to two and three and sometimes more than three years, and we are paying interest at the rate of anywhere from eight to ten or twelve percent interest and it may not necessarily mean that we will be taking less money for our wheat. But until we find out what all the ramifications are of the move that the Federal Government has taken, I'm not prepared to comment on it any further.

MR. USKIW: A subsequent question, Mr. Speaker. Is the Minister not undertaking any action, that is to bring pressure to bear on the Federal Government as to what the possible solutions may be?

MR. WATT: I don't think that anybody can come up with positive solutions until we know what the problem is going to be as a result of the action of the Federal Government.

MR. USKIW: . . . clarify my point. I'm wondering whether or not the Minister has taken the initiative in suggesting to the Government of Canada that they provide the guarantee to the producers that they will not be losers in the reduction of the wheat prices, that the Government of Canada will be prepared to meet the balance.

MR. WATT: Mr. Speaker, I'm not prepared to support subsidy to the western farmers insofar as the grain farmer is concerned until I find out if it's necessary.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. DOUGLAS CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Honourable the First Minister. Quite a few days ago I asked him a question with regard to placing before the members of the House the written copies of briefs of the Government of Manitoba at the recently held Constitutional Conference. I asked at that time also - and by the way, two briefs have been placed before us in that regard - but in addition I asked if there had been a verbatim transcript of all the proceedings at the conference and if it could be made available to the members of the House. I understood my honourable friend the First Minister to say that he would be checking on that recently, or subsequently. I understand that he's been in Ottawa although his time wasn't all taken up with the Federal Government. I was wondering if he was in a position to give us an answer now as to the availability of the material of the conference.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, yes, there have been two of the Manitoba briefs laid on the desk. There's one more to follow which should be along probably today or tomorrow, and in terms of the transcript I haven't yet got the answer. I've had some staff checking it out. It may be in my office but as the honourable member mentioned the last day or so I haven't been in there very much, and whether the information is sitting on my desk or not I don't know. I'll transmit it to the House as soon as I have it.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. I am sure my honourable

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd) friend would recognize that if it could be made available it would be very helpful when we reach a certain resolution that is now on the Order Paper. That's the reason for my anxiety in the matter.

MR. WEIR: Well, Mr. Speaker, we do have a few very limited copies in terms of working papers of unedited — many many errors in them, but to my knowledge they're all being used by people who are preparing the Manitoba position for future conferences and it's a large book that we're trying to get our hands on and to find out what the situation is in that regard.

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

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Health. I'm informed that the Manitoba Chambers of Commerce, who had a meeting in Winnipeg yesterday, invited the government to have a representative present on a panel to discuss Medicare, and one didn't show up. Could he indicate why there was no representative to discuss the Medicare plan from the government's standpoint?

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, they wanted the Minister there. I 'phoned the Chamber and informed them that my job was in this House at 2:30 in the afternoon, I was not able to take part in that debate. The debate was concerning whether or not we should enter Medicare. I suggested that my presence was probably in this public forum at that time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Honourable the Minister of Consumer Affairs. The Globe and Mail reports — I imagine it includes him — the prairie representatives or representatives of prairie governments urging Mr. Basford to take strong steps to combat misleading advertising and to see that there is better labelling on products sold in Canada. Is this notice of the fact, Mr. Speaker, that our Minister does not intend to deal with legislation governing this matter?

HON. J. B. CARROLL (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs) (The Pas): Mr. Speaker, this is a matter that's within the area of responsibility of the Government of Canada and we're very happy that they are taking steps to strengthen the laws dealing with advertising and labelling and truths in packaging and things of that kind, and we thoroughly support their action in this regard, or their proposed action in this regard.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MOLGAT: I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Transport. Can he advise the House whether he's received as yet the report of the Royal Commission on Northern Transportation?

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN, Q.C. (Minister of Transportation) (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, it's not been received.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, is the honourable member aware that the author of that report apparently is leaving the province. Is it likely that we will obtain the report before his departure?

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Speaker, I wouldn't like to speculate about that but I'm sure that the departure of the Commissioner will not in any way affect the orderly completion and receipt of his report.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question again to my honourable friend the Attorney-General. You will recall that yesterday I asked him whether or not the \$1,425 in fines that were paid by the denturists went to the Dental Association. Today I would like to ask him whether or not the \$1,425 went to the Provincial Treasury, or the Consolidated Fund.

MR. LYON: My honourable friend, Mr. Speaker, will recall that when he asked the question yesterday I answered that it was not an appropriate one to be asked on the Orders of the Day because it requested a legal opinion, which I don't have, and even if I had it I wouldn't give it to my honourable friend because it's improper to ask it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture. Some days ago I requested whether he could supply information with regard to the total production of fertilizer and fertilizer exported, and he couldn't give the answer at that time. I wonder if that information is available.

MR. WATT: No, I'm sorry. I haven't got the answer to that question yet but I hope to shortly.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie. The Honourable the Minister of Finance.

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Finance) (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, I find that I am not able to support this motion. Correspondence between the Government and Manitoba Hydro is privileged and the Government is not able to support the motion at this time.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I understand that this is a debatable motion and now that it has been rejected by the Minister may I express my keen disappointment at the attitude of the government in rejecting the motion which asks for copies of correspondence between the Government of Manitoba and Manitoba Hydro with respect to the Nelson River hydro-electric power development.

I think, Mr. Speaker, it can be fairly said that in this particular circumstance the question of the tabling of the correspondence between the government and one of its agencies is so vital and goes beyond the norm for the tabling of correspondence because it deals with an area of supreme importance to Manitoba in many respects. It deals with the matter of the expansion of hydro-electric facilities and energies in Manitoba. It also deals with the probability or the possibility of depriving a large area in Manitoba and the people of that particular area of their livelihood. It deals with the question of changing the physical structure of a large portion of our province.

We have had or seen reports in the local news emanating from officials of Manitoba Hydro, suggesting that the original program of Manitoba Hydro as enunciated by the former Premier of this province, the Honourable Duff Roblin, in 1965, that that program has been changed, that it was not a locked in or a built in program as far as Manitoba Hydro is concerned. The announcement of the expansion on the Nelson was made in this House by the Premier. I have yet to hear from the government of the curtailment of the plans that were announced at that time but we have heard them from officials of Manitoba Hydro. I think it would be interesting to know the basis on which the reports were made, and I am sure that if the government would table the correspondence, we would be able to get this information. Also involved, I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, in the correspondence, which if tabled by the government, as indeed I think it should be, we may be able to ascertain some of the basis of the change in plans and also we may have revealed to us some of the reports as to reasons for changes in decision that came from advisors to Hydro and through Hydro to this government. I regret very, very much that it appears that the government is hiding behind parliamentary technicalities in this case, because the whole matter respecting the development of the Nelson River has caused fears and apprehensions right across the length and breadth of our province and has caused misgivings with our people. Why cannot the government be open, aboveboard, and reveal to all and sundry the correspondence requested in this order, or this address for papers. I heard my honourable friend mumble. -- (Interjection) -- Because it's privileged. My honourable friend, Mr. Speaker, the Attorney-General says, "because it is privileged." I say privileged to whom? Surely it is a privilege of the people of Manitoba, in respect of this important development . . .

MR. LYON: . . . the word and the manner in which it's intended, privileged correspondence . . .

MR. PAULLEY: My honourable friend is chirping away once again.

MR. LYON: Just trying to educate you again.

MR. PAULLEY: I suggest to my honourable friend the Attorney-General, Mr. Speaker, that where the people of Manitoba are so concerned, as indeed they are, over this matter, it is a privilege or should be their privilege - the people - to have revealed to them the full story behind the Nelson and the development there. Heavens to Betsy, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources set up a commission to hear facts and propositions respecting this matter, and when it appeared as though some of the facts that were emanating from that hearing were being unfavourable to the government, the hearing ended and the government changed its plan, and we will be in due course considering in this Assembly, legislation dealing with Southern Indian Lake, which is different than this. But I say, Mr. Speaker, the Government of Manitoba in refusing this Order, this Address for Papers, the government is letting Manitoba and Manitobans down. It seems to be hiding behind the skirts of so-called privileged documents, and I regret it very, very much. I do want to appeal to the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer to change his mind and let's have a full revealing of all of the

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) circumstances, all of the correspondence dealing with this important matter.

I repeat once again, Mr. Speaker, in 1965 or thereabouts, three or four inch headlines in our local press media of the great development that is to take place in the north. Changes have been made since that time by both the government and apparently its Crown agency, and now the government hides behind a parliamentary device in refusing this correspondence on the basis it's, the Honourable the Attorney-General says, privileged information. Only privileged, I would suggest in view of the attitude of the government, Mr. Speaker, because they fear to reveal fully the information to this House.

MR. LYON: Is my honourable friend aware of the amendment to the Public Utilities Act some three or four years ago, which requires Manitoba Hydro and the other utilities to appear before a committee of this House to answer any and all questions about any and all projects? Has my honourable friend ever been denied information from Manitoba Hydro about any aspect of their operations before that committee? So, is my honourable friend saying he can't get information from Hydro to the nth degree when they appear as a separate corporation before that committee?

MR. PAULLEY: Are you asking me?

MR. LYON: Yes, that is the question.

MR. PAULLEY: I'll answer it.

MR. LYON: Or is my honourable friend merely whining?

MR. PAULLEY: No, I want to tell my honourable friend the Attorney-General I'm not whining now and I never whine in this House.

MR. LYON: No?

MR. PAULLEY: I know my responsibilities, however, as a member of this Assembly which my honourable friend the Member for Fort Garry occasionally forgets. Of course I'm aware of the fact that Manitoba Hydro and Manitoba Telephone do appear before the Committee on Public Utilities to answer questions. But surely to goodness my honourable friend realizes and should understand the difference between the production of correspondence between the government and Hydro than simply asking questions. There is a vast difference, and I want to say to my honourable friend, if he has not forgotten, that there is no recording, unless specifically asked for, of the proceedings in the Committee on Public Utilities or any other committee outside of this House. We have to recall and recollect what transpires at our committees. So my answer to my honourable friend is yes, I know the rules of the House. I know that we have the opportunity of asking questions of the public utilities, and I do say in all fairness to the management of both Manitoba Telephone and Manitoba Hydro, that they do produce the answers. As a matter of fact, they're more productive than my honourable friends opposite are when it comes to giving us information. -- (Interjection) -- Well, thanks. I want to thank my honourable friend for asking it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, my remarks will be very brief this afternoon, but I couldn't let this order go by, when it is being refused, and not make some comments. I've noticed that whenever we deal with Crown Corporations as members of this House, that we are given the treatment of arms' length treatment, and I'm one that does object to this. I appreciate these meetings that we have in the Utility Committee where we can ask questions of the officers of the Hydro and Telephone. Surely, these are very good; and I think this should be kept on; this practice should be kept on. But when we come to situations as at the present time, where members are requesting certain information and it is denied because of the rules and because, as they state, that this is privileged information, that a certain amount of skepticism is creeping in, and you will find a certain amount of distrust, and I think this is an inherent weakness that is in effect in connection with our Crown Corporations, and I think we should find some means where we can correct this, and that this shouldn't be growing on us. I think this should be corrected while most of them are still relatively young because we see what happens in Ottawa with the Crown Corporations there, with Air Canada taking actions that the Minister doesn't even know about. I think we can have these Crown Corporations take too much power unto themselves and not be guided by Parliament or by the Legislature, as the case may be. Therefore, I do not have the answer today but I'm just wondering whether, if the Manitoba Hydro were still under the department of government whether certain information would not be available to us at the present time that is now denied. And this is the point: that we should at least be given the same

(MR. FROESE cont'd) information that we would normally get if it was a department of government.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, if no one else wishes to speak, I would like to adjourn the motion. I'll be closing the debate though.

A MEMBER: Seconded by whom?

MR. JOHNSTON: I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Carillon, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Burrows. The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, the member is not in his seat and I believe he had adjourned the debate for me in my absence, and with the approval of the House I would speak at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I intend to support the resolution that is before us. I think that nothing but good can come by having the standing committee consider the methods of sales in this particular area. I rise, however, to suggest that it might be useful for the committee to consider many other areas of sales in Manitoba. I'm thinking particularly, Mr. Speaker, of those areas where deposits or payments in advance are requested by the sales people. We've had some difficulties, for example, with some of the so-called vocational schools. I'm not, obviously, speaking here of government schools but of the private type of school where an individual has to pay in advance for a course, and in some cases the course never materializes. I understand that in other areas, for example in the case of the dancing studios, that there are difficulties as well, where someone is urged to take on a series of lessons, to pay for the whole of the course and then if the individuals who are behind the venture are not solid enough financially, it may turn out that half way through they are out of funds and the course isn't produced.

Some years ago, the House debated the question of prepaid funerals, for example. It was agreed, after the sales had been going on in Manitoba for some time and some difficulties unfortunately had arisen, it was agreed that in these areas there would have to be some funding and guarantees that the service would, in fact, be produced when the purchaser called for it, which could be, in this particular case, some years after the purchase quite obviously. And I simply rise, Mr. Speaker, to suggest that it might be useful for the committee to consider all those areas of sales where there is in fact a request in the initial stages for prepayment or for the rendering of the service over a period of time, to ensure that there be adequate safeguards for the purchaser, whether it be by an insurance structure or by a funding, as we did in the case of prepaid funerals; in other words, to guarantee that the purchaser isn't simply caught in some cases with very substantial amounts of money and no guarantee that the service will in fact be provided.

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

MR. WALLY McKENZIE (Roblin): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from St. Matthews, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for St. John's, the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Selkirk in amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. MOLGAT: If he's not -- could the matter be -- if some one else wishes to speak, we have no objection. Or could it be allowed to stand in his absence.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed? The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks, standing in my name. I would remind the House that objection was raised as to the permissibility of proceeding with the proposed resolution. Having taken this under advisement, I am of the opinion that, in view of the statement quoted as made by the Premier prior to the by-elections held February 20th, and the statement of the Minister of Transport on Friday, March 5th, in reply to a question of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia, and in particular the statement of the Honourable the Minister of Finance Tuesday evening, for the record I'd like to quote what transpired on March 5th, Hansard page 104, March 5th:

"THE HONOURABLE MEMBER FOR ASSINIBOIA: Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Transportation. Two days before the by-elections the government increased provincial assistance to the Metro Transit System. I see no reference to it in

(MR. SPEAKER cont'd) . . . the Throne Speech and I wonder if legislation is going to be brought down this Session in respect to assistance to transportation. And my second part of the question is, will the same consideration be given to other transit systems in the province?"

"THE HONOURABLE STEWART McLEAN, (Minister of Transportation): Mr. Speaker, legislation on that matter will come forward from the Minister of Municipal Affairs since it is one of the Acts under his jurisdiction, and the legislation will apply to all publicly - owned transit systems in Manitoba."

Also an item was included in the estimates of the Department of Transportation which was recently passed. My thinking suggests that the discussion on this subject would be more timely and beneficial in its rightful place at the time of the consideration of the legislation alluded to in the statement of the Honourable Minister of Transportation and that of the Minister of Finance. As a consequence, I rule the resolution out of order.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I realize that it is not permissible to debate your ruling, but I would like to ask, if I may, did you consider Item (b) on this resolution?

MR. SPEAKER: That was -- I appreciate the opinion brought up by the Leader of the New Democratic Party. That was my problem, but at the same time in my thinking of the whole situation and what has gone before in matters such as this, I felt that I must come forward with a ruling, which I have just brought before the House.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, in all due respect to your office, I very regretfully challenge your ruling.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members. The question before the House: shall the Chair be sustained.

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

YEAS: Messrs. Baizley, Barkman, Bjornson, Campbell, Carroll, Claydon, Cowan, Craik, Dawson, Desjardins, Dow, Einarson, Enns, Evans, Froese, Graham, Guttormson, Hamilton, Hillhouse, Johnson, Johnston, Jorgenson, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McGregor, McKellar, McKenzie, McLean, Masniuk, Molgat, Patrick, Shoemaker, Stanes, Steen, Tanchak, Vielfaure, Watt, Weir, Witney and Mesdames Forbes and Morrison.

NAYS: Messrs. Cherniack, Fox, Green, Hanuschak, Harris, Kawchuk, Miller, Paulley and Uskiw.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 42; Nays, 9.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost.

Adjourned debate. The Honourable Member for Inkster. The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON (Rock Lake): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave of the House to have this matter stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have leave? (Agreed)

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, just for the record, it should be indicated, I believe you said that the motion was lost -- I believe the motion was carried. That the Speaker be sustained. That motion was carried.

MR. SPEAKER: It's always a nervous moment. The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member is not present.

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

MR. PETER FOX (Kildonan): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Burrows,

WHEREAS the minimum wage and its application have been the subject of much discussion, debate and dissension; and

WHEREAS the existing criteria or terms of reference used by the Minimum Wage Board to determine minimum wages are not in keeping with the objectives of Manitoba for the well-being of its citizens; and

WHEREAS the cost of living is continually changing and the Minimum Wage Board has no specific guide lines on how often it is to recommend its submission to the Government;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the criteria for establishment of a minimum wage be such as would provide an individual with an income sufficient to meet normal living conditions consistent with the standard of shelter, food, health, education, recreation and such other amenities of life as are considered basic to the enjoyment of life in Manitoba; and

(MR. FOX cont'd)

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Board be required to

- (1) Report to the Minister when conditions warrant such report but at least annually and/or before March 31st for the period ending 31st of December previous;
- (2) The report of the Board shall be submitted to the Legislature if it is then in session; if not, at least at the next session thereof.

MR. SPEAKER: I hesitate to remind the honourable members again, but a moment ago the Honourable Member for Kildonan was addressing the Chair and there was considerable conversation and considerable moving around by the members, all of which, as you all know, is against the rules of the House. I would ask for a little more attention to that matter.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

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

MR. FOX: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I did not think you were in that much of a hurry that you wouldn't allow me a few minutes to at least discourse on the resolution. We spoke on this resolution last year, Mr. Speaker, and there was very little debate from the government. The only thing we got out of the Minister of Labour at that time was that we weren't discussing a fair wage or an equitable wage, we were discussing a minimum. Well, Mr. Speaker, we have a new Minister and with the new Minister I hope we may have a little more success than with the previous one. Possibly a new broom may sweep cleaner and he may have a little more sympathy with regard to the minimum wage.

Minimum wages are one way of raising the people out of poverty. Many people like to work, but nevertheless they find themselves, that even while they are employed they are just not able to make ends meet and consequently they sink farther and farther into poverty and eventually they become a burden on the rest of us through taxes, because we have to support them in other ways.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is not a very difficult resolution. The Minister the other day, the Minister of Labour when he was speaking, was referring to the ILO and the wonderful work it was doing. Well, one of the recommendations out of the ILO was concerning employment policy, and this is an excerpt I shall read into the record: "Fundamentally one of the objectives of the ILO which Canada is signatory to, was that all human beings irrespective of race, creed or sex have the right to pursue both their material well-being and their spiritual development in conditions of freedom and dignity, of economic security and equal opportunity."

Now this is a very high-sounding objective, Mr. Speaker, and I do not expect the government to be able to come up with a criteria which would fit this, although I would imagine they would probably strive to do so. Now the present criteria that we have in the Employment Standards Act are very spare and very sparse. Let me just read them to you. It says: "A Board, in settling the recommendation it makes to the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, shall take into consideration and be guided by the cost to an employee of purchasing the necessities of life and health." For purchasing the necessities of life and health. I wonder, Mr. Chairman, what the Manitoba government thinks the necessities are; what kind of criteria it would like to establish. Will the \$1.25 that we have at the present time buy those? I'm not certain, but I do think it's worthwhile taking a look at to see whether we can't come up with some better criteria than we have at the present time. Purchasing the necessities of life and health may just mean some bread and water and a pallet to sleep on and nothing more. Of course we could go all the way around to the other extreme and include a Cadillac and a big mansion and all the sumptuous living and eating that you could imagine, but no-one wants that. But we do want something that is equitable.

I should like to say this, that Manitoba is putting on a real big drive about "Going into '70." I'd like to know at what speed we are going into '70 and in what kind of condition the people that are at the bottom of the economic ladder are going to enjoy life in '70. I think we can improve that. All the government has to do is sit and have a good look at the criteria it wants to evolve so that we can have something substantial to work with.

The Minimum Wage Board at the present time, the way it is set up, is composed of two parties plus a chairman, management side and the employees' side, and of course the chairman is supposed to be an impartial person. Well, I'm of the opinion, Mr. Speaker, that this hasn't worked out too well. Nevertheless, this is the way this government wants to operate, but this board in its duties goes from one end of the province to the other trying to determine what the minimum wage should be. It gets representations from all kinds of people, but the one basic

(MR. FOX cont'd) thing that has been lacking is that it has not been getting representation from the people who are working for the minimum wage, primarily because those people have to work almost night and day to exist at that wage level so they haven't got time to take off to make a presentation before the board. Usually those people are also deprived of an education that would make it feasible for them to make an adequate representation. They also don't have the facilities with which to hire expert counsel for it to represent them so therefore they are very seldom heard. The other people who are making representation either have a vested interest or else are those who are there in a professional capacity, but they really do not understand or live under those conditions so they really can't express reasons why the minimum wage should be more or less. The employers have a vested interest when they appear before that board. Every time they can deny a person an increase to keeping the minimum wage at what it is, it means that much more money in their pockets, and I feel for one, Mr. Chairman, that this government must take a good look at improving the standard of those people who are at the bottom of the economic ladder. They must have someone to champion their cause and this is what government is supposed to do.

Now, some people would argue that if we raise the minimum wage it's going to put some of the employers in a difficult position. This may be true, but I think they would probably be in a difficult position whether the minimum wage was at whatever figure we had it because more than likely these people are operating their plants very inefficiently, and I do not believe that it should be the prerogative of the people employed by them to subsidize an inefficient employer. Someone has to make these people become aware of their responsibilities to society to make themselves more efficient.

Mr. Speaker, there is one other aspect in regards to raising the minimum wage and that is that it raises the economic output of this province, and this is one of the things that we discussed under the Minister's Labour estimates, that when it came to -- and I won't quote the figures again because there's no purpose to it, but nevertheless it's an evident fact that Manitoba is at the bottom of all the provinces, outside of the Maritimes, when it comes to the average wage and salary on a weekly basis or on any other industrial base that we want to discuss it.

The Minister did mention that -- we were referring to Winnipeg at that time -- but Mr. Chairman, we've got to take Winnipeg in the context of what it is. It's one of the fourth largest metropolitan centres in Canada and nevertheless it finds itself -- all right, the Minister's shaking his head. Maybe it's the fifth; it's slipping behind like all of Manitoba's been doing for some time. But nevertheless it was at 37th or 38th level in regard to all other centres of comparable size, and this is a disgrace for Winnipeg as well as for Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to for a moment discuss what has been achieved through the Minimum Wage Board and when it went around in its determination to find out what the minimum wage should be. I know that the last time there was a minority report by the Minimum Wage Board because they couldn't agree, and I'd like to speak on this aspect of it as well for a moment. To begin with, when you have two parties who have completely opposite point of view in regards to the contention that is before them, you will very seldom get an agreement or a consensus as to what they should arrive at. Consequently, the chairman has to make the final decision, and therefore you're really putting one person in the position of having to determine what to do in regard to minimum wages, and of course any other board that is in this category of having two opposing parties and a chairman who makes the final decision. And this brings up the fact why I really want to bring it before this House, that we have to look at the criteria and establish a broader base for them so that the person will be guided by some concrete proposals with which to work.

Now the other aspect of the last report, the minority report of the Minimum Wage Board, was they suggested that minimum wages should accomplish a number of things. One of them was the reduction of poverty resulting from substandard wages. The other one was the elimination of unfair wage competition of unscrupulous employers; and the third was the maintenance of buying power necessary to sustain employment, and I think I touched on all of those previously, Mr. Speaker. Further to that, Mr. Speaker, I was happy to see that for a change there wasn't unanimity. You know, it is really in a sense a form of blackmail when a chairman says that a board must have a unanimous report, otherwise he won't report it. This time, one group of the board decided that they would not go along with this kind of coercion and they did put in a minority report, and therefore we are able to find out that everyone is not in agreement with the way we have been setting the minimum wage.

(MR. FOX cont'd.)

The second part of my resolution, Mr. Speaker, deals with the frequency that the Minimum Wage Board should report. Now, as you are all aware, and I'm certain I don't have to mention it to anyone, the cost of living is rising continually. There is no way of holding it back and I don't think we should if we can keep the wages in comparison. As long as people have the purchasing power, then the costs can rise but if the purchasing power slips behind, then we are in difficulty. And apparently here in Manitoba we're having that difficulty. Some people have at least the opportunity to negotiate and raise their economic purchasing power, but the people who are working at the minimum wage level have no one to do this for them so therefore the criteria should be such which would take care of this contingency. The other thing is that we should have a report from the board more frequently in order to keep the thing in line with the cost of living.

Now many of the people who have negotiating power write in escalator clauses which keeps them in touch with the cost of living as it rises. This may be one of the criteria that the government may consider when it thinks about altering the criteria for the minimum wage. If not, then possibly it should really consider what is said in the resolution and this is where I come to my second part of the resolution, Mr. Speaker: 1. Report to the Minister when conditions warrant such report, but at least annually and/or before March 31st for the period ending the 31st of December previous; and 2. the report of the Board shall be submitted to the Legislature if it is then in session; if not, at least at the next session thereof. Because I think that if the Board does not do this, Mr. Chairman, time goes by and these people just have no means of keeping their standards up. It deteriorates continually and, as was recently asked of the Minister of Labour, "When is the Minimum Wage Board going to report?" he replied in the negative. Here we have a prime example of where these people are losing purchasing power continually as the cost of living goes up and they have no way of gaining it, and the farther they go in the hole the more difficult it is for them to come back to the surface again and consequently they become a drain on our establishment, on our social order, and we have to pay more taxes for welfare and everything else.

I think this is all I wish to say at this time, Mr. Speaker, on this resolution. I do commend it to the House; it is really non-controversial; it is not asking for any fixed sum; it is just asking for the government to be a little more realistic in looking and appraising itself of the criteria for minimum wages. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. LEMUEL HARRIS (Logan): Mr. Speaker, if nobody else wishes to speak, I would move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Burrows, that debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Burrows. The Honourable Member for Burrows. No. 10.

A MEMBER: Ethelbert Plains, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MICHAEL KAWCHUK (Ethelbert Plains): If you are referring to Resolution No. 10 on Page 3 ...

MR. SPEAKER: That's right. Imagine me making that mistake. The Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains.

MR. KAWCHUK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. John's, WHEREAS the direct sale of grain from the farmer to the feed mills are undermining the Wheat Board quota system and the price of grain;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this House request the Federal Government to pass necessary legislation requiring feed mills to purchase all cereal grains from the Canadian Wheat Board with provision to offset freight charges to the Lakehead.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. KAWCHUK: Perhaps it might be appropriate to say a few words at this time, Mr. Speaker. As you probably will recall, we had a similar resolution last year that somehow or other the members of this Assembly did not see fit to support and consequently was lost. However, I think before I go into the history of how it came about that the feed mills were exempt from the Canadian Wheat Board, it might be interesting to know that last year there were some 5 million bushels of grain that was exempt from the Wheat Board and found its way through various channels to the feed companies, and that, Mr. Speaker, was one of the reasons that our quota system this year is considerably lower than it otherwise had been had the feed mills not

(MR. KAWCHUK cont'd.) had this privilege.

I can vividly remember in 1960 - I believe the date was February 12 - when the Federal Government first announced its intention of exempting the feed mills from the Wheat Board jurisdiction. There was a mass gathering of farmers at the Marlborough Hotel. If I recall correctly, there must have been some 600 farmers from the Province of Manitoba as well as farmers from Saskatchewan and Alberta, and at that time the Minister of Agriculture, I believe it was the Honourable Mr. Harkness, had indicated to the farmers that this move was made on a temporary basis; if the farmers felt that this was to their disadvantage the Government of Canada would reconsider its position.

However, needless to say, Mr. Speaker, that has not occurred as had been promised by the then Conservative Government of Canada. And I suspect, Mr. Speaker, that that was one of the reasons that the Conservative Government lost its popularity at the polls in the federal election of '62. That's my personal view.

However, it is interesting to note that in 1960, when this legislation first was enacted, there were some 5 million bushels sold to the various feed companies, or grain that had moved through various channels into the feed mills, and in 1968 this volume had increased by seven times or, in other words, the volume that was sold to feed mills directly was 35 million bushels. And I can appreciate the stand that my honourable friend the Member for Gladstone took the other day, that the farmers are in dire need of cash to cope with their bills and the like of that, and they want to sell as much grain to the feed mills as they possibly can to obtain some badly needed hard cash to satisfy their suppliers, but I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the total volume of grain fed in Western Canada is not altered by the fact that the feed mills can buy directly from the farmers or if they had to buy it from the Canadian Wheat Board. So, in essence, what is really happening is the farmer is undermining himself by selling it to the feed mills.

It was interesting to learn during the by-election campaign in the constituency of Birtle-Russell, I learned that the feed mills were buying oats for as low as 25 cents per bushel. Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm sure all the farmers in this House will readily agree that that is somewhat below the cost of production. It was even more interesting to find out that the places that they were buying these oats from, or the farmers they were buying the oats from were the farmers who had commitments to make or payments to make to finance companies, and somehow or other, probably by sheer coincidence, wherever there was a farmer who was just on the verge of having to make a payment to a finance company, all of a sudden by sheer accident a buyer from the feed company would appear in his yard and say, "Well, we can probably buy some feed grain from you but at a very low price." So I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the farmer is at the disadvantage from both ends. In the first place, I think - but I can't document this evidence - that the finance companies are playing it so that the farmers are forced to sell this grain to the feed mill and the feed companies probably, by some method of collaboration, are making sure that they appear at the right yard at the right time. It would probably follow, Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that this grain is obtained so cheaply or inexpensively, that the feeds produced by these feed mills would in turn be made available to feed lot operators and farmers at a very moderate price.

However, as the facts reveal, that it was presented to us by the Manitoba Farmers Union in its annual submission to the Government of Manitoba, and this release took place on February 21st and I'm referring to now the figures and charts presented on page 3, it is interesting to note that while the price to the farmer for his feed grains decreased considerably - take for example, in 1965 the price paid to the farmer for a bushel of oats was 55 cents, in 1968 the price paid to the farmer was only 35 cents - however, during the same period of time, although the price of oats decreased 20 cents per bushel, the cost per ton of feed increased \$4.00. It sold for \$84.00 per ton in 1966 while in 1968 the retail price per ton of feed was \$88.40, an increase of \$4.40. So, by that token of reasoning, the farmer really gained nothing. He sold his grain at a drastically reduced price and yet had to pay more per ton of feed. So it is obvious who has been making the profit in this particular case.

So I submit, Mr. Speaker, that it is probably one of the reasons why appropriate legislation has not come about to remove these exemptions enjoyed by the feed mills. And by sheer coincidence, Mr. Speaker, the feed mills are now going into vertical integration insofar as hog marketing is concerned, and I notice by a newspaper clipping that the president of the National Grain Company has indicated that they are starting up in B. C. with a huge hog operation, and I think it's anticipated that they will produce about 24,000 marketable hogs a year and they --

(MR. KAWCHUK cont'd.) in B. C. they presently market 70,000. So, in essence, the National Grain Company will be supplying one third of the hogs that are now produced in B. C. and consumed there.

So, Mr. Speaker, I hope I have made it abundantly clear just what is happening here. This grain is being bought at a drastically reduced price from the farmers and converted into feed and shipped out of the provinces into feed lot operators' hands, which is in turn , however, the price that the finished product is at has not reduced considerably. And I submit for that reason, Mr. Speaker, that it is high time that we appealed to the federal authorities that these exemptions be removed and that the farmer, like any other businessman, enjoy a fair return for his finished product.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. WARNER JORGENSEN (Morris): I should like to ask the honourable member a question. I'd like to know if he would be opposed to the removal of the freedom of farmer to farmer sales that exist at the present time, or that existed before the change in regulations took place. Is he opposed to that type of transaction as well?

MR. KAWCHUK: Mr. Speaker, I have no objections to the transactions which take place between farmer to farmer if it only pertains to seed. However, I think that the feed proportion should be applicable the same to the farmer as it is to the feed mills.

MR. JORGENSEN: how this sort of thing can be policed?

MR. KAWCHUK: Well, Mr. Speaker, if I may inform my honourable friend from Morris, and I'm positive he need not be informed because he was at the right place at the right time and I had a great respect for the honourable friend when he was in the Farm Union Movement. He had a very good mind at that time to speak on behalf of the farmers. Somehow after he got elected that's slightly tapered off. But I would like to point out to my friend that the feed, or the coarse grains, were under the jurisdiction of the Wheat Board for some eleven years from the period of 1949 to 1960, and there was no problem at all with respect to farmer to farmer sales at that time. So I foresee no reason to be worried about it this time.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, I'm not worried about it, I was just asking the honourable member a question. I should like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet, that the debate be adjourned.

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

. continued on next page

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

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether members of the House are at all acquainted with the subject matter before them, but I'm going to move, seconded by the member for Inkster, that

WHEREAS grain farmers have suffered severe income losses due to lower grain prices of the last few years; and

WHEREAS costs of production continue to climb each year; and

WHEREAS costs of harvesting the 1968 crop were unreasonably high due to wet conditions; and

WHEREAS the prices of 1968 grains are very low due to its poor quality and moisture conditions;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Government of Manitoba consider the advisability of entering into a cost sharing agreement with the Government of Canada to provide financial assistance to grain producers to cover costs of grain drying.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

MR. USKIW: As I said a moment ago, Mr. Speaker, I'm probably quite sure that members of the Legislature are fully familiar with the subject matter, but I want to simply point out that there are glaring things that we have not taken a good look at. I want to point out that although the prairie farmers of Canada have had a very severe setback last year due to the weather conditions, that although this has occurred, neither the federal or provincial governments have seen fit to undertake some program by which means some of the economic setback to the producers could be alleviated.

I want to illustrate, Mr. Speaker, that Ottawa - the Federal Government in its budget of this year, has reduced expenditures in the Department of Agriculture, and that if this report is correct, agriculture expenditures will reduce from \$255,798,775 to \$250,823,000, Mr. Speaker. In a year where we have a crisis in agriculture, Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government reduces their budget for agriculture by some \$5 million, and I want to point out to you, Mr. Speaker, that it's my opinion - and I would hope the opinion of members present - that the opposite should have been the case, that the Government of Canada should have undertaken, in concert with the provinces, some program whereby the grain producers of the three prairie provinces would have received some financial assistance to cover the costs of drying their grain.

The Saskatchewan Farmers Union estimated some time ago - and I have a clipping here - where it states that the estimate of the cost of drying grain on the prairies will be somewhat in the neighbourhood of \$70 million. And I want to ask the members here whether they think it's reasonable to expect the producers alone to take a \$70 million kick in the pants, Mr. Speaker, because that's what it amounts to, a \$70 million economic setback for the producers, or whether or not the country as a whole should have approached the problem on the basis of it being a national problem, a national crisis in the agricultural industry, because this is, Mr. Speaker, my opinion, that it should be considered as such, that it is a national problem and that it should have been treated as such. The Provincial Government had a definite responsibility, and if indeed the Federal Government didn't recognize its responsibility, the Provincial Government should have taken the onus on themselves and reminded their federal counterpart as to what the situation really is and what should be done about it.

The other day the Premier of this province, the Leader of the Opposition and the Leader of our Party, went to Ottawa to make representation to the Defence Department about the future of the Rivers base, Mr. Speaker. The reason they went there is because they continued to take the position that the loss of that base would be a severe economic setback to the Province of Manitoba, and we must do all things possible to make sure that the economy of Manitoba does not suffer. So regardless of what the price is, we must somehow try to continue the operations at Rivers. And, Mr. Speaker, the Premier mentioned to the province that that was a \$6 million economic package as far as Manitoba was concerned; that is the benefit, the sum total of economic input into Manitoba. Now, Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that members here will recognize that Manitoba is losing a great deal more than \$6 million in the monies that have to be outlayed by the producers of our grains in Manitoba, that we are losing more economically than we would lose if we lost the Rivers Air Base, but yet I don't see any activity

(MR. USKIW Cont'd.)... on the part of the government side, I don't see the government of Manitoba taking the message to Ottawa that something ought to be done. Somehow, agriculture isn't that important in the minds of my friends opposite, and I can't for the life of me understand that type of rationalization.

The Federal Government, a few months ago, introduced extended cash advance payments to farmers to cover the cost of drying grain. The Federal Government introduced cash advances - this was a loan, an interest-free loan that is to be repaid by July 31st next, Mr. Speaker, a short term credit facility to cover the cost of drying grain. Now, let's examine what they really did, Mr. Speaker, because I'm sure that we did not thoroughly examine our position in this respect. They provided that the farmer may borrow 10 cents a bushel as per six bushels per acre to cover the cost of drying grain, which means that in essence the farmer could borrow 60 cents an acre as per six acres -- not six acres, Mr. Speaker, 60 cents an acre for the cost of drying grain. His actual cost, Mr. Speaker, based on a 30 bushel per acre yield and based on approximately 20 cent a bushel cost for drying, is \$6.00 an acre.

So here we have, Mr. Speaker, the Federal Parliament, spending untold hours in debate, making a provision that farmers could borrow 60 cents an acre, but recognizing that it actually will cost them \$6.00 an acre to dry their grain, basing that on an average of a 30 bushel crop. What kind of nonsense is it, Mr. Speaker? And it is nonsense! That kind of provision is meaningless; it doesn't approach the problem at all. If you take for example a 200 acre producer with a yield of 30 bushels per acre, we know that he will have 6,000 bushels. Mr. Speaker, his cash advance would be \$120.00 They would borrow him \$120 to dry 6,000 bushels of grain, but his costs, Mr. Speaker, would be \$1,200. Nonsense - absolute nonsense - and this government, Mr. Speaker, has done nothing to draw to the attention of their federal counterparts what the proposal should have been and what we should be doing for the producers in Manitoba. If you take a 500 acre producer at 30 bushels per acre, he has 15,000 bushels to dry, Mr. Speaker. His cost or his credit is \$300.00. The cash advances provide that he could borrow \$300, but his cost, Mr. Speaker, is \$3,000, and I for the life of me can't understand why our members of Parliament wasted precious time in debate in Ottawa making such meaningless provisions to try and deal with the crisis that we have before us.

And let's take the maximum, let's take the large producer, because there is a maximum of \$600 in credit for anyone that has the maximum under the regulations. A producer to qualify for the maximum amount of credit for grain drying would have to be a producer of 1,000 acres, and at a 30 bushel yield, Mr. Speaker, he would have 30,000 bushels. He can borrow \$600 to dry 30,000 bushels of grain; his cost, Mr. Speaker, is \$6,000. I still maintain, Mr. Speaker, that the whole program is meaningless and that the Federal Government did not at all attempt to deal with the problem in a meaningful way, and the Provincial Government has been negligent in not attempting to communicate the situation with Ottawa, in not calling the two other prairie provinces together and going in concert with them to Ottawa to demand some meaningful action so that we could in fact alleviate the severe situation that our farmers are facing on the prairies this year.

The farm income position, Mr. Speaker, is a bad one. I don't have to remind members of this House that prices of wheat have gone down in the last number of years. We took an 18 cent drop a year ago; the price of credit, Mr. Speaker, on a bushel of wheat is something like 14 cents if you figure an 8 percent interest rate, and that today seems to be the preferred rate. The cost of drying a bushel of wheat, Mr. Speaker, is 20 cents. I don't know how much we're going to lose in the recent price cuts at the international level, but without taking that into account, Mr. Speaker, and without taking into account the fact that we have lower grades of wheat which will not bring in the returns that we normally get for a bushel, that we are losing somewhere in the neighbourhood of 50 to 60 cents a bushel as it now appears. This is a severe economic impact, a severe reverse for our agricultural industry in Manitoba, and this government, Mr. Speaker, has not seen fit to implement any program, has not seen fit to make any recommendations to the government at Ottawa; they always say that the farmer is a tough person and somehow they will survive, Mr. Speaker.

And I want to say in that connection that I'm not one that believes in that philosophy, because I recognize that with today's high costs of production and high cost of credit, that it does not take very long for a businessman, whether he be a farmer or anyone else, Mr. Speaker, whether he be the implement dealer or the fuel dealer, it does not take very long with the high interest rates of today for a person to lose his business. We cannot continue to neglect the

(MR. USKIW Cont'd.)... agricultural industry in the way that we have in recent years, Mr. Speaker, and I charge this government with the responsibility of doing something, initiating some action to make sure that the producers of this province are given a reasonable chance to maintain themselves in business. It's important to the whole economy of Manitoba, because if you look at all the press reports you will find that your fertilizer sales are down, you will find that your implement sales are down, you will find that your other sectors of the economy are suffering, mainly because of the short cash position of our rural people, and to sit here and do nothing, Mr. Speaker, is an insult; it's an insult to the intelligence of our rural people. Thank you.

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

MR. HARRY GRAHAM (Birtle-Russell): Mr. Speaker, I would like to move that the debate on this be adjourned, seconded by the Member from Springfield.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Proposed Resolution of the Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains.

MR. KAWCHUK: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. John's, that

WHEREAS low delivery quotas create serious financial hardships to producers of cereal grains; and

WHEREAS present cash advances of farm stored grain do not meet current cash needs; and

WHEREAS recent increases in farm loan interest rates further reduce farm income;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this House request the Federal Government through the Canadian Wheat Board to purchase farm stored grain at initial prices up to a maximum of \$6,000.00 per farm regardless of delivery quotas.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains.

MR. KAWCHUK: Mr. Speaker, I do not want to burden the House this afternoon any further by making long speeches on the agricultural situation, suffice it would be to say that although I appreciate the fact that there has been an increased cash advance made available on grain stored on the farms through the Canadian Wheat Board last fall, however, I think the time has now come where we should make this \$6,000.00 available to all farmers irrespective of their acreage or the size of farm. As has been mentioned by my honourable colleague the Member for Brokenhead, the farmers are badly in need of cash at this time.

I was just driving in with an implement dealer last Monday into the city and he said his implement sales are away down from the year before, and he had been anticipating that there would be a further 25 to 30 percent reduction in the forthcoming season. And of course there are all kinds of newspaper clippings I have here which indicate the same thing. "The implement business of last year has suffered a decrease of about 22 percent across the nation and this is usually the indication of the level of prosperity in the farming communities." This is a clipping. I know that the fertilizer situation is the same. There are many farmers who have now told me that they do not even anticipate putting fertilizer in with their seed this spring because of the short cash situation, and last year many of them had increased their input, the fertilizer per acre by a considerable percentage, some of them as high as 100 percent, and this year, because of lack of cash, they will not be buying this. So all this means, Mr. Speaker, is not only will the farm community suffer but so will the urban communities in turn, and our industrial centres because of the lack of circulation of cash.

Perhaps it would be suffice to say that at this time, and I of course commend this resolution to all the members of this House and I'll have probably more to say on the closing of this motion.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. FRED T. KLYM (Springfield): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell, that the debate be adjourned.

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

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

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Seven Oaks, that

WHEREAS Canadian grain producers have been trying to compete on World Markets

(MR. USKIW Cont'd.).... without Government subsidies; and

WHEREAS other exporting countries are subsidizing their producers; and

WHEREAS the Canadian Consumers under present grain pricing policies enjoy the benefits of cheap grain and beef products; and

WHEREAS it is unfair to expect grain producers to carry the load of a cheap food policy;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this House urge the Government of Canada to institute a two-price system whereby \$3.00 a bushel on the first 2,000 bushels of wheat with corresponding cash returns for oats and barley be paid to bona fide farmers and the remainder find its own price on markets through a vigorous sales policy.

MR. SPEAKER Presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, the question before us here today, and much more important than it otherwise would have been because of recent developments at the international level, the main question before us here today is can Canadian producers of wheat, in particular, compete with other exporting countries on the basis that we have no federal support, on the basis that we have to sell our wheat in competition with other countries that are prepared to undermine the international grain arrangement of a year ago. Can our producers, Mr. Speaker, put up with that kind of competition if in fact you add to that problem the ridiculous situation with which we are faced with with our domestic consumption, and that is our domestic consumption price is tied to the international price level. We in this Party, Mr. Speaker, for a number of years, have advocated the idea of the two-price system in recognition of the fact that it is unfair to place the price of wheat on the domestic market on the same level as it is on the international market, that what we can get for the producers of this country from the international scene has very little to do with what we should be getting for our producers on the domestic market. We recognize that we have a great deal of domestic consumption in terms of the seed requirements and the feed requirements and the human consumption, and that at least for that part of our production we should be looking for a much greater return that has a meaningful relationship to the cost of production.

The Minister this afternoon suggested to me that he was not prepared at this point to suggest that we should go into a program of subsidies. I just want to illustrate to the Minister that I'm not suggesting that we subsidize the producers at all. My argument is, Mr. Speaker, that we should not continue to subsidize the consumer, that the producer should not be in the position of providing the subsidy. If we recognize the fact that we have a Canadian cost of production which bears no relationship with the price levels of grain on the international market, then we come to the conclusion that we ought to have a price for the product that is consumed in Canada at least set at a different level, and it is my suggestion, Mr. Speaker, that that level be \$3.00 a bushel for the first 2,000 bushels of wheat. It is an arbitrary figure, I recognize that, Mr. Speaker, but the figure is there for the purpose of showing that there is a need for this kind of program, that we ought to, through this kind of program, guarantee some semblance of security to our producers in the three prairie provinces.

I am not one of those that believes in wholesale subsidization of any agricultural program, as was done, Mr. Speaker, in the United States for a long time, because I recognize that it's unfair to ask the Canadian Taxpayer to support an unlimited form of subsidization, if you like, if that's the term you want to use, in the sense that people that are producing beyond their basic requirement to sustain a livelihood should not be subsidized in that portion of their production, and that is the reason, Mr. Speaker, that I have introduced a limitation, and the limitation in this resolution is a 2,000-bushel limitation that would be bringing back to the producer a higher return per bushel than that sold at the international level. And surely, Mr. Speaker, that is not too much to ask, because we recognize, Mr. Speaker, that the rural people of Canada are in a bad financial situation. We recognize that insofar as the foreign markets are concerned we are not going to look in that direction to improve their position, that we can only improve their financial position if we look at our own domestic situation in terms of wheat pricing.

I want to say that in the last six months there have been many reports suggesting to us that our primary producers are in dire financial circumstances, and it's quite frequent that we see articles in the newspaper - and I have a number of them here, I'm just going to mention them very casually - and I quote, Mr. Speaker, November of 1968, "Farmer Low Man on Income Poll, Survey Claims" - and I'm not going to go into detail. These kind of articles, Mr. Speaker, have been prominent in the last two or three months. "Bleak Prospects for Wheat

(MR. USKIW Cont'd.)... Exports" - another newspaper article. "Farmers Economic Position Deteriorated." This is the Bank of Nova Scotia. All sorts of people in our economy have been analyzing the rural picture and everyone agrees that the farmers of this country are in real trouble financially speaking, due to loss of sales, due to poor pricing and many other factors, due to high cost of production, something which is beyond their control.

So, Mr. Speaker, I say that it is the responsibility of the nation to come up with a decent food policy, to not expect the producer to continually provide for the consumers of this nation a cheap food policy strictly at their own expense. I think if we want a cheap food policy then we ought to determine ways and means of achieving it, but that it should not be that the farmer himself bear the full brunt of such a food policy of the nation. I don't think we ought to sacrifice the producer. We have had a substantial decline in the number of producers the last five to ten years, and if things continue as they are, Mr. Speaker, we are going to have rural bankruptcy on a scale which we haven't seen since the thirties. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that these are grave times for these rural people and that governments must take some action to alleviate the kind of catastrophe that we might be faced with within a short time.

A two-price system, Mr. Speaker, would ensure, at least to some extent, a reasonable price and a specific amount of production, and with that it would ensure that it would be only the true producers that would be receiving the benefit, that we would not be subsidizing the people that have corporate interests or people such as Canada Packers or Federal Grain or the like that grow a few acres of grain. We are not interested, Mr. Speaker, in this resolution to support those people, but we are interested, Mr. Speaker, in trying to ensure some stability for the farmers of this country, not only this province, and this is a meaningful way by which this Assembly, if they support the resolution, could enhance the well-being of our rural people in Manitoba. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q.C. (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, I only rise to call to the honourable member's attention the fact that his resolution says "\$3.00 a bushel on the first \$2,000.00 of wheat." I think you should amend that with the leave of the House.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I believe that must be a misprint on the part of the Queen's Printer. It's \$3.00 a bushel on the first 2,000 bushels, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: I accept that. It looks like a printer's error no doubt and it will be corrected as explained. The Honourable the Minister of Agriculture.

MR. WATT: Would the honourable member permit a couple of questions?

MR. USKIW: Yes.

MR. WATT: I'd just like to ask the honourable member, Mr. Speaker, if this subsidy-my honourable friend likes to refer to it as a two-price system, I would rather refer to it as a subsidy - does he suggest that this should be paid for by the consumer through the increase in the cost of bread, and if so would this apply to these people who live at what my honourable friends opposite like to call the poverty level?

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, it's my preference that we not increase the price of food to the consumer, and my point in this resolution was that if we have a cheap food policy, if we want to maintain such a policy, that that should not be maintained at the expense of the producer alone, that the nation should take the responsibility for that cheap food policy. It's my opinion, and it's our Party's opinion, that it is the federal treasury that could provide the difference as between the foreign price and the domestic price, and it does not have to be charged to the consumer directly.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. D. MORRIS McGREGOR (Virden): I beg leave of the House, Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Wolseley, that debate be adjourned.

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

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

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member not being here, I wonder if we could have leave to have this matter stand. The honourable member is ill.

MR. SPEAKER: (Agreed) The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Logan, that

WHEREAS it is fundamental to the process of education that the entire community

(MR. GREEN Cont'd.).... participate; and

WHEREAS the educational system in Manitoba provides for the democratic participation of citizens through their elected School Boards; and

WHEREAS there are numerous children of Indian origin who are presently attending Manitoba Public Schools whose parents are denied the right to participate either as electors or trustees; and

WHEREAS the denial of said persons to participate in the educational process weakens the whole community;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Public Schools Act be amended to allow Indians living on reservations to participate in the democratic process by being permitted to serve either as electors or school trustees.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I was astonished to learn that the present system of public schools in Manitoba is such that Indians living on reservations apparently are not permitted to serve either as school trustees nor are they permitted to vote in divisional elections. I understand that the history of this anachronism is that generally speaking, and as originally constituted, the children living on reservations attended and were expected to attend the reservation schools, and to some extent, possibly to the greater extent, that is still the case. But as of late, and as of more recent years, there has developed the practice of Indian children living on reservations to attend the public schools, and rather than them participating in the normal form of school tax assessment, what occurs is that the Department of Indian Affairs pays to the school division the amount that would normally be paid by an outside resident attending at the school - or some equivalent, I'm not sure of the exact figures - but apparently this is the scheme by which these children attend schools. The difficulty is, Mr. Speaker, that the Indian community who are thereby part of the school system become still an outside part, that is that they are not really involved in the educational system, as such, but are sending their children.

Now I think, Mr. Speaker, that it wouldn't be a valuable use of our time to go into all of the reasons as to why education must be an activity which is participated in by the whole community. I think that this Assembly, and indeed the communities right through this province, recognize that the educational system is not a system whereby there is a tutor and a student; the educational system is one in which the total community is involved, and I think more recently, especially with the announcement that the province intends to in some way restrict the leeway which is given to a local school board to increase its budget - and we haven't had exactly the mechanics of this up until now but there is an indication that the local school boards are going to have some restriction on their ability to increase their budgets and to that extent to control their own school systems - I think that the question of community participation in the schools is brought more into focus.

I happen to believe, Mr. Speaker, that the trend of school boards having less control over the budgets is one which will continue. I happen to think offhand and without giving it a great deal of thought, that that is not the negative feature that the Honourable Member for Rhineland predicts, because I think, Mr. Speaker, that the community can participate and that school boards can participate a great deal in the educational process whilst having less control of the school board budgets. I think that that's happened over the last several years and I think that it will continue to happen.

But nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, what I'm suggesting is that the question of community participation in the school boards comes into focus by virtue of that type of legislation, and I say that the question of the participation of all people in the school board comes into focus, and I think that it's the desirability, or at least it's the expressed desire of people in our community, that the native peoples in particular become a meaningful part of our society, and by a meaningful part, Mr. Speaker, I don't mean an assimilated part. I don't think that in order for people to participate meaningfully within a society that they must become assimilated with another group; I think that we have to accept their participation for the people that they are, just as I would hope that this House would accept my participation or the participation of any other group as people, not as someone who must become as they are. Well, Mr. Speaker, if we're prepared to do that, and I believe that in our hearts we want to do it, then I say that we have to take those steps which make this participation demonstrable.

And this is one of the steps that I think should be taken, that where we have the situation,

(MR. GREEN Cont'd.)... and I know it's not universal, but we have the possibility of the situation, we have the actuality of the situation in many respects of the Indian children coming to the public schools, then I think that the participation cannot be meaningful to them, and what is more important, Mr. Speaker, cannot be meaningful to us unless they participate in the same manner as the other citizens of our society. In other words, we have to participate equally in the school system because any other form of participation is from the beginning a backward step in a wholesome educational advance.

Now as I indicated, Mr. Speaker, I was in fact shocked to hear that this is not already the case. I think that this is a rather simple reform; I think it's one that the government could be expected to agree with and I think it's one that all members of the House could be expected to agree with. I haven't asked the question, and perhaps I should have as to why this is not already the case, and I'm sure perhaps the Minister will be able to enlighten the House as to the reasons for it. Nevertheless, I think that this resolution brings the question before the House for a purpose of examination. I will wait anxiously to hear any explanation as to the existing situation which would preclude passing of this resolution. I don't see any at the moment. I believe that it's very important, I repeat, both from the point of view of the children that are being educated, I think that there is far more self-interest, and when I say self-interest I mean total community interest, in this than normally appears to be the case.

We have seen, Mr. Speaker, that the results of segregation, the results of somehow having either an articulate or inarticulate second class group comes back to haunt the people who have maintained that situation. I think that many of the civil rights difficulties that we see in the United States stem from the fact that sixty or seventy years ago people in the United States, including those at the highest level, the Supreme Court of Canada, said that there could be such a thing as separate but equal facilities. It's only in recent years, Mr. Speaker, that we have reached the enlightened position of saying that separation alone implies the destruction of the equality, and the destruction of the equality is a danger both to the people who don't achieve equal status and those who have what may be a very temporary superior status. I'm sure that as events in the United States will demonstrate, there is a great toll being paid by a society which for years thought that it could continue on the basis of that separate but equal doctrine. Now we tend to look on things that happen to the south, or things that happen in South Africa or things that happen in Rhodesia with a very superior view. I think that we should examine our own society and I think, Mr. Speaker, if this is one very small reform that would go towards achieving a more just society - to use a much hackneyed phrase - then, Mr. Speaker, I think that the House should approve. Thank you.

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

MR. ROBERT STEEN (St. Matthews): Mr. Speaker, I would like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Fisher, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. SAUL MILLER (Seven Oaks): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Member for Brokenhead, that

WHEREAS the present high rate of property tax is imposing great financial hardship on many of our citizens; and

WHEREAS property taxes should be levied only to pay for services to property;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Provincial Government give consideration to the advisability of:

(1) Providing services such as education, health and welfare through the more equitable tax base of provincial revenue.

(2) That legislation be enacted to permit municipalities to exempt the first \$2,000.00 of municipal assessment and that the Provincial Government reimburse to each municipality the equivalent amount lost to the municipality by way of such exemption.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, a few years ago the Manitoba Government introduced a \$50.00 rebate scheme, the purpose of which was to take some of the burden off the property taxpayer and in theory the idea was a good one. The proposal accepted the idea, or the concept that there had to be some relief from taxation. The problem was, however, that the

(MR. MILLER Cont'd.)... method they used, the technique they came up with in making this rebate wasn't a very practical one. They felt that they had to get the glory for the rebate and so they started sending out individual cheques to each and every homeowner or property owner. They then switched the system - I think it's a couple of years ago - and in doing so I think they perhaps took a backward step, because when they introduced this legislation, or this concept, they recognized that not all homeowners are on the same position. They recognized that owning a home or having a mortgage on a home, a so-called owner of a home didn't imply or didn't necessarily give that individual the ability to pay. We know that years ago ownership of property did reflect a man's wealth; it was a measure of a man's wealth. But surely it's accepted by all that the ownership of a home today doesn't reflect anything of the kind. It simply means that a man has put down a down payment, sometimes a very minimum down payment, has assumed a very large mortgage, may never really acquire title to that particular home either because the mortgages run anywhere from 20 to 30 years. So that in fact what we're talking about are people who are in a home, they are considered owners or ratepayers but in fact they're long term renters from the mortgage company, and at today's interest rates they're paying at a very high rate of rent. But certainly it is no longer an indication of a man's ability to pay.

The problem is aggravated by the fact that a man moves into a home, he needs a home, he has nowhere else to live, he's got a young family, he has prospects in that he has a fairly good job, but then the very next year something comes along, either through illness or perhaps the job didn't develop to the extent that it might have, he finds himself suddenly in a position where his ownership of a home is established, he's considered to be a man of property, and yet his income for that year may have dropped drastically from the year before. But the municipal tax cannot take that into account. The municipal tax is quite blind in that sense. It simply states that you live in a home; it's assessed at a certain value and therefore you must pay a determined mill rate on that value, irrespective of whether in that year you have made a dollar income or you've made \$25,000 income, it doesn't take it into account at all. Most severely hurt are those people who years ago bought modest homes, have gradually paid for them and then were caught up in the post-war period into the shift of population demanding homes, coming into some of the suburban areas in particular demanding high services - high rate of services, with the mushrooming costs of education, these people are really caught in the squeeze. Many of them are on fixed pensions, whether the old age pension and supplement, or in addition to that perhaps some small pension which they earned years ago through their employment, but certainly none of these pensions reflect the cost of living today. So these people are faced with a problem of being concerned annually with spiralling municipal taxes on their homes, and the municipalities have no choice, they have nowhere else to get their funds.

The proposal that we're placing before this House is this, and it has two facets to it. On the one hand, that the province permit the municipalities to exempt the first \$2,000 on the assessment, and that could be on the equalized assessment to make it fair across the province, and that the province reimburse to the municipalities the amount that is lost to the municipalities by that exemption. In that way the best use of the funds could be made. The people who are in most need, the people who are most directly affected would get a benefit in that the taxes they pay would drop. At the same time, the municipality would not have to add higher mill rates on to the assessment over \$2,000. The municipalities therefore could be assured of their incomes; those least able to pay would benefit; and the province would be making a direct contribution both to the municipality and to the homeowner at the same time.

I don't think anyone here again can argue that this is improper because I think if we haven't yet all agreed, I think most of us acknowledge the fact that we're coming very rapidly to the date when finally the acknowledgment was made that services to property should pay for those matters or those things in our community which relate to property; that a service like education, which can in no way relate to property, shouldn't be a charge on property, and that the community as a whole, even the country as a whole which benefits from education should pay for education; that services such as health should not be determined by the area in which a particular individual lives. If he happens to live in an area or in a town which has a low assessment, then he's going to get a lower standard of welfare, a lower standard of health services. And this is wrong. People live in Manitoba and the standard of services should be equalized throughout, and that can only be done if the province accepts this as a principle and accepts that it has to pick up the cost of these services to the individual.

(MR. MILLER Cont'd.)

It can be argued, and I wouldn't question it, but when you pave a lane you're directly improving the value of that property, you're directly helping the person who is fronting or flanking on that lane. It's true some other person may come along and use that lane or even that residential street, and to that extent that it's a paved street or lane anyone can drive on it, but there's no question that the property itself is enhanced in value because it has the service. But the property is not enhanced in value when it has to pay for health services or welfare services or educational services. The community is enriched by it but the property itself really doesn't benefit.

Two factors have to be considered really; how to measure the ability of the individual to pay and how to assure an equal burden of taxation amongst the individuals. Now property taxes never -- no one has ever pretended that property taxes reflect ability to pay, we all recognize that they don't but because a great hardship is now being imposed upon a certain element of our society - and again I say those on fixed incomes, those on low incomes - then we have to try to alleviate that burden by somehow coming to their rescue at this time. I think the most sensible way, and a way that will reach the people involved and will most directly assist those that need it most now, would be to, as I say, accept this concept and this resolution which calls for a \$2,000 exemption on taxation with the province to turn over to the municipalities the amount lost in that exemption.

And so, Mr. Speaker, with those few words I would urge the House to give serious consideration to this resolution, keeping in mind that this is not new. What I'm suggesting is not a revolutionary thing, it has been used in other jurisdictions. Variations of it have been used in some areas. There are graduated assessments and in the State of Michigan they follow this system - or rather in the State of Minnesota they follow this system; in the City of Toronto years ago they had some form of graduated system; in Ontario today they are using the \$2,000 basic exemption on homes as a method of easing the tax burden on property. So we wouldn't be breaking any new ground; we wouldn't be getting into any philosophical hassles I hope, because the principle was established by this government a few years ago. The mechanics I feel were at fault and that's why it didn't work. But once the principle is established, I can see no reason why they shouldn't consider at this stage introducing the kind of legislation this resolution is proposing. And so with these few words, Mr. Speaker, I would ask this House to give it serious consideration.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Would the honourable member permit a question? -- (Interjection) -- Beg pardon? Assuming that Item No. (2) of your resolution were adopted, what would the cost be to the Provincial Government of the loss of revenue suffered by the municipalities?

MR. MILLER: I can't give him the answer to that because this is not -- I couldn't use the figure based on the equalized assessment across Manitoba. It's the number of property owners and it's the first \$2,000 of assessment. It's a figure that I haven't got and perhaps the Minister of Municipal Affairs might dig up, but he might have problems.

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

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

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

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

MR. LEMUEL HARRIS (Logan): I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Kildonan, that

WHEREAS the need for new housing, and buildings used for agricultural purposes, and for repairs and improvements to such existing buildings is recognized as a very high priority for the welfare of a great number of Manitobans;

AND WHEREAS the Federal Sales Tax greatly increases the cost of construction beyond the reach of many;

RESOLVED that the Government request the Government of Canada to rescind its sales tax on building materials used for housing and agricultural purposes.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. HARRIS: Taxes on building materials increase the cost of any building and are felt

(MR. HARRIS Cont'd.)... most keenly by the people in low income who try to build a home. Now for instance, Mr. Speaker, in this respect right here I can vouch for that myself, so can many in this room I guess, I don't have to look around this room to see many of the people that have had to renovate a home and have had to do things which today underneath these taxes they couldn't possibly do. I know I went in 1956 and I built a home; today that home would cost around \$30,000. Now with this added tax going on, you would have an extra \$5,000 put on the cost of that home. We talk of our low income people and how they are going to get houses. This is against them all the way through. The man that has a higher income, he can go ahead and get a home at any time he wants, but the very man that wants a home, the man that has children and everything else, he cannot possibly go there and get himself a home because he hasn't got the price. I know years ago when I went to build a home I had around about \$2,000. Well, what would \$2,000 do today if you'd have to buy a lot and have to go and buy material and everything else, building material. You wouldn't go very far. -- (Interjection) -- Yes, you would have to put a tent up. We always look to our native people here and say that they are not smart, but by golly I'm telling you they are smart, they lived in tents and they know how. But our people never had to do that. For thousands of years they have built themselves homes. Now it seems like this provincial government, and also the Federal Government, are driving us all back on the prairies, because with the amount of money we are earning in this province we cannot pay this federal and provincial tax.

So, as I say, it is most keenly felt by our low income group. It is a hardship on people who have a family and who find a difficult place to rent. Now you can go along, a man has a home and he has the upstairs he would like to rent, but he says here's a man coming along with five or six kiddies. Does he feel like renting to this man? Not with five or six kids he doesn't. He might feel in his heart some sympathy for this man, but when it comes down to hard facts he says, well I have to repair this place, I'll have to renovate this place, I'll have to pay the price of the material plus tax on tax. Isn't that something? It's not sufficient to tax us once but they have to go through the whole

Now, Mr. Speaker, I can't seem to see this at all. Here we are, we seem to be going through this stage of inflation, you go out today and you have a wage, and by the time you get it home you haven't got that buying power that you had before. And even if you wanted to do something for building a home, you couldn't possibly do it because you couldn't keep up the payments that you would have to pay for this home. Who today would like to go out and pay as high as 35 to 40 thousand dollars for a home? Who today, as they say, would put that money out in that way? The man may just as well go and pay rent because that's all he's going to do, because by the end of 30 years he still hasn't owned that home. So this is a sad picture.

Farmers, they are compelled to build extra granaries. We've often heard them talk about low sale of grain. The farmer has had to store this grain, he has to put in extra granaries to store this grain. Now this man has got cost on cost, and now they come along and they break the international agreement. So I hear them say, well the other countries are doing it so why shouldn't I? But the farmer is going to take it all, and I wonder if he can take it because it seems that we're driving off our farmers off the land with this tax.

Now I say that goes all the way down the line, and it seems to me that we are dipping into the pocket of the poor man. It seems every time that we feel we need money - I've often said this many times - that we feel that if there's any money to come, we're all Manitobans. Yes, we're all Manitobans, but when it comes to dipping in the pocket, they dip into the poor man's pocket first, the man that gets in the -- (Interjection) -- Oh yes, that's it. You say that. They were saying, Mr. Speaker, thank our Cabinet Ministers across the way. So I say, well that may be so. You can go along and they have a nice beautiful home and this and that and everything else, well that's fine. But let's give help to the poor man, the man that has a family, the man that can't rent any place because people don't want them. The people that are coming in from the reserves; the people that live in my community there, on the bottom end of my community there; the people that live in the slum conditions that there are; the people that live with bedbugs, cockroaches, dilapidated wiring in the place; these are the people that I talk about. These are the ones that I speak of this tax that is put on our people.

Mr. Speaker, taxes on buildings retard progress and retard making necessary improvements. Well that we know. You go down to certain parts of the city and you go through there and you see a place all boarded up. It's a well constructed place but it is boarded up and there's a sign on it, "Unsanitary". Why? Because the landlord figures this is a poor

(MR. HARRIS Cont'd.).... location. I don't want to make improvements because I'm not going to get sufficient returns; the cost of material is too high so therefore I don't come in here and make improvements; I don't come in to renovate this place. You come along there, you see this place here, you see that place over there and you wonder, what goes on in this place here? I know I go through my constituency on the lower end there and it's saddened me to think that here was one of the first parts of Winnipeg, and you look at it today. Why is it so? Why has it been left to run down like that? What are we doing to improve it? Are we trying to improve it by adding more tax? I don't think so.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the tax on building materials increases the cost of all buildings. On instances where accommodation is rented, this increase is passed on in the form of higher rental payments, in many cases working a hardship on low income groups. Now, Mr. Speaker, we talk of low income groups, working a hardship on them with rents. I wonder- \$300.00 a month, that's a big sum, \$300.00 a month, a man has to come home with \$300.00 a month. So he has to pay out -- we'll say he pays out \$125.00 or \$130.00, unless he wants to go down into the slum area, and then they're going to gouge his eyes out anyway. So, Mr. Speaker, when we listen, as I listened to my colleague here speak of the minimum wage, I can well understand why we have to have these things, because our people have to pay, and how is he going to pay. You'll hear them talk of giving him help from welfare. You go back to the government.....

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I hesitate to interrupt the honourable gentleman but I'm sure he has much more to say, so being 5:30 -- (Interjection) -- It'll again appear in your name.

MR. HARRIS: leave it till next Friday, Sir?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. It's now 5:30; I'm leaving the Chair to return again at 8:00 o'clock.