

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
9:30 o'clock, Friday, April 7, 1967

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions.
Reading and Receiving Petitions.
Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees.
Notices of Motion.
Introduction of Bills.

HON. THELMA FORBES (Minister of Urban Development and Municipal Affairs)(Cypress) introduced Bill No. 111, an Act to amend The Local Government Districts Act, and Bill No. 115, an Act to amend The Municipal Act.

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed I wonder if I might direct the attention of the Honourable Members to the gallery on my left where we have 28 students from the Robert H. Smith School. These students are under the direction of Mrs. V. Doe and the school is located in the constituency of the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce. On behalf of all the Honourable Members of the Legislative Assembly I welcome you all here today.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

HON. J. B. CARROLL (Minister of Welfare) (The Pas): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Highways, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the following proposed resolutions standing in my name and in the name of the Minister of Education.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition)(Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, I am not going to make a case this morning on this, but I want to serve notice that when the Committee on Rules meets again, I would hope that we will look at this whole matter on Private Members business and government business, because here is an example where we had agreed that this morning we would be dealing for the first hour and a half with Private Members business and yet we are faced with Committee of the Whole with three major resolutions of government business, and I think that this is not the intent of Private Members Day. As I said I will not object today, but I want to serve clear notice that when we reach rules on this, this is the type of thing which I think we should change. Where it's Private Members Day it should be clear that we go either into Private Members bills or into resolutions, with no intervening government business ahead of it.

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier)(Wolseley): Mr. Speaker, I suppose it's in order to speak on the point of order raised. Certainly there will be no objection to the Committee discussing this, but I myself believe that until we reach the Orders of the Day we are not on Private Members business or any of the regular business of the House, and that it has been long considered to be well and advisedly established that before the Orders of the Day the introduction of bills should take the place that it occupies on the Order Paper, and I must say that, speaking for myself, I'll require some pretty extensive argument before it will convince me that a change would be desirable.

MR. DOUGLAS CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, speaking on the point of order or on the motion, either one, I think this is a perfectly unreasonable stand for the First Minister to take, particularly in view of the unreasonable rules that the government has already imposed upon us.

MR. ROBLIN: They were accepted by unanimous consent.

MR. CAMPBELL: They were not by unanimous consent.

MR. ROBLIN: Yes they were.

MR. CAMPBELL: I have the minutes and I have the facts recorded that I opposed them at every stage, every stage of the minutes. My honourable friend can shake his head all that he wishes but I know what happened. I opposed the Private Members part; I opposed the 80 hours in Supply; and now, now we are starting to see where we are left with this kind of thing. With Private Members business cut down the way it has been, we still put government business on in front of it, and it's just ridiculous to say that this is a fair way to conduct the business of this House, particularly in view of an arrangement that has been made where only an hour and a half has been allotted to Private Members business this morning. And then the government would have the effrontery, Mr. Speaker, to move into government business after an

(MR. CAMPBELL, cont'd)undertaking that Private Members business would come first; they would have the effrontery to, in violation of that agreement, to move into government business that could take, could easily take a lot of time.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I take exception to the language of my honourable friend. To describe the conduct of the government as effrontery is, in my mind, quite unjustified. Every member of this House knows very well what the order of business is before the Orders of the Day are reached. There was absolutely no indication at any time that we were going to make any change in the established regulation and procedure of this House with respect to routine proceedings at any time, and I regard it as, well quite unjustified of the honourable member to accuse us of bad faith which is what he is doing by saying that we agreed to change this matter in the way that he suggests. No such agreement was ever made. Nothing was ever suggested of that account. My honourable friend knows that that's not the case and he also knows that regardless of what he said in the committee, the rules that we are operating under now were received by all parties in this House - all parties in this House. It wasn't imposed by the government; it was agreed to. And he may say what he likes about what he said in committee and he may talk about effrontery all he likes, but I think that his observation is quite unjustified and is typical of the attitude that he is displaying these days.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I'll now speak on the point of order and I'll say that I repeat that this is effrontery by the government, that it's a violation of the undertaking that was given yesterday, because if my honourable friend is right, and I absolve the clerks of blame if the rules of the House require that the Order Paper be shown in this way, but I certainly say --(Interjection)-- I know a lot more in the 45 years than my honourable friend is inclined to give me credit for, and one of the things that has come out of the 45 years . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. I wonder if there is anything to be gained from continuing this discussion. The remarks that have been made by the Leader of the Opposition, note will of course be taken of his remarks, and I wonder if this might not be discussed in committee and some conclusion arrived at at that particular time without going further.

MR. CAMPBELL: Except that I would want to complete the point that I was making when the Honourable the Attorney-General interrupted me, and the First Minister, and that is that even if the rules required that it be shown this way, there is no reason why the government can't live up to the arrangement that it made yesterday and say that they would move on to Private Members business, and this is the arrangement that was made yesterday.

MR. ROBLIN: It was not.

MR. CAMPBELL: It was so - that the first hour and a half would be Private Members business. Now I'm not even interested in the particular Private Members business but I am interested in the arrangements that are made being adhered to, and those were the arrangements, Mr. Speaker.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party)(Radisson): Mr. Speaker, if I may, just on the point of order. I understand that the Leader of the Liberal Party raised an objection and suggested that he was prepared to proceed with the business of the House this morning and that the matter would be raised when the committee on the conduct of the business of the House considers the whole matter. Now I respectfully suggest, Mr. Speaker, in all due respect to the First Minister, the Attorney-General and the Member for Lakeside, the argument will not achieve anything. We are wasting time insofar as getting into the business of the House is concerned, and I suggest it cease and we will take the matter up when the Committee . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I appeal to the good will of the House on this particular occasion in order that we might proceed with the business of the House.

Are you ready for the question? Order please. I heard no response to my appeal to the House. Are you ready for the question?

MR. SPEAKER put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried, and the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole with the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

MR. CARROLL: His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor, having been informed of the subject matter of the proposed resolutions, recommends them to the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The resolution before the Committee is: Resolved that it is expedient

(MR. CHAIRMAN, cont'd) to bring in a measure to amend The Social Allowances Act by providing, among other matters, that a municipality may carry out projects of work activities and provide welfare services, the costs of which may be included in the costs incurred by the municipality in providing indigent relief to which the government contributes.

MR. CARROLL: Mr. Chairman, the explanation is very short. This merely spells out more clearly that the work activity programs and welfare services provided by municipalities and others will be considered as indigent relief and thereby be shareable with the Government of Canada under the Canada Assistance Plan. We think that this should help to tidy up our statute and make sure that it is compatible with the new federal legislation and regulations. Some of the definitions that are used in here are taken directly from the federal statute and we think it just is a neat and tidy way of doing it.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q.C. (Selkirk): Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Minister would advise us of what the definition of "work activities" comprises, because my understanding was that there was a recent meeting between members of your department and certain municipal officials, and arising out of that meeting it became quite apparent that the work activities that you were envisaging under this particular Order are not the same type of work activities as the municipalities were envisaging, and we had quite a discussion on that during part of the estimates when the Honourable Member for Lakeside complimented the government in going to include into its legislation work activities, but my understanding is now that the work activities that you envisage under this legislation are work activities which are in the nature of rehabilitation programs and they do not include the ordinary work activities which municipalities today are involved in, namely, putting an able-bodied man who is in receipt of relief into some of the Public Works departments and trying to work out the relief through services rendered, but this program you have here does not include that type of activity, and I would like to have an explanation from the Minister as to what type of activity is included in the projects of work activities you refer to here.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Chairman, I'm interested in this resolution. Are we in any way going to decentralize the activities of the Department through the municipalities? Is this something new in its way or is it just going to provide some way as already pointed out by the Honourable Member for Selkirk. I'm interested to know more of the details of this.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask my honourable friend whether or not this is similar to a resolution that was introduced a year ago pertaining to work activity and the correlation of municipalities in a program on which we had a considerable discussion; and is it related to the incident of that time and due to the deferring of the passage of the Canada Assistance Plan it wasn't able to be proceeded with, and is this more or less to tidy up insofar as the proclamation that was contained in, I believe, last Saturday's Gazette in respect of the previous Act? Is it all connected, and if it is then I review what was said a year ago without taking time of the Committee. But there's one objection I do wish to register, Mr. Chairman, is the continuation of the term 'indigent relief'. I think this matter has been considered in the past in the House and I think that it's about time that we got away from the use of the word 'indigent'. It has a connotation I don't think that is proper and fitting in these days anyway and I'd suggest to the Minister that the wording be changed.

MR. CARROLL: Mr. Chairman, this is merely to try and clarify the legislation that was passed last year adding some definitions to it to make sure that it is compatible with the Federal Statute. We're not attempting here to pass along to municipalities any greater responsibilities than what they've had in the past. It is an attempt, however, to be able to claim for more of the services that are being provided by municipalities in the way of service to indigent people. With respect to the name of 'indigent relief' I'd be very happy to look at this again possibly in Committee to see whether there is some other terminology that can be used that will distinguish between the kind of assistance that's given by the province and the kind of assistance that's being given by municipalities. It may be possible to get some other term that would be less offensive to the dignity of people who find themselves having to take assistance.

With respect to work activity projects I think we can only try to make a fairly broad definition because we don't know the kind of activities that the Federal Government are going to approve. While they did pass the Canada Assistance Act last July, July 7th I believe, they still haven't proclaimed regulations dealing with work activity projects so of necessity our reference to work activity projects here must be broad because we don't know at this stage the

(MR. CARROLL, cont'd) kind of projects that will be approved by the Federal Government. It will certainly take into account, we think, such things as workshops, the kind that are run at Selkirk, of the kind that are being run by the Society for Crippled Children and Adults, activities of that kind that give skill to people to help to rehabilitate. I think these definitely will be included, the kind that will rehabilitate, the kind that may be preventive.

We're not sure that it will take care of the work activity program of the kind that is mentioned by the Member for Selkirk which I would consider the winter works kind of activity without necessarily restricting it to the winter months. I think this is the kind of thing that is being asked for here. I'm not sure at the moment whether the federal regulations will embrace this kind of a program or not. If it does then I would think that the present changes will enable us to cover this under our regulations and approve that kind of program as well.

MR. HILLHOUSE: How soon do you expect to receive information from the Federal Government as to what is comprised in their definition of work activities?

MR. CARROLL: I wish I could say 'soon', I really have no idea.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Is it advisable to bring in this legislation until we know what we're voting on?

MR. CARROLL: Well if we want to be able to recover any money from Ottawa with respect to work activity programs we'll have to make sure that whatever we've got here is compatible with what they're likely to bring in. If you would be content to deny us any recovery during the next twelve months until we find out what they're going to do, I would hope that their regulations might be available within a month or so. I don't know. But if it were and our legislation didn't permit us to take advantage of that then we would be the losers here in Manitoba and our people would be the losers who might be able to benefit from this kind of program.

MR. HILLHOUSE: It isn't my intention to deny you the right of recovering anything from the Federal Government but it seems to me though that this is a program which has to be worked out in co-operation between the Government of Manitoba, the Government of Canada and the Municipal Corporations here, and I think the municipal corporations, since they are going to be partners in this, should have full knowledge of what they are becoming involved in, and what we're doing here now is passing legislation, or taking the first step in passing legislation and we're going to foist on a municipality something which may not be acceptable to them.

MR. PAULLEY: . . . on this point. Is the legislation for which the Minister is asking authority to bring in the legislation by this resolution, will it be drafted to be compatible with that that's already been passed by the federal authority and will the difference be, and is the holdup at the present time dealing with regulations -- if you can't make the regulations until you receive the copy of the regulations at Ottawa? If that is the case then of course we don't need to worry about it as long as our legislation is compatible with that of Ottawa in order that the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council following that would be able to bring in regulations that are compatible which of course doesn't require the consent of the Legislature.

MR. CARROLL: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I think that's a good explanation. This is designing our legislation to be compatible with what the Federal Government have already passed. We're not attempting in this way to foist anything on the municipalities; we're just opening up new opportunities to municipalities who wish to take advantage of work activity programs and other welfare services that will enable them to make larger recoveries for people that they're serving and for services that are already being provided by them in many cases.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN (Inkster): Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask the Minister whether it is the intention of this resolution that the municipal councils will be able to get work done in exchange for welfare relief and whether the payment for work would then be the amount that a person receives on welfare, and if so would this not result in merely a reduction in the wages that a municipality would ordinarily have to pay to get this work done?

MR. CARROLL: At the present time I'm not sure whether this sort of thing is possible. It may be that it will just be workshop kind of programs where people learn skills while they're doing work. I don't know yet because the federal regulations don't tell us. I see the concern that you have that the city public works department may be filled with former indigent relief cases and thereby cut down on their present staff. I would think that this would not be the case although there might be other activities that are not being done, for instance by the City of Winnipeg today in terms of cleaning up, painting up programs where they might use

(MR. CARROLL, cont'd) people who would normally be on relief, who would be learning the skills of painting or decorating or whatever and this kind of activity may qualify. We would hope it would.

MR. GREEN: I want to make it clear that I'm not really concerned with the cutting down of staff. What I'm concerned is that work should not be done for relief wages when to get that work done under ordinary circumstances they'd have to pay wages let's say as determined by collective agreement. So although that's a problem it wasn't the problem that I expressed that there'd be a transfer of staff from present staff to indigent staff. I'm worried about bringing the wage rate down by having work done for that kind of wage.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, there's one other point that I would like to get information on. Are we through the legislation that will be coming about going to spend extra money in Manitoba for this purpose? Is there extra money provided in the estimates for this? Or are we just making arrangements which would enable us to accept federal monies and pass these on to municipalities?

MR. CARROLL: I think primarily what the changes in legislation are doing here is giving us access to the Federal Treasury for certain programs that we aren't sure we're able to share with them on at the present time. This just enables us to spell out more clearly the kind of services for which we will be able to claim from the Federal Treasury including work activity programs.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I'm curious as to how this legislation is coming about. Is this as a result of consultation between the Province of Manitoba and the Federal Government? Have there been meetings on this and have they all the way along built up the plan which the government intends to follow?

MR. CARROLL: I can't say that there have been specific meetings dealing with legislation, but at the time that we brought in certain changes to our statute last year anticipating the Canada Assistance Plan we didn't know what their legislation was going to say. We do know what their legislation says at this time; we're changing our legislation to make sure that our legislation fits with theirs and that we are able to take maximum advantage of the sharing of our programs with the Government of Canada.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, you know the legislation Ottawa is bringing down then? I thought a few moments ago the Minister had indicated he didn't know.

MR. CARROLL: We know the legislation; we don't know anything about the work activity program for which the Member for Selkirk wanted specific information. We don't know what kind of work activities they're going to approve at the present time -- by regulation.

MR. MOLGAT: I gather then that this has been in consultation with Ottawa that the matter has developed. Now what consultation has there been between this government and the municipalities, because the municipalities are the ones who are going to be obviously involved in doing this. Has the Minister had consultations with the municipalities? Has this been built up in co-operation with them?

MR. CARROLL: The consultation with the Government of Canada I think started about the end of December. We just got the draft regulations about the end of January so we really can't say that we've been very close to Ottawa in the development of their program. We started our communications with the municipalities again in, I think, mid-January after we got the draft regulations from Ottawa and we knew what their program was going to involve.

MR. HILLHOUSE: In the draft regulations didn't they define what their work project activities would be?

MR. CARROLL: I'm sorry I missed that question, Mr. Chairman.

MR. HILLHOUSE: You refer to the draft regulations that you got from Ottawa. In those draft regulations that you got from Ottawa wasn't the definition of 'work activities' defined there? --(Interjection)-- And no particulars given of it?

Well do you mean to say that neither you nor the workers in your Department know the types of work activities that are going to be approved by Ottawa?

MR. CARROLL: That's right.

MR. SAUL MILLER (Seven Oaks): I'm concerned about another aspect of this and to me it seems that in view of the federal decision and the announcement from the Federal Government and this government that the Federal Government will be taking over the cost of retraining and training for adults who are in the labour force, it seems to me that -- I can't see why the municipalities are involved in this at all. Because the suggestion here is that the Provincial Government will of course pick up part of the cost as if this were a welfare cost and

(MR. MILLER, cont'd)the Provincial Government would pick up its portion. From this I can only gather therefore that the municipality will be saddled with part of the cost. Now it's true the municipality may be paying welfare to an individual but it's a straight welfare payment and the province picks up 60 percent of it, but if they're going to go into workshop activities or any training, formal training of any kind, then obviously the program in the municipalities has to be enlarged if they don't have any and will have to be started from nothing really, so that the municipalities will be saddled with a new cost, a cost of setting up programs, a cost of starting programs and having the teachers of the staff to institute such programs, people in charge of it. These are not recoverable in the normal course of events.

I am concerned that the municipalities are asked in any way to participate in any retraining program whatsoever. Surely this is a provincial and a federal responsibility, not a municipal responsibility. So that I would like some clarification on why the municipalities are brought into this at all, if this isn't a straight -- if the municipality simply cannot use a man and pay him and then claim for part of the normal wages from the province. Beyond that I think the municipality shouldn't be asked in any way to get into this type of activity.

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Chairman, I'm still not clear on this. The Minister says that he's had very little consultation with Ottawa if any; he's had none whatsoever with the different municipalities who will be asked to take part in this. On the other hand we're told that this is a sharing program and then in answer to the Member from Rhineland, he does admit that there's no money provided for this in the estimates. What kind of a dark secret have we got here? I mean, what is it that they're asking us to approve? The Minister shakes his head. Is it true or isn't it true that he says that we did not approve any sum in the estimates? This is what I thought he answered to the Member from Rhineland. Would you mind answering, please instead of just shaking your head. I don't know what that means.

MR. CARROLL: There's certainly money in the estimates to cover any program that we anticipate under "work activity" or any of these other matters that are covered within this amendment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution passed . . .

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, provided the municipality takes advantage of the program that's announced then so far as indigent relief is concerned they will be paying 50 percent of the costs, right?

MR. CARROLL: The same arrangement that applies at the present time.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, is that arrangement 50 percent?

MR. CARROLL: No.

MR. CAMPBELL: What is it? --(Interjection)--

MR. CARROLL: The average that the municipalities pay in the Province of Manitoba is around 35 percent.--(Interjection)-- The average is 65 percent.

MR. HILLHOUSE: You've changed that formula, haven't you . . . Social Allowances Act

MR. CARROLL: No, it's the same one.

MR. CAMPBELL: . . . revise that then by taking the part that where it exceeds a certain proportion that the government pays 80 percent, but where it's below that proportion the government pays 60 percent. Is that correct? And you have to take in the areas where 80 percent in order to get that average figure that you're speaking? Is that correct?

MR. CARROLL: That's right.

MR. CAMPBELL: A lot of the municipalities, it's 40 percent that they pay, right?

MR. CARROLL: We pay 40 percent up to one mill or 80 percent over one mill, whichever is to the advantage of the municipality.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Under this new legislation what you're going to pay now is 50 percent of the salary of the social worker that has to be hired by municipalities to implement this program, plus of course your share of "indigent" relief - the word that my honourable friend on the left doesn't like.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would like to draw the attention of members of the House to Beauchesne's Fourth Edition, Page 216, regarding the object of this resolution. "The object of the resolution recommended by the Crown is to give the House a first opportunity to discuss the advisability of making a certain expenditure. The details of the projected measure are not then disclosed and debate is confined to the resolution which should not be lengthy although care must be taken that the terms used are sufficiently wide to cover the whole of the bill which will be subsequently introduced."

(MR. CHAIRMAN, cont'd)

Now gentlemen, when I first came into the House the debate was brief, the Minister introduced the resolution, there was perhaps two or three questions and then the debate took place when you had the bill before, when you saw what you were discussing in the bill at second reading, and I would ask the members of the House to co-operate so that the business of the House can be expedited, and try and keep the debate at this section of the proceedings as short as possible.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I take it when these resolutions do come into the House that this is the time that we discuss the financial aspects, this is the very reason why the resolutions are brought forward, and when I placed a question to the Honourable Minister as to whether this legislation was there and whether it meant that we would have to provide extra monies through the estimates and whether these were contained in the estimates or whether this was purely a matter of enabling us to get federal monies for this very purpose, and he answered me in part. Now I find out later on that there are monies in the estimates that we have been passing for this year for this purpose, so I think he should have given me a fuller answer in the first place. But, Mr. Chairman, as I pointed out that this is the time to discuss the financial aspect of this legislation.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Chairman, we were asked to resolve that "it be expedient to bring in a measure." Now how can we as members of this committee determine whether notice is expedient unless we have the facts?

MR. CHAIRMAN: You get the details when you have the bill, you don't know what's in the bill now and get the details and be able to discuss it on second reading in committee. Law Amendments Committee - there's lots of opportunities to discuss the bill when you've got it before you. Now you haven't got the bill before you and the debate should be brief as set out in Beauséjour.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask the Minister how much money is involved here insofar as the province is concerned. What does this appropriation mean, provincial expenditure in dollars and cents?

MR. CARROLL: Mr. Chairman, as I tried to point out earlier this primarily enables us to get into the Federal Treasury and share in programs that are presently in existence and to make provision for the possibility of work activity programs which may or may not increase expenditures of municipalities and the province. I doubt that it will increase any of our expenditures but it does enable us to share whatever expenditures are made with Ottawa.

MR. MOLGAT: In other words, this is taking advantage of Ottawa money which my honourable friend has persistently claimed wasn't coming.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution passed. Next resolution before the committee:

RESOLVED that it is expedient to bring in a measure to amend The Department of Welfare Act by providing, among other matters, that the Minister of Welfare may, through The Department of Welfare or through authorized agents,

- (a) provide assistance;
- (b) provide welfare services and develop programs of welfare services; and
- (c) carry out projects of work activity.

MR. CARROLL: I think the explanation here is very largely the same as the one I gave before, again to try to share programs presently existing with -- the cost of these programs with the Government of Canada. This enables us to share some of the programs that are presently under way involving some private agencies in the Province of Manitoba; The Family Bureau, The Society for Crippled Children and Adults, The John Howard Elizabeth Fry Society, etc.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, is there any provision here at all to help the welfare recipient to be able to afford the sales tax at all?

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Chairman, rather than waste the time of the - 'waste' is not the word, but use up any more time - the remarks that I made in the previous resolution I wish to be applied to this second resolution.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution passed . . .

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I just want to make the point. The Minister says this is to enable us to share. From his previous comments though there's no intention on the part of the Manitoba Government to share. The intention of the Manitoba Government in these two resolutions is to obtain federal money and have the municipalities share the cost. The province takes advantage of this but does not share. I think that should be made very clear, that it's the

(MR. MOLGAT, cont'd) municipalities. Therefore I think that when there are programs of this type that the municipalities should be involved in the discussions from the very beginning, that if there are negotiations between the province and the Federal Government, and if it's the intention that the municipalities are the ones that are going to pay the bill, the province will coast in, then the municipalities should be directly involved in any of the negotiations.

MR. CARROLL: Mr. Chairman, the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition are completely wrong.

MR. DESJARDINS : . . . the Minister a few seconds ago said that he did not think that this would cost any more for the Provincial Treasurer. Didn't he say that?

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to get a little clarification on the words "authorized agents". Are we not just dealing through municipalities and municipal officials or their offices, or do we have special agents under the Department of Welfare?

MR. CARROLL: Yes, Mr. Chairman, we have a great many private agencies working in the welfare field. The largest are The Children's Aid Society - I mentioned two or three others a moment ago - and we will be able to share some of the services with the Government of Canada - some of the costs of these services.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, the Minister says my remarks are completely wrong. They're taken directly from his statement, Mr. Chairman. If he'll go back and check the statement he made during the course of this debate he will see that my statement emanates directly from what he said. Now, could the Minister tell me on this one, this resolution, how much money the Province of Manitoba is expected to expend under this resolution?

MR. CARROLL: Mr. Chairman, during my estimates we discussed the expenditures of our Department which includes grants that we make to many private agencies. We hope now to be able to share some of these costs with the Government of Canada, but there are provincial monies going to The Children's Aid Society and these other agencies that I'm talking about. It was promised over a year ago that these costs would be sharable with Ottawa; we're now trying to make sure that we take advantage of that Federal money.

MR. MOLGAT: So there is no additional provincial money, it's getting Federal money.

MR. PETER FOX (Kildonan): I would just like assurance from the Minister that under Section (c) this would not create work at substandard wages just like the Member for Inkster mentioned in the first resolution. Shall I repeat that? I just said I would like to have assurance from the Minister that under Section (c) of this resolution it would not create work at substandard wages.

MR. CARROLL: Mr. Chairman, I think we should deal with that in committee at second reading.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution passed. Next resolution before the committee:

RESOLVED that it is expedient to bring in a measure to amend The Teachers' Pensions Act to provide, among other matters,

(a) for an increase in the benefits to persons whose pension is calculated under the provisions of the former Act;

(b) for the retirement of teachers on an actuarially reduced pension after they reach the age of fifty-five years and have certain qualifications as to years of service;

(c) for the payment of benefits to the spouse or estate of a person who dies after he reaches the age of sixty at a time when he could have retired and been entitled to an annual pension; and

(d) for the payment of pensions under the Act to new classes of persons; which may require additional payments to be made from and out of the Consolidated Fund.

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Education)(Gimli): Mr. Chairman, a couple of the provisions here - one or two of them are to - one of them is to keep this bill in concert with the amendments to The Civil Service Superannuation Act. Section (a) in this resolution calls for the increased rate of pension for those whose salaries have been so low that the salary formula when this Act came in gave them a lower pension than they would have received by taking their service pension as under the TRAF Fund plus any annuity to which they were entitled. This bill proposed to increase this somewhat for the few hundred senior teachers who retired early, in the old days. They had an average of about 31 years of service and they had a voluntary retirement at the age of 60 in those days; they had the old pension plus the annuity and this will increase slightly that pension to this group.

(MR. JOHNSON cont'd)

The second portion of this resolution is again to keep this Act in concert with the Civil Service Superannuation Act to extend the early retirement provisions of the Act to permit teachers whose age and years of service combine or total 90 or more to retire at any time after the age of 55 and receive a pension. The earliest this can be done at the present time is age 60.

Section 4. This again was explained by the Provincial Secretary and similar provision for The Teachers' Act. Under the present Act, a teacher who is elected a guaranteed pension form at least one year beforehand may retire and apply for said pension between the ages of 60 and 65, provided he has met the specified length of service. Under this Act if a teacher who has met all these qualifications suddenly dies without being able to sign an application form, the guarantee he had elected therefore can't be put into effect, and the only benefit payable is a return of contributions to the estate. On the other hand, if such a person has sufficient time, after being critically injured or stricken by a fatal disease, to sign his name, the guarantee as elected would go into effect upon his death. In fact this just removes the necessity to apply for the pension in these circumstances.

(d) The support part here deals with new classes of persons similar to provisions we have made previously for certain classes and just extends these, and I can give details on that on second reading.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the Minister for his explanation. Did I gather correctly that under (a) the intention is to increase the pensions for people who are presently on pension? Is that correct?

MR. JOHNSON: Yes.

MR. MOLGAT: If that is so, then I think, Mr. Chairman, that this brings up a discussion we had the other day with the Provincial Secretary on another pension plan, the Civil Service Superannuation, where I asked him at that time what consideration was being given to people who are presently on pension and who quite obviously, because of the increased cost of living are forced to meet much higher costs. The Minister indicated then that he would look at this but had no solution to offer. I take it that the Minister of Education, on the other hand, has a solution to offer because this is presumably what he is proposing here, and I would suggest, therefore, that we have a look at the whole field, not just the teachers' pensions. If my two honourable friends could get together they might come out with a solution that would be suitable to this side of the House.

I'm also curious, Mr. Chairman, as to what steps have been taken insofar as making our pension plan here similar to those in other provinces, and the portability of the plan with other areas.

The item (d); the Minister said that he would give us the details under second reading and I have no objections to that. I would hope that we would have a complete list of what he intends to cover by then.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister could clarify a bit this first provision here that some of the teachers who have been retired are going to get increased assets. I'm not clear in my own mind whether he's referring to all teachers who retired -- I think he indicated there are certain groups or certain -- who had retired earlier. He's not referring then, I trust, to all teachers who had formerly retired but simply to some particular classification who is getting a lower amount.

I'd also like to ask him if he would clarify what he means by new classes of persons; whether he could indicate some samples of this.

And finally, on the question of portability; again this has been raised and is it not possible for the province to make negotiations or enter negotiations with other provinces to introduce portability to teachers' pensions? I mean, do we have to wait we don't know how many years, before we can get portability in almost all instances of pensions? I mean, don't some provinces now have working agreements between each other? This is a matter of great concern to teachers and there's some movement between provinces.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I have just one question and that is, I take it the increase in pensions will have nothing to do with teachers who are presently contributing to the pension fund but who might not want to carry on indefinitely and who would like later on to withdraw their contributions. They will not be affected, I take it.

MR. JOHN P. TANCHAK (Emerson): Mr. Chairman, in the (a) part of it - increased pensions for retired teachers - I think that meets with the approval of the Manitoba Teachers' Association. They've been asking for that for quite awhile and we certainly agree with that.

In the (b) part of it, the teachers may choose to retire at 55; I personally know of some teachers who at 55, after giving service for over 30 years, at 55, probably due to ill health and so on, they were not fit to teach any more and they just hung on and tried to drag the time on themselves ...and I agree with this part of it.

There's one clarification in (c): It says, "for the payment of benefits to the spouse or estate of person." Does that mean that supposing the spouse of the teacher remarries, would her pension continue after that, or does she lose the pension after the spouse marries? Maybe some of them feel young enough to get married again at that age. We do not know about that.

And then in (d) part, it mentions "new classes". The Minister didn't fully explain what he meant by new classes.

MR. BEN HANUSCHAK (Burrows): Mr. Chairman, I'm concerned about Part (a) of the resolution. I believe I heard the Honourable Minister say that this would provide for some increase in the pension presently received by the retired teachers in this category. I understand that the number is quite small; there's only 15 or 20 teachers in this group, or not much more than that. Would the Minister correct me if I'm wrong. I believe that the problem here was that these people were caught in the change in the pension legislation; that under the old Act they would have qualified for full pension. When the new Act came in, by reason of some changes, what they in effect are receiving is not full pension under the new Act. Anyway these people do feel that they are aggrieved in some respect there. Now this increase that they would get, will that bring them up to -- up to what level would that bring them? Would that bring them to the same level as teachers who meet retirement requirements under the new legislation, or would it merely provide some increase with the hope that that would satisfy them?

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, I think most of these questions can be answered more clearly when you have the Bill before you. Briefly, Section (a); for those members who weren't here when the original Bill came in, under the old TRAF fund you could retire at 60 if you had 40 years of service and I think you got \$40.00 -- or 30 years of service. You got a maximum of \$40.00 per year towards your pension and then these teachers had an annuity fund. When the new Act came in, under the provisions -- their salaries had been so low over their last 10 or 15 years of service that these teachers under the new formula would have got less pension, or not much increase at all, so the \$40.00 was increased per year to give them more recognition of their problem. There are about 500 of these teachers left with an average of 31 years of service and it is proposed to raise this somewhat to assist them at this time.

MR. CAMPBELL: In that case, in the case of the ones that the Minister mentioned last, then all of them are being raised, not just some?

MR. JOHNSON: That's right, Sir. Of those that are left.

MR. CAMPBELL: Is it planned to review them as well. I mean review them as between individuals or just a blanket raise? I don't mind if the Honourable Minister leaves that until we come to the Bill itself but the point that I would like to make is contained in the last two lines of the resolution: "which may require additional payments to be made from and out of the Consolidated Fund." Has the Minister an estimate, even though a rough one, of what that will amount to?

MR. JOHNSON: I think I could give the details on second reading, if you wish, but I believe the first one, Section (a), would cost around 40 to 50 thousand; the last one is very minimal, the last Section (d).

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution passed? Committee rise. Call in the Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Committee has adopted certain resolutions and requests leave to sit again.

IN SESSION

MR. JAMES COWAN Q.C. (Winnipeg Centre): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Pembina, that the report of the Committee be received.

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

MR. CARROLL introduced Bill No. 113, an Act to amend The Social Allowances Act, and Bill No. 84, An Act to amend The Department of Welfare Act.

MR. JOHNSON introduced Bill No. 110, an Act to amend The Teachers' Pensions Act.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Public Works. I am informed that the Crerar Papers have been taken from the Manitoba Archives and transferred to Queen's University. I was wondering what effort, if any, was made by the government to retain those valuable papers in our province.

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN, Q.C. (Minister of Public Works)(Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, I have no information. I'll be glad to make inquiries.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Public Works. Is it the intention of the government to sell the farm portion of the property known as the Macdonald Air Field?

Second question: Has anyone been authorized to negotiate a sale? And if the answer to that is yes, does the offer include both land and buildings that remain there?

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Speaker, I think I would have nothing that I could usefully add to what I said previously on this matter, that the Department of Industry and Commerce is endeavouring to see whether it is possible that some use may be made of the facilities there, and that might or might not include the use of the farm land. No decision has been made since, as far as I am aware, no firm proposals are yet ready for consideration by the government.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, a subsequent question. Is it correct, then, that the Minister is not aware of anyone having been authorized to offer the property for sale?

MR. McLEAN: Oh, well, I am aware of the fact that under direction of the Executive Council, the Department of Industry and Commerce has been authorized to determine whether some use could be made, as I have said, from the standpoint of industrial or commercial development.

MR. CAMPBELL: ... Mr. Speaker, direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce? Is the Minister aware of anyone being authorized, or firm being authorized, to offer the property for sale?

HON. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q.C. (Minister of Industry and Commerce)(River Heights): Mr. Speaker, I have nothing to add other than what my colleague has already said.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, what his colleague said was that the matter was in his hands.

MR. MOLGAT: Well, Mr. Speaker, I would like to pursue this question because it's been asked some time ago and I was just checking my Hansard to see exactly when. The Minister then said that it was not up for sale. I was trying to get his exact comment but it was that no one had been authorized to sell it. He did say it was in the hands of the Minister of Industry and Commerce. The Minister of Industry and Commerce has been asked this morning a specific question: "Have you turned this over to anyone, to a firm of lawyers, to a firm of real estate people, to anyone and authorized them to sell it for you?" It's a very straightforward question and deserves a straightforward answer.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, as has already been indicated in Hansard and today, the matter is before the Department of Industry and Commerce and the Department of Industry and Commerce is, as far as I know, the only government agency and the only one interested in Macdonald at this point.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, I wish now to ask a supplementary question of the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce. Has any person or firm or organization been authorized to offer this property for sale?

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, the answer is no.

MR. CAMPBELL: Thank you.

MR. EARL DAWSON (Hamiota): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask a question of the Honourable Minister of Education. Sir, in view of the fact that we are one of the few provinces that still have the oath of allegiance form for school teachers, are you considering doing away with this?

MR. JOHNSON: No.

MR. DAWSON: A supplementary question: and why not? There are many many complaints from school teachers throughout Manitoba, especially those that transfer in from other provinces. They think this is ridiculous.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, from time to time we are concerned here with strict rulings and the Speaker refers us to Beausheue. I would like to ask a question. I'm not sure who the question should go to, but are copies of Beausheue made available to the various parties in this House, and if so, could I get a copy?

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q.C. (Attorney-General)(Fort Garry): I think there is a copy, or more than one copy, in the Provincial Library.

MR. FROESE: I notice that other leaders have their copies in their desks. Are they copies of their own? Did they acquire them themselves or ...

MR. ROBLIN: I have one in my desk and I acquired it myself. I recommend the same course to my honourable friend.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Education. Does he have any comment on the press report of a day or so ago that the government is now going to do an about-face and bring in a bill to give additional grants to the divisions which voted against the referendum?

MR. JOHNSON: No comment at this time.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I believe it would meet with the wishes of everyone if the next item of business were not called at this time and that we proceed immediately to the first resolution on Page 2, the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for St. Boniface.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I wonder - there were arrangements made between the two groups that (I should say the three parties) that we would split the morning and in view of the time that has been taken on government business this morning, and in view of the fact that the Opposition side has agreed to move up a private resolution which is sponsored by a government member for debate, I wonder if the House Leader would consider continuing on government business until 11 o'clock and then proceed into Private Members business at 11 o'clock.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I think that the suggestion should be considered but what I would suggest is that we go into private business and stay there until 11:30 and then move into government business.

MR. SPEAKER: Do I understand we go to Bill 56 now?

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I believe - again I'm speaking from information given to me and I think the Whip of the Liberal Party would concur in this - but there is a resolution here dealing with the State of Nebraska. I understand there has been some arrangement made, I think, this time, - I hope - that this resolution can be brought forward at this time for discussion. It's a resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for St. Matthews, Page 17, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: ...proceed to Page 17, the Resolution standing in the name of the Honourable Member for St. Matthews.

MR. RODNEY S. CLEMENT (Birtle-Russell): Mr. Speaker, I would ask that we carry on with the resolutions as they are in order, right after this one.

MR. ROBERT STEEN (St. Matthews): Mr. Speaker, I would like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Turtle Mountain, the following resolution:

WHEREAS on March 1st, 1967, the State of Nebraska celebrated the One-hundredth Anniversary of its admission as a State to the United States of America; and

WHEREAS on July 1st, 1967, the citizens of Canada will celebrate the One-hundredth Anniversary of the Confederation of Canada; and

WHEREAS for all of the last century Canadians and Americans have lived together in harmony and peace on the North American continent based upon mutual affection, trust and respect of each other and sharing the longest undefended border in the world; and

WHEREAS the citizens of Canada, during the year 1967, will be celebrating their Centennial of Confederation with many public events; and

WHEREAS the citizens of the Province of Manitoba, in our capital City of Winnipeg from July twenty-second to August seventh, inclusive, will be playing host to the Pan-American Games and inviting athletes from both North and South America to compete therein;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Government and people of the Province of Manitoba extend to our good friends, the citizens of Nebraska, our congratulations on the occasion of their Centennial celebrating their admission as a state to the United States of America, and our very best wishes for their future progress, peace and prosperity; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that we extend to our friends in the Cornhusker State an invitation to visit our country in 1967 and in particular our Province during the course of the Pan-American Games, and let us join together in the mutual celebrations of our respective centennials; and

(MR. STEEN cont'd)....

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this resolution be printed and engrossed and sent by the Clerk of the Legislative Assembly to the Governor of the State of Nebraska and to the President of the Nebraska State Legislature.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I think that this is an excellent example this morning as to how resolutions should be passed and possibly we could have the agreement of the government for the rest of the Order Paper in the same way?

MR. SPEAKER: I should like to take this opportunity and congratulate the honourable members for the action taken.

MR. CLEMENT: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Gladstone, that the resolution...

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Speaker ...

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order.

MR. CLEMENT: Did you not say I had the floor, Sir?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I wonder if the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell would take his seat for just a moment.

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I think it was the understanding that having disposed of the resolution by the Honourable the Member for St. Matthews, that the resolutions in the order as printed on the Order Paper, starting on Page 2, would be the order of proceeding in our business.

MR. DESJARDINS: It was my understanding, Mr. Speaker, it was understood that we keep on at 17 and I think you are absolutely right in calling the next motion.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, I believe that in this case, that for once the Honourable the Provincial Secretary is absolutely correct. It was agreed, as I understood it, because of the peculiar circumstance we take the resolution dealing with Nebraska and then go back to the proper Order Paper.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. I distinctly heard from the floor that when we dealt with the Honourable Member for St. Matthews, that we would carry on from that point, and that was the reason that I called this resolution. Order please. However, it has been pointed out that I erred and I believe the Honourable Members would agree with me that we should follow the Order Paper as laid down, and I wondered if the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell would bear with me on this occasion.

MR. CLEMENT: Well Mr. Speaker, you are the Speaker and I have to bow to any ruling that you make, but you distinctly mentioned me as the next speaker and surely the government don't always have to have their own way. This, I think, is a very important resolution. What justification is there more to go to the one we just heard than mine? I'm next on the list. Let's carry on and then revert back. This order has been on the Order Paper now for at least two weeks, if not three, and it's very important, and I was recognized and I don't see why the Minister or the government can stand up when I'm in the middle of my move...

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Order please. I appreciate the opinion of the honourable gentleman and I must suggest to the House that from time to time in recent sittings there has been a confusion and deliberation across the floor of the House when we have been attempting to make a decision and it has made it most difficult, most difficult indeed, for me to determine exactly what was required by the honourable members of the House. I am simply turning back to the Order Paper, which is our way of doing business, in view of the circumstances that I have endeavoured to outline. So therefore we will move back to the position in accordance with the rules of the House.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order and not to make your task more difficult, but it has appeared to me -- I have two resolutions on this Order Paper that have been on since the beginning of this particular -- for almost since the month of January. Now my suggestion is that when this Committee on Rules, at least on Elections and Privileges, sits, of which you are a member, that the suggestion should be brought before that committee that our resolutions should be, the minute a resolution is spoken to or stood, it should go to the end of the resolution paper, because this system we are following today, I have two resolutions on this Order Paper, we've never reached one of them yet; and unless we put our resolutions to the end of the paper as we speak to them or stand them, well there's a possibility that this Session may end and these resolutions that I have here will never be reached.

(MR. HILLHOUSE cont'd).....

I had no objection to allowing the Honourable Member for St. Matthews to deal with his resolution but I do hope that when that committee meets that that matter will be taken into consideration, because I think it is most unfair that an individual who has a resolution which he wishes to deal with, should have to wait and allow all these resolutions that are prior in point of order on the Order Paper, to be disposed of before his resolution can be reached.

MR. SPEAKER: I thank the Honourable Member for Selkirk for his most timely remarks. I can assure him it has been quite a concern for the Chair as we have progressed along throughout the Session, and I can assure him that what he has had to say will be brought before that committee for consideration.

.....continued on next page

(MR. SPEAKER cont'd).....

The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface. The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Things are back to normal. The Attorney-General is all keyed up to listen to me and the First Minister is back in his office, so I guess I can proceed. I think that a few days ago, Mr. Speaker, I --(Interjection)--well, isn't that normal - when I get up? Mr. Speaker, I would like to proceed to finish this resolution. Could I ask, Mr. Speaker, how much time I have left? I think I spoke for about three minutes last time.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Clerk, is it three minutes or two minutes? Twenty minutes.

MR. DESJARDINS:... 17 minutes I wasn't far wrong, Mr. Speaker. Well Mr. Speaker, I think that last time we established that there certainly was a shortage of hospital personnel. We established that. I stated anyway, I tried to make the members realize that the reason for this motion was not -- I'm not too confident that it will pass, Mr. Speaker, but I thought that this was sufficiently important and I thought that the government and the members of this House, and the people of Manitoba should not pretend that there is no shortage, that the shortage does not exist and that we couldn't do anything about it, so I think that last time I made it quite clear, like I documented that, that there certainly is a shortage of nurses and hospital personnel here in the province, and therefore today I think that we should proceed into seeing what can be done. It's no use always fighting about the past, and as I stated we have to get together before this becomes a drastic shortage - it is pretty close to it at times - and see what we can do.

Now I'll just reread the last two paragraphs that I read from this Minister's Report -- Committee on the supply of nurses, because this is very important contrary to what has been said in this House; and I quote, "It is in the nature of things that a lot of nurses get married, become pregnant or succumb to wanderlust. This, however, does not explain the high turnover of nurses in hospital employment which is averaging 53 percent annually while at least one large hospital is reporting 90 percent." What's going on? --(Interjection)-- Explain what? The 90 percent or the wanderlust. You'd be too old to understand the rest.

"This is comparable to industries employing unskilled or low skill female labour. Large offices with predominantly female clerks turn over 30 to 35 percent annually as against 90 percent, Mr. Speaker, while school boards this year have reported changes in 17 percent of their teaching positions."

Now I think that this explains that there is certainly a different situation that exists in the nursing profession. Some of the members are pretty frivolous. The Member from Winnipeg Centre, I think, was saying well there's only fifteen resolutions that was aimed at the government, but did he read them? I wonder if he's list them. I think they're important enough and I think if the government followed those we'd be doing quite well. There's one here, for instance, on Page 73, recommendation No. 16, that the Manitoba Association of Registered Nurses be authorized to act as the bargaining agent to negotiate reasonable salaries and other terms of employment on behalf of member nurses. I think that in the past these people have been taken for granted too much.

Then there is something else. We are talking about education, and for years the Minister and the former Minister did not admit this - in fact they said that that wasn't the case - when I spoke about using the student nurses to subsidize this plan, and this is exactly what has been said and something should have been done about this long ago, and the Honourable Member is talking about a two-year course. Well, we haven't received, we still have received no guarantee that this would be done. In fact, if you were to talk to the administrators at different hospitals you'll see that their budgets have been reduced from a certain amount that they're asking, to replace these student nurses, because they're doing an awful lot of work. And this has been turned down so far, so I think that this resolution comes at the right time.

Listen to what this Minister's Committee says on this, on the education part of it: "It is interesting but probably not too profitable to conjecture about the variety of enrollment patterns evident at the individual schools of nursing. We might risk a general hypothesis, however. We know that the total number of high school graduates eligible for admission to nursing schools did not decline from 1961 to '65, but increased. We know further that this number increased markedly in rural Manitoba and that a phenomenal improvement in facilities for high school education in rural areas took place in these years. We know that decreases in the enrollment of some schools of nursing were not due to a lack of students but to a shortage of teachers. We have seen from Table 15 that, with one exception, wherever there was a reduction in enrollment rural students felt the brunt of it and wherever there was an increase urban students

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd)... accounted for the lion's share. Perhaps we may conclude," says the report, "that (a) not all eligible candidates for admission to the nursing schools could be accommodated in 1965. (b) When nursing schools are more selective urban students enjoy certain advantages over their country cousins."

This is what the report says; this is not something that I invented. And in the report if you -- this was stated also that, "The changes being proposed will cost money but it must be clearly understood that these are educational costs, not health costs." And the First Minister took me to task for suggesting that maybe we spend money on this when he was talking about taxes. But do we know -- does the honourable member know - I'm sure the Minister does - how much it costs to educate a nurse? There was a survey made by the General Hospital, or at the General Hospital, and costs are over \$2,000 per year per student, and Manitoba is an exporter of nurses. It's an exporter of nurses. We are educating nurses for other provinces, Saskatchewan, next to us, is an importer of nurses and we're an exporter of nurses, and this is what it's costing us. So I think that this is not -- sometimes when you want to save a few pennies it's costing you an awful lot more, and this is certainly not a saving at all.

And what are we doing for the education? What facilities have we at the University of Manitoba for nursing education? I asked the Minister of Education; he couldn't give me any reply that anything was being done on this, and the Honourable Member from Winnipeg Centre, I think, would be well advised to go and visit this and then he'd know what is being done, then he'd realize that the government should not be commended for what they've done - or what they didn't do.

I feel that -- certainly in what I read, I think that this was approved that we need better adequate facilities to develop our teaching nurses, those that will teach others. This is where we have to start. We've got to get the teachers and we haven't got this here. How many degrees of nursing have we in Manitoba, Bachelor or Master, or Doctor rather? What have we got? We've slipped on this and we should have done something about this a long time ago. As I said, we did not take action after we received the Willard Report, the second part of the Willard Report, but quite a while after and this is what were presented and the government did not say one thing that it will implement in this, and this is the reason for the motion. I know that it will be defeated but if we can wake you people up it will be worth it.

Before I leave the book I'd like to read this on the second year course. It is in here. "There is a general consensus shared by the Committee that nursing education should be divorced from nursing service. As the first step in this direction the Committee recommends that the education program for the preparation of diploma nurse be based on a two-year course." This is one of the only 15 resolutions directed at the government but this is a big one. If the government did nothing else but that it would be doing something, but it should have acted long before now. And we saw that the reason why so many girls are leaving, it's because they are dissatisfied. This would give better job satisfaction.

Another thing, the girls, the nurses, would not be overworked as is the case right now in Manitoba. You say there's no shortage of nurses and we're stretching it so fine that it is at the danger point and this is what the administrators of all the hospitals will tell you. This is what they told me. We know that the casual nurses will refuse to work in certain wards. This is the case. They will refuse to work in certain wards because they're overworked, because there is too much to do. So again this is dissatisfaction and we're losing nurses. Some of the student nurses - going back to the student nurses - some of them have the responsibility, (I'd like the Member from Winnipeg Centre to take notice of this) for 36 patients. A student nurse, up to 36 patients; the responsibility for up to 36 patients. And some of these girls can't graduate soon enough to leave the province with those conditions existing.

Now maybe we should start by really recognizing this is another -- this is another, not resolution, well, advice of the Committee, a recommendation - that the Nursing Association must have a voice in discussing the mutual problems. We are not talking with these people. We are talking with the Manitoba Hospital Commission and sometimes with the doctors but those people have no voice at all, and they certainly play an important role here in the hospital care of our people. They are asked to -- first of all they are asked to accept all kinds of jobs but they have nothing to say about this. Sometimes they do the work of a doctor. Some doctors figure that they've got a little stooge there running around and they do a lot of the work. This is not right. They are not there for that at all. They're operating machines that should be done by technicians or sometimes by doctors. They are relieving these people. This is fine. They're not going to complain if they get the proper help and discuss these things with them.

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd.) They are a professional body also, and I think that they should have a voice in this.

Now for instance we have intensive care. You have nurses actually -- they're doing the work of a doctor there aren't they? The intensive care, they're taking -- there's an awful big responsibility placed on some of these girls. Did we ever discuss the planning of any hospitals with any nursing group? The steps that these girls have to take? It's always the doctors. This is fine, but what about those girls? They spend an awful lot more hours in the hospitals than any doctors. I think that they should be -- I think that the former Minister of Health agrees with me. He's smiling and I think that he thinks it would be a good idea and I hope that he will suggest this to the Minister of Health.

I say that we should have more -- is the Minister saying that you have proper consideration for the nurses? Can he stand up now and say that this is the case? I don't think that it is.

And there is the question of salaries, of course. The provinces to our left and to our right have always paid, or they're certainly paying more than we are now, and as I said before, Saskatchewan is importing nurses where Manitoba has been exporting nurses. Now we're not saving that much money when we do that.

For the Member for Winnipeg Centre I would say that if he wants the exact amount of what it costs to train a nurse at General Hospital, it is \$2,120.00 per year per nurse. So when we chase them out of the province we're saving an awful lot of money. We're spending this money training, and we're doing the same thing with technicians and a lot of other people. I don't want you to think that it's only the nurses. A girl can have a degree in business, not take any more time if she'll work and she'll be trained at this place, to work on a computer she'll start at \$550.00 a month. And what will a nurse start at? And I'm not talking about a nurse with a diploma, I'm talking about a degree. She'll start at \$450.00. Now can you tell me that this is right? Look at what we're doing for the teaching profession. Why? Because they're together; because they're standing together and they have a little more weight. So I would say let's recognize the association of the nurses. Let's discuss things with them. Let's make them -- let's show them that we appreciate them, appreciate the work that they're doing and that we recognize the work they're doing.

Now the Minister also said that there's not -- everything's going to be fine -- the shortage of doctors. Well I want him to remember this, that he said that this Medicare program will not bring any shortage of doctors and hospital personnel. I want him to remember this because he said that, and we will see in a year or so, I don't want him to say, "Oh well we have Medicare." Because he was warned and he was warned last year and the year before. There'll be some rural districts especially without doctors.

Let me read this, quote from the Tribune here, Mr. Speaker: "The head of Winnipeg General Hospital said Friday the introduction of national Medicare will create a serious gap between demand for health services and the facilities available. Doctor L. O. Bradley, Executive Director of the 950-bed hospital told the 93rd Annual Meeting that even if brick and mortar can be provided the problem is not solved." And this is what I've been saying all along. "Hospital expansion is now limited by personnel shortage. The education of medical and all other health personnel is limited by shortage of . . .

MR. SPEAKER: . . . the honourable gentleman that he has four minutes.

M.R. DESJARDINS: Four minutes? I'll try to read fast. " ' . . . shortage of instruction of personnel,' said Mr. Bradley. He said, 'The Federal Government's decision to introduce Medicare on July 1st, 1967, will trigger some real excitement for the next few years.' Dr. Bradley added if hospital experience is any criteria in . . . , a demand for medical attention will follow." So let us not be too sure that things will be so easy. I say that we're going to have trouble. I don't say that the government should be blamed for all of that but recognize this fact, then you'll do something about it. This is the important thing. Talking about that there's no shortage of staff, forgetting the nurses now. This is one of the reasons why there is a shortage of nurses because hospitals are on a skeleton staff during the week-ends, for instance, and the nurse must do the work of the dietitian and pharmacist, because there's a shortage of pharmacists and dietitians. They can't -- there's a short staff during the week-end and the nurses have to do that again. The physiotherapists -- the Minister I asked him why this was not covered by the plan in St. Boniface. Do you remember that? Does the former Minister remember that? I've been asking that for the last four years, and he said, because there's a shortage of physiotherapists. If that right? Because I can find the page in Hansard where he said this. Now he says there's no such a thing as a shortage. Now what is the score? Let's

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd.) come clean on these things; let's tell us what is happening.

Maybe before you call me to order I should read this statement by the Chairman of the Manitoba Hospital Commission. He says, "For one thing we have such a shortage of health personnel in the province and in Canada that the hospitals would most likely fail to obtain everyone they want to hire, and at the same time there is now enough money in the individual hospital budget that every trained person in the province who wanted to work in a hospital can find a job. Mr. Holland said that the personnel squeeze remains most noticeable in the professional nursing field, but also, said, that the hospitals won't be able to get as many ward aids and ward clerks as they wish."

Well, Mr. Speaker, I could go on and on except that I only have a couple of minutes. I'm just saying that let's not blame the government, but unless the government admits that this is wrong, that there is a shortage, let's work together on this, but you will never accomplish anything if you close your eyes and if you're afraid to accept the responsibility and say "We did everything we could," because this is not the fact at all. You build hospitals like mortars and bricks like you're saying, but you do not keep up with the personnel and this is all I'm asking in this resolution. I've talked about this for many years with the government not really being concerned. Now I wanted to bring out this fact - let them vote against it, but with a guilty conscience, and if nothing else, to say, all right, we'll get down to business and we'll do something about this.

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

MR. DESJARDINS: Yeas and nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

MR. DESJARDINS: I'd like to see the First Minister's face once before I go.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

A standing vote was taken, the result being as follows:

YEAS: Messrs. Barkman, Campbell, Cherniack, Clement, Dawson, Desjardins, Dow, Doern, Fox, Froese, Green, Guttormson, Hanuschak, Harris, Hillhouse, Johnston, Kawchuk, Miller, Molgat, Patrick, Paulley, Petursson, Shoemaker, Tanchak, Uskiw and Vielfaure.

NAYS: Messrs. Baizley, Beard, Bjornson, Carroll, Cowan, Craik, Einarson, Enns, Evans, Hamilton, Jeannotte, Johnson, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McGregor, McKellar, McKenzie, McLean, Masniuk, Roblin, Shewman, Spivak, Stanes, Steen, Weir, Witney, and Mesdames Forbes and Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 26; nays, 29.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the resolution lost. The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Logan. The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member for Kildonan as a trade unionist and a skilled employee called for the establishment of a permanent committee to study the problems of automation, and we now have before us an amended resolution by the Honourable Member for St. Matthews who proposes in its place a conference. This is a rather simple solution to a complex problem. I think that the Honourable Member for St. Matthews failed to recognize or give due weight to the complexity of the problem. For example, the Economic Council of Canada recently reported on a study of automation, which took two years with representatives of the various groups and a 27 member advisory council and apparently this resolution which is now amended proposes to initiate a study, and I hope that the conclusions won't be that this will therefore solve a very complex problem, because as we all know, automation has affected our economy and our life, is affecting it, and will more greatly affect it in the future.

For instance, we know that the effects on certain groups will be absolutely devastating. The unskilled worker, the unskilled labourer will in the future be practically wiped out if not in fact wiped out. Skilled labour - in some cases some of the occupations of skilled workers will disappear and others will require a great deal of retraining. There are some areas though that I think people are not aware of and this is the white collar worker and the worker in middle management, people who generally work in offices and who feel that technological change will not affect them. But they too will be very drastically affected and many of their occupations will be wiped out. And of course this would leave, in general, top management or the executive positions, that they too, if not replaced, will certainly face an altered kind of world where decision-making will be completed in many instances by computers and so on - other electronic devices. In addition to this there are problems of leisure time, a reduced work week and so on.

Now for example in the last few months we have dealt with two groups in particular that

(MR. DOERN cont'd.) appeared to require special study, youth and women. Mr. Chairman, there's no doubt that the future in terms of employment is rather cloudy, but one thing is certain, and that is that the world of work will be radically different in the future. So what are our youth to do about it? Are we going to give them the necessary guidance and assistance that they require to make decisions regarding their occupations - and women in particular I think require some guidance and assistance in preparing for the future. Many women feel I think that they now have excellent job opportunities in the sense of secretarial or working as clerks, etc., where the greatest proportion of them work in the white collar field, but many of those jobs will disappear in the near future. Clerical jobs will disappear; white collar jobs in accountancy which are now done by thousands and thousands of bookkeepers will simply be done by computers; telephone operators are now being replaced by direct distance dialing and so on; and eventually even a typist may disappear because they're now working on machines where a person talks into a machine and a typewriter types it out. But I guess the complexity of the English language will perhaps prevent this from taking place in the near future unless it's felt necessary to go back and revise some of our spelling.

At any rate, the Honourable Member for St. Matthews believes that a conference will solve this problem, sort of a situation of automation made easy or understood or wiped out in one simple lesson, and I would like to know just what form this conference would take, whether this is going to be a one-day conference or a couple of days and so on. In any case, it will be inadequate because what we need is a continuing study on this problem or at least a study in depth, because for example to study, as the resolution sets out, to study the effects of technological change - I like that word "study" - and to study its moral and its economic and sociological implications at a conference seems to me to be a little bit overly optimistic, because to actually propose an indent study at a conference with moral, economic and sociological effects, I think is unrealistic.

But this is the motion before us and I feel that, as the saying goes, "Half a loaf is better than none," or in this instance perhaps a crumb is preferable to no bread at all, because perhaps if we accept this tiny crumb there may be a promise of more bread in the offing. So I feel that the members of this House should support this resolution because it does provide some hope - and it's a very limited hope - because maybe the conference will draw some of these problems to our attention, and in particular it might recommend the initiation and development into a permanent study group. I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, that this will be one of the conclusions, that the conference will feel frustrated in its efforts and will recommend that a permanent group be established which was the original proposal of the Honourable Member for Kildonan -- or for Logan, pardon me.

HON. OBIE BAIZLEV (Minister of Labour) (Osborne): Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words on this topic. I got a little concerned when the Honourable Member for Elmwood suggested that we might automate women, and I think that's probably going a little far and a little fast.

But we're quite aware, all of us in this House, that our lives have been affected by technological change. I am sure members opposite are aware that there were meetings held in this past year with representatives of labour and management to take a look at the problem of automation and technological change. One might say when I use the term technological change, I'm including automation. I understand from some of the experts that they don't like the two to go together, that they are different, but I think for purposes of this discussion and for we members here, if you will accept the fact that when I'm talking about technological changes I'm talking about automation.

We have good reason to be optimistic here that we can cope with the problems of automation in our society. I can appreciate honourable members being concerned, but to say that nothing has been done is not true. You look at the government measures and procedures that have been instituted to relieve the impact of automation and technological change by expanding training methods for adults, for encouraging adults to retrain and for paying allowances for retraining.

Honourable members acquainted with the trade union movement know that there are many programs in contracts that call for measures that will relieve the impact of change on the worker. I have to agree with the Honourable Member from St. Matthews when he suggests, in light of our experience here in Manitoba, that we have a conference, and I think that the Honourable Member from Elmwood carried on a little further and he was getting very close to what we expect would be the benefit from such a conference, that if in fact it is a problem in the

(MR. BAIZLEY cont'd.) province, that there will be a committee established and it will be studying the continued effect. -- (Interjection) -- It is a problem, but that problem I must tell my honourable friend is offset when you have a high rate of employment, when training is readily available and people can be retrained. I'm not suggesting that it is not a problem; I'm not suggesting that there aren't people who are hurt by technological change; and I don't believe that the community should benefit from technological change without devising some ways and means of lessening the impact of that change on individuals who have been hurt, and I think the government has pledged a very forward-looking role in this scheme of things. You have taken measures to relieve the impact. We have gone so far as to work with labour and management groups to study the problems, to find out what measures might be more beneficial than those measures that are being used at the present time.

The other thing that we can be thankful for is that the people coming into the work force in today's society are much more adaptable and much better prepared for rapid changes that are occurring every day than the older generation. As the honourable member pointed out, the problems today in our society are with the middle management group, people in the young middle age, or like myself in the old middle age who hope to see another half century but who have been in a particular position for twenty-five or thirty years, who have lost confidence in being able to do anything except that particular job or method of operation that they have been doing for so many years. And they are not protected. They are not protected by union, and in many instances it is very hard to motivate them to take advantage of measures that are available to them to improve their situation and give them a new lease on life.

So I commend very highly to the members of this House the amendment to this resolution, and I can assure honourable members opposite that I have the same concerns about what might happen, about what the responsibilities of government should be, and I say to honourable members that government is facing and has faced its responsibility to cope with technological change in our community in a very adequate manner. We have labour and management recognizing that they have a role to play, that management itself today is not just interested in a sheer profit motive, that they have the responsibility to inform their employees as well in advance of any major changes as they possibly can and their intentions. I don't think that this is interfering with any management rights at all, I think that it is a moral obligation that most managements feel they have today to their employees. You have instances where large corporations have seen fit to establish large sums of money to ease the impact - I'm thinking of the Domcar situation in Eastern Canada - where they have entered into a pact with their employees where they will establish a fund of some \$5 million to assist any of their employees that are affected by technological change.

Now while our industrial community is expanding rather rapidly, I'm not suggesting that our community and our employers here have to establish a \$5 million fund to ease the impact of technological change, but I am suggesting that they can be concerned. There are many alternative methods that are not too costly, and the best method that has been arrived at so far is one of consultation between employee and employer as to what the hopes and aspirations of the employer are and where his particular employees fit into the scheme of development, and are they interested in retraining.

I would like to suggest here, Mr. Speaker, that the trade union movement can play a much greater role in facing up to these changes than they are at the present time and the role is this, a service to their membership and an encouragement to take advantage of the measures of training and retraining that are available today. All too often they enter into contracts for immediate benefits, or for benefits for today, without giving the necessary consideration to the benefits that should be considered for their membership over the long term, but I am sure that some of these facts will come out.

No doubt you have gathered by now that I'm not in favour of introducing any legislative measures at this time that may impose rigid rules - as some members opposite suggest might be a good idea - rigid rules on the parties. While changes are occurring rapidly, labour, management and government are coping with it, as has been suggested by the amendment of the Honourable Member from St. Matthews recommending that government conduct a conference. I give assurance to members of this House that it will be a meaningful conference and we look forward to inviting some of the members opposite who have been most concerned about this problem, so that at a later date we would have the privilege of their experience at the conference and of their criticism of the conference. I urge you to support the amendment to this resolution.

MR. R. O. LISSAMAN (Brandon): Mr. Speaker, like so many of the people that we heard who weren't going to speak, but certain things that are said promote some words. I have never spoken on this particular resolution although we have had it in various forms for several years now, because as a result of my own experience and reading and so on, I'm not unduly concerned about this tremendous worry over automation that the NDP group seem to enjoy.

I think it's rather much the same attitude that was taken during the industrial revolution in Europe a century or two ago, and my reason for this -- I think if every member would remember back I think they would realize that man is a pretty adaptable animal, and thinking through my lifetime, as being a child and from there on, cars certainly were created or invented before I was born but they came into general usage during my lifetime. The same might also be said of the telephone, and then we have had many new industries, completely new industries born during my lifetime, and my experience tells me and my common sense tells me that this technological advance we are going through will do nothing more than make a better, more wealthy in all senses, not just in money but a profitable and wealthy life for people to enjoy. It will mean more leisure because we do enjoy the profits of the machine and the technical devices that are being developed. It will mean living literally like kings. We are buying things now and enjoying things that in medieval history kings could not possibly enjoy.

Now when you think of the tremendous developments ahead -- and many of them are already conceived but it is just not yet practical, economically, to put them on the market -- for instance we are all aware of transistors and now there is such a thing as an electronic chip which brings within the size of a match head 20 or 30 normal components of transistors and condensers and the like. It is possible now to put on one square inch of surface 10 times the amount of information recorded upon a long play record counting both sides. If you go back and just think of how our grandfathers, and even some of our parents in this country, were simply too busy grubbing for a living to be able to enjoy the things that you enjoy, now imagine our grandparents feeling wasteful enough to buy such a thing as a potato chip, and yet here we have multi-million dollar industries producing potato chips and giving employment to thousands. How anyone can have the slightest fear of the developments that are coming along through man's knowledge is beyond me.

The Minister mentioned a moment ago the corporation attitudes today, and because corporations are formed by many people and not the old idea of the boss, they have an attitude to the community and feel that this is one world and all must have the right to a decent living. I suspect that most of us who are branded as Conservatives in this day and age only probably think conservatively in this sense, that we do believe that everyone should contribute their share, that no one should get a free ride in this world, and within that meaning we will enjoy things in this life that were unbelievable a generation or two ago.

Now I have always thought this for example -- because the product of invention will give us more leisure time and more enjoyment -- if you just think of this one thing, if everyone who would like to travel suddenly had the time and the financial assistance to be able to travel, it would keep almost an entire generation building up travel facilities and hotel facilities. There is literally no end. The only problem -- and labour unions and corporation attitudes and in fact legislators' attitudes make this almost a certainty. The only problem is the sharing of the benefits of the machine and these new technical devices, and the only danger in the meantime -- and this is probably what the New Democratic Party workers particularly worry about -- is the impact of the change during this period.

But as I said before, man is an adaptable animal. Thinking of all the things that have come along through the lifetime of a person of my age and seeing the completely new things develop, I remember -- and this is an aside, but it is kind of interesting -- I was asked to speak to a group of children on citizenship in a public school, and in speaking to children I knew I didn't have to appear to be terribly profound or very precise or perfect so I didn't bother making any notes, but as I went about my normal duties for a week or two I thought, now what should I tell grade school children as one of the prime requisites of being a good citizen. I decided that I should tell them that probably the most necessary thing was that they should get themselves all the education that they could possibly get. Then I proceeded to illustrate and I said, you know when I was a boy there were countless jobs available to people with practically no education. For example, the draying business, teamsters, and I said now just think of the technical knowledge that a teamster needed in comparison to a modern truck driver. The vehicle was simply largely two spindles, four wheels and a platform, and the extent of his technical knowledge probably was pulling the wheel off and greasing it and putting it back on.

(MR. LISSAMAN cont'd.) Well, horses are animals; we are animals, and we know relatively and generally how to treat them but a modern truck is a very complicated instrument, and even if the driver is not called upon to service it and make mechanical adjustments, he certainly does have to have a lot more technical information about that truck than the teamster did when I was a boy driving horses.

Well from then on I started to get myself in trouble. I reminded them of the old-fashioned gramophone compared to the modern electronic device for reproduction of music and sound that they had in their homes, and then I suddenly realized that none of these children had probably seen the old gramophone and I had to describe how the needle following a wavy track actuated the diaphragm and created sound waves. Well, I went through several items in the home and found that as I was describing the old element that had been replaced, that none of these children had seen it and I had to describe the old one. But it impressed in my mind that this had come along in one generation.

Now certainly change is going to come faster in the years that lie ahead than that has preceded, but man is an adaptable animal and to have any worry about it, other than that of simply sharing in the benefits, is ridiculous. It means completely more opportunities, more leisure, more enjoyment, more time for the better things of life, and maybe the right of the common person to enjoy just simply living, which this generation certainly seems to have thrown to the winds where previous generations had their nose to the grindstone.

So, Mr. Speaker, while I'm going to vote for the resolution, I don't share any feeling of despondency or discouragement that this technological change is any threat at all to mankind.

MR. LEMUEL HARRIS (Logan): Mr. Speaker, . . .

MR. ROBLIN: Would my honourable friend care to adjourn the debate as we've reached the time we agreed to go into government procedure.

MR. HARRIS: I'll adjourn the debate.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would just inform the House that if my colleague from Logan takes the adjournment it will be closing the debate. If anyone else wishes to take part in the debate, they should be notified.

MR. HARRIS: I move, seconded by the Member for Wellington, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, before we go on to government business, may I be allowed a moment on the question of privilege. Earlier on today the Honourable Member for Lakeside and I indulged in a heated altercation about a point of order and I fear that in the course of those remarks I made what can only be described as an unkind remark about my honourable friend, and on reflection I regret having made that statement. So I'd like to take advantage of this opportunity to apologize to the House and to my honourable friend for having made an unkind remark about him and I trust that I may be forgiven.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned on a previous occasion, accustomed as I am to having almost any kind of remark made about me, I am always unaccustomed and slightly embarrassed when somebody reverses the procedure. The first part is very easy to take and becomes more easy with the passage of time; the second one is a role in which I am unfamiliar. However, I would like to say, if I made any defence of the Honourable the First Minister, that we all perhaps say things in the heat of debate that we would wish afterwards that we hadn't said, and I would have to admit that once in a while I have been guilty of becoming - oh, just a trifle heated in my remarks myself, and so in acknowledging the Honourable First Minister's courtesy and recognizing of course that at least part of his statement was true, I would say that I appreciated the spirit by which he was actuated at the moment.

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate . . .

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I believe the order of business we would now have called, Sir, would be the Committee of the Whole House to consider Bill No. 56.

MR. SPEAKER: Committee of the Whole House.

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Provincial Treasurer) (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Attorney-General, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider Bill No. 56.

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

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution of the Honourable Member for Inkster that the Committee give consideration to the advisability of amending Paragraph 4 (1) (h) by adding after the word "therefor" the words "and tools required to be provided by an employee as a condition for his continued employment." The Honourable the Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I expressed my views on this last night but I'll just re-iterate them very briefly. I'm sure that the government recognizes that in principle the same consideration should be applied to tools which an employee requires as a condition of his employment as the principles which prompted them to exempt farm implements, farm machinery and repair parts. We understand, and as has been expressed by the Honourable Minister, that the failure to exempt these tools rises strictly from administrative reasons and has nothing to do with the fact that the government would not like to make this exemption.

I would urge, Mr. Chairman, that the government take the same action, if they feel disposed, with regard to this resolution as they took with regard to the resolution concerning Paragraph (e) put by the Member for St. John's and concerning drugs and medicaments. I think, Mr. Chairman, that there might be some avenues of making this exemption possible merely by a consideration of the administration that would be involved, and I just wonder whether the Minister couldn't have another look to see whether this change can be administratively possible, because if it is, it certainly in principle is something that the government appears to be willing to do.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, I would want always to try to be open-minded. As my honourable friend says, we have no objection in principle but I still find it impossible to agree at this stage, but all of these matters will continue to be reviewed as the tax measure is installed and developed either by regulation during the course of the year, or a year from now it will be possible to reconsider it again. At the present moment I can't support it.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, on the statement of the Minister, do I understand him to say that this might be changed by regulation during the year, because if he did, then what is the purpose of us passing or considering these various clauses as to the items that can be or can not be taxable in Bill 56? If I heard my honourable friend correctly, it would indicate to me that notwithstanding what we agreed upon or - well we're not agreeing with anything really - but it seems rather misleading.

MR. EVANS: Well, I think I was trying to indicate that we want to have an open-minded attitude, that as we administer the tax there will be changes by regulation. I would say this one would probably require a change in the Act and could not be brought about by a change in regulations.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, the one last ditch effort which the government sometimes uses as an expedient, the Minister could bring in a subsection with regard to tools required by an employee and have the subsection one that would not come into force until proclamation, but that at least would recognize in the Act that the government legislatively wants to make this exemption but it would not come into effect until the government proclaims it, which is similar to what is done in many other cases. To give you a good example, the legal entity clause came into effect on proclamation, and I would say, Mr. Chairman, that this group is certainly going to support this amendment, but if the Minister comes back in a couple of days and puts something like I suggest in, then we'll think we've touched him anyway.

MR. EVANS: Well, I assure my honourable friend he always touches me. It would be, in my view, administratively impossible to adopt the resolution as put forward, certainly on the grounds of requiring formal proof, for example tools being necessary for continued employment, for example. I see that as administratively impossible at this stage and for that reason I can't support the resolution at this time, and all I wanted to indicate formerly was that I hope to continue in an open-minded attitude.

MR. FOX: Mr. Speaker, in view of the words that the Minister just now said that administratively it would not be possible to recognize people who have these tools as a necessity for work, I think there's not that much of a difficulty. As was suggested last night, the Minister of Labour could held the Minister of the Treasury out on this. I have a certificate as an engineer; the electricians have journeymen's licence; carpenters have journeymen's tickets. Now these are all that would be necessary for proof and I don't think that it should be that difficult to administer. I know that auto mechanics need as many as 1,700 to \$2,000 worth of tools if they're working in a specialized line of work, and every day this is increasing because of the technological change that is taking place in the cars, the new tools they need. The company doesn't supply them because these people are free to move from one job to another, so if they're going to work and earn a livelihood, especially under the difficulties that they encounter at the present time with regard to working on a flat rate basis, they have to have the most up-to-date tools to do their job. So it's a requisite to have them, and I'm sure that this administrative difficulty could be overcome. Mr. Chairman, in support of this motion might I point out to the Minister that in Section 4, subsection (3), provision is made, notwithstanding section 3 previous, that no tax is payable in respect of machinery or equipment used by the purchaser thereof directly in the process, manufacture or production of tangible personal property. Now if the company the man works for is able to buy equipment, and will be able to buy equipment I assume on the signing of certificates claiming exemption, surely the employee should be in the same position because he will have to bring these tools to work with him if he's to hold his job. So that I think the same consideration should be given to the employee who requires tools as to the firm which employ him who will be able to buy his equipment without the tax imposition.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I think it should be noted here also that certain people that are acquiring skills at the various trade schools and so on have to furnish some of their own equipment and tools while they're in training. I'm informed of a certain party that -- he had to get roughly \$300.00 worth of tools himself in trying to get these skills. Now what is the case in connection with these people? Will they have to pay a tax on it or will it be exempted?

MR. CHAIRMAN put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion lost.

MR. GREEN: Ayes and nays, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Call in the members.

A standing counted vote was taken with the following results: Ayes, 25; Nays, 28.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Motion lost. (h) -- passed. (i) -- passed. (j) -- passed. (k) -- passed. (l) -- passed.

..... continued on next page

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Chairman, I would like to make an amendment on (1). As the section reads, it says all these items "when purchased in bulk for farm use." Mr. Chairman, there are many chemicals and weed control fluids that come in two gallon cans or one gallon cans or five gallon cans, fertilizers come in 50 pound bags although mostly it's ordered by the ton, but the way this section reads: "When purchased in bulk for farm use," would exclude all sorts of packaged items.

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Provincial Treasurer) (Fort Rouge): I wonder if my honourable friend would mind if I interrupted him on this point because we'll get into the same situation here that we got into the other evening on medicaments and things. I have a message from His Honour authorizing the change that my honourable friend has in mind. Now if he cares to proceed with his address and would like to continue that, I would like to inform him that I have a message and an appropriate amendment which I think he will find acceptable. And now I'd be glad to listen to the rest of his speech. Now I hope I'm not interrupting some plan that he has but I think this would be the right way to do it. If he cares to address the House without moving the motion it would certainly make it easier to accomplish what he wants.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does the honourable member wish this to stand in Committee?

MR. EVANS: No, I think if my honourable friend will complete his address then I can make a comment afterwards. I did want to draw his attention to the fact that I have an amendment prepared to accomplish what he wants.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of N.D.P.) (Radisson): Mr. Chairman, I wonder on this vein whether I might - or in this vein may I make a suggestion to my honourable friend. It might save a lot of debate on other items as well if our honourable friend the Provincial Treasurer would at the commencement of the hearings on the tax bill or the consideration of the tax bill, bring in his message from His Honour at that time even though we're not at the particular item concerned, and then we will know there won't be needed to carry on a debate.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, ... one. When the amendments were brought in originally the first day when the Minister gave us the list of amendments I particularly asked him then were there any other government amendments? The Minister said, "no." So we have no means of knowing what is going to be proposed.

MR. EVANS: ... two more or three more have arisen since. One we dealt with last night. The present item is clause (1) subsection (1) of Section 4 and I propose to move an amendment with a message from His Honour on that section. Another one is Section 28 of Bill 56, clause (f). Now it's a technical amendment having to do -- it will have the effect of adding section (g) defining for the purposes of clause (1) of subsection (1) of subsection 4, the item that we're dealing with now. Quantities of fertilizer, insecticides, fungicides, rodenticides or weed control chemicals by reference to weight volume or values. And it will be the intention to do what -- I don't want to interrupt or spoil my honourable friend's speech. I'm sure he wants to make a presentation as to the reasons for it and I don't want to interrupt him any more than to try to escape the difficulty we got into the other night. --(Interjection)-- Yes, I'm informing the House now that I propose to bring in a message to effect those amendments.

MR. JOHNSTON: I thank my honourable friend for his disclosure in this regard and I won't pursue that part of the argument any further but have another point to make on the same clause. And it says, "when purchased in bulk for farm use". Well, Mr. Chairman, these items: fertilizers, insecticides, fungicides herbicides and rodenticides, etc. are used for other than farm use. They're also used by small market gardeners. They're used for the production of food, not necessarily on a farm. So the amendment I have, I would like to make my amendment and then if there is some agreement that it would be acceptable we could discuss that later. So I move that the Committee of the Whole give consideration to the advisability of amending Bill 56, Section 4, clause (1) (1) by deleting all the words after 'purchased' and adding the following words: 'for the production of food.'

MR. CHAIRMAN: Are you ready for the question.

MR. EVANS: I wonder if I could see the amendment. Mr. Chairman, I thank the Committee for allowing me a few minutes to discuss this matter. It does seem to me that to use the term 'for the production of food' would change the intent of the section the way it stands now or the way it would be amended, because the intention is to relieve farmers of this expense, farmers who are in the business of growing food and only that; and not to extend that exemption to the casual growing of vegetables in a personal garden at the home or whatever the case may be. Consequently I find I'm not able to accept the amendment in the form in which it is and I'm in the same difficulty as I was with the other matter.

(MR. EVANS cont'd).....

I don't want to be put in the position of voting against what is the principle of this amendment because I have, after some technical discussion with the Fertilizer Association and my officials having had many discussions: I've had discussions and representations from the North-West Line Elevator Association, from the Fertilizer Manufacturers' Association, from a number of distributors of fertilizer — and on the basis of that I am bringing forward the resolution in the form that I have it which I think accomplishes the purpose of relieving the farmers of the production costs, the tax on production costs, namely, fertilizer and these other things. That is the sole purpose of the section, not to exempt other classes of usage, and consequently I must say that I'm not able to agree to the wording of this amendment.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, the difficulty here I think arises over the definition of "farm". Market gardening after all is one of the major industries in the Province of Manitoba and where are we going to draw the line here? Surely someone who's engaged in the production of food is what we are trying to cover, and it seems to me that if we took that definition — and I would assume that the Minister intends to exempt the market gardeners. I would think his colleague, the Minister of Agriculture would regard that as one of the important things to do, particularly that we are trying to encourage our people to diversify. Well then what is left really if we say "the production of food," when we're dealing with fertilizers insecticides, fungicides. The balance of it for casual garden use by individuals would be insignificant in quantity. It doesn't apply to the growing of flowers and these matters, it's strictly the production of food. It seems to me that the amendment proposed puts the intent that the Minister I believe has and would simplify in the final analysis the drafting of his own regulations.

HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Minister of Agriculture and Conservation) (Rockwood-Iberville): Mr. Chairman, if I may perhaps be of some assistance to my colleague. There are some significant areas of other use such as perhaps golf course, etc. where a considerable amount of fertilizer could be used for the maintenance of greens, and it's for this reason that the amendment that my colleague is proposing to support has to be worded in that way; it can't be all inclusive.

MR. MOLGAT: I recognize that golf courses, and the Provincial Government itself buys a fair amount of fertilizer in these matters, but if we say for the production of food doesn't this arrive at the exclusion that we want here? Obviously golf courses would not be exempt from the sales tax on fertilizers. But if it's for the production of food then we don't have to get involved in analyzing which market gardener is eligible because he happens to produce only a portion or he's a small market gardener; is he eligible or is he not. This is what we're going to run into unless we make this type of definition.

MR. EVANS: ... clear up one point. I would certainly agree that a market gardener is a farmer. That would be a farm use; obviously growing food as a living or for profit is obviously a farm use. But to phrase it the other way makes it necessary for the inspection staff, first of all to satisfy themselves either by way of statement or affidavit or whatever the case may be of the use to which it is intended to put a particular purchase, probably in a small package possibly at a department store, and to satisfy themselves that the stuff was actually put to that use after having been bought. Now I think when a farmer known to be a professional farmer buys a substantial quantity of fertilizer that is reasonable assurance that it is being used for the purpose set out in the Act. That is a part of the reason for phrasing the proposed amendment in the way that we're doing after discussion with the large distributors of fertilizers to the farm trade.

MR. MOLGAT: I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if we might resolve this by asking the Minister to give us a copy of the exact amendment that he proposes and leave the section open and then we'll be prepared to reconsider whether we should withdraw ours.

MR. EVANS: Yes, copies are ready and I would ask that we distribute all of the amendments that I've referred to now, particularly those that are going to be introduced by way of a message. So that my honourable friends then will have all of the proposed amendments that I know of to this point. I tell the Leader of the Opposition that I try to keep an open mind, if other things come forward that I agree with, some of them may require a message in which event I'm afraid I'll have to introduce it.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, there's one point that hasn't been covered. I don't know how many farmers there are in Manitoba but I've been told there's somewhere over a 100,000 farms, farmers. They will be using any tax free purchases that they would buy for their business of farming for their personal use as well in their own gardens, and this is

(MR. JOHNSTON cont'd)... nearly half the population. Surely you won't be expecting the farmers to decide how they're going to use it once they get it home and pay tax on a part of it that they would be using in their personal gardens. Now my point is, if that part is administratively impossible to handle, then why not exclude all uses mentioned in the clause and let everybody in the province have the equal right to use it tax free in their own garden?

MR. EVANS: Well I think you can make a reasonable presumption when a professional farmer or market gardener buys fertilizer in suitable quantities that it is in connection with his business. If some of it is put on his lawn but by all odds the largest part of it used for farming, that is something that is probably not controllable; but on the other hand many other uses are not intended to be exempt. We would not intend to exempt the casual use for lawns even for small bits of vegetables, nor for golf course, nor for many other uses, and so I have stated the intention of the Act is to exempt fertilizer from tax to be used in the business of farming.

MR. JOHNSTON: I ask the Honourable Minister how is the hardware merchant going to distinguish when a person comes in and buys a five gallon can of 24-D whether it's going to go to a farm or to a home in a town; how is the hardware merchant going to distinguish in this case?

MR. EVANS: Well I am sure it can be checked as to whether it is being sold to a farmer and it can be checked as to whether it's in suitable quantities. If our Compliance Officer or Inspector is able to satisfy himself as to those points then he will recognize that the sale is made tax exempt.

MR. EDWARD I. DOW (Turtle Mountain): The Minister has been talking about the fertilizers, but what about these weed control units that are through the province, are they going to have to be taxable for their use of material which is weed controls which are primarily used in and around the farms to protect the spread of weeds. Will this exclude these units from being taxed for their materials that are necessary for weed controls or are they tax free?

MR. EVANS: That is one case that will have to be given special consideration as indeed the weed control chemicals used by railways on their right-of-way. That is a special case that must be given consideration. I think my honourable friend will perhaps understand that I don't want to give a firm indication at the moment because it's a complex matter and I want to get the right answer before I give any indication of what it will be.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, in coming to the right answer would the Minister also consider that the insecticides and pesticides purchased for the purpose of mosquito abatement by a municipality may be a special consideration as well, and then when you come in with your right answer let's hope that that will be one of the things that's included.

MR. EVANS: Certainly we'll take a note of that item. These specialized items I think, many of them, will require further consideration. There are a lot of complexities about some of these. I've had raised privately to me another question in connection with gravel and sand to be used by municipalities in the construction of roads, sidewalks and gravel roads; and this is a very complex matter. We don't even know really who owns the gravel or whether the price of the gravel should be - if it isn't to be taxable, if it's to be regarded as incorporating private taxable personal property into real property as in the case of a building, that's quite clear. Is a sidewalk or a road in the same category? I'm not sure. Then if it were to be considered taxable what's the price; is it merely the royalty on the gravel itself? My honourable friend was kind enough to raise this point with me privately and I'm having it looked into. I'm merely saying that there are good many complex matters of this kind and I don't want to give an answer until I've had a chance to study it with my staff.

MR. SAMUEL USKIW (Brokenhead): Mr. Chairman, there's something here that concerns me and that is the question of whether or not municipalities should be included in the exemption in the weed control programs. I don't see anywhere in this Act where this is provided for and if the Minister would just clear this point one way or the other I would pursue an amendment.

MR. EVANS: It's the same point that my honourable friend from Turtle Mountain has just raised. He referred to it under the title of weed control units. I take it those are municipal weed control units. I have undertaken to look into the matter; I'm not able at this point to give a definite answer.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Agreed that this clause be allowed to stand? (m) passed. In (m) there's a typographical error in the second last line. It's "t-o-o-", it should be "t-w-o".

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, before we reach (m) I think this would be the proper place for

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd). the inclusion of another section, and I'm referring to farming supplies. My honourable friend the Minister has referred on a number of occasions to the Ontario Act and Saskatchewan Act. I think a good deal of his definitions come from both Acts. When you look at the Ontario Act for example, we find that they have specifically stated in the Act the following: "binder twine, baler twine, baler wire, barbed wire, farm, hog and poultry fence" as specific exempt items. We find in the Saskatchewan Act the definition is not identical but it specifically lists under various headings, in one case baler twine, another heading baling wire, another case, binder twine and then has a very long list, specifically under farm tools and commodities, where it goes into quite extensive details. Section 25 from (a) to (s) was on fence pickets and so on. In other words a much more detailed item of farm supplies that are exempt.

Now the Minister has indicated on a number of occasions when we have proposed some amendments that if the amendments were accepted we would be out of line with the other Acts, so I assume it is his desire to be in line with the other Acts, and quite obviously there is a sound valid reason for doing this. Otherwise we'll be sitting here as an island with different regulations than those around us. But here is a case then, that unless we make some changes in the present definitions, I would assume that these farm supplies which are a fairly important part of farm costs, particularly in those areas where we want to encourage cattle production, and this is one of the diversification features that the Department of Agriculture has been pressing on Manitobans, these farm supplies then become of considerable importance to those specific areas.

So I would like to suggest, Mr. Chairman, that we have a section in the Act, and I think this would be the proper place for it, specifying that these are exempt. So I'd like to move that the Committee of the Whole give consideration to the advisability of amending Section 4, subsection (l) of the Bill by adding thereto a new section (m) to read as follows: "binder twine, baler twine, baler wire, barbed wire, farm, hog and poultry fencing."

MR. EVANS: This is obviously an important matter and I would like to have a chance to relate the intent of this amendment to whatever provisions there are here, and frankly, to sort it out. We'll have another case, if we were to agree to the intent of this, if it did have the effect of broadening or widening what we already intend to do, it would obviously be another one that would have to be included with a message.

Now, if my honourable friend would agree to leaving his proposed amendment, which is not an amendment to an existing section, but leave it in committee, give us a chance to return to it another day.

MR. MOLGAT: I have no objection, Mr. Chairman, to this one. I recognize the Minister cannot agree without checking with his own departmental people. No objection.

I wonder if I could recommend then to the Minister that when he undertakes to look at this that he ask the Minister of Agriculture to sit in on the discussions with his own people and the Treasury people and have a look at both Ontario and Saskatchewan Acts to see what other areas might be covered at the same time.

MR. EVANS: Oh yes. Well I always clear with my own colleagues before I bring it to the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Typographical error in (m) corrected; (m)--passed;

MR. HANUSCHAK: Are we on subsection (m)? Would the Honourable Minister be good enough to explain why only the commercial vessels over 200 tons gross are exempted from sales tax?

MR. FROESE: While the Minister is looking for his information I would like to propose an amendment to (n). I propose that the Committee give consideration to the advisability of the inclusion of buses as an item of exemption from taxation under Bill 56.

MR. EVANS: We're on the section just previous and if he could just hold that for a minute and come back to this other. My interpretation is that all boats used in fishing in our lakes will be exempt as it stands now. That is to say (m) as it reads now is commercial... (Interjection)--

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Minister is correct but the last phrase of Section (m) exempts commercial vessels of more than 200 tons gross so apparently there are boats used for various purposes on our waters, some for fishing and others for other commercial purposes, for freighting and such, and those for freighting, only those exceeding 200 ton gross.

MR. EVANS: I think my honourable friend is right. It's intended in the first place to

(MR. EVANS cont'd)....exempt the equipment and boats used by fishermen. That's perfectly clear in here. And intended also to exempt the larger transport vessels on the lake over 200 tons gross, and that's the purpose of it. The reason for it is to assist to that extent in maintaining or expanding lake transportation, which is something we think we should have and should assist.

MR. PHILIP PETURSSON (Wellington): Mr. Chairman, I don't know whether it would come under this particular clause or not but there's rather a tremendous activity carried on in the northern part of the province in the wintertime with tractor trains and things of that sort - caterpillar tractors hauling great quantities of goods on sleighs that follow along behind. Are these included anywhere or have they been given any consideration because they do the same thing as freighters on the lakes do in the summertime. They do the same thing in the wintertime that freighters do in the summertime on the lakes, freight boats and so on.

MR. EVANS: The matter of tractor trains and winter roads and the equipment on winter roads has been the subject of discussion not only with respect to the sales tax but with respect to motive fuel taxes as well. This is a matter in which the government is in discussion with the people concerned. There is no special exemption provided here for the equipment used in - I can only call them tractor trains or whatever the appropriate title is - for winter road transportation.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, before we leave this item I gather from the Minister that it is his intention to exempt production equipment, in general terms. Now where do we stand in the matter of the forestry equipment, that isn't specified as I see in the Act. I may have missed it. We did have a brief discussion on that before. I'm thinking of, for example, some of the tractors that are normally considered to be farm tractors but are used in forestry work. I know that from the federal sales tax end there have been problems at times in this regard. It has also been a problem as to when the tractor is used part-time at one function and the rest of the year at some other function. But the forestry end of it is an important one to the Province of Manitoba and I don't see any clear statement in the Act. I wonder if the Minister could tell me if it is there and whether he intends to bring in any specific amendment.

MR. EVANS: I might tell my honourable friend that when I did make that very long reply to questions that had accumulated at the time of the other debate, I mentioned forestry production equipment particularly. I repeat now, it is the intention to make them tax exempt under subsection (3) of Section 4 where it says "no tax is payable under this Act in respect of machinery, equipment, or apparatus or parts thereof which, in the opinion of the minister are to be used or are used by the purchaser thereof directly in the process of manufacture or production of tangible personal property for sale or directly in rendering a service."

So under the powers of that section forestry handling equipment will be exempt.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (m)--passed; (n) - now in (n) there's a typographical error, insert the word "in" after the word "defined" in the second line. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Yes Mr. Chairman, I would now like to propose my amendment that the Committee give consideration to the advisability of the inclusion of buses as an item of exemption from taxation under Bill 56.

Mr. Chairman, if I may speak to it. We note that the Bill contains the exemption of railway rolling stock under item (n) and also the aircraft is exempted from taxation and I see no reason why we could not include the matter of buses. Indeed some members must have received a similar letter that I got from the Grey Goose Bus Lines which points out a number of facts stating that there have been no increase in fares since 1954 and that the buses are used -- 90 percent of all traffic on buses is composed of people who cannot drive automobiles. These are the elderly, the widows, the children, the women indigents, university students, Indians on welfare, the blind, the physically and mentally handicapped and others in need of medical aid from rural Manitoba. Mr. Chairman, I feel that this amendment warrants consideration and that we should give consideration to the inclusion of buses as an exempted item for this very reason, because we recognize these others.

Then too just yesterday we passed in estimates under the Urban and Municipal Affairs an item of urban transit assistance of \$250,000, that's to the buses in the Metro area. If we're going to do in one case, why cannot we at least give some consideration to the exemption of buses under this tax on the other hand which would apply to the rural people. I think this definitely warrants consideration by the Committee and by the government, of exempting buses.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Chairman, I had an amendment prepared on this section dealing with the buses, and I would rise to support the Member for Rhineland in his contention regarding the buses. It is people in the rural parts of the province who are - of the lower income bracket - that are forced to take buses to and fro because they don't have the wherewithal to buy cars and I think it's these people that we're going to penalize if we don't take the tax off the buses.

I would also like to suggest that in view of the fact that clause (n) exempts railway rolling stock that this is discriminatory against our trucking industry in Manitoba. I feel that we should exempt trucks to put them at least on a fairer basis than they are at the present time. The trucking industry is not subsidized and I feel that the trucking industry warrants this consideration. So therefore I would move that the words "and buses" be added to - "and trucks" I beg your pardon - be added to the amendment submitted by the Member for Rhineland.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, in support of this motion, the proposed amendment, the entire matter again of Metropolitan transportation I think comes into the picture. I think it's essential that some consideration be given to the exemption of buses being used by Metro transit throughout Greater Winnipeg. The costs to Metro are going to be immense if these buses are being taxed. The cost of maintenance of the buses, the cost of replacing buses are very very high. Metro has come up with very large deficits year after year. Recently in the debate on the estimates of the Department was not prepared, or the government was not prepared to increase the amount of grants payable to Metro to help cover this deficit. They're coming up with the same amount as last year and now we find that Metro is going to be faced with increases by virtue of the fact that the tax is going to compound their deficit. I think it really is unfair, it's an unfair tax because the money has to be raised in the final analysis by the ratepayers who ostensibly are to be helped by the passage of this sales tax, and so it's a vicious circle. We're coming around again to imposing the tax back on the public.

Now under Section 3 the Minister has the discretion to exempt buses, because he says that no tax is payable where the apparatus may be used directly in rendering a service. Now surely the Metropolitan Transit System is rendering a service. It's rendering a service at cost - and as I mentioned not even at cost, they're not covering the cost - they're rendering you service and the cost has to be borne by the ratepayers.

So, Mr. Chairman, I think this amendment should be supported by all members of this House, because unless we do we are creating a problem for Metro which they have been living with for a number of years, have been looking to this government for a solution to this problem but up to now has gotten nowhere, and if we leave it as it stands, I'm afraid we're imposing on Metro an additional hardship over and above what they have today and are not only not helping them to eliminate their deficit, we're adding to it.

MR. LYON: I move the Committee rise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Call in the Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Committee has approved certain clauses and asks leave to sit again.

IN SESSION

MR. COWAN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne, that the report of the Committee be received.

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

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, if I may, before the motion to adjourn, once again remind the members that are coming to Brandon this afternoon that the bus is ready and waiting at the front of the steps. I'd like particularly to point out to those members who are coming down by their own cars that the Directors of the Fair Board wish to meet with all of us upon arrival at their arena office which is located in the arena.

For the benefit of the Leader of the New Democratic Party, the intention is that the bus leaves at 10:00 o'clock sharp in the evening coming back.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I would remind honourable members before moving adjournment that the Law Amendments Committee will be sitting Monday morning at 9:30, Room 254. I move, seconded by the Honourable Provincial Treasurer, that the House do now adjourn.

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