

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Wednesday, April 28, 1971

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.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed I should like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery where we have 80 students from Grade 11 from the Windsor Park School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Geoghegan. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Radisson. We also have 80 students Grade 11 standing of the Teulon Collegiate. These students are under the direction of Mr. Masters, Mr. Revel, Mr. Allen and Mr. Hoffman. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Gimli. Also as well there are 25 students of Grade 10 standing of the Westwood Collegiate. These students are under the direction of Mrs. Pybus. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia. On behalf of all the Honourable Members of the Legislative Assembly, I welcome you all here today.

STATEMENT - RULING BY THE CHAIR

MR. SPEAKER: Yesterday I took a matter under advisement. It is true that our Rule 100, subsection 2, allows for the transferring by the Clerk to the items for debate at the next sitting at which Private Members' business takes precedence.

Definition of debate under subsection 2 of the same rule states: "For the purpose of sub-rule (1) an indication by a Minister that the government (a) accepts an Order for Return or an Address for Papers; or (b) accepts an Order for Return or Address for Papers subject to conditions; or (c) does not accept an Order for Return or an Address for Papers, shall be deemed not to be a debate of the motion for the Order for Return or for Address for Papers."

Votes and Proceedings are the record of procedure and debate in the Assembly. In disallowing the Honourable Minister of Health and Social Development to proceed with the debate the Chair was guided by what was recorded in Votes and Proceedings. After perusing Hansard I find that the Honourable Minister of Health and Social Development did not debate the motion but indicated non-acceptance. The Chair wishes to apologize to the Honourable Minister since obviously Votes and Proceedings was not correct.

I should like to thank the Honourable Minister of Labour for drawing to my attention Rule 100. Where an indication by a Minister for acceptance subject to condition or non-acceptance is stated and the matter is asked to be laid over for debate, the Chair finds that repetition does occur if the indication of acceptance or non-acceptance is not brief, should subsequent debate occur. If there is to be wide latitude for the honourable members to express themselves and participate in debate the Chair recognizes that the rules must be enforced with flexibility. At the same time in order to eliminate repetition and expedite the progress of the work of the House the cooperation of all is desirable.

In order to prevent recurrence and error in Votes and Proceedings as transpired yesterday, I have instructed the staff that an Order for Return or an Address for Papers transferred to the next Private Members' Day for debate shall not contain the honourable members as having participated in debate provided the request is introduced without comment and reply is also limited to an indication of acceptance or non-acceptance with a brief explanatory comment.

One other matter arising out of yesterday's proceedings, the Chair would like to recognize the point the Honourable House Leader, the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources made last evening. The Chair extends its apologies for the misunderstanding. Since the Chair is not clairvoyant it would expedite the work of the House if members wishing to adjourn the debate would extend the courtesy to allow others to proceed who may wish to debate the motion, before adjourning. Thank you.

The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q.C. (Minister of Finance) (St. John's): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if before the Orders of the Day I can make a statement.

STATEMENT

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I have the bill for the City of Greater Winnipeg Act, the draft has now been sent to the Queen's Printer and I'm informed that it will take somewhere in the neighbourhood of three weeks before it comes back from the printer, and because it is an extensive bill and a very important bill and because in the past I, in opposition, felt it difficult to deal with a bill of this magnitude, I have made arrangements for copies of the draft which has gone to the Queen's Printer, to be made available to every member of the Legislature today so that those members interested in preparing will be able to start examining the bill and preparing for debate on it.

I might indicate that the proposed bill contains 22 parts and I think honourable members would be interested in knowing that parts 1, 2, 20 and 22 should be noted particularly. Part 1 deals with the incorporation and political organization; Part 2 deals with the administrative structure; Part 20 deals with the environment and contains some new concepts in that regard, and Part 22 deals with the transitional powers. The remaining parts adhere to existing municipal legislation as closely as possible, that is where possible in drafting this Act we've adhered to the existing provisions in the Winnipeg Charter, the Metropolitan Winnipeg Act, the Municipal Act and the Municipal Assessment Act, and therefore members who find some 500 pages to be a very large task should in my opinion deal more particularly and with greater care with parts 1, 2, 20 and 22. I have requested that if there are any changes in the printed bill as a result of proof reading or for whatever reason, changes from the draft which will be distributed in the bill itself, that they be brought to my attention so that when I introduce the bill on second reading I will be able to indicate to honourable members those portions which may have been changed so that they will be able to relate the draft which I am distributing with the bill when it will be presented.

Might I also say that the report of the Greater Winnipeg Electoral Boundaries Review Commission, the changes suggested there are not reflected in the bill itself because of just the timing and the fact that we had to proceed, so that that will obviously require amendments to the extent that amendments are suggested in the Review Commission Report, as will any other matters which will of course be discussed after the bill goes to Committee. I think therefore that is all I need say at this stage. Copies will be distributed today and there's a very limited supply of course because they were run off for this express purpose.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q.C. (Leader of the Opposition) (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, I welcome the statement of the Minister of Finance. I may say that the first question to be asked by myself as a result of our caucus meeting this morning was to ask whether in fact we would have the bill before us by May 15th. There has been a tendency, Mr. Speaker, and the present government is not the only one guilty of this, I believe that we were as guilty when we were in office, but there's always been a tendency to take those bills that are controversial and those bills that are lengthy and introduce them at the end of a Session when -- I say that that tendency was in fact shown by the present government when we talked about Bill 56 last year -- but there has always been a tendency to introduce it at the tail end of a Session when everyone is tired and when everyone has -- (Interjection) -- Mr. Speaker, may I remind the Honourable Deputy House Leader that if I want to make particular reference to Bill 56 and the conduct by the government of Bill 56 last year, I have a perfect example of the kinds of procedures that we would like to see stopped with respect to those matters in which there is both public interest and the necessity for study and debate.

It is interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that the Honourable Minister of Finance has indicated that it is some 500 pages and that makes it -- (Interjection) -- 499 to be exact -- and that means, Mr. Speaker, that this will require considerable study. Now the members on the opposite side have not had the time, the energy, the expertise that the members of the government have had in examining the 499 pages and it will be our hope, Mr. Speaker, that we will be given the time and the opportunity to examine it with the same kind of scrutiny and detail that they have had in arriving at approval of section by section of that bill. We will discuss the principle of the bill and I think that you can expect from us a constructive opposition position in connection with that.

I may say as well, Mr. Speaker, that there are several matters that I'm sure that the bill itself will not indicate but which are germane to any consideration of the uni-city bill to be proposed by the government, and that is the information on costs and what we are talking about in terms of the proposal. Mr. Speaker, from our point of view it's not just the necessity of

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd.) presenting in legal language the specific sections under which the proposed uni-city bill will operate nor in legal language defining the geographical boundaries of the wards to be presented. We are going to want the specifics of the information that is in fact available to the members on the opposite side presented so that we can intelligently debate the issue and present jointly between the information supplied by the government and ourselves the proper information in record with respect to the cost of the proposal.

Mr. Speaker, there is one other point I think that has to be mentioned to the members on the opposite side. The local government boundaries -- the Boundaries Commission had a provision, and you're aware of that, that provided that the provisional plan was in fact to be presented for public review. That particular section -- (Interjection) --

MR. SPEAKER: Point of order by the First Minister.

HON. EDWARD SCHREYER (Premier) (Rossmere): The point of order I submit to you, Sir, is that while it's in order for the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition to comment on the statement made by the Minister of Urban Affairs relative to the bill that's being tabled or being distributed, however, his right does not extend to refer to a subject matter quite separate and apart from the subject matter of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: The point is well taken. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, Mr. Speaker, on the point of order. The First Minister is no more clairvoyant than you are, Sir, and he could not in any way anticipate what my remarks would be. I'm suggesting -- (Interjection) -- well, yes, I know that the Deputy House Leader believes he has those powers . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. I would agree that I am not clairvoyant and I am certain the other members aren't. but the point that the Honourable First Minister raised was going through my mind and I was on the verge of rising too, so would the Honourable Leader of the Opposition apply himself to the point at hand.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my intention is to speak on the bill but I hope, Mr. Speaker, in the 499 pages, the 499 pages that are to be presented to the House there will be a section revoking the particular section in The Boundaries Commission Act which provided that the provisional plan was in fact to have a public airing and a public hearing.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance has a point of order.

MR. CHERNIACK: Then I take back -- I won't deal with my point of order.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. I wonder whether he can inform the House whether either members of his department or members of the Manitoba Development Corporation or the solicitors for the government travelled and met the James Bertram people in Scotland prior to the receivership of January 7th?

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

HON. LEONARD S. EVANS (Minister of Industry & Commerce) (Brandon East): Well, Mr. Speaker, members of the Manitoba Development Corporation, the officers of the Manitoba Development Corporation, have been in continual contact with all four companies throughout the course of the complex as the honourable member should know and this is part and parcel of the functioning of a development corporation, a lender who has to insure that conditions are being met in accordance with the terms of loans.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: A supplementary question. Was Mr. Hallgrimson -- did he visit Scotland prior to January 7th and discuss the matter that he's now acting as receiver, with the company James Bertram?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition didn't receive a reply. I recognize another member. The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I have a question for the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce. Has the government or the MDC Corporation, Manitoba Development Corporation, got a first mortgage or security on the assets of the forestry complex at The Pas?

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

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the honourable member would be kind enough to submit an Order for Return.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: My question is to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. Did the government ever obtain information of what work was to be transferred from James Bertram in Scotland to the proposed plant to be built in The Pas?

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

MR. EVANS: Well, Mr. Speaker, I indicated just a few minutes ago that the officers of the MDC have been in continual contact with members of the representatives of James Bertram of Scotland and of Canada.

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

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the same Minister on the same subject. On the basis of the announcement by the Receiver, Mr. Hallgrimson, that the James Bertram & Son plant will not be proceeded with, by how much will the Federal incentives grant be reduced because of this?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I'm not in a position to give an indication of that at this time. It's impossible to indicate this.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON (Rock Lake): Mr. Speaker, I direct this question to the Minister of Finance and Urban Affairs. Is it the intention of his government to allow a referendum to be held on the uni-city concept?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker. No.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce and he can answer with yes or no. If the government or MDC has the first security on the complex at The Pas, then why is the Receiver proposing to pay off the liens on the complex?

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

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member is engaging in hypothetical situations.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE (Roblin): Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the First Minister. I wonder if the First Minister could announce to the House if he has assisted the Dauphin town council and the Dauphin Chamber of Commerce in their efforts to place a freeze on the centralization of services and the job reductions at Dauphin?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I have to be a little clairvoyant to answer that question because the honourable member has not indicated what agency he is referring to when he refers to the centralization of services and job reductions. I presume he means the Canadian National Railways and inasmuch as it is not within the power of the Government of Manitoba to put a freeze on any of the operations of a national railway, it's just not within our power to do so, therefore the answer would have to be no. On the other hand, I'd like to inform my honourable friend that the Minister of Labour and Railway Commissioner has been in communication with representatives of Canadian National Railways and representatives of the railway workers in Dauphin and is probably in a position to answer your question in more detail.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. MCKENZIE: I have a supplementary question and I'll direct it to the Honourable Minister of Railways then. Has he been in touch with the Minister Without Portfolio, Robert Andras?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour) (Transcona): I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker. The answer is no, I have not been in contact with the Honourable Robert Andras. I have been in communication with the Minister of Transport under whose direction the railways operate insofar as this situation is concerned.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: I wonder if I could just add that I had lunch with Robert Andras and will be seeing him this evening, if the honourable member has a message to send.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. MCKENZIE: I have a further supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Honourable Minister of Railways has been in touch with Labour Minister Bryce Mackasey or Manpower Minister Otto Lang, re the Dauphin problem?

MR. PAULLEY: I did briefly discuss this with the Honourable Federal Minister of Labour. It is not within his jurisdiction. I have been in correspondence with the Minister responsible, as I indicate, the Honourable Don Jamieson.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. GORDON W. BEARD (Churchill): I would like to direct a question to the czar of the railroad, or the Railway Commissioner, pardon me. Has he any indication whether the rates will be raised on the Hudson's Bay Railroad line, that's either for freight or passenger service?

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry that I cannot - well I can say to my honourable friend that I haven't any indication that rates will be raised on the northern line regarding freight or passenger, but I am pleased to announce that as the result of the efforts of the commissioner of railroads and his associates, we are able to reduce the rates of the transport of steel from the town of Selkirk northwards to make it comparable, or even less, than previous rates that were in existence.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Minister of Health and Social Development. Could he inform the House as to whether or not his department is considering the advisability of establishing or locating proposed health clinics within the vacancies that would come into place after the uni-city plan comes into force, namely, the number of city halls that would be empty in the Metropolitan Winnipeg area - is his department intending to use these city halls for this purpose?

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

HON. RENE E. TOUPIN (Minister of Health & Social Development) (Springfield): Mr. Speaker, we are looking at the needs of all the Province of Manitoba pertaining to health and social development centres. If there are any adequate facilities available in the Greater Winnipeg area, and if there is a need for a health and social development centre in that area, any half decent facility will be looked at. We haven't considered the newly built city hall.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I want to assure the Honourable Minister that I am very serious about the question. Under the proposal of perhaps building ten health centres . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Would the member place his question.

MR. ENNS: Yes, a supplementary question -- (Interjection) -- Fine, I'll certainly do that, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Honourable the Minister of Finance who earlier made the statement. Will the new uni-city be obligated to honour and will it be subject to obligations of the City of Winnipeg in regard to perpetuity contracts such as the one that it has with CPR?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, surely now that the draft bill has been distributed, there should be a review made and questions of this type should be reserved I think until the bill is in the committee stage, otherwise there could be any number of questions that would relate to that extensive draft.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Finance. I wonder whether he can indicate whether the government has made a decision with respect to City Hydro?

MR. CHERNIACK: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPIVAK: At the time that the uni-city bill is formally presented, will it be likely that the government will have reached a decision on that matter?

MR. SPEAKER: A matter of policy; not necessary to answer. The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the First Minister. It has to do with the Ombudsman Report to the Legislature. Could it be possible for the Ombudsman to come into the Legislature and answer questions of the members? This was done in Alberta this year I understand.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I'm not clear from the honourable member's question whether he is suggesting that the Ombudsman appear before an appropriate Standing Committee

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd.) of the House or before the Assembly in the Assembly. I should think that if it's the latter, that it would probably be not a good precedent. If it's the former, I think we would be quite willing to check with other jurisdictions that have established such an office to see whether in their experiences this has been found necessary or desirable.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

HON. SIDNEY GREEN, Q. C. (Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management) (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to lay on the Table the Annual Report of the Manitoba Farm Loans Association for the period ended March 31st, 1970; the Annual Report of the Manitoba Water Supply Board for the year ended March 31st, 1970; and the Annual Report of the Department of Mines and Natural Resources for the year ended March 31st, 1970.

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

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM (Birtle-Russell): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Honourable Minister of Youth and Education. In view of the recent completion, or in the almost completion of university education this year, has the student employment program as yet effected any job placements for this coming summer?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Youth and Education.

HON. SAUL A. MILLER (Minister of Youth & Education) (Seven Oaks): Mr. Speaker, the agency dealing with it, accepting the applications, is processing them at the present time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

HON. BEN HANUSCHAK (Minister of Consumer, Corporate & Internal Services) (Burrows): Mr. Speaker, in accordance with past custom I wish to lay on the Table the Annual Report of the Department of Consumer and Corporate Affairs for the year ending March 31st, 1970.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism and Recreation.

HON. PETER BURTNIAK (Minister of Tourism, Recreation, and Cultural Affairs) (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to table several reports: One, the Manitoba Centennial Citizens Campaign financial statement for the year ended March 31st, 1970; the Manitoba Centennial Corporation report and accounts for the year ended March 31st, 1970; and the Manitoba Centennial Centre Corporation report and accounts for the year ended March 31st, 1970; the Manitoba Arts Council Second Annual Report from April 1, 1970 to March 31st, 1971; also the Manitoba Centennial Corporation Sixth Report for the period April 1, 1969 to March 31, 1971; the Horseracing Commission Report and financial statements for the year ended December 31, 1970; and the Annual Report of the Manitoba Telephone System for the year 1969-1970.

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. Has his department given endorsement to the Cashchek operation - the credit card operation which is operating in the province?

MR. HANUSCHAK: I'm not quite sure I understand the question of the honourable member, because our department does not endorse any company.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: If I may rephrase my question, Mr. Speaker. Has his department given approval or given the okay to the Cashchek operation - the credit card operation presently -- (Interjection) -- Cashchek, Cashchek.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Cashchek is licensed under the provisions of the Consumer Protection Act.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Has the Minister or his department received any objections to this type of operation -- written objections?

MR. HANUSCHAK: Seldom a day goes by that we do not receive at least 200 objections to something or another going on in the business community.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member has had two supplementaries. The honourable member well knows there is no necessity for a Minister to reply. He did receive a reply.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: I would like to place a question to the Honourable the Minister of Education. When can we expect financial statements from the affiliated universities and colleges under the grants commission, that receive grants through this commission?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Youth and Education.

MR. MILLER: I'll take the question as notice.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the First Minister for the interest of the insurance agents of the province. I wonder would the First Minister advise the House of the guidelines that have been established for the Transitional Board?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Obviously I couldn't do that by way of a verbal reply to a verbal question, but if the honourable member would care to, he could discuss this either under the estimates of the Minister or by way of a written Order.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I wonder would the First Minister care to name the chairman of the board?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, the composition of the board will be announced in due course and in fact, quite soon.

MR. McKENZIE: A further supplementary. Would there be a deadline for their final report?

MR. SCHREYER: I'm not quite clear as to what the honourable member means by final report. The nature of the board is such that it may well not be necessary for it to make a report as such but rather to deal with specific cases of need for transitional assistance.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: Orders for Return. The Honourable Member for Riel. Matter stand.

GOVERNMENT BILLS

MR. SPEAKER: Second reading government bills. On the proposed motion of the Honourable -- oh, I'm sorry. The Honourable Minister of Finance. Bill 2. (Stand) The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Call Bill No. 9 please.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 9. On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Finance. The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. ARTHUR MOUG (Charleswood): Mr. Speaker, I intend to be brief on this bill. I don't believe that it's a bill that was necessary to come out right at the time without having a bill on the uni-city proposal. I am opposed to it in its present form and I think that anything in here that's retroactive could put councils of the several municipalities into a bad position and have them operating illegal for the first half of the year, previous to this bill having third reading. The curtailment of the use of reserves or proceeds from the sale of capital assets would indicate that this money will in the end result be going into a giant melting pot and spread over our new city, and at the same time many overexpenditures of 1971 in current estimates will be levied over the municipality affected only; so they are taking what we have in assets, spreading them over and any overexpenditures will in turn be levied back to the one municipality that's overspent.

I don't think that this bill is any reason to hold up the approval of budgets from the area municipalities. Bill 13 is a different bill. Bill 14 is a different bill where we are anxious to see these go through, because we know that that could hold up budgets. No. 9 on its own, I see no reason for it to play an important roll in the budgets that are currently in front of the Minister. I think that the City of Winnipeg is a budget you have to look at because it costs them \$22,000 a day if their budget is not approved by May 1st.

In the bill, I believe under No. 3 - this is under Variation of Estimates. When I read that it makes it sound to me that if you've levied into Public Works there's no way you can change that back into Administration. If it happens to be levied under Police, there's no way you could work it into Fire; and if this is the case I'm sure the Minister will be receiving letters daily asking for permission to change this stuff around. There's several to the departments throughout the Metro area. The cities are bargaining with unions over the Police and Fire at all times and it's quite possible for the Police Department to run out of money in October. I don't think we need to be without them. Although apparently, by the newspaper, with the cutback the City of Winnipeg was asked to make by the Minister, they are not going to be picking up the 12 policemen they had anticipated for this year.

Section 8, subsection (1). There be no elections held in the municipalities in the year 1971 to elect members to council. I wonder what would happen if North Kildonan hadn't got settled

(MR. MOUG cont'd.) and they got those three councillors back. They couldn't get a quorum together and they were without council meetings for six weeks. This would have put them out for the balance of the year.

As far as this bill's concerned, Mr. Speaker, I feel Charleswood and Tuxedo probably has as much to lose or more than anybody; they'll have a 40 percent increase in their taxes and this is something that goes on, not just in the initial . . . when you're losing your reserves, but this goes on for all time.

The Member for Winnipeg Centre says that all the cities and municipalities should be the same and equal, but the fact that people live in different municipalities and under different conditions seems to me that they shouldn't all be the same. He seems to think there's 15 of them, according to Hansard; I've only been able to count 12.

Section 6 on the enumerating . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I realize the gentleman's having difficulty in respect to the principle but he's starting to debate each section by section. I think that he should try to couch his terms of reference without naming the sections and sticking to the principle of the bill. At the same time I would like to ask the gallery to preserve a bit of decorum; that they be seated. There are seats available upstairs. Would they please all sit down. Thank you. The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. MOUG: Mr. Speaker, in another section of the bill where they bring in enumerating, our municipality has gone ahead and we've got our enumerating all done; I think tomorrow will clear it up, so I can't see that this bill needs rapid passage for the enumerating that they keep bringing up in the House here.

And then it says in the bill that they'll be appointing an Enumerator, Revising Officer and a Returning Officer, so this looks like some more in-migration from Saskatchewan.

On the enumerating, Mr. Speaker, now that Charleswood's gone ahead and done theirs, I don't see there's going to be any duplication; it's a matter of taking the scissors and cutting the streets up and put them in the several wards when this uni-city becomes legislation.

I want to make reference, Sir, to . . . Dealing with that to that point, Mr. Speaker, I think that we're aware that rapid passage of some bills is necessary. The acreage payment of course we all are sure that that is necessary to the farmers in order to get out, that they make use of it. The big concern for farmers on that side of the House or agriculture I can't understand because they haven't got anybody on that side of the House that's involved in agriculture. If they would have, I'm sure they would have made him Minister because the farmers on this side of the House, they're the ones that want to get out. If we need rapid passage on Bill 9, we could have started here in January or February and let the farmers get out of here to do their work. I think probably the timing on our session is to aggravate the members on this side of the House. There's no farmers on that side because anybody that I see on that side of the House couldn't farm. They would never get out to the field, Mr. Speaker. They'd get lost between the House and the barn.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney.

MR. EARL McKELLAR (Souris-Killarney): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lakeside debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Would you call Bill No. 15, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable the Attorney-General. The Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney.

MR. McKELLAR: Mr. Speaker, I thought after last year, in Centennial Year that we'd had our last lottery operated by the Government of Manitoba, but lo and behold! we come back this session and what have we got? Got another bill on lotteries -- a bill that would suggest setting up a commission to operate lotteries and a licensing board to look after the licensing of lotteries in the Province of Manitoba. It was mentioned by many, I think, but I notice by the Minister of Finance and somewhere during the election by the Premier, there's not going to be any increase in taxes. They are going to hold the line on taxes. Lo and behold! What do I find in the bill? The moneys that are made out of the lotteries operated here by the government are going into the Consolidated Fund. I don't know how much they hope to make but I suppose it would be around three-quarters of a million to a million dollars. And while I realize it's not a direct tax on people, it is an indirect tax because 20 or 25 percent of the money out

(MR. McKELLAR cont'd.) of each ticket purchased will go towards the financing of the Province of Manitoba.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, this is not right. This is not right for many reasons, and the reasons are: Many communities in our Province of Manitoba this year, while it isn't Centennial Year, have many projects in mind, and one of them I would like to state at this time. A very important one is in the Village of Wawanesa. It's operated by the Wawanesa Lions Club, and they are in the midst of selling tickets at the present time on a horse race that's going to take place in Wawanesa on the 26th of June, and paying out to the extent of \$13,500.00. What happens if the government gets into the business? I suppose they're going to flood the whole countryside with tickets and it's a good chance that that Lions Club, instead of making a profit on that sweepstake, will lose money. I'm all in favour of lotteries operated at the local level by community clubs or service clubs, but for the life of me, why do governments have to get into lotteries? -- (Interjection) -- That's all right but I don't think it will ever happen. Mostly by service clubs. There's no particular reason why a municipality should operate lotteries, and I know they won't be.

Why are the government getting into lotteries? I heard many speeches of the Opposition in past years gone by. They were against it. Why? Because it wouldn't raise any money. And I'm looking forward to seeing the vote on this particular bill to see whether there's a change of heart. And if there is a change of heart I know very well the reason why there will be; because there's \$69 million that has to be picked up by the Minister of Finance, my good friend over there, and I know he struggled many hours this past winter trying to arrive at a solution, and if \$700,000 will help the situation, well he's all in favour.

In the past we've always had a free vote on this but I know this is a government bill we can't at this time. The only way a man on the government side could avoid embarrassment is to not be here. It's quite easy. But I know they won't do that. I know they are all going to be in their seats because it's a government policy, government policy the government get into lotteries.

The government are already in the business of making money out of horseracing, in a way. They used to make around a million dollars; I imagine it's over that now out here at Assiniboia Downs, and if they wanted to raise more money why didn't they put on an extra five percent on parimutuels? Why didn't you do it out there? People who've got the money go out there -- (Interjection) -- I'm all in favour if you want to do it. Sure. But if you want to do it that's the place to do it, rather than start in the sweepstake business. -- (Interjection) -- Well, I know they're hard up for money; I know they are; I know they're going to have trouble. If they don't have troubles this year, they'll have troubles next year. -- (Interjection) -- That's right. That's right.

But what's going to happen in places like Wawanesa if this bill is passed in the next couple of weeks; what's going to happen? Are you going to go out and run opposition to these at the present time? What horse races, or what are you going to compete with, what sporting event? And if you do have something around the 1st of July or the 1st of August, any horse race that you're going to use, I'm sure that it will interfere with many of the decisions made by local community clubs.

We were told last year there was a good chance this would be it, it would be a one shot deal, and if there was another go at it it would be operated by sports federations or some other group such as that, non-profit organizations, but it was never suggested to us by the government that they in turn were going to do this on an annual basis hereafter.

There's one particular part, and I know, Mr. Speaker, we're not supposed to deal with sections, but I see one very important part at the tail end of the bill that's made retroactive. When we were elected, and we were elected many times when we were on the government side, retroactive legislation shouldn't be, shouldn't be for a very good reason. Has this Board been appointed? Was it appointed 1st of February? I don't watch the Gazette that closely, but if it was, why was it appointed the 1st of February? Are they already in operation? Has a staff been hired? Has the commission been appointed? These are questions I would like to ask at this time.

Is it the Centennial Corporation that's suggested in the Bill or have they extra staff there? Why haven't the staff been reduced if . . . why don't you operate it on your own without involving the Centennial Corporation? I don't think it's necessary the Centennial Corporation be involved; Centennial's over. I realize the Centennial Building's down there to operate but I

MR. McKELLAR cont'd.) don't think they should be involved in the operation of the lotteries in the Province of Manitoba.

I also don't think this money should be put into the Consolidated Fund, for a very good reason. If you're going to talk about sweepstakes like Irish Sweepstakes, this money is used to operate hospitals. Why don't you use it for a particular reason. Why put it in the general revenue? Is it only for holding the tax line at this time? Partly hold it. I know you can't hold it all.

These are the questions that I am asking, Mr. Speaker, at this time. Is this going to be the system that you're going to use? I know you can't raise income tax, the provincial income tax, corporation tax. Are you afraid to go to eight percent sales tax? Are you afraid to go to six, seven at this time? Are you afraid to go? Is this the reason why you got this lottery bill before us? -- (Interjection) -- I'm asking you, Sir. I'm asking you. You reply you're on your own. These are the questions I want to ask right now, and I hope that members of the government will stand up, state their position as they stated before, before us, where they were against lotteries. I want you to come out this time and say are you for or are you against lotteries. -- (Interjection) -- I'm against government lotteries; I'm in favour of community lotteries or operated by service clubs which designate that money to a certain project, which designate it to a certain project - every cent. And I tell you there's no profit made out of this Lions Club. Their services are given free to that particular community.

So this is the reason why I am speaking; I'm speaking on behalf of the Wawanesa Lions Club who want to know at this time, are they going to be flooded with government lottery tickets around the western part of the Province of Manitoba competing with their tickets? This is the question that they want to know and I would like an answer in their behalf.

Mr. Speaker, I think it's about time that we in the Province of Manitoba as taxpayers decided how many taxes we want to pay. And goodness knows those of us who made our income tax up in the last month now know what it's costing many people for Medicare that are trying to work a little longer than eight hours a day, work a little harder. They are contributing a goodly sum to the income of the Province of Manitoba, and if you want to raise money in other ways, such as lotteries, go and tell the people your budget, go and tell the people of the Province of Manitoba that you must do this in order to get along.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to say again that I am against government lotteries and I hope that many members of the front bench such as the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources will come out and state his convictions as I know he told us he's going to do it last night, and tell us in a manner which he can only relate such as he related to acreage payments last night. And I know he will because he's not a man to hold himself back from an issue. This I think is one of the issues I think that each individual has to decide for himself - what kind of a tax load the people of Manitoba want at this time, in an economy such as we have. And I say again, and I'm willing to go along with it, if you're willing to put another five cents on the parimutuel out at the race track at Assiniboia Downs, that's the kind of tax I'm in favour of. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister Without Portfolio.

HON. RUSSELL DOERN (Minister Without Portfolio) (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to ask the honourable member a question. Did he purchase a Centennial Sweepstake ticket, or one or more?

MR. McKELLAR: No, I didn't.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the bill on second reading but I do so with some real serious reservations and I hope that this will be a free vote like it was last year when the bill was before the House for the Centennial Sweepstake and I think we would be consistent with the principle that we started on this legislation -- make it a free vote.

Mr. Speaker, I'd have no argument if the sweepstake lottery would be used in the same way or the same manner it was used last year and I would like to see that this would not eliminate the local organizations or local communities from getting involved and raising the money for the things that they need, be it sports or community clubs and so on. But in the bill I do see that profits or the money will be going to the Consolidated Fund. I'm somewhat concerned if this is ways and means for the government to raise money because if this is what the government has in mind, my own feeling is that lotteries as a means of financing social welfare and other government programs to keep tax rates low is not a good argument because

(MR. PATRICK cont'd.) . . . so far there is no such proof that this is the case. It doesn't matter where the lottery is. I know it is the feeling of many people in Manitoba and other parts of the country that in the State of Nevada the gambling supports most of your social legislation. Well, Mr. Speaker, this is not the case. Information that I have, the sales tax in the State of Nevada brings much more revenue than all the gambling revenue and the gambling tax. So this is not the case that you can raise a lot of your revenue for many of your things.

Now I also understand that the two states that have had considerable experience which is New York and I believe New Hampshire with lotteries and sure enough the first few years the sales were pretty good and there were quite a bit of revenue accrued to the government but after a few years the sales started to drop off and the costs are there to administer but the revenue is not there any more. So I would say to the government that you better take a close look if this is one way or means that you're trying to raise revenue because I don't think that this is a good way of doing it.

Some of the points that I'd like to point out and my reservations: I wonder why the duplication and why another board? We already have a municipal board I think could administrate. It may need a few more staff, but why not? Why do you need another board? You have a racing commission board already that perhaps could administer this Act as well. And why not limit the number of board members on this commission instead of leaving it to the Order in Council and this is what I'm quite concerned about because why not limit it in the Act or in the bill so then you know that you'll only have to put so many people on it instead of leaving it to the Order in Council and which leaves an opportunity for the government, rightly or wrongly, to put many of their friends on the board and as you know there are quite a few other boards already appointed this year or will be appointed, Environmental Board, and many others so I am somewhat concerned.

The other point that the Minister has not told us: What will the annual cost of running the lotteries be? I'm sure he has some knowledge and some indication because from last year's experience. How much of an office staff will you require? How many people that you'll need on full time staff and what kind of an office space you will require. These are all important things and so far the Minister has not told us.

Not only that we're going to have a Lottery Board but there's another board, there's a licensing board in addition to the lottery board. So there's two boards already just to run this one thing. So really, Mr. Speaker, this concerns me quite a bit and I'm sure it would concern most of the members in this House. It isn't that I'm so much concerned about the lottery; I am concerned about the quality of this bill. I hope that the Minister doesn't take this personal but this is true, I'm quite concerned. He hasn't given us any reasons why all the appointments -- you've got two boards, your licensing board, your lottery board and I feel that this can be administered by one of your boards already, Municipal Board or one of the others that are in existence today.

Now the legislation is retroactive, you know, it permits the government itself to go into lottery business and this is what I disagree with. It has no cost factors or it hasn't given us any projected costs. I think that it should also give us some projected income, what it may be because the Minister has this information and these are some of the things that I appeal to the Minister to point out to this House and I'm not certain that it's a free vote on the government side but knowing some members of the government when they sat on this side, every time that anything came up in the way of lotteries or the racing commission, some of these members were the first to argue the point, not argue or debate but debate for an hour, for forty minutes, never took less so I, myself, I made it clear at all those times I'm not against lotteries as such but I feel the government itself should stay out of it.

Now I don't know what the experiences have been, I've pointed out what's happened in some of the other states and in the State of Nevada which people are under the impression that all their revenue comes for the social services from gambling and it's not the case at all. I came across a little article and I don't know how accurate it is but it's by a really great statesman, Thomas E. Dewey when he was the Governor of New York from 1943 to '55, and this is what he stated: The entire history of the legalized gambling in his state shows that it brought nothing but poverty, crime, corruption, demoralization and corruption. -- (Interjection) -- Thomas E. Dewey said that. Well I'm not saying this. My argument is and I don't know if this is true or not, I have no argument for lotteries if they can be run the same way they were operated last year. I feel the government itself should not get into business of raising revenue for welfare and other programs of government.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Mr. Speaker, I would like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Swan River, that debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Could you call Bill No. 13, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Education, The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. R. (BUD) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, we had intended to give speedy passage to this bill and we still intend to do so but our principles and convictions were very much aroused by the examination that we ourselves have tried to bring to the content of the proposed legislation by the views that a number of others with whom we've been in contact have expressed and if I may say so, Sir, by the remarks made in this Chamber last night by the Honourable Member for Rhineland. Possibly our conduct on this legislation looks somewhat bizarre to members opposite. They may find it difficult to appreciate why we are reconsidering our position on it momentarily and temporarily. I think some of the more cynical members on the treasury benches, Mr. Speaker, probably -- (Interjection) -- no, well for the Minister of Mines and Resources excludes himself from that umbrella and perhaps he's not cynical but he doesn't know the type of cynicism that I'm about to refer to at this juncture so -- so he is excluding himself before the fact. He may want to do it after the fact too but what I was going to say, Mr. Speaker, was I think some of the more cynical members on the government side have the mistaken impression, perhaps they've convinced themselves that we over here on this side approach all questions with a closed and inflexible mind. The Minister of Mines and Resources studiously insists that he's not one of those cynics so I thank him for that and I'm gratified by that statement of his position and I'll watch for evidence and manifestations of it throughout the session.

Our thinking is not closed and inflexible on this or any other question that comes before the Chamber, Mr. Speaker, and hopefully we underscore that point by the fact that we have chosen to reconsider for a few hours our position on this particular bill but as I said I repeat we have no intention of stalling its passage; we just want to put two or three opinions on the record. When someone talks sense in this Chamber we listen and that goes for the speeches of the Honourable the Attorney-General and the speeches of the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Resources and their colleagues. It also goes for members in all benches and in all positions in this Chamber, not the least of whom is the Member for Rhineland and he said some things last night that gave us cause to examine his thinking and to reassess the position that we think this Legislature should be taking on this legislation. We also wanted a chance to have a legal interpretation of one or two of the measures involved in the legislation. We have done that now and we have had a chance to caucus our position more fully, Mr. Speaker, and our position is this: that we do not intend to resist passage of this bill but we do intend to introduce amendments at the committee stage.

There are many features of it with which we are unhappy. We are particularly unhappy with what we feel is the reflection of a kind of a backroom politics philosophy which is creeping in, unfortunately, to much of the legislation with which this House is being confronted and which reveals itself again in this particular piece of legislation. This is a worrisome pattern, a worrisome pattern, Mr. Speaker. It's a cause for concern, I suggest, among members on both sides because the more legislation that is passed by this Chamber removing authority in a direct way from the members of the Chamber and transferring it or transposing it into the hands of the Executive Council, the more difficult it's going to be in the future for all legislators in this Chamber, regardless of which side they're on, for we all know that except in one or two administrations and one or two jurisdictions it's very seldom that the parties to which any of us belong reign eternally and forever in office and in power. The day comes when one finds oneself in opposition rather than in government and I suggest that it's in the interests of everybody here, those who are members of the government of the day and those who are members or potential members of the government of a future day to ensure that the private members in this Chamber, in this Legislature, now and in the future retain and are permitted to retain the authority over spending, over the use of public funds and over legislation that is their democratic right. And it seems to us that there are aspects of this bill that, as I say, reflect a pattern that should worry all of us. There are aspects of it that take authority for scrutiny

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd.) over public spending out of the hands of the Legislative Chamber itself, out of the hands of the private members and transfer it into the hands of the Executive Council creating a situation where decisions having to do with the expenditure of public funds are being made more and more -- or the potential for making them -- is being developed more and more in the area of the Executive Council itself.

I can't go into specific sections at this stage of the bill; I recognize that, but any reasonably conscientiously examination of the bill, Mr. Speaker, particularly the latter sections of it will disclose to anybody in this House that that kind of pattern is expressing itself in this legislation. The evidence is there.

I refer particularly to the provisions having to do with the maximum differential, the maximum differential that now exists in the school levy between residential and business taxpayers, between residential and commercial taxpayers. The Minister knows well, Mr. Speaker, that up to this point in time the differential in the school levy between residential and commercial taxpayers was 24 mills, the maximum was 24 mills. The differential could not exceed that. The bill before us specifically and explicitly provides for removal of that particular clause from the existing legislation. In other words, Sir, it provides for removal of the ceiling that now exists on that differential and in fact at the present time it's my understanding that in the new budgets the differential already broadens this year to something like 25.5 mills. I think it broadens by 1.5 mills because of the reduction on the residential end of the scale.

Well, it seems to us potentially dangerous and certainly potentially inequitable, Mr. Speaker, to open that area up in the way that's being proposed in this legislation. Future decisions on these respective levels, future decisions on this differential would be made under the terms of this legislation by the Executive Council. They'd be made by regulation, there'd be no need to refer the matter to the members of the Chamber at all and it's this tendency that I have suggested unfortunately -- that unfortunately has appeared on a number of occasions in some of the legislation that we have been confronted with, that appears again here and that concerns us most of all.

There are other sections of the bill that reflect a similar tendency, earlier sections of the bill not dealing with that differential, Sir, but dealing with other aspects of the program, I submit to you, also contain and reflect that worrisome tendency and I would ask the Minister to re-examine this concept and this philosophy. The Member for Rhineland also raised the point of discrimination, raised the objection that discrimination seemed to be embodied in the legislation as it applied to pupils in non-unitary school divisions. He discussed the difference between the \$12.00 and \$18.00 grants being made available on the one hand in total to those schools and students in unitary divisions and on the other hand, in part only to those schools and students in non-unitary school divisions.

I would suggest that the argument of discrimination, the argument of unfair differentiation is well taken, Sir. It seems to me that on the strength of what has happened respecting Bill 14, that the Minister could stretch a point in this case and include the non-unitary schools, the non-unitary recipients, in the entire program and permit them to qualify for the \$18.00 per capita grant in addition to the \$12.00 textbook allowance. Bill 14 means, Mr. Speaker, and we gave it second reading last night, Bill 14 if I may refer to it for a moment, means that the Minister can now much more easily bring non-unitary divisions into unitary status. All he requires is the necessary petition. He required much more than that before, but as members now know, on the basis of Bill 14, there is a much easier, a much more flexible, a much more realistic avenue open to him now to bring the non-unitary divisions into unitary status and I would submit, Sir, that without trying to anticipate the Minister's plans and programs, that this is very likely to happen in the very near future, that those non-unitary divisions - the Minister holds up two fingers - two areas, well, I submit that the bringing of those two areas into unitary status, the transforming of them from non-unitary status to unitary status, is only a matter of a very limited time away.

This is going to happen in the very near future, and for that very reason I must point out to the Minister that we feel that the legislation as it's presently worded seems harshly discriminatory against the non-unitary schools and students. If they are going to be brought into unitary status in the very near future anyway, why are we passing legislation at this point which differentiates and discriminates and will militate against their ability to meet their financial commitments in the current school year and the immediate school year of the future. If they are coming into unitary status anyway, why cannot the government permit the umbrella, making provision for an \$18.00 per capita grant apply to them now in the same way that the

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd.) \$12.00 per student textbook assistance applies. It seems to us unnecessarily discriminatory. It seems to us an unnecessary point of differentiation.

Those, then, are basic objections to the legislation at this point, Mr. Speaker, the unfairness of the differentiation between non-unitary and unitary schools, students and divisions as reflected in Bill 14 and Bill 13, and the removal of the ceiling on the differential, the removal of the ceiling on the maximum differential in the school levy between residential and business taxpayers. Underlying all that, as I suggested at the outset, is the philosophy that disturbs us, that transfers power which rightfully belongs to the members of this legislature to those few members who sit in the Executive Council. We on this side have a responsibility to scrutinize the public spending, to scrutinize the distribution and dissemination of the revenues in the public purse. We feel that it's incumbent upon the members in the Legislature to point out to the government the existence of worrying and unfortunate tendencies of this kind as we see them, when we see them. It seems to us that there is an effort, whether deliberate or not, an effort to concentrate too much in the way of spending power in the hands of the Executive Council, Sir, and we can't for our part idly sit by and acquiesce in that.

The point I think that government members should be asked to remember in this specific connection is that we are dealing here with the supervision of a great deal of public spending, of a great deal of money, of a great deal of Manitoba's public funds. The resolutions in the estimates having to do with financial support for public schools total an estimated public expenditure of something in excess of \$106 million out of a total estimate of expenditure for the Department of Youth and Education being sought by the government of something just under \$180 million. So we are talking about \$106 millions out of \$180 millions; both of those are massive sums and the lesser of the two is approximately two-thirds the total. I mean, not the lesser of the two, but the former that I mentioned is approximately two-thirds of the total, that is the amount being asked by this government for spending in the area of financial support to public schools totals two-thirds of the entire departmental estimates of \$180 million so when we are looking at the dispensation and distribution of a sum of money of that size, Mr. Speaker, we, I think, have every right to insist that the supervision of it remain in the hands of the private members of this Chamber and not be transferred into the hands of a government council that does not reflect or include within its ranks the spectrum of opinions and points of view that the full Legislative Chamber itself represents.

On those grounds we intend to move amendments when the legislation reaches the committee stage, to ask that the particular clause pertaining to the maximum differential between the residential and business levies be left in, not be struck out of the new legislation and that the discriminatory aspect of the legislation be removed similarly. With that caveat on which we intend to follow through at committee stage, we are prepared at this point, Mr. Speaker, to allow the bill to pass second reading and I reiterate that the decision that we took last night to adjourn debate and uphold or withhold passage and approval for twenty-four hours was taken for the tactical reasons of wanting to re-examine some of these important points that had been introduced into the debate, both inside and outside the Chamber by many persons from whom we have heard in the past few days.

. Continued on next page

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Minister of Youth and Education.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, if I speak I'll be closing debate. Mr. Speaker, I was very interested in the remarks by the Honourable Member for Fort Garry and I followed him part of the way and then I lost him.

He says they are very unhappy about two aspects of the bill and the one in particular they apparently want to bring an amendment on is that one dealing with the differential which has been set in the past at 24 and the suggestion is that giving the government the power by Order in Council by Lieutenant Governor in Council in any way vary it is an abrogation of responsibility to the executive. The fact is that we have to live within certain timetables laid down in the Act. As members well know, March 1st the school boards are supposed to submit their budgets to the Finance Board. March 15th the Finance Board is supposed to return to the school boards the budgets after scrutiny and advise them the amount of money they would be earning under the Foundation Program and so in fact, year after year ever since this program came into being, the government, long before this House entered into session in many cases and certainly never in my recollection before the estimates are tabled in the House, gave the information to the Finance Board as to how much was being planned in the way of input by the provincial government into the Foundation Program.

And this is one of the problems that one has to deal with administratively and I don't want to get involved in the niceties of the law but I feel it is my obligation as Minister of Education to properly administer education in this province. I can only do that if the school boards are apprised of the money they can expect to get. I can only do that if the school boards know when they make up their budgets, how much they will have to levy beyond what the Foundation Program gives them and this could have been done this year without any reference at all to this House but we did one thing this year which is somewhat different than other years.

We could have, as has been done in other years, have allowed the foundation levy, that is the levy on property to rise beyond last year's level on both residential and commercial and we could have done that, advise the Finance Board and the levy might have gone up to 11 mills or whatever was required on residential and perhaps 35 mills on commercial but we didn't. We had undertaken as an obligation to do something about financing education in Manitoba and we didn't take the easy way out; the easy way would have been to simply raise the percentage from 70-30 ratio to 75-25 and would simply have said well, wherever the property tax then falls, so be it. We did not want to impose any additional taxes on residential or farm property and so we took the next, the logical step; we attacked it in two ways, because there are two facts - and this apparently a lot of the members have missed the point - there are really three factors in looking at the Foundation Program. It is one, the number of dollars that go into the Foundation Program and has been pointed out, and I have agreed that the Foundation Program required improvement and this has been said by a number of members that it hasn't been substantially altered since 1967 and it needed a dollar infusion and we did just that, but we didn't stop at that.

We also decided that the province should carry a greater percentage of the cost and so we altered the percentage from the present 70 percent provincial, 30 percent property to 75-25 so the province put in more dollars into the Foundation Program and also picked up a larger percentage but in order to assure that the people we didn't want to hurt should not be hurt -- and that is the people who live in homes, farm and residential -- should not be faced with an increase in their property tax, we said in addition we will also decrease their levy, the levy imposed upon them by their respective councils by 1 1/2 mills and that's what we did and as a result of that, we then had to alter the differential.

If we hadn't altered the differential, we would also have had to lower the tax on commercial and industrial and frankly, Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to standing here and saying that I have no desire and the government no intention and no wish to lower the property tax on the real estate on Portage Avenue or on that type of real estate. Our concern was and is the individual home owner, the farmer and it was his property tax that we wanted to ease, that we wanted to move in on, not on the commercial and industrial and so we left the industrial as is, we did not raise it. We left it but in leaving it we created a differential and we are simply saying that in order to live within the administrative problems of trying to run a school system, the school boards faced with having to prepare budgets, to know when they come to the Finance Board how much money they are going to get, for the Finance Board to know where it is going to get its funds, and the amount of that fund, there has to be a flexibility because as I predicted

(MR. MILLER cont'd). . . . in 1967 when I was in Opposition, the dates established are such that never in my experience - and I can see in the future continuing - can the estimates and the budget of any government bring forward its budget for that year, ever be passed in time to meet the timetable of the school board who has to present its budget to the council so the council in turn can make its levy and so Mr. Speaker, these are the reasons why we acted as we did.

To the Member for Rhineland and now to his new found friend in the Opposition who feel that there is grave discrimination here suddenly against a certain group of people, may I remind them - I don't think I should, they can read up their own speeches better than I can - of the history of the formation of unitary divisions, and that when these divisions, unitary divisions were created that they were to be financed partially through provincial funds and partially through the funds made available to the Finance Board through a levy on property. The \$50.00 rebate was cancelled in all the unitary divisions; that was simply removed. The non-unitary divisions still get the \$50.00 rebate on every title that they possess, that a man has, whether it be six parcels of land or one; they have at no time since 1966 participated in paying into the Foundation levy, at no time have they participated in contributing to the Foundation levy as has every other municipality and taxpayer living within a unitary division and that levy has been substantial from 1967 on.

On residential it has been nine mills in 1967 on residential and 33 mills on commercial. It went up the very next year to 13.1 for residential and 37.1 on commercial. It dropped to 10.9 the next year, to 34.9, and without repeating all these figures, I'm simply saying they have never, no resident of a non-unitary division has ever contributed towards this fund, and now suddenly to cry "Discrimination" is a mockery. I don't know if that's on my sheet or not but if it is, I apologize for unparliamentary language. But I say it's nonsense in any case to even bring that in as discrimination. We have introduced Bill 14, which I'm happy that all members opposite were so pleased about with the exception of the Member for Rhineland. He at least is being consistent; he opposed No. 14 as he opposes Bill 13. The members opposite agreed to Bill 14, or recognized the need for it and recognized that the day of the non-unitary division just doesn't make sense in today's society and today's educational system and I think one of the members opposite said just that.

Now having gone this far I can't see them suddenly reversing themselves and saying, Ah yes, but now let's reconsider; perhaps we should recognize the needs of the non-unitaries and pay them the same per pupil cost. Mr. Speaker, whether it's paid through a per pupil cost or through an authorized teacher cost or through a maintenance or through a supply grant, whatever it is, it is part of the Foundation Program and the non-unitary divisions have never participated in it. They never contributed to it directly through their levy, and they have never fallen under it and they do not get any money. -- (Interjection) -- I didn't hear that remark. -- (Interjection) -- That comment I just don't understand so I can't make reference to it.

The member claims that Dauphin-Ochre is not a unitary division. With all due respect to him, Dauphin-Ochre is a unitary division. As a matter of fact it was the first one in Manitoba, the one with one board for an entire area and it is today and has been to my knowledge, when I took over certainly and I believe since 1967, a unitary division and classed as such. It has one school board.

When I pointed to the member just a few minutes ago and I pointed to areas, I was trying to convey to him that as of last fall, last year, there were six non-unitary divisions remaining in Manitoba. Last fall a straw vote was held in Tiger Hills. It carried and as a result of that I declared it a unitary division. At the same time a straw vote was held in Mountain; that too carried but that was challenged in the courts and because the referendum was held not quite in accordance with the requirements of the Act which is very precise, the judge ruled that the referendum was not valid and therefore I could not declare that area unitary and so my hand was stayed. The passage of Bill 14 will now free my hand so I will do exactly what the residents and electors of the Mountain School Division requested by a majority vote, and that is to declare them a unitary division and that's what I'm doing.

The other division which probably will qualify will be the Pembina School Division which I know is waiting urgently for this legislation, because both in the case of Mountain and Pembina the school boards have been asked - because they know that this legislation is coming forward - the school boards are holding back from finalizing their budgets so that they will know how much money they are going to be getting so that the levies that the councils then have to apply on property will be made known to them and they can apportion the levy in accordance with the assessment throughout the unitary divisions, and that is why there was an urgency and that is

(MR. MILLER cont'd) why I asked or sought the co-operation of the House.

But to now suggest that after the passage of Bill 14, after the insistence for years that in order to qualify for the grant under the Foundation Program divisions should be unitary, to now say well, there are still going to be two or three non-unitary divisions left, let us now consider and perhaps we should change the ground rules and give them consideration, flies in the face of the realities of the program as it has developed and really negates the very concept which gave birth to the unitary divisions in the first place, and I say if we do that we're being completely inconsistent and members opposite will be even more inconsistent because they are the ones that introduced it in the first place.

The new grants - this has been brought up and perhaps I should clarify it. This is not a new grant. This is an infusion of money into the Foundation Program. It could have been tied to a specific service in response to the requests of everyone in the field - teachers, trustees, administrators, my own department, and members opposite. It was realized that the present method is too restrictive; it doesn't give the flexibility in programming that school trustees want and need, and it was felt there should be a per pupil grant to give them that flexibility so they are not tied specifically in spending a dollar in a specific way, that they can perhaps introduce programs so that they can deploy their people, their resources in a much more efficient manner than is done today. And certainly members opposite should not oppose any attempt at making school divisions operate more efficiently, because I always hear about the increased cost of education and the spiralling cost of education, and I am satisfied that with the introduction of this infusion of money into the Foundation Program it is going to help the school boards to meet their needs. It will, and has already, been translated in easing of the cost on property because quite a number of school divisions and councils have already reported back that, thanks to this, they are going to be able to either lower or hold the line on their mill rate for this year so it has proved its purpose.

Now, the fact that it has not helped the non-unitary divisions I agree, just as none of the Foundation Grants in the past have ever applied to non-unitary division. They are not part of the scheme; they haven't been part of the scheme; they get their \$50.00 rebate on each piece of property but they contribute nothing towards the Foundation levy and I make no apologies, Mr. Chairman. If they wish, and through their spokesmen, if he wishes to remain in the 19th century, that's his business but I don't see why the House should follow him back.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The debate is concluded. The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. GRAHAM: Will the Minister permit a question? Has the Minister ever made any representation to the Minister of Municipal Affairs regarding the present ever-increasing inequities in assessment practices in the province?

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I'm not quite sure what assessment has to do with this bill but I'll gladly answer the question. I am aware that there are inequities, as has been pointed out, and I have heard about them in this House. I have not discussed it with the Minister. The levy is made on the equalized assessment. It really doesn't alter the picture whatsoever. It really has no effect on this bill or on Bill 14.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. GABRIEL GIRARD (Emerson): I wonder if the Minister would submit to another question. I listened with enthusiasm to your discussion on the general levy. I wonder if the Minister is in agreement that the real crippling

MR. SPEAKER: I'm sorry, I couldn't hear whether the Minister is in agreement or not. Would the member state his question if he has one for clarification.

MR. GIRARD: I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, I'll try and re-phrase it. In your discussion, did you mean to say that the real crippling levy is the general levy rather than the special levy when it's imposed on divisions that have a low assessment per student population.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I didn't refer to that aspect of it at all in any of my remarks. I was referring to the special levy which all residents of unitary divisions pay and contribute to the Foundation Program through the Finance Board, and that the non-unitary divisions don't contribute a nickel towards it and never have since the inception of the unitary system in Manitoba.

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

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, would the Minister entertain one more question?

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd) Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister whether - - I would like to phrase my question to the Minister this way. Wouldn't the removal of the differential between residential and commercial taxpayers mean that the commercial levy, the levy on commercial taxpayers could be raised without resort to the legislative chamber?

MR. SPEAKER: Please, I am afraid the member is stating a fact instead of asking a question. Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Would the removal of the differential between residential and business taxpayers mean that the business levy could be raised without resort to the Legislative Assembly?

MR. MILLER: Well, without referring specifically to a clause, I don't think so. I don't think it would raise it; the differential could continue to increase. In other words, the differential between one and the other could alter, but as to whether it would rise above the amount now is difficult -- I can't answer that question. But I do know this, and I would like this understood, that over the last four years there have been changes in the Foundation Levy; there hasn't been a year that it hasn't changed. The only thing is there has always been that constant 24 mill differential between them. We have changed them, and in changing them we have done what we set out to do, ease the tax on residential and farm property. That was our concern.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: I would also like to ask the Honourable Minister a question. Are unitary divisions the only ones subject to revision and further assistance?

MR. MILLER: I'm not quite sure I understand the question. I wonder if the member would repeat, I don't think I have caught it all.

MR. FROESE: The question is, are unitary divisions the only ones subject to tax revision and further assistance?

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, in this bill they are the only ones that are covered.

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

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I would ask for Yeas and Nays.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have support?

MR. FROESE: Yes, we have three members.

MR. SPEAKER: Four are required, at least. Call in the members.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The question before the House is on the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Education. Bill No. 13.

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

YEAS: Messrs. Adam, Allard, Barkman, Barrow, Beard, Bilton, Borowski, Boyce, Burtniak, Cherniack, Doern, Einarson, Enns, Evans, Ferguson, Girard, Gonick, Gottfried, Graham, Green, Hanuschak, Henderson, Jenkins, Johannson, Johnston (Portage la Prairie), Johnston (Sturgeon Creek), Jorgenson, McBryde, McGill, McGregor, McKellar, McKenzie, Mackling, Malinowski, Miller, Moug, Patrick, Paulley, Petursson, Schreyer, Shafransky, Sherman, Spivak, Toupin, Turnbull, Uskiw, Uruski, Walding, Watt and Mrs. Trueman.

NAYS: Mr. Froese.

MR. CLERK: Yeas 50; Nays 1.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion carried. The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Would you call Bill No. 18, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Agriculture. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, after the vote just concluded I didn't expect any applause for getting up and speaking on this bill. But I don't mind standing up for what is right and as long as I'm in this House I will always reject something that is wrong and support that which is right, and when the government introduces bills and legislation which is completely wrong I will always reject it.

The bill before us now has to do with authorizing payments of special emergency grants to farmers. The farmers today are in need of help, there is no doubt in my mind on this, and in a way I'm happy that this government realizes this and realizes the need. I think this was evidenced right throughout the meetings that were conducted by the Minister of Agriculture earlier last fall, or late last fall and early this winter. On every occasion we heard of the hardships that the farmers in this province are experiencing. We know the competition they're up against through the wars, inter-provincial wars that are going on at the present time and that certain products cannot be exported as readily and cannot move as freely as we would like. This certainly has to do with the marketing of our products and it makes it that much worse, so

(MR. FROESE cont'd) that many farmers today are selling off their flocks or killing them off and we will see a great reduction in the number of poultry and laying hens for the next year. Eggs are selling at 10 cents and if the farmer is getting 10 cents a dozen he is happy today, some get less than that and this is way way below cost. They tell me the cost of producing a dozen of eggs is 16 cents -- 16 cents is a bare minimum, there's no profit and not even their wages and labour. So this is a cost that they have to experience and therefore they have to sell way below cost and the farmers are holding their flocks these days, it's purely on the ground that they want to continue in business and that they hope that sooner or later the market situation will change, and that they will again be in a situation where they can realize a profit.

Same holds true for hogs. The hog market is away down; the farmers are getting less than 20 cents, and here again not only are the markets down but when the situation is this way the grading system seems to create havoc too, that they'll grade down the hogs when they arrive at the slaughtering plants and are slaughtered. So that not only are the prices down but the grading system seems to work against them as well in these situation. So, certainly it's no surprise to me when the government says that there is a need to assist the farmers.

I was rather surprised though in the approach that this government is taking now and coming out with acreage payments, because members who were here during the last few years in this House know too well when the government was on this side of the House what position they took and how they denounced acreage payments. That was -- (Interjection) -- you bet, it was a sin almost. But now that they are on the other side they're taking a lesson and taking a second look at what went on when Diefenbaker made acreage payments, how well this was accepted through Canada, the support that he drew as a result of the acreage payments and which is still continuing. I think if it wasn't for Diefenbaker and the Conservative Party, their support in the west certainly wouldn't be near as strong as it is today. So now we find that this government is more or less copying what the previous federal government did.

But what I just can't figure out is, when is this government sincere? Was it sincere before or are they sincere now? This has arisen on several times now, on several occasions, that there have been changes. Yesterday we debated a certain change and I'm still not satisfied. Are they sincere now that they are on that side and are the government, or were they sincere before and that they're just faking? I would like to hear from the Minister on this, whether this really is this change is as sincere when they're coming out with acreage payments for the farmers in Manitoba.

Then, too, other speakers have already spoken of and have indicated more or less that this might also be a game of politics, since when they came -- they came out during the by-election of Ste. Rose and that this was to be one of the vote getters for them. If that is the case no doubt it did help them because they won the Ste. Rose seat, and we have evidence of that with the member present today. So I hope that this government, if they feel that it is such a success that they will continue with this, and not only continue but increase the amount of payments because if the economy will get worse, and certainly there is not too much indication at the present time that the farmers' economy will be improving to any extent, will further payments be made? I'm interested in knowing -- or is this just the one-shot deal and that this was just a political gimmick. Because if it's not a political gimmick, then certainly I would expect that further payments will be made if the economy doesn't show an upturn.

So I didn't intend to speak at any length on this particular bill but I was also interested in the Order-in-Council where it referred to the unexpended emergency funds, and under the fourth whereas just -- was there any money in that fund before this contribution was made, this \$4 million was added? What was the situation of the fund as at March 31st, 1971? And if any further payments will be made, will they be brought in under the same system or will a different course and a different practice be instituted?

Certainly I will support the bill. I think the Agricultural Department, the agricultural industry, has been a forgotten industry too long, that we have not done our share in this House in really furthering it and giving it the impetus that we need in making it and maintaining it to be a going concern. We know of past experiences where the government did set up funds for the purposes of loaning monies to young farmers and so on. Surely certain things have been done -- I wouldn't say that nothing was done -- but I think we haven't done enough in the aspect of marketing. I feel that this should be explored to much greater extent, and I asked a question of the Minister the other day whether or not the being a party to the Bretton Woods Agreement as a country, as Canada, whether this is not hindering our trade and that we are not free to trade

(MR. FROESE cont'd) as we would like. As I understand it the signatories to the Bretton Woods Agreement have to seal wheat for American currency only. Yet when it comes to the countries to the Communist world, which are not necessarily friendly to us, and we would much more prefer to deal with the country that's friendly to us, that we can only extend credit to the Communist countries. Is this not the case, and are we restricted in our trade as far as wheat is concerned in this matter to this extent? Because if that is the case certainly we should prevail on the Federal Government to get rid of this; to release ourselves from this obligation so that we could extend the credit to other countries who would then be in a position to buy from us so that we could increase our trade with these countries that are friendly to us, and in this way expand our markets. This is at least the information that I have. These are some of the restrictions that are presently placed on the trade, Canadian trade, in respect to wheat and I feel that unless we get rid of this particular restriction we will never go anywhere. This is why we see other countries making great strides and we are taking a back seat. I certainly would like to hear from the Minister, if not now, during the discussion of his estimates, what the case is and whether this is not the case. I once more want to congratulate the government on bringing in a measure of this type and give assistance to the farmer.

MR. SPEAKER: The Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I rise in the debate to once again present the position of the Opposition with respect to this bill, and I'm happy that the First Minister is present because it is to him that I would like to address my remarks. The Minister of Finance obviously is not interested in pursuing a course that would be the right course in connection with this bill, and I implore the First Minister to listen and to act in accordance with the procedures and practices that have been the tradition of this House and the House of Commons with respect to this particular kind of situation.

I want to deal with this, Mr. Speaker, on the basis of the principle involved, the method and the perspective that we must have as we view this particular item. With respect to the principle, I think I can say without question that we on this side for some time have agreed that acreage payments in fact are a method of transferring part of the public resources to those people in need. The agricultural industry was in need and that there was justification for this kind of action. So therefore on the question of the principle, Mr. Speaker, unlike some of the members on the opposite side, there has been unanimity of opinion and a conviction with respect to that, and that has been offered both in the debate that has taken place in the Legislature and in fact in the actions of the Progressive Conservative Party when they were in fact in office on the federal scene.

Now with respect to the method, Mr. Speaker, I think we should understand the method and what has taken place. The government has the right after the estimates have been passed to deal by Order-in-Council and special warrant in the transfer or the use of the moneys that have been voted to them by the budget of this House that has been approved and the estimates have been passed, to in fact allocate and pay out money as they deem advisable within the jurisdiction and responsibility that they have. In the normal course of events, they could have very well undertaken the responsibility, Mr. Speaker, of issuing a special warrant or an Order-in-Council, which is what they did on March 17th, and they could have issued the cheques, Mr. Speaker, pursuant to that, but the cheque, Mr. Speaker, must be issued before the end of the year, because at the end of the year if the cheques have not been issued, notwithstanding a vote that may have taken place allowing the government to spend money under a particular item, at the end of the fiscal year, which is the end of March, Mr. Speaker, everything stops. At that point, Mr. Speaker, the money that has not been spent, the cheques that have not been issued stop, and in effect the money is transferred over to the budget of the following year.

Now this is the procedure, the rules, the way in which we have operated throughout the years. Mr. Speaker, if it was the desire of the members on the opposite side to take part of the moneys that were allocated for the fiscal year ending March of 1971, March 31, 1971, they had a perfect right, Mr. Speaker, to have adjusted this by allowing the moneys to have been taken into surplus for this coming year and to have allocated in the estimates Mr. Speaker, to have allocated in the estimates sufficient money to cover the payments that they want to make which is approximately \$4 million. That would have been the normal, accepted procedure, the procedure that has been always followed in the past; but, Mr. Speaker, for reasons best known to themselves, they made a decision to do something which is extraordinary, and so far as I know it has never been done in Manitoba, so far as I know it has never been done in a provincial

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) House in Canada, and so far as I know it has never been done in the House of Commons. They have set aside a portion of money of last year's budget into a trust fund, or trust allocation within the Consolidated Fund, and they are now asking us to approve what they did to allow the cheques to be given to the farmers.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Lakeside, my colleague, indicated that the government was not that silly to issue the cheques before March 31st because then for sure the issue of bribery which had been raised in the by-elections would have been proved. It was one thing to make the promise but it was another thing to issue the cheque. Now I must say, Mr. Speaker, that I like many other people in Manitoba, when the announcement was made that in fact an acreage payment was to be offered, when the announcement was made about the Foundation Program, when the announcement was made about the contribution that the province would be making towards the budgets of the municipalities for next year, these announcements all indicated what we considered would be the thrust of the government's program in the coming year. Those announcements indicated in effect that the government, through its management, would have the ability to take the moneys from next year and to be able to operate in such a way that would allow us to be able to examine it, Mr. Speaker, allow us to examine it properly. They were going to use the moneys that were going to be forthcoming, the revenue that was going to be forthcoming and they were going to allocate it accordingly.

Mr. Speaker, to our surprise, the government in the case of the acreage payments were using moneys that were allocated obviously in the past year and in effect were taking it out of last year's budget. Now that's very interesting, Mr. Speaker, because we at this point do not know what department did not spend the money which allowed them the opportunity to use the \$4 million. We do not know what programs have not been carried through which has now given them this bonus of \$4 million and, in turn, we do not know whether there is any increase in the anticipated revenue that was forthcoming, and we have to, Mr. Speaker, look at it in the perspective of the total overspending of the government when we take into consideration winter unemployment programs, when we take into consideration the Health and Welfare Department and the money that was spent in that department. So, Mr. Speaker, from our point of view, because it is important for us to know where this money is forthcoming, this becomes important in relation to our position with respect to the perspective that one must have with respect to this particular item.

Now let me ask you, Mr. Speaker, why couldn't the government have allowed, if they had a surplus of \$4 million, for it to be transferred over into the surplus of this year and to follow the normal procedure. I have not heard from the other side one reason that would indicate why they couldn't have followed that procedure. Mr. Speaker, they are asking us to approve something that has never been done. -- (Interjection) -- Yes, now that's very interesting. The Minister of Transportation says vote against it. All right, he says vote against it. He says vote against it because in his crude way, Mr. Speaker, in his crude way, Mr. Speaker - and I say that with a smile on my face so that there will be no mistake for the House Leader - in his crude way, Mr. Speaker, he hopes that maybe we will get 30,000 farmers angry. But, Mr. Speaker - and the Minister of Transportation is one that knows now what tradition means - Mr. Speaker, we follow a tradition in a practice and we fight, Mr. Speaker, to ensure that our procedures are correct just as much -- (Interjection) -- That's right, that's right, we fight to ensure that our procedures are correct. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I find it amusing that the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources who has fought so hard in the courts on many occasions should laugh, should really laugh at anyone who suggests -- (Interjection) -- You've never fought procedure. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Honourable Minister can suggest that in his court battles he has never once fought on a procedural point or not. Yes, well I see by the smile on his face that he has.

Mr. Speaker, the procedure is wrong. We are being asked to approve something we should not be asked to approve - not the principle of the 30,000 payments or cheques that have to be issued to the farmers, we have agreed on that, but we are being asked by the government to approve a procedure that is incorrect, and Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance for 10 days has known that this was our objection. In fact the Honourable Member from St. George was correct and it would take two weeks to do the correcting that would have been necessary - and that's all he suggested in his speech on Page 328 of Hansard - then ten days have elapsed. If the Minister of Finance was really seriously concerned and interested in seeing to it that the cheques were received by the farmers, he could have made that correction immediately. As a

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) . . . matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to you that in the two days that we were absent while the honourable members opposite were waffling at their convention -- (Interjection) -- Well, that's a question of interpretation. In those two days, Mr. Speaker, the bill, the supplementary estimates, all the work and procedure that was necessary to ensure that the bill was put in its proper form would have been undertaken.

Mr. Speaker, without in any way being sure of the answer, I would suggest to you that there is something hidden in the procedures that the government have brought forward. There is a reason why this procedure hasn't been used in the past and there has to be a reason, Mr. Speaker, and we are entitled to find out that reason and the First Minister is entitled to give us the reason why it was necessary to do it that way. -- (Interjection) -- It was necessary? -- (Interjection) -- It wasn't necessary. Then, Mr. Speaker, if it wasn't necessary why have you not put it in a proper way? Why have you not followed the tradition of the past? Why have you not allowed us to scrutinize this as we should be scrutinizing every other item with respect to -- (Interjection) -- We're too slow? I assure the Minister of Agriculture that the Member from Morris ten days ago announced that we would give rapid passage, in fact immediately if a new bill was introduced and supplementary estimates were added to the estimates to provide this, yet you haven't seen your way clear to do this.

And this is very interesting. Why not? Are they really interested in seeing to it that the cheques are presented to the farmers or are they, as possibly the Minister of Transportation, interested to see that on the question of principle we are going to oppose it so that they can say, hey, we didn't want to give it to the farmers. Now we have been put in sort of this, you know, uncomfortable position. Well, I'll say we've been deliberately put in this uncomfortable position. The government simply says sure, you don't want to give the cheques to the farmers and that's what the Member from St. George said, and he said that with the full knowledge of the Minister of Finance. You know, Mr. Speaker, if we don't approve this the farmers won't get their cheques and if the farmers don't get the cheques you are to blame.

But we have been asked, you know, to approve a procedure which is very interesting, because I think we can apply that procedure to the next general election, and in the next general election we're going to have the power of the government to take whatever surpluses they want to use for whatever amounts that they want to use and to be able to allocate it to whatever body they decide to use, because, Mr. Speaker, they now have a winning formula. It's simple. You control the Election Act so that the candidate can only spend so much money but the government can take the peoples' money and they can offer the people their money in the process of winning an election - and if anyone doesn't believe me, look at the smile on the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources now. Very clever, very principled and consistent with the statements that always have been made by the members on the opposite side when they were on this side of the House. -- (Interjection) -- It's not sour grapes.

Now having said that, Mr. Speaker, and having again - and I plead with the First Minister - we are prepared to see that the cheques are issued. I understand that the computer has them programmed now. There is absolutely nothing that would suggest that this bill could not be withdrawn, supplementary estimates introduced, a new bill forwarded and, in turn, rapid passage on our part. I assure you there will not be a speaker, we will just okay it immediately so the cheques can go out, but at least do the procedure correctly. Don't put us in the position of having to fight this issue on the question of the principle, because if you do we are going to have no alternative for the simple reason that you are asking us to do something that no other Legislature in Canada has been asked to do. Now the Minister of Finance looks at me rather aghast. I want him to cite the examples. I want him to cite the examples.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance on a point of privilege.

MR. CHERNIACK: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I feel that it is not for the honourable member to interpret the way I look at him and making it a matter of record. I have enough trouble as it is.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: I have enough trouble looking at you as well.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let's take a perspective of what the government has done. Albeit was an election, an election that was pretty vital to their majority, and they appear very clever about what they have done. The Speech from the Throne talked about a humane government, and we must view what they have done in the context of those other people in our society who may very well have required assistance and who should receive the same kind of compassion and humaneness which they have shown to the farmers by awarding them the amount of money that they have, and taking part of the public revenue and allocating it for them. And, Mr. Speaker, this is important because we have other groups in our society, one in particular who, as yet, and in all probability will not receive the same kind of consideration the farmers have, and I talk about the fishermen in Manitoba. The fishermen of Manitoba, who the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources suggested yesterday are being let down by the Federal Government and - yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: On a matter of privilege, the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

MR. GREEN: . . . I said that I fully expect the Federal Government will do justice to the fishermen and I never suggested that they were being let down - at no time. I don't expect the Federal Government to let them down. I would be horrified if . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Minister is stating an argument and a statement. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I want to tell you something. The Minister of Mines and Natural Resources has illustrated in the manner in which he has handled the fish processors of this province, and in the manner of the fishermen, that he hasn't got one ounce of compassion in his body and, Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I would like to ask the Honourable Leader of the Opposition to stay within the realm of the principles of the bill and not within the realm of fisheries.

MR. SPIVAK: I am in the realm of the bill because I am talking about the perspective of \$4 million being offered by way of acreage grants to farmers prior to a by-election, and I am talking about another group in our society who are in desperate need with whom the government is taking the position that there must be federal support before they are going to offer a program.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the member has said that the government has taken the position that the Federal government must offer support before we are involved in the program. The government has never taken that position. The government has indicated that it has formulated a program. -- (Interjection) --

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. A matter of privilege is one in respect to the House and in respect to the honourable member. The Honourable Minister is stating an argument. Order please. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, the question of acreage payments is interesting. The Federal Government did not provide the acreage payments; the Minister of Agriculture said therefore we had to provide it to be able to embarrass them and because the need was there. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government has not offered assistance by way of compensation this year to the fishermen - they did last year - and therefore the same kind of compassion and the same kind of attitude that the Minister of Agriculture had offered, should have in fact been offered by the government. But there's a difference, Mr. Speaker, the fishermen were not involved in the by-election in Ste. Rose.

Mr. Speaker, the First Minister has talked about intellectual dishonesty and a couple of days ago pounded the table with: dishonest, dishonest, dishonest, and I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that if anybody has been dishonest to the fishermen it has been the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources who has not followed through with this procedure.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please. I was going to suggest to the Honourable Leader of the Opposition that he was casting reflection upon members of this Chamber. I would ask him to rephrase what he has said.

On the question of privilege, the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member - and I use the prefix "honourable" only because I am required to do so by the rules of this House - has suggested that I have not, has not suggested but has said that I have been dishonest vis-a-vis the fishermen, and I ask

(MR. GREEN cont'd.) him to withdraw that allegation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, my expression was the same expression as the Premier used the other day, and I pounded the table in the same way. And, Mr. Speaker, I followed the procedure that the Premier did, who suggested that we were intellectually dishonest and I suggest, Mr. Speaker, on the other side, they are intellectually dishonest.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: I rise to try to be of some assistance to you, Sir, in determining whether or not there is a point of personal privilege. I believe, I recall that when I was speaking in the context to which the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition refers, that I was making that charge with respect to the actions of the party and I believe that my honourable friend is now using that terminology with respect to an individual member of this House. I believe in one case it does constitute a case of personal privilege.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I will then rephrase it and I will withdraw my remarks to the Minister and I will now express it with respect to the Party, and I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the Party opposite are dishonest, dishonest and dishonest, because the principle of acreage payments that was applied by the Minister of Agriculture in justification for their actions cannot stand with respect to the fishermen who are not receiving compensation and the situation is exactly the same. The difference, Mr. Speaker, is that the fishermen who are involved were not capable of winning a by-election for the honourable members opposite. They didn't have the political club at the time so the government that is so full of compassion did not use it or exercise it for them; and, Mr. Speaker, I have waited for ten days to see, because I have been aware of the fact that the Honourable Minister has gone to Ottawa and went to see the Minister of Fisheries. I have waited, Mr. Speaker, to . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister on a point of order.

MR. SCHREYER: . . . Mr. Speaker, if you would not be able to agree that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, that his remarks are not germane to the subject matter of the bill that's now before us, and that not only is he -- he is not making passing reference to some analogous situation but is dwelling on a subject matter which is not germane to the bill that is before us.

MR. SPEAKER: Well taken. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, just on the point of order, my remarks I suggest to you are germane. They deal with the principle of acreage payments; they deal with no payment out of the public treasury to one group in our society and I suggest there are others . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I would suggest respectfully to all members that I have been pretty lax - and this is my own particular problem - in the way I've allowed debate to continue. It is true that sometimes prefacing remarks are necessary in an argument or in a debate, but I do think that members should really be cognizant of the principles that they are discussing and extraneous material, even though it may be relevant in another sense, definitely do not contribute to a principle of an argument and I would ask the honourable members to remember this. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, the principle is very simple. The principle is the use of public treasury to offer support to those groups who require support in our society, those who have economic difficulties, those who are in need because they cannot make it, and we've agreed in principle that the farmers require support. It should have come from the Federal Government but it has come from the Provincial Government and it comes at a particular time when I think the reasons can in fact be questioned. I have mentioned the fishermen because they are a particular group; I've mentioned it because the principle happens to be identical. The Federal Government should be supporting them; they did support them last year; they apparently are not going to support them this year -- (Interjection) -- Well, Mr. Speaker, I have no intention of fighting on it, believe me. Believe me, I must say to you, you're the one who is fighting the fishermen, I'm not fighting the fishermen at all.

MR. SPEAKER: If the honourable gentleman wishes to continue, I would ask him to really consider making his remarks towards the Chair and possibly then he wouldn't get any feedback from any other direction and be able to stay on the topic that we have under discussion at the present time. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I would be delighted to have the Minister rise and say that in the event the Federal Government does not support them that they are going to be prepared to in fact offer cash compensation. Those questions have been asked, Mr. Speaker, and they have not been answered as yet in the House. I have asked questions and I haven't received any answers. -- (Interjection) -- Well, I've asked the question already and you never answered it in the House so I have to . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I don't know what I have to say to the honourable members so that they will address their remarks to the Chair. Now I have an earpiece which tells me what is going on in the Assembly. I do not hear all the other extraneous remarks that are cast about and I'm sure Hansard doesn't either. I would like to point out to all members that a two-way conversation does not look very good in Hansard if only one half of it is recorded. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, it would be easy to dismiss the arguments advanced on this side by saying, well, we've broken traditions so what. Because that's a sort of a common thing. We break traditions and we don't worry too much about it. But let's understand the tradition we're breaking, and that's the perspective we have to deal with. The tradition we're breaking is the right of the Opposition to examine in detail and scrutinize the use of the public purse. We vote and approve or disapprove the estimates of each department and the budget of the government for its fiscal year. In that we follow a tradition that is part of our heritage. Our obligation is to see that in fact the budget has been spent properly and correctly and that there has been no impropriety on the part of the government. This is the obligation of the Opposition.

In addition to all the other things that we may do within the House, in addition to the contributions - that other members opposite may not think are contributions - that we may make to debate on specific issues, our obligation is to ensure that the public purse is spent as allocated and approved by this Legislature. In this particular situation the government exercised the right that it has of doing something by special warrant, but it did not do it in its fiscal year, and by all right and by all standard and by all tradition that money should have been in the surplus and been transferred to this fiscal year and the money that is to be allocated should be in the estimates and the bill that is to be presented should be a bill dealing directly with those estimates in this fiscal year.

Our argument and our quarrel is not with the acreage payments, but our argument and quarrel is why the necessity of this method. What reason did you have? Is it possible, Mr. Speaker, that had there been a general election after the by-election the cheques would have been issued anyway? Is that possible, Mr. Speaker? I don't know but I can question now, Mr. Speaker, because the procedure is unusual. Mr. Speaker, I have had the opportunity of talking to some noted parliamentarians in Canada, one who I think would be equal to any now living in Canada, and I'm satisfied, based on that discussion, that the procedures and the posture is incorrect and wrong, and I'm satisfied as well that there is an obligation on the part of the government to change it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we announced this position ten days ago and the Honourable Member from Morris brought forward our position, and we did this in a way which would have allowed the government to have altered and changed its procedures. I don't know the reason why they did not and I think there is an obligation on the part of the First Minister to suggest why they did not. I do not think, and I say this in advance because I anticipate this, that it can be dismissed on the basis that it's an old tradition which we should change, because I see danger in this, Mr. Speaker, and the danger I see is the procedure that could be followed prior to the next general election, possibly at a time when we are at the end of a fiscal year or close to it and we have the same kind of situation. I don't think, I don't think -- (Interjection) -- The sooner the better? Oh, the sooner the better for me. I welcome the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources to run in River Heights against me. -- (Interjection) -- You run in River Heights; I offered it first. I asked you to run in River Heights - and the smile is on the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources' face again.

So, Mr. Speaker, again through you to the First Minister, I suggest that if you examine what I have said and you examine your own conscience, you will realize that the proper way is to follow the procedure that we have advised. Withdraw the bill, rescind the Order-in-Council, enter it in supplementary estimates in a new bill and we will pass it one, two, three, the \$30, 000 for the computer, or the 30, 000 cheques can be issued. -- (Interjection) -- Well,

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd.) if there is some question about the cheques I must refer to the statements of the Member from St. George on Page 328 who indicated that "I was told that a computer program for the issuance of the cheques to the farmers has been ready and the cheques are all processed and they could be in the mail upon the passage of this bill."

Well, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that if the procedures were followed, the rescinding of the Order, the withdrawal of the bill, the introduction of supplementary estimates, the introduction of a new bill, we'll pass it one, two and three, then -- (Interjection) -- Like we passed the \$64 million on the housing. And let's refer back to that, Mr. Speaker. We passed \$64 million pretty quickly and I assure you that we'll pass the \$4 million for the farmers just as quick to allow these cheques that are in the computer program to be processed and the farmers to receive it. But do not put us in the position where we have to authorize something that is against the basic tradition and history of the Legislature and the House of Commons in which the budget, the estimates and the purse is to be examined correctly and properly by the Opposition.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, it's possible to refer to three separate aspects of the debate that has gone on so far with respect to this Bill No. 18. The one element involved which the Opposition has been trying to make much of, and that is the question of motivation and what motivated the government in following this particular policy in introducing this particular legislation; a second element has to do with the principle itself of a measure of financial assistance to the agricultural economy of the province; and the third has to do with the financial administration procedure.

In the latter connection I sincerely can say, Sir, that I tried to follow the reasoning of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition but I really am not able to understand what his apparent concern is really all about. He insists that he's not opposed to the principle of providing for a measure of financial assistance to the farm economy but he thinks that it's very dangerous that we should try to do so by means of bringing in a bill that authorizes the transferring of money from one fiscal year by special warrant to another fiscal year and then have the Legislature deal with the matter. I really have to argue, Mr. Speaker, that the important thing surely is that Parliament is having brought before it the substance of the measure and is able to exercise a control over the administration of our finances. To my way of thinking there is really no substantial difference whatsoever whether we follow the honourable member's course of action or the course of action that we are proposing here.

As a matter of fact, Sir, I think that this has already been explained to honourable members opposite, but if doing it the way we are proposing here entails one instrument and that is the bill itself, doing it the way that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition is suggesting involves four different instruments being put through this Assembly, and unless one has some kind of inexplicable desire to have to go through four procedures, four instruments rather than one, unless one had such a strange desire I really wonder why he would insist on the longer way around, the one that takes more time of the Assembly. It's not as though we're trying to shortcut or bypass the Assembly because here it is by way of a bill before the members of this House. I think that the superseding principle of parliamentary government is that Parliament have an opportunity to explore and to render its opinion on a proposal being made by government and clearly this is exactly what we are doing by following this procedure, and I would ask the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition not to be so stubborn in insisting on one particular procedure which I am firmly convinced does not enhance or respect the rights of Parliament any more than the way that we are proposing.

Now perhaps I should take the opportunity to deal with some of the other arguments that were put forward by the Leader of the Opposition. He says that he is not opposed to the legislation. He thinks that it's perhaps in order to provide for this financial assistance to the farm economy but he certainly doesn't make any effort to conceal his subconscious belief that we were motivated in this respect because of considerations having to do with the by-elections. Well, there was a lot said during the by-elections about this government introducing measures and giving notice of measures in such a way as to attempt to provide special favours for the residents of the two constituencies. Mr. Speaker, there's all the difference in the world between a government that in campaigning in by-elections proposes measures that have to do only with the constituencies involved in by-elections. That's what I would call "goodies", as the expression was used during the campaign and in the newspapers at the time, but when a

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd.) government brings forward proposals and measures that relate to the entire province or to an entire sector of the economy of the province, then I certainly dismiss any argument that this is bringing forward "goodies" for the residents of a particular constituency.

It's interesting to hear the Honourable the Member for Rhineland's comments in connection with this bill. Farmers in his constituency are just as eligible for this assistance as are farmers of Virden, the farmers of Ste. Rose, the farmers of Lac du Bonnet and the farmers of Gladstone or wherever. There is no special treatment here that was designed to appeal to the people of a particular area involved in a by-election so let's just get rid of that nonsensical notion.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, I must say that the Member for Rhineland and the Leader of the Opposition both are being just a little bit careless when they talked about the present Provincial Government simply copying actions of a previous Conservative administration. The fact of the matter is, and everyone knows, that the acreage payments that were made in the early 1960's - which certainly helped alleviate the situation facing farmers at the time - was a program that was undertaken by the Federal Government, and the Government of Manitoba had ample opportunity in 1959 or '60 or '61 to come forward with a program that would have provided a measure of financial assistance to the farm economy. They didn't do so and I just think that it's unfair to compare the efforts of a provincial government with that of a Federal government in the jurisdictional field of agriculture.

It's generally been recognized for a long time that the superseding responsibility in respect to farm income stabilization in this country lies with the Government of Canada, but because there was an effort made by the provincial Minister of Agriculture of this government to come to some understanding, to attempt to persuade the Government of Canada to come forward with a meaningful income stabilization program for agriculture, and when we were satisfied that there didn't seem to be any imminent prospect of this happening, we felt that since we had been talking about it for a matter of six or seven months it would be in order to provide a measure of financial assistance, particularly in light of the circumstances, and so everyone should know who's been following agricultural policy that these discussions and negotiations, actually discussions, have been going on for a matter of many months.

Now, just because the province has taken this course of action does not mean that the onus on the Federal Government is somehow lessened, because we would all hope that the interest and concern and action that the Government of Canada would be willing to take will be undiminished, one hopes even enhanced by the example that the Provincial Government has taken, bearing in mind the proportions of responsibility between the two levels of government for farm income support.

So I assume that everyone is in favour of the principle of the legislation before us except that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition says that since we have done this with respect to the agricultural economy, and farmers, now what about fishermen. I want to say to him that his remarks will look in retrospect to be very absurd. The reason that the Government of Manitoba has undertaken a considerable financial responsibility with respect to programs of financial assistance to fisherman who were put into precarious circumstances because of pollution of certain of our commercial fishing waterways, the Government of Manitoba along with the Government of Canada has spent something in the order of a million or a million two for programs of financial assistance to fishermen, and I'm sure that my colleague the Minister of Mines and Resources, for that matter all of us here don't appreciate one little bit the clumsiness of the Leader of the Opposition in following up the bargaining position of the government of this province because I want the Honourable Leader of the Opposition to know that we have no intention, as a provincial government, to simply sit back and allow the Federal Government to slip off any continuing responsibility it has to share with the Government of Manitoba with respect to any possible continuing program of financial assistance to fishermen.

And I would like to say to my honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition that if he wants to talk about compassion for those in difficult circumstances then I refer him to the fact that this Government of Manitoba made a greater all-out effort with respect to programs to alleviate unemployment this winter than was done by the governments of some of the so-called free enterprise parties in this country, and if it is all right, if it's acceptable to engage in special programming in order to alleviate unemployment and pump in five or six million dollars in special winter works programs to alleviate unemployment, it is equally justifiable

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd.) to pump in something in the order of four or five million dollars, a like amount with respect to the farm economy if it's going through a difficult period as it has been. And with respect to fishermen, I would say that here again no other government in this country, provincial government in this country, has done any more on a per capita basis, and even in absolute terms perhaps, than has the Government of Manitoba with respect to programs of financial assistance to commercial fishermen who have problems because of pollution of their fishing grounds.

So any way one would like to take it, Mr. Speaker, whether it be with respect to alleviating unemployment with special winter works programs, whether it be financial assistance to farmers in western Canada or anywhere in Canada or whether it be with respect to fishermen in precarious economic circumstances, the Government of Manitoba, it so happens, has made a greater effort and a greater financial outlay than the governments of any of the so-called free enterprise party governments elsewhere in this country.

That is simply a fact of the matter and there have been those who have taken the trouble to do some accurate analysis and research, unlike my honourable friend, and who have been moved therefore to comment on the fact that the Government of Manitoba has made unusual and extraordinary efforts with respect to programs of alleviating unemployment, and I can refer my honourable friend to a number of editorials in the Toronto Globe and Mail, for example, of the past three or four months, pointing with special interest to the fact that in Manitoba there were programs launched of a special nature to attempt to cope, to deal with problems of unemployment and unfortunate financial economic circumstances.

So we don't apologize of course for introducing this special legislation to provide a measure of financial assistance to farmers. It is unusual, I agree. My honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition is so concerned with precedent and tradition. Well, I can tell him that if the Government of Manitoba of 1971 were blithely guided, exclusively guided by tradition, then we wouldn't have made any payment at all to farmers because no provincial governments have ever been moved to provide financial assistance on an acreage basis to farmers. It's never happened before. There was ample opportunity and ample reason to do so for example in 1959 and again in 1961. If it hadn't been for the Federal Government at the time then nothing would have happened. -- (Interjection) -- Well, I think that in comparative terms what you're talking about is small potatoes.

Mr. Speaker, the problem actually is that the honourable gentlemen opposite, unlike the Member for Rhineland, the rest of the honourable gentlemen opposite have a feeling of frustration at the fact that this government is prepared to depart from tradition when necessary in order to get meaningful programs implemented, and both with respect to the substance we're prepared to depart from tradition, and with respect to the procedure we're prepared to depart from tradition, bearing in mind - and I insist on this, Mr. Speaker - that the superseding principle of parliamentary stewardship and supervision and control is in no way impinged upon because the bill is now before the Legislature and the honourable members had better show where they stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: I wonder if the Honourable First Minister would submit to a question. I wonder whether he would indicate to the House whether he is prepared to break with tradition, if necessary, and issue the cheques after the fiscal year.

MR. SCHREYER: If I understand my honourable friend's question, he's asking whether or not we would have been prepared to issue cheques on the basis of a special warrant without the concurrence of Parliament or the Legislature, and if that's his concern, if that's his real and sincere concern, I can disabuse him of that. The reason a special warrant was issued was simply to authorize the transfer of moneys into a special fund, but then the disbursement of the moneys from the public purse remains to be determined by the Legislative Assembly. Therefore, as I've said once already, the overriding and most important principle of legislative or parliamentary supervision of spending has remained unimpaired.

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

MR. J. DOUGLAS WATT (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Swan River, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: It is now 5:30. The House is adjourned and will remain adjourned until 2:30 tomorrow afternoon.