

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
9:30 o'clock, Tuesday, October 7, 1969

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; Orders of the Day.

The Honourable Leader of the Official Opposition.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. WALTER WEIR (Leader of the Opposition) (Minnedosa): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might inquire of the House Leader if I'm right in assuming we now have all the contemplated legislation before us that the government intends to bring in, with the exception of those routine financial bills that are normal.

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour) (Transcona): I believe that to be so, Mr. Speaker, unless some emergency arises of that nature.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Before the Orders of the Day, Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the First Minister. Is the government considering to make Highway 59 through Elmwood a secondary street? I understand the present situation is causing great hardship on many small merchants.

HON. ED. SCHREYER (Premier) (Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, I understand that there is a problem being caused the merchants that have their places of business located along the old 59. Unfortunately, Sir, I'm not able to tell the honourable member just what course of action is under consideration but I shall take the question as notice.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I don't know if the Minister is aware the reason I posed the question. The present highway is barricaded and I think if it would be made a secondary street it would solve the problem.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, all I can say is that the Minister of Highways is looking into the matter. I shall try and have some information for the honourable member soon.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

ORDERS OF THE DAY - GOVERNMENT BILLS

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, if there are no further questions we might proceed with -- I see my friend is not here. Mr. Johnston, the Member for Sturgeon Creek assured me yesterday he would proceed.

HON. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q.C. (Minister of Finance) (St. John's): He's right there.

MR. PAULLEY: Oh, fine. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if you'd kindly call the adjourned debate, Bill 44.

MR. SPEAKER: Second readings. The proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Labour. The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, this bill, as the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs has stated when he presented it, that the communities in the metro area have been receiving partial taxes on buildings that are partially finished. I believe this to be a bill to make them equal to Bill 45 which is the downtown Winnipeg tax freeze. In my opinion the downtown Winnipeg tax freeze is a very necessary thing for the City of Winnipeg. We're only kidding ourselves if we ignore the centre of Winnipeg because the large buildings, the \$35 million or \$25 million buildings will be going there and the sooner they're there the faster the suburbs are going to gain from this and the other cities will gain from this.

But, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to say now that we are not opposing this bill, we are for it mainly because the legislation is permissive. The municipality or city can opt out of this legislation if he so desires and this means the local government will have the autonomy to make this decision. And as I said once before, I believe that they should make the decision. There's just some things that should be brought to the attention of what this bill could do. I might have said that downtown Winnipeg is a special situation, have the legislation for it and leave the Municipal Act alone, and I think I could have said that without any provocation at all, because all we're doing here is if everybody opts out we'll be the same or if everybody stays in we'll be the same; and certainly if one person opts out we're starting a situation where there will be

(MR. F. JOHNSTON cont'd.) competition among the municipalities to try and get developers in their area. At the present time we're all the same.

The only person that is going to benefit by this legislation, in my opinion, is the developer and I would hope that some of the cities and municipalities, the aldermen of these cities, will be very careful with this legislation. First of all for the first year while it's in - I'll give you an example of the city I know best. If you're taking the taxes added to the roll estimates you're talking \$225,000.00. Now a lot of this is housing and what have you that will be finished during the year anyway; but on the large business the Metro assessment comes along and while the building is in progress this is income to this city. Now this is just one year, Mr. Speaker, and the following year the city will catch up. But during that one year or the next year when this bill becomes in force they will not be able to estimate any revenue of taxes added to the roll of buildings that are in partial construction. This could mean that some of the cities and municipalities may or may not have a little bit of strain on their mill rate because there is an income here that they're depending on.

There's another complication, Mr. Speaker, that I would hope the aldermen of the cities take a look at. And that is this: At the present time a developer comes into an area, he's usually required to finish the house or start the house after six months or four months or three months - they're all different in different areas - after he receives his option. There is the possibility here that if a man starts a street of houses in November, the basements in, and he does not finish these houses until, oh let's say next June or July, the city or municipality will not gain any income from that row of houses until 1971. Now here again the developer is certainly going to be benefitting from this situation. It will put competition between cities and municipalities there is no doubt about this; and as I say it's up to the city fathers to decide whether this legislation goes through or not.

There is one other thing, Mr. Speaker, the type of houses that are being built today by the developers is not generally the type of houses that are in real need today. They are selling 35 - 40 thousand dollar houses in most areas, but the type of houses we're looking for today are in the \$20,000 range or down, because there are many people looking for this area of price range and they're just not available. So the present house contractor as I say will benefit. You could look at this as almost a type of winter works program for more development, but I don't think the winter works program should be at the expense of any local taxpayer in the city, and also the large buildings which are carrying on, and very often you'll find that the city has had to do a lot of administrative work as far as getting these developments going. There is the drawing up of agreements between developer and the city; there is the policing; there is the roads that have to be kept clean while development is going on and the city does have some expense which the Metro government has been helping out with their assessment situation. They'd go out, assess the building as it stood and you received payment from the developer as he went along. This will now stop for this first year. As I say it will be only one year, and the loss of the taxes added to the roll in that year plus the fact that housing developers will now start in November, which could be a good thing, but it's a very serious thing and as I say we are not opposed because the city or municipality has the opportunity to opt in and out.

As I said before, we could have quite easily passed Bill 45; there is no doubt about the fact that Bill 45 is downtown Winnipeg, it is a special situation, it should have been looked at in a special way and we could have left the Municipal Act alone. But because it is permissive we are not opposing it, Mr. Speaker. I'm just saying some of the things that could be dangerous to cities and municipalities. Thank you.

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

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the bill. You may recall that during the Throne Speech debate I criticized the government at that time for not proceeding with a tax freeze in the centre part of Winnipeg because I think it was most important and required for the development of the centre core, and if the centre core is vibrant and growing the municipalities will grow as well.

Now in this case I do appreciate that the land will not be exempt from taxation during the construction year, the land will be assessed from the time that construction takes place and the building will only be exempt from the time that the construction is started and will be exempt until such a time that the construction is almost finished or that the building is ready to be occupied, and I agree with that portion. As the Member for Sturgeon Creek has already said, it is permissive and the information that I have and the knowledge from some of the

(MR. PATRICK cont'd.) municipal people this was the case in parts of rural Manitoba, that they not tax or assess the building during the construction period. So in many parts of Manitoba this has been the case and this has been going on for the past, I understand, many years. So I do agree with the legislation and as I mentioned I was happy that the government did bring in Bill 45 in respect to the Winnipeg Charter as well because during the previous session there was some indication from the New Democratic Government at that time, or the members of the New Democratic Party that they may not be in favour of the tax freeze in Winnipeg.

When the Member for Wolseley discussed this in this House I mentioned to him if he would have restricted to the city core then I'm sure most members would have been agreeable, but as it was I think at that time the bill was for the whole Winnipeg area and I could not see how the municipalities or the other parts of Metropolitan Winnipeg would buy a proposal like that. I'm in favour of what the past bill was, 45, which it restricted to the city core and I think it's most important. Not only that I feel to some extent this may attract some developers to come to this area, but as well I think today urban renewal is one of the greatest challenges that the city representatives or any municipal government or the provincial government face today. I think this is most important. I think if we are going to shape the type of urban cities that we want to, this is important and, Mr. Speaker, I do support the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. AL. MACKLING (Attorney-General) (St. James): Mr. Speaker, I wish to make a few brief observations in respect to the comments that have been made respecting this bill. I appreciate the constructive comments that have been made by both the Members from Sturgeon Creek and Assiniboia.

We believe that this bill represents the thinking of municipal people throughout Manitoba. I know that I personally have heard strong argument in favour of this at a number of meetings, particularly when this matter was discussed by the Urban Association in Dauphin. It represents sound logic in that land which otherwise would be taxed only on land will be taxed on building as well; but those who are investing in the construction of a building will not be taxed until they actually commence to get some revenue from it, within a reasonable time. So it will be fair. And as has been pointed out, this provision has been open in some parts of Manitoba for some time.

In respect to the comment that it might induce contractors to spread their construction over a longer period of time - this is possible, Mr. Speaker, but I would suggest that given the costs of building today that no contractor or developer will want to leave a substantial investment sitting unoccupied and not bearing revenue for too long a period of time, because what little he would gain from a tax point of view he would lose many times over from the loss of revenue both on the actual rental of the building or on the investment that he has tied up for which today he is paying substantial interest rates. So I think that notwithstanding the otherwise sound observations that have been made in respect to this bill that it will be an inducement to construction and development of property in Manitoba.

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

MR. PAULLEY: I wonder if you'd call second reading on Bill 46, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Second readings. Bill No. 46. The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Minister of Agriculture) (Lac du Bonnet) presented Bill No. 46, The Agricultural Credit Corporation Act, for second reading. (Recommended to the House by His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor.)

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that members of the House recognize the plight in which many of our agricultural producers find themselves in today. I don't think I have to go back over the various representations that have been made by farm organizations to government and opposition alike in the past year or two; and indeed I don't have to review positions which I have taken in this Assembly over the last number of years.

I want to point out that only a short while ago we as a province were in the direct lending field and only a year ago the former government decided that probably there was no role to play in that area and amended the previous Act to take the province out of the direct lending business, which resulted in a serious cash shortage to the farmers of Manitoba. Without question, Mr. Speaker, it has become quite evident that the guarantee system did not work out. The Agricultural Corporation Board was very disappointed in the result of the latest legislation

(MR. USKIW cont'd.) and has strongly recommended that the province go back into direct lending in concert with the guaranteed system. In other words, what I am suggesting in this bill, Mr. Speaker, is that we are not abandoning the guaranteed system, but what we are doing is adding to the legislation to also provide for direct lending on the part of the corporation.

The question of duplication may arise as between provincial and federal involvement, and no doubt members opposite will raise that point. I just want to point out that there has been a serious problem in trying to provide for the farmers of this province, and indeed perhaps for farmers in Canada as a whole, a complete line of credit wherein there is some rationale as between the monies extended and the equity of the farmer in question or the applicant. We find that the FCC, a farm credit corporation at the federal level, requires substantial collateral for loans which they make, which leaves the provincial corporation very little equity in which to finance any shorter intermediate term loans, and this becomes a very serious problem in that we have, to some degree, a conflict as between the two lending institutions, and it is my opinion, Mr. Speaker, and the opinion of the Farm Credit Corporation Board, that the way to handle it is to have a one complete package system wherein one can get a long, intermediate and short term credit arrangement through one source.

Now it doesn't mean that we are going to encourage people away from FCC. Certainly not, because we think they may still play a vital role, but as much as possible wherein we want to be involved in the development of a healthy agricultural industry in Manitoba, wherein we want to be involved in the setting up of economic units of production in Manitoba, it is my belief and the belief of our board that it is good to package the credit needs through one source so that we have the kind of surveillance, if you like, of the operation of one of our customers and that we are going to indeed provide that individual with the kind of research in the marketing area, research in the production area, or information at least and advice, that will assure the success of that business. You cannot do this where you have one individual borrowing from two or three different sources. It's very difficult to establish a cash flow with any sense of security, if you like, and very difficult to advise unless you know the total financial picture of a farmer, and it is hoped that this legislation will provide the kind of expertise in the system that will advise farmers in such a manner that they will get the maximum out of their operation. In other words, tied to credit will be farm management consulting, various forms of advice that the farmer will find invaluable in his program.

I want to point out also that one may argue that perhaps we should have asked the federal people to extend their lending program, and while this may be the case, Mr. Speaker, I think we have to recognize that we can't wait for federal action in this regard. We have to deal with the problems as they arise. It is my intention and hope that at some future date we will attempt to ask Ottawa, or to get agreement from Ottawa, to compromise its position with respect to the availability of credit so that the provinces can be the administrators of the federal credit system. Now this has been attempted to some degree at the meeting we held in Fredericton of all the Ministers of Agriculture of Canada, of all the provinces. We had attempted to engage the federal Minister of Agriculture in this kind of discussion, and I have to admit with no degree of success at that time, but hopefully, with the unanimous support of the provinces, we might get the Federal Credit Corporation to pass on to the provinces the administration of their Corporation. That would be the most sensible approach. The provinces know their respective problem areas, the regional difficulties, and are best capable to administer a credit program. But until such time as we get that kind of co-operation from the Federal Government, it seems we are going to have some degree of duplication, hopefully not too much, but that the province does have to play some role in the provision of capital for the farmers in Manitoba.

I want to point out that this program is not designed to simply make money available without consideration to the application of such funds, without making sure that the facility will be directional, the credit program will be directional, to the extent that we hope to move away from a surplus production commodity as much as possible, that we would hope to use the lever of credit to influence the production of agricultural commodities in Manitoba in such a way that, as the years go by, we would less depend on the cereals, for example, as far as the farmers in Manitoba are concerned. We would hope that we would encourage the kind of diversification that would give Manitoba a well-rounded economy, a system wherein we don't have to subject ourselves to the fluctuations of the world marketplace in grains and the likes of that. I think this is a sound approach, Mr. Speaker, and I would hope that members opposite would recognize

(MR. USKIW cont'd.) the need and would support the bill.

It has come to my attention on many occasions in the last month or two that there is a very tight money squeeze on at the moment, that the conventional lending institutions, the banks, the credit unions and the trust companies, finance companies, are very selective at the present time; they are demanding high interest rates; and in essence what it amounts to, Mr. Speaker, is that farmers are paying anywhere from about eight to 24 percent on their borrowing depending on which source of credit they use. And it's hoped that this legislation will provide a level of interest rate that will be most reasonable in relation to what is happening at the present time, that we may effect some consolidation of debts in this program, or through this program, so that the actual cost to the farmer is going to be much less and thereby lower his cost of production.

Many farmers have resorted to the financing of the purchase of implements through the company financing system, that is through their dealers, and this has become a very expensive procedure. The interest rate, I believe at the present time, is somewhere in the neighborhood of 14 or 15 percent if not more, and it varies, Mr. Speaker. And if at all, we can provide funds for these producers at a rate which, while it is not indeed going to be a subsidy, but a much lesser rate than what is available to them through these conventional channels.

With these few remarks, Mr. Speaker, I would hope that members opposite would endorse the principle of this bill.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOUGLAS WATT (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to direct a question of the moment to the Minister of Agriculture. In view of the fact that there was no money in supplementary capital supply for agriculture, could the Minister tell us just what money will be injected into the Corporation to set this program off, and what the interest rates would be, if he can give us this information at this moment?

MR. USKIW: I don't want to close debate at the moment, Mr. Speaker. I'll answer that question. There is unused capital available to the extent of \$6 million which includes -- well, I should say it includes unused capital supply plus the repayment of principle that the Corporation is now receiving, which we expect will be in the neighborhood of some \$2 million between now and January or February, by which time we hope to be back in session and bring in another Capital Supply Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Has the Honourable Member for Arthur another question?

MR. WATT: I was going to adjourn the debate. If anyone else wishes to speak . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. GEORGE HENDERSON (Pembina): Mr. Speaker, I'm very glad to hear that we've got a bill coming up that's going to be of some assistance to agriculture. I'm very glad to hear that there's going to be money available at, I believe he said, very reasonable rates. Now I don't know what he means by that but I hope it's at quite a reduction. I even would go so far as to say that interest rates should be subsidized because we do have money for welfare programs and other things like that, so I can't see why this can't be done. I'd like to say to the Minister that you can't borrow yourself out of debt, that's for sure. You've got to have a constructive program going for you. By what he said, they're working on this and they're going to have expertise working on this.

Now I think I'd caution him with expertise not to get too many or else you'll maybe have more trouble, because even in our farm management courses, if we took all the advice we got, there's many of us that have been more successful when out of business, because when you keep books when you're farming on one particular thing, even for a couple of years, you could easily lose money on it and your advice would be to go out of that, it's losing you money, and the next year you could be told to go out of something else. They tell the story about the farmer that was keeping books and they told him to go out of cattle, so he went into hogs - they were paying good. By the time he was in there with a big set-up in hogs he was losing money, so they advised him to go into chickens. "But," he says, "if I do that I'm not going to keep books." "Well," we said "Why?" "Well," he said, "if I keep on keeping books," he said, "I, going to have to quit farming." Because if you listen to the expertise all the time and the advice they give you, it doesn't always work out. As I said before, you can farm and it's working out on paper, but it's really not that way at all, and I think what they need in that department is probably people with good common sense that have a good way of assessing things, and I think there should be quite a study made as to markets and things like this. Now I know he did hint that

(MR. HENDERSON cont'd.) these things would happen, but I really think this is very important; and by the way, I was very happy to hear that at this here western meeting they had of the western provinces, that they were talking about setting up some type of an office in Japan or some of these other countries which are very happy to trade with us and which could consume up a lot of our products.

I think probably that's all that I'll say at this time and maybe at some other time I may be able to give you some information or my opinions on agriculture. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. WATT: If no one else wishes to speak, Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Roblin, that debate be adjourned.

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

MR. PAULLEY presented Bill No. 47, an Act to amend The Legislative Assembly Act (2), for second reading and referral to Law Amendments Committee.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, this is self-explanatory. As the honourable members are aware, there were considerable changes as the result of the redistribution of seats in the Assembly and the purpose of this bill is to make possible the payment of the extra allowance of \$1,500 to the constituencies of Flin Flon and The Pas.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. JAMES H. BILTON (Swan River): Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time, not necessarily to object to the meaning of this bill and what is intended by this bill, but I do well remember a few years ago when a plea was made to provide funds for northern members, and I remember \$900.00, I believe, was approved at that time, and it was an amount of money that was grudgingly - and I say grudgingly - given to the Members of Rupertsland and Churchill. The argument at that time was that due to the isolation of many of the areas it was felt that the honourable members should have some assistance toward the high cost of air transportation. This argument seemed to me to be the one that carried the day. I believe it was agreed that further assistance was given a few years ago, raising this to something in the neighborhood of \$1,500. At the same time, as I recall it, it was indicated that insofar as these two members were concerned, actual members of the Legislature, that the government aircraft, when it was in their particular areas, would be available to them and they would be free to use the aircraft to visit these areas.

Since that time, redistribution has taken place, as you know, and some constituencies were reduced in size, land-wise that is, and others were increased. In my own particular case in Swan River it was increased to a large degree, and from Swan River to the most northerly point of my constituency which takes me within 70 miles or 80 miles of The Pas, it's some 160, 170 miles. The same to the south, and somewhat the same to the east to Lake Winnipegosis. I know during the last election I travelled many thousands of miles and only touched a portion of my particular area, and looking at the expense statements it would appear that my opponent in the election possibly got all around because his costs were twice as much as mine. I, Sir, couldn't afford it. In my case too, Sir, it's a 600-mile round trip from Swan River to Winnipeg, and during the years I've been in office I have taken this in my stride and paid my way. Again I say that I don't rise objecting to the honourable members receiving this treatment, but I do say that it is discriminatory to the degree that you have one man serving a large area and you have another man serving a large area and there is that differential between the two. I know in my area we have the welfare people, a staff of some 14, 15 people; we have the probation officer; we have 14 Mounted Policemen; we have a health unit that's one of the largest outside of Brandon. These people are not there, Mr. Speaker, simply to serve the people of Swan River. I merely mention this to indicate to you the area that is being covered. They are being provided with automobiles and travel at government expense, but not the M.L.A.

My colleague from Roblin has somewhat a similar problem. From Roblin to the furthest east point, it's some 140 or 170 miles he has to travel. He, too, has an Indian population that must be served, and I feel that if there is to be a change in the monetary status of members, that this matter might very well have been referred to a committee for consideration, rather than this piecemeal approach which we have before us.

I'm sure it's not the intention of the government to be unfair in this particular regard but, Sir, I suggest to you that there are other problems with other members which have large constituencies to serve. It is agreed that in many areas such as mine that there is a reasonably

(MR. BILTON cont'd.) good road system; but there is a large area that I serve that you cannot get into by road. I have not been in there yet and it's the biggest regret that I haven't been there. But it's either going to be by plane or boat to cover my particular area. And it's new. It only came into effect in recent months and I will do my level best to get up and do what I can and visit with those people.

But in the meantime, I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, these things cost money. I didn't come into this Legislature with the idea of going away from it rich, but I don't want to go away from it poor. And at the same time, I say in all conscientiousness that if those people that I have outlined to you that are in our area serving these people, and are underwritten by government expense, particularly in transportation, surely the member that also has a responsibility to these people, might be given some consideration.

MR. SCHREYER: Would the honourable member permit a question?

MR. BILTON: Yes.

MR. SCHREYER: I'm sorry I didn't hear all of his remarks but is he giving us to understand that the riding of Swan River - important a riding as that is - is in any way to be compared with the northern riding communities which are accessible only by aircraft? I know that Swan River is an important riding, but what communities other than Cowan or Barrow or Mafeking are really any distance from the Town of Swan River? And they're all on the road.

MR. BILTON: I'll attempt to answer that question to the First Minister; I'm very glad he brought it up. May I say to him now that the west side of Lake Winnipegosis from Duck Bay, right around to the northwestern shoreline of Lake Winnipegosis, along the Red River to the Saskatchewan border, is inaccessible only by water or otherwise. That is the part I am speaking of, Sir. And at the same time, I have attempted to outline the mileage from Swan River, for instance, to Westgate which you were good enough to mention, which is some 160 miles from Swan River. There are along that railway line, as you know, several communities, I didn't mention, of course, Pelican Rapids, which is some 60 miles in from Mafeking, and which is a well established and well settled area by Indian and Metis people on the one hand, and a large school area on the other. And as I say, I'm not pleading for the money, but merely pointing out the differential, or the comparison if you like, between one and the other.

Certainly, Sir, my constituency is every bit as large as Flin Flon; and the mileage that I would have to travel, Mr. Speaker, would far exceed, I believe, that of the honourable gentleman that I mentioned.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. WATT: Before the question is put, I'd just like to address a question to the sponsor of the bill, the Honourable Minister of Labour, Mr. Speaker. I ask the Minister if this legislation is not a bit premature in view of the fact that the Minister of Transportation has made the statement that top priority will be given to construction of highways in the north; that it may not be necessary to bring this legislation in?

MR. PAULLEY: I would prefer to answer my honourable friend in the reverse, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CHERNIACK: I'm wondering if the Minister is not closing debate by answering the question.

MR. PAULLEY: Well he directed the question toward me, I . . .

MR. CHERNIACK: But it was a question directed after he spoke.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE (Roblin): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to rise and ask a few questions of the Minister relating to Bill 47, which has been introduced this morning, and associate myself with some of the remarks that have been brought forth by the Honourable Member from Swan River.

I agree in the principle of the bill that there are certain members of the Legislature that have more problems with transportation and expenses of transportation than others, and of course the argument comes up, where do you draw the line for the north and who in fact should get the extra indemnities or expenses for this, and so the argument goes on. I'm wondering why, if we were making a study of this particular aspect at this time, that the Minister didn't possibly do it in a committee and come up with a sliding scale or some way where - I'm not crying for money or anything this morning but my constituency now is twice the size that it was under redistribution. From where I live to Camperville is well over 160 miles, and take it here or take it there. Let's compare myself with one of the city seats. Now where is the

(MR. McKENZIE cont'd.) justification in giving X numbers of dollars to the Members from Rupertsland, Flin Flon, The Pas - so the line is drawn there and then I don't get anything; or the Member for Roblin, or the Member for Dauphin. Would it not be fair, Mr. Minister to have it half for those that have constituencies the size of mine? I'm asking and no doubt he will answer.

The other thing, I'm wondering, like in some cases would it not have some bearing on where the member lives. Now we have the Member for Rupertsland who's a city resident. Now if he was living at home, like the member that used to live in Rupertsland, it's a different ball game. There was transportation costs when the Honourable Member from - Mr. Jeannotte was in Meadow Portage. Well there is a difference. In this case, as I understand it, the Honourable Member for Rupertsland resides in the city.

But anyway, no doubt the Minister will have some suggestions to bring forth as why this bill is before us and the method it was prepared; why he established that figure, no doubt, and we'll get some of the answers that I'm asking this morning, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I should like to speak briefly on this bill that's before us, perhaps mainly because during the course of the past 10 or 11 years I have served four different constituencies, each differing considerably in area from the others.

I do believe that the Honourable Member for Swan River begins to have an argument when he suggests that the riding of Swan River is for a rural riding, becoming quite large and perhaps consideration should be given to extra emolument to cover additional expense. And this is something we would be prepared to look at between now and the next session, or during the next session.

The Honourable Member for Roblin represents the kind of constituency that I have in the past, and I do not regard it as an area that because of its size is difficult to represent or which brings with it any amount of additional expense. It becomes more expensive when a rural riding includes a considerable amount of northern territory which contains communities remote and accessible only by aircraft - single engine aircraft on floats in many case or skis.

The Member for Roblin is quite wrong when he tries to argue that it matters whether the MLA lives in the area or whether he lives in an urban area and represents a northern territory. Every member receives a mileage allowance. I believe that's a fact. -- (Interjection) -- One return trip per session. The Honourable Member for Rupertsland, although he may be in residence from time to time in the Greater Winnipeg area, I believe he lives in St. Boniface. The fact is however, Sir, that to service the constituents of Rupertsland does require travelling about in that area for the most part by aircraft, so there is additional expense. This was recognized by the previous administration. I believe that special provision was made way back in '58 or '59. There is no problem with respect to Rupertsland or Churchill. There is, however, with respect to Flin Flon and Thompson and The Pas.

We did not include Thompson for the reason that while it is by area quite large really, most of the communities are accessible along the Hudson's Bay line and only one or two are in a sense remote and accessible only by aircraft. Since we simply did not see fit to include Thompson -- in the case of Thompson, in the case of Swan River the area is just, in our judgment, not large enough.

Swan River shows up on the map as being about one-third the size of Flin Flon, perhaps not even that - about a quarter of the size and about one-third the size of Thompson. -- (Interjection) -- Well we have the maps here. The honourable member can have a look. If he cares I'd send it to him. I would advise my honourable friend that the assistant clerk has drawn in the boundary of Swan River, and I believe it to be accurate. And you can see the proportion of size there.

I think no one would argue that in the case of the constituency of The Pas it is, with redistribution, a large constituency and quite difficult to move about in from the northwestern part of the riding to the southeastern part and communities lying in between. So that is the reason why my colleague the House Leader has introduced this bill that is now before us.

MR. BILTON: Would the Honourable the First Minister permit a question?

MR. SCHREYER: Yes.

MR. BILTON: Would he not agree that the southern part of The Pas constituency is to a large degree not inhabited by people whatsoever, and that there are very very few communities. May I suggest to him, and in looking over the map, the area spread of communities throughout

(MR. BILTON cont'd.) my area that must be visited?

And again, with regard to Flin Flon, is not the concentration of the people in the Town of Flin Flon itself rather than in the surrounding areas, except I believe it includes Snow Lake.

MR. SCHREYER: The area of Snow Lake and Pukatawagon. I believe Pukatawagon is in Flin Flon? - yes. And Sherridon. There are some - I know the geography of Manitoba fairly well, Sir.

In the case of Swan River I have already said that it may well be that some consideration should be given, and prepared to look at that in the course of the next few months - with the help of my honourable friend from Swan River. But other than that, I do believe that there are no other constituencies, except those which do lie north of 53, which do cause extra problems and expenditures to members who represent these areas in this House.

The honourable member has asked about The Pas in particular. I would say that there is inhabited area in the southeastern part of The Pas - the reserve communities of Peguis and Koostatak and Little Jack Head and Easterville and on through, stretched all the way between the area in near proximity to the north Interlake and all the way north and west to The Pas itself.

Sir, without taking any more time of the House, I would suggest that this is the kind of bill that I would hope there would be virtual unanimity on because we propose to treat merely in the same way two ridings that are in their size and in the population pattern very similar to Rupertsland and Churchill which have been given this special consideration for the past ten years or more.

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

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM (Birtle-Russell): Mr. Speaker, it's amusing to hear the justification for this bill that the First Minister has just given. He may be able to convince some people for the reasoning that he has given, but, Mr. Speaker, I would like to go back to some other legislation and authorities that have been given in this House in the past, and at the present time, to cover inequities; to cover travelling expenses and to make certain adjustments for the inequities of rural representation as against urban.

I carry in my wallet, at this present time, a pass on the Canadian National Railways; a pass for the Canadian Pacific Railways; a pass for the Greyhound Bus Lines and a pass for Grey Goose Bus Lines, I believe. These were authorized by the Legislature I understand. I do not believe that these are courtesies of the companies; I believe that the Provincial Government pays these. -- (Interjection) -- Well in that respect I would have to pay a tremendous compliment to the private enterprise that have recognized the needs and the wants of the Members of the Legislature.

However, Mr. Speaker, I would like to suggest this to the government; that if the transportation problem is such that special remuneration should be given to those in inaccessible areas, we have a precedent in the House of Commons whereby air travel once per week for members to return to their constituencies is an accepted fact, and I would think that such a move would probably be far more equitable, far fairer than a feather-bedding bill such as this. I would say to this government that if this bill passes they will have to answer to the electorate in the next election, and to my mind a bill such as this is very hard to justify.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Minister of Transportation.

HON. JOSEPH P. BOROWSKI (Minister of Transportation) (Thompson): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to say a few words only because I come from the north and I think when they complain that they're not on, the opposition is not on, I think on the surface they have a fairly good argument except that it just happens that there's nobody from the opposition elected in the north. It's unfortunate. There is one member and he's on the Commission. Now I really can't understand why you're complaining. If you were dealing with farm problems I don't think that we should be consulted. We don't know anything about farm problems. These are northern problems. Surely the best qualified people to deal with northern problems -- (Interjection) -- Oh I'm sorry, I thought we were on Northern Task Force.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): . . . a question of the Minister. Now that the Honourable Minister of Transportation has spoken, I would ask him if there's any relationship to the bill now before the House and the one that the Minister of Transportation has been talking about.

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

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Leader of the Liberal Party) (Portage la Prairie): I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Assiniboia, that the debate be adjourned.

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

GOVERNMENT RESOLUTIONS

MR. PAULLEY: I wonder now, Mr. Speaker, whether you would kindly call the adjourned debate on the resolution standing in my name, the adjournment held by the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Minister of Labour. The Honourable House Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Well, Mr. Speaker, we find a rather startling departure in the setting up of committees of the House contained in this resolution. It has been the custom in the past when committees of the House are set up, they are usually done in consultation and at the beginning of a session a seven-man all-party committee is formed and in consultation the members of that committee reach some agreement upon the setting up of House committees, and this is the first time that I can recall where a special committee of the Legislature has been set up without any form of all-party consultation. I hear some dissenting remarks from my honourable friend the House Leader, but I can't recall when there has been a special committee of the Legislature set up without some form of consultation with other parties. It has been said by some unkind souls in the coffee shop that this is a method of placating some backbenchers on the government side who are extremely unhappy with some decisions which were reached by the Cabinet with respect to indemnities.

MR. CHERNIACK: You don't believe that, do you?

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Oh I don't believe it but it has been said. As a matter of fact, one cynical soul said to me today that this is a great way to travel around your constituencies at \$20.00 a day plus expenses. Now I know this was not the intention of the Premier and the Cabinet but this is the way it appears. This is the way it appears. And it is our intention - it would have happened right this moment except for the long hours that we're keeping, and my secretary is in the process of typing up an amendment - one of the other members in our Party will be making amendment to this resolution to change in some way the make-up of the Special Committee of the Legislature.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to speak to this resolution as well, first of all to regret, to express regret at the cynicism expressed by the Honourable the House Leader of the Liberal Party when he suggests that we are setting up this task force and naming these three individual MLAs in order to placate them because of some alleged dissatisfaction with indemnities. I can dismiss that out of hand and I believe to the satisfaction of everyone here, when I simply refer honourable members to press reports going back to last July before this House was ever called, where I made reference to the, in our judgment, desirability of establishing a task force on northern problems and remote northern communities, and I believe I indicated at that time that it would be logical to have representation on this task force, in addition to people from the general community outside this House, also two or three members from this House who represent the north and who understand it and who grew up with it. And it so happens that from northern areas we have gentlemen like the Honourable Member for Churchill, who is not a member of this Party, and we have the Honourable Members for Rupertsland and The Pas who are, and if there were an MLA of another party who was representative of communities of Manitoba north of the 53rd parallel, I can assure honourable members they would have been named to this committee as well, but there aren't any, and that's the simple fact of the matter. And just as we would not, as my honourable colleague the Minister of Transportation said that he would find it somehow incongruous to name some member from a northern community to a task force on agricultural problems, so would it be unusual to bring someone in from the south to sit on this task force just because the party doesn't happen to have representation from the north country.

We are not trying to in any way give a political slant or majority to this committee, this task force, and that is why we have it in mind to establish a task force that would have more members from outside, from the general community, than will there be MLAs from this House on the committee or on this task force. So if it is a seven or nine-man task force, one can see

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd.) that there will be three MLAs and four or six from the general community of northern Manitoba that will constitute this task force. There are no underlying motives; there is no attempt to keep out any political party; there is no attempt of that kind at all. The Honourable Member for Churchill is not a member of our party but, as everyone can see, he is named to this task force. What is hoped for here is simply that we will have a group with flexibility made up of members of this House from that part of the province that will be under study, and other people as well from the general community who will be able with terms of reference to look in a detailed way at the problems faced by those people in our province who live north of the 53rd parallel who face higher transportation costs for the goods they have to buy, people who live in remote communities and who pay a very great amount extra for goods they have to buy because it has to be freighted in by expensive modes of transport like single engine aircraft and so on, problems of lack of employment opportunities, under-employment and so on; a task force which we hope will be able to make specific recommendations as to what can be done or what is likely to be able to be done to bring greater employment opportunities to the residents of northern Manitoba north of the 53rd parallel.

I should add too, Mr. Speaker, that this is not entirely a novel proposal because task forces have been established in other jurisdictions. I believe that at the federal level the former Minister of Transport himself established and led a task force on housing. Whatever one may want to say about this task force on housing, the fact of the matter is that it did take a good deal of time in making their study and some of their proposals, I felt at least, were quite meritorious. It's really the same thing we have in mind here and to suggest that there is some kind of ulterior motive is to me bordering on the incredible. I might say that a few years back, when I was a member of this House, I was named to a Special Committee on Livestock Marketing and an effort was made to name only those members from each party who were representative of rural areas in which there was a livestock industry, and it had to be approved by a resolution such as this in order to enable the Legislative Assembly to pay the per diem of \$20.00 plus out-of-pocket expenses, and that's all that's involved here.

What possible opposition can there be? I listened to my honourable friend from Portage to see what it was in principle that he was objecting to and I could not understand. If there was anything in fact in principle he was opposed to, I suppose it's only that there are three members named here and -- (Interjection) -- I'm sorry. The method of setting up, that there was no consultation. Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't know -- there was consultation. I consulted with the Honourable the Member for Churchill and he was agreeable and, as I said, if there were anyone else north of 53 who was sitting in this Chamber who was not consulted, I would apologize, but we consulted every one of them and the matter should rest there.

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Would the First Minister permit a question? By the wording of the resolution there will be members other than MLAs on the committee, is that correct? Will they serve on the committee on the same terms of reference -- mileage and all expenses and per diem allowance?

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, just as the task force on housing - we looked to it for some guidance as to how to establish the machinery - what is required for others, these others who will serve on this special task force on northern problems, they will be named and emolument will be provided by Order-in-Council since that's all that's required. The amount that would be paid would be an amount determined by our own judgment and I would suspect it would be somewhere in the same order, somewhere in the same order of per diem amount and perhaps a little more but not very much more, perhaps identically the same amount.

MRS. INEZ TRUEMAN (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question of the Honourable First Minister? Don't you think the federal Task Force on Housing was a poor example to use considering its fate and the fate of its chairman?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I believe that the task force concept is a good one. It provides for a certain flexibility and provides for what I think is a happy combination of effort between elected members and those from the general community who have some experience in the given area that is under study or investigation. It's true, as my honourable lady friend suggests, that its results may not have been happy but that's no fault of the concept of the task force.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to make a few brief

(MR. F. JOHNSTON cont'd.) comments on this resolution and I certainly have no quarrel with the honourable members who have been chosen to be on this task force. I would only like to bring to the First Minister's attention, or bring this idea to him, that many of the times when the Honourable Member from Churchill has spoken he uses the phrase "understanding of northern Manitoba." I would like to propose or suggest that the way that the people of southern Manitoba will have more understanding of northern Manitoba would be that if there were some people from the south on this commission or task force that could be up there with the people that do understand the problems and have it explained to them, that it would be beneficial to all involved. Thank you very much.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. BILTON: Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak to this resolution and I will endeavour to refrain from being repetitious, having spoken a few moments ago. But again I feel, or I should say that I agree with what my Leader had to say yesterday and I'm not going to cover that particular ground. But here again, Sir, I come to the area from whence I came to this Legislative Assembly, and earlier on in the Session I did comment and I didn't mean to be facetious when I said that I felt that the north began at Swan River. And while I'm not going to labour that point, I would like to point out that with redistribution again, if I may say that, that the constituency that I represent is just as much part of the north as it is the honourable gentlemen that are chosen to make up this committee. I, Sir, have had an interest in the north for many, many years, and again I don't wish to indicate that I am holding out my hand to go on this committee. If I give that impression, Sir, I would like you to know that it's simply the knowledge that I have of not only northern Manitoba but northern Canada is available to this committee.

Again coming back to Swan River, Sir, I would say to you that we have a health unit heavily staffed by people; we have a senior citizens' home; we have three hospitals, one a two million dollar complex; we have a welfare office staffed by some fourteen people; a probation officer; we have an Indian-Metis counsellor appointed, and this government has been underwriting the Indian-Metis Centre in the Swan River Valley. And when I talk of the Swan River Valley I'm talking of the north, of Mafeking, that spreads itself into the north. The government of the Province of Manitoba has seen fit to expend some \$6,000 in this effort year by year. I personally have taken a personal interest in this. We have a magistrate's court that meets every week and with a large docket representing, I feel to you, Sir, that there are things going on in the area, and as I said earlier in my remarks, we have 14 Mounted Policemen, only four of them assigned to the town, the other ten to the area that I've referred to earlier - our Indian reserves and our Indian communities in Pelican Rapids, Duck Bay, Baden, Westgate, Mafeking and all round Lake Winnipegosis. Sir, I have been fighting for the confined area of Swan River and for the development of northern Manitoba all the time I have been in this Legislative Assembly, and many of these things that are there now I claim to have been part of, and I am merely saying that I'm available to assist this committee, and I am concerned that the area that I represent are not going to have their say in this committee, or their problems brought before this committee by their representative, due to the fact that their representative has for some reason or other been overlooked; he's not considered a northern man. Why on earth that attitude is taken, I'll never understand.

We have a residential school in Swan River for retarded children that come from various parts of this large area that I represent. We have hundreds of Indians working in the bush bringing out pulpwood and all these sort of things that have problems in themselves. The economics of my area are tied in, tied in solid with the north. If there are problems in Flin Flon, Thompson and Churchill and The Pas, those very problems are the same in Swan River or the Swan River area, and I am appealing for something to be done in order that the voice of the people I represent will be heard in no uncertain terms on this committee, this Task Force that is being set up for the betterment of northern Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Transportation.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, there isn't very much I can say. The First Premier has said most of the things I wanted to say and he said it much better. I would like to point out to the members opposite we were consulted, the member for Flin Flon and myself were consulted. We agree wholeheartedly with the Member for Churchill and the other two members being on the Task Force, and our reasoning was, as I indicated a minute ago, that they are from the north and surely people to deal with the problems of the north should be the people of the north; they understand the problems because they live with them every day. I don't really think that

(MR. BOROWSKI cont'd.) you should argue too strenuously that this isn't correct.

You may think that the Member for Swan River feels he should have been included. Maybe he has a point; they do have quite a large constituency and possibly some isolation, but the problem again arises if you include that constituency where do you stop. The next one will say, well maybe we should be involved or included also.

The last point I'd like to make is that the south has not been excluded because they will have an opportunity to do something for the north when this Task Force reports, and I don't know when it will report, but one day it will report back to the Legislature and all of us in this House will have an opportunity to vote whether there's any money involved or some changes for the north, we'll all have an opportunity to vote to bring about some changes. So I suggest we will all have an opportunity to do something for the north.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. McKENZIE: Could I . . . question, Mr. Speaker, of the Honourable Minister. Would you not think this committee is overloaded politically?

MR. SCHREYER: I don't mind answering that question, Mr. Speaker, and I'll answer it . . .

MR. WEIR: On a point of order. I don't think the First Minister is in a position to answer, he's not the last speaker.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure that it's in order for the Honourable Member for Roblin to direct a question to a Minister other than the one who has introduced the legislation, which would be the House Leader. -- (Interjection) -- Mr. Speaker, I've still got the floor I believe.

MR. WEIR: . . . agreed to accept the question.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, I'm still on a point of order myself. -- (Interjection) -- I am on a point of order, Sir, and I have not taken my seat and the Speaker hasn't called me to order, so I believe you must take your place.

MR. JORGENSON: Let's hear your point of order. I think you're out of order.

MR. SCHREYER: All right. My point of order, Sir, is that as long as it's understood that if the question is put to the Minister of Transport he doesn't have to answer if he doesn't feel so inclined.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, in view of what just has happened, I think it's best that I don't answer the question.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. GABRIEL GIRARD: Mr. Speaker, I would like to on this resolution state that I have full confidence in the members that have been appointed to this Task Force. I know that they are people who are very knowledgeable about problems of the north.

I would like to underline, however, that it would seem to me if these people who have been appointed could study the studies that have been made in the past, the Mauro report and so on, that possibly the Task Force would not have to travel throughout the north because they already know the details about it. I don't think anybody is more qualified than the people chosen to know the facts, to know the details; but I do think that the government missed an opportunity in appointing these people only to the Task Force because it's not important that those people get more details, it's important that other members of this House become more informed about the problem, and it would seem to me that an opportunity was missed in not bringing people who are not as familiar about the north into this Task Force.

May I just add to that that the trip we took to Churchill and the northern points was very fruitful because it brought to us from other parts of Manitoba a real sense of appreciation of the problems of that area, and unless we operate this way, what is going to happen seems to me a reiteration of what we already heard from the learned members from the Task Force. I do think that besides the political issue I think that the government missed the boat on appointing only the specialists.

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

MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the members of the official opposition haven't too much to say when they choose a resolution such as this to voice their disapproval. I think that it is very clear first of all this party have said . . .

MR. BILTON: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I didn't register any disapproval. In fact I spoke otherwise.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I didn't realize that the member who rose on a point of order formed the whole party of the official opposition, because I understand that there's been quite a bit of opposition. He expressed opposition in a round about way, it's true, but he expressed opposition. He expressed opposition because he wasn't chosen. He was sincere I'm sure when he talked about his interest in the north and I think that probably most of the members that would get up in this House and say that they're interested would also be valid. It might be that he has a little more experience and I have no doubt about that that he's interested. But I wasn't referring to him too much. Mind you, now that we're talking about him, I think that what he said this morning made it quite clear that maybe his constituency did not have the same problems, because he stood up and he told us of all the wonderful things that they have already in this constituency. I think that he said that they had the health unit, they had this, they had that, and congratulations to him and his constituency, this is fine. But I don't think that this Task Force is there to find out all the good things . . .

MR. BILTON: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the honourable gentleman would permit a question?

MR. DESJARDINS: Yes, I will.

MR. BILTON: I wonder if he hasn't got the wrong impression. I merely mentioned those facilities to indicate to him that there is a service being given to people throughout the area I represent.

MR. DESJARDINS: No, I don't think I had the wrong information. If the constituency is that well organized, and this is good, that it can give the service mentioned by my honourable friend, I imagine that they have less problems, this is exactly the point I'm trying to make. If they're in a position to give those services they have less problems and we're not looking for this so much, we're looking to see the problems that we have up north.

We have a map here, Mr. Speaker, and it's quite clear where the north is, it's quite clear where the north is. Here's Churchill; here's Thompson, and there's Flin Flon and there's the constituency of my honourable friend. -- (Interjection) -- It happens to be close . . . I beg your pardon?

MR. BILTON: It's a dandy too.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, I think it probably is a dandy, this is why they might not be too concerned who they send to represent them here, maybe this is the thing. Maybe they have no problems. This might be true. But anyway, if my honourable friend is preaching for a call -- and he has the right to do it, it shows his interest. But let me say not to be too afraid. There's nothing in this resolution that says all the rest of the members will not be able to attend, they will not be informed; in fact, technically this group could ask for other members of this House and use their experience and so on, because one of the clauses: "Whereas it also deemed advisable that this task force should include, in addition to representatives of various interested groups of citizens, certain members of this Assembly."

But what I object to and what prompted me to get up this morning is in reply to the Member from Roblin who has the gall to suggest that this is a political committee. There's three of them and they're all members from the north and there's one that's an independent, and I say the gall because I think he should hide his face and his head in the sand, maybe his whole body in the sand, because he cannot say like the Mayor of St. Vital, I didn't know I wasn't there. He was a member of a cabinet that set up the Boundaries Commission. Need I say any more, Mr. Speaker? Need I say any more? -- a bunch of defeated candidates.

MR. JORGENSEN: What's that got to do with it?

MR. DESJARDINS: What's that got to do with it? It's the same principle my honourable friend. I know that you don't like to be told when you're acting like this -- (Interjection) -- I beg your pardon?

MR. JORGENSEN: You're admitting the principle now.

MR. DESJARDINS: What principle am I admitting?

MR. JORGENSEN: Well, you said it's the same principle.

MR. DESJARDINS: I'm admitting nothing, I'm saying that you should hide your face in the sand. Name me, name me one defeated candidate, one defeated candidate of the Liberal Party, or of any other party, or the NDP Party that was on the Boundaries Commission. It started with a fellow that was supposed to do full-time work and he's not. They have every defeated candidate and brothers of other members and everything. This is the biggest political -- it's a political joke. These are the people that are supposed to -- it's an independent group

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd.) because it has to be above the partisan, no partisan politics in this at all.

At least this is a committee that's going to do some work, Mr. Speaker; it's not just flying a kite to see what's going to be popular and what's not going to be popular in order to let the government be in a better position to go along, to roll with the punch. I certainly think that there's nothing wrong with a committee of three, it's all members from the north. I think that it was certainly well explained, the First Minister explained the reason for this. There's leeway there to invite other people to come in and I'm sure that the meetings will not all be secret meetings.

My honourable friend from Emerson had a point. He suggested that maybe there be other members that know less about these things should be invited. I know that he means well, but this could be dangerous. In effect you're saying that the less qualified should be on there because it will serve as an education for them, and this is dangerous. We're not trying to educate the members of this House right now. Mind you, a lot of them do need an education, but this is not the point. The point is, we're trying to do something for the north. And these people had their chance when they were in power and they did nothing for the north, nothing at all, and now to save face they're going to try to oppose this and say that this is a political committee. It's not going to wash at all. -- (Interjection) -- I know I thought so, maybe I do. But the people of the north know it's true, the people of the north know it's true. Tell me one of your members that won an election up north? You were swept out of the north. Why? And you had a member that was a member of your group that left you. Why? Because you did nothing, you paid a little bit of service, lip service. -- (Interjection) -- I beg your pardon?

MR. BILTON: Would you like me to answer that one?

MR. DESJARDINS: For a former speaker, you have no decorum for the House at all. Yelling like this, I think that's awful. Look at that, Mr. Speaker. He's not even saying "point of order" -- that's awful for a former speaker. No wonder we have no decorum in this House at all with an example such as that.

MR. BILTON: You don't help it any.

MR. DESJARDINS: I think I've got the floor, I think I've got the floor. Now, Mr. Speaker, this is not going to -- regardless of what is going to be said, the feeble attempt of a dying party out there, the feeble attempt of these people to protest this, it's not going to wash. This is a good resolution, it's a step forward -- any step is a step forward up in the north after following these people for 11 years. I think that this group if we give them a chance will do good work; and if my friend keeps quiet, who knows, he might even be invited to sit in some of these meetings and then he'll give us the privilege of listening to him and the benefit of his experience.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, might I have the privilege of asking the honourable member a question?

MR. DESJARDINS: Sure.

MR. McKENZIE: I wonder would the Honourable Member for St. Boniface list the qualifications of this committee, such as their present occupation or what qualifications have they got to sit on this committee?

MR. DESJARDINS: They have the best qualifications of all; they represent the people of the north and this is why they were chosen.

MR. GIRARD: Might I just comment that in my statement I did not exclude the members that were mentioned. I was adding others to it rather than excluding them.

MR. DESJARDINS: I understood, and I think I mentioned that I thought the member was sincere. I was just showing him that this could be dangerous because you might not have the time of educating the people, that we should have people that are qualified to look into this problem.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, I hope I do not disappoint the Honourable the House Leader in getting up to speak. I'm not adjourning. I would like to extend an invitation to the committee that is just about to be appointed to go up to the north and bring back a report as to the potential and what should be done in northern Manitoba. I have every confidence in the Member for Churchill, most likely to be chosen chairman in my opinion, because he's been speaking very strongly on behalf of the north and I think members have full confidence in him, that they will be bringing back a valuable report.

(MR. FROESE cont'd.)

I'm only sorry to see that the Honourable the the Minister of Transportation is not on this committee, or is not named, because I feel that he represents a constituency there that not only has potential but is booming, and expanding. I would like to have him on the committee in order to find out just what secondary industries could be brought into Thompson . . .

MR. SCHREYER: May I ask a question of the honourable member? Would you support the addition of one more member to the committee?

MR. FROESE: I certainly would support the addition of the Honourable Minister of Transportation because I would like to see secondary industries brought into Thompson because we're shipping too much of that product out in raw form, or at least it should be in a form that would have much more processing taking place right here in Manitoba. I asked a question earlier on in the session about the Royal Canadian Mint, whether it would be located here. We haven't heard lately of any developments. I think this is a matter that the Honourable Minister if he were added could certainly take a look at and also encourage some development in that respect.

Then too, we were on the trip up north, we visited Churchill, Gillam and we stopped at Thompson, but at Churchill the Honourable the First Minister gave a speech to the Chamber there in which he outlined some of the possible things that could be developed in the north, and if I recollect correctly, something was indicated of probably egg production and so on.

We as members visited the terminal at Churchill. We saw the grain cleaning and drying facilities. We saw the amount of screenings that comes out of the grain that is cleaned, and these screenings were being used for fuel. Maybe they could be used to better advantage. Maybe egg production is a matter that could be brought into the Churchill area so at least to supply the northern people with eggs produced right in the north. Certainly this is not a thing that couldn't be done. And since we have a large supply of wheat at the Port of Churchill, certainly egg production is one that is most feasible in my opinion.

MR. SCHREYER: Would the honourable member permit a question?

MR. FROESE: Yes.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, since the honourable member is making reference to the trip that he made to northern Manitoba back in August, I wonder if he could confirm or deny rumours that were brought to my attention that he had been put behind bars when he was in Thompson.

MR. FROESE: Well, I was let out too, so I don't know whether the people up north would want to keep me up there. I don't think they would.

But certainly, as I've pointed out, certainly there is potential in the north in many and varied ways, and I would like to extend an invitation for this committee to visit southern Manitoba first before they go up north, because they might get a number of ideas in southern Manitoba so that these could be furthered in northern Manitoba.

Then, too, I would suggest to the Honourable the First Minister that we also set up a committee for the south because I think we have a number of things to offer and a number of areas that could be much more fully developed. We have the matter . . .

MR. SCHREYER: If my honourable friend had been denied any more public works, we would have set up a committee. You'll get your roads and all.

MR. FROESE: Because we have special crops in southern Manitoba and in this area alone, there is very considerable improvement that could be brought in. I think we could even have a larger variance than we have at the present time. Certainly the matter of breeding and of new crops and new varieties; we have the matter of irrigation in another matter that certainly should receive close attention because we in the south feel that we should have the development of the Pembina River basin. We need the dams badly. I'm sure that if we had a committee of the south that this would be one of the factors that would be brought to the attention of the members of this House much more than has been to date.

The matter of cultural and industrial well-being is mentioned in the resolution. I think this also should receive, and to a degree is receiving, special attention. But I think this area is also an area that could be much more fully developed.

Then, too, probably some of the members have never been in southern Manitoba and seen the beautiful constituencies that I and some of the other members represent, and I would certainly like to have them to see the industries that we have in the south, like the oil extraction plant in Altona which has been going on for a good number of years. I'm sure this would be of interest to them. We have two canneries in the south and this I think is also something

(MR. FROESE cont'd.) that they could make use of in the north because of the fish and so on. A cannery might be another development that could take place in northern Manitoba. And if you could see our canneries in operation, I'm sure that this would be of benefit to the members when they try and do their job.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think that the argument is quite valid that we should also have a committee of the south, but that doesn't mean that I'm opposing a committee of the north, not by any means. I feel that it is the proper thing. As to the matter of how the committee is composed, this is completely another matter than the matter of the work of the committee that I am speaking of.

So, I would like to see that the government add the Minister of Transportation's name to the committee.

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

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Member for La Verendrye, that the debate be adjourned.

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

. continued on next page

MR. PAULLEY: I wonder, Mr. Speaker, will you kindly call the adjourned debate and the other resolution standing in my name, the adjournment being held by the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Minister of Labour. The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, I first want to thank the House Leader for having deferred this earlier this morning at my request. I'm now prepared to speak on it and, rather than hold up the matters any further, I will speak this morning rather than this afternoon.

Mr. Speaker, obviously I'm more than pleased to see this resolution before us. You may recall that at the very beginning of the session I had a resolution on the Order Paper asking for four, or the four points recommended by the TED Commission as being the basis of organization for development. This resolution at that time was discussed and judged to be out of order on the basis of anticipation, and the First Minister at that time indicated that he would be prepared to tell the House those matters on which the government was prepared to act. There were two of them, this being one, the establishment of the Standing Committee of the House; the other one the high level advisory council on economic development. Now I realize that one is not before us at this time. I just want to say that the Minister has alluded to this group. I don't know if the intention is to bring a resolution forward or on what basis the government intends to establish it. I would hope that we will hear about it before the end of the session and know for sure that that second step will in fact take place.

But coming back to this one, Mr. Speaker, I consider that the establishment of this special committee of the House is indeed a very important step. One of the constant problems in politics, and really in the whole development of our province, is having the involvement of people and making sure that the population of the province knows the problems and what's going on, and that we get as great an involvement as possible in solving the problems of Manitoba. Therefore the beginning, it seems to me, here in the House, the establishment of a standing committee of the House is eminently sensible, not simply government - and by that I'm referring to the ministry and the civil service - not simply having government involved, but everyone involved. And I know that the First Minister is making some very determined efforts in this direction himself. Last week he went through an arduous trip through eastern Canada. I can say I was pleased to be able to assist at two of his meetings - the one in Toronto, one in Montreal - to help him in this work of developing Manitoba. I regret that my meagre financial resources did not permit me to continue this very delightful trip on to New York, but I must say that the First Minister was doing the job that I think the First Minister needs to do in Manitoba - in his capacity as well as Minister of Industry and Commerce, but as well as the First Minister of the province.

Now, this then must continue. It can't be just the First Minister - it must be every Minister of the Government. It must be, Mr. Speaker, every member of this House. It must be every individual in Manitoba, because it's not something we can say: "Let George do it", because it's not going to happen if we do. And so I'm pleased that the resolution comes forward. I'm very pleased as well to see the enthusiastic support last night of the present Member for River Heights. At the last session, when he was the Minister of Industry and Commerce, I had urged him at that time to proceed on the four particular points recommended in the organization for development. I found it very difficult at that time to get a statement of policy from that Minister. I had particularly, Mr. Speaker, referred or deferred from introducing a resolution at that time so that the matter might not in any way be considered a partisan one, and I've said at the time that in my opinion this question goes far above partisan considerations. And speaking on behalf of my party - of which I was then the Leader - I said that we were prepared as a party to forget completely partisan considerations, to participate in any way that we could in this major problem of economic development, because we recognized, Mr. Speaker, that unless we get the economic development, then the social reforms that I want to see in the province, that the members of my party want to see, will be very difficult indeed to accomplish, and that we must have this economic base to make it work. Now at that time, as I say, the Minister of the day was not prepared to give us a statement of the policy of the government, which in my view was regrettable because valuable time has been lost.

The TED Commission is not one dealing with the next century for Manitoba. It's one dealing with Manitoba from now to 1980 - a bare ten years. And we just can't afford the time

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd.)... and luxury of waiting until next year to begin the process. And so, I'm all in favour of this resolution, Mr. Speaker, and having it move forward as quickly as possible, and establishing the committee and getting it to work.

I want to return though, Mr. Speaker, to the question of the non-partisan approach, and I think that it is important that we make it clear to all Manitobans that this indeed is not a partisan question. It's not whether the NDP are going to do it, or the Conservatives are going to do it, or the Liberals or the Social Creditors or the Independents. We are all in this together and if we fail, then all of Manitoba suffers. So I think it's important, Mr. Speaker, that this Standing Committee be clearly a non-partisan committee.

Now I'd like to suggest to the First Minister, who has had experience in Ottawa in this regard, the idea that this would be a good committee on which to start a completely non-partisan approach and have this committee chaired by a member who is not a member of the government party. I know that in Ottawa this has been done in a committee which really had much greater political dangers, if you want to put it that way, to it in the Public Accounts Committee. And, surprisingly enough, it's worked out very well. Now in this particular case it's not the political considerations or the dangers that concern me. It's much more than that. It's the getting across to the people of Manitoba that this is the job of all of us, not just the job of government, not just the job of the party who happens to be in power at the time, certainly not the responsibility of members on the other side of the House to be detracting from what government is doing, but working together.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Member for La Verendrye, that the motion be amended by adding thereto after the tenth line, the following words: "and Whereas there is urgent need for increased economic development in our province in order to provide more and better employment opportunities for the people of Manitoba; and Whereas it is desirable that all Manitobans recognize that the drive for increased economic development is the responsibility of all Manitobans and is above partisan political considerations," and that the motion be further amended by adding after the twenty-fifth line the following words: "And Be It Further Resolved that this Standing Committee on Economic Development consider, amongst its terms of reference, the advisability of electing as its Chairman a member who is not a member of the government party."

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak briefly to the resolution and the amendment offered to it by the Honourable the Member for Ste. Rose. I want to thank him for his moral support which he referred to in passing, which he gave to me and to others from Manitoba who were in this mission - if one can call it that - to Toronto and Montreal last week.

I do believe that people in other parts of the country, particularly bankers and investment people, are all the more impressed when a trade or business mission has in its ranks representatives from more than just the government party, especially such well-known representatives of other parties as is my honourable friend for Ste. Rose.

Whether or not the mission was a success in the most complete sense remains to be seen. However, I have reason to think that it was more than just a slight success.

With respect to the comments made by the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose to the substance of the resolution, I welcome and endorse most of what he had to say. I do believe that it can be very useful for members of this House to have established a committee which will be able to call on the experts in the field of economic development, to call on people who are very actively involved in the activity of economic development, and this is what this Standing Committee on Economic Development will be empowered to do. I think it will be a most interesting committee to be on and I, and I would think all others whose names appear in this resolution, look forward with anticipation.

Now the Honourable the Member for Ste. Rose has suggested that it would be desirable to emphasize the impartiality, the political impartiality of this committee by having it chaired by a member other than a member of the government party. I must say that I rather like the idea that of all the committees, standing committees of the House, that at least one important one should be chaired by a member other than a member of the government party. Now I don't believe this has been a practice here in Manitoba to date and I think it's time that we make some innovations in this direction. I should have thought however, Mr. Speaker, that it would be more appropriate to have the Committee on Public Accounts as the one that would be, for a starter at least, chaired by a member of Her Majesty's loyal opposition. This is the practice

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd.) . . . in the federal House and I think there is some logic to it, not just because it's a practice in the federal House but because here you have scrutiny by members on both sides of the spending of monies voted by the House to see whether they have been spent in accordance with the votes approved by members, to see whether there has been any misapplication of public monies, which is really what members of the Legislature are most responsible for, the taxing power and the safeguarding of the proper expenditure of funds of the public purse.

So I certainly would go along with my honourable friend the Member for Ste. Rose if he had proposed in a different context that the chairman of the Committee on Public Accounts be chaired by a member other than a member of the government party. Now whether it can be acceptable to have a member of the opposition, of some opposition party chair this particular committee on economic development, I am really uncertain in my mind, I confess. I'm not saying that I oppose it, I am a little apprehensive about supporting it, but the way the amendment is worded, it says that "the committee consider among its terms of reference". I sincerely believe that the committee should consider this particular proposal and so therefore I'd be inclined to accept this amendment.

So, Mr. Speaker, whenever members wish to have this come to a vote I want to indicate that we'd be prepared to accept this amendment and have the committee members themselves deal with the question as to who shall chair it, chair this committee's work.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question on the amendment? The Honourable Member for LaVerendrye.

MR. LEONARD A. BARKMAN (LaVerendrye): Mr. Speaker, I will be very short and brief. I do not get up to try and repeat what has been said. I think all of us are very enthused about this resolution. It brings back to mind certain things that took place during the TED Report and other events. I certainly agree with my colleague when he mentioned that there should be perhaps a chairman of non-partisan position. I definitely believe that this could be the start of something that perhaps it would be wise for us to accept in the future.

I also thought, like the two speakers that just spoke, that the involvement is really the important thing. I remember the one visit that some of the members of the TED Committee made to our town. It wasn't just the members that belonged to this committee, but I seen something else, it was also our own people getting involved with other people from other areas. In fact it is much more important I believe than we realize. As I said, I do not wish to repeat what has been said. I wish perhaps the amendment had gone a little further. I notice the committee is a selection of very capable people. I do, when I look at it, somehow feel that it might have been quite all right if we had somebody from the far north on this committee also, or perhaps another one from the south. And I'm quite serious about this, because while I'm very happy with the people that are on this committee, at least most of them, I think it might be perhaps an idea not just to consider the non-partisan of it. In this case we have a member from the north that could be considered as non-partisan in this Legislature and we have also a member representing the south, also representing a party.

So I think that as far as this amendment goes it's fine, but I'd like to go a little further and I'd like to suggest an amendment to the amendment. I would beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Assiniboia, a sub-amendment, that the motion be amended by adding to the end thereof: "And Be It Further Resolved that this House give consideration to the advisability of enlarging the membership of the Standing Committee on Economic Development to include representatives of all groups in the House, whether they are recognized as official parties or not under the House rules."

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, before you present the amendment to the amendment, is my honourable friend not aware of the fact that the Honourable Member for Rhineland, who does not represent a political party under the terms and rules of this House, is a member of this committee?

MR. BARKMAN: Yes, I am. I'd just like to say this. I think the Member for Rhineland has his seat pretty well fixed for the next five or ten years, but this of course you realize could change in the future.

MR. PAULLEY: This committee in any case, may I respectfully suggest to my honourable friend, terminates on its report to the next Session of the Legislature and could or could not be reconstituted according to the desires of the next Session of the Legislature.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, might I ask a question of the member who has just spoken. Is it not the intention that this be a Standing Committee of the House in the same way as the . . .

MR. PAULLEY: The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose is correct, but the composition however, the point that I made as to the composition nonetheless is valid.

MR. SCHREYER: Sir, while you're considering the sub-amendment, could I ask the honourable sponsor of the sub-amendment whether he, in the light of the answer and information given him by the House Leader, is he perhaps prepared to withdraw the sub-amendment or does he insist to proceed with it.

MR. PAULLEY: It only involves the Member for Churchill really.

MR. BARKMAN: I'm not sure what I should answer. I would, if possible, like to see the principle established, if the Speaker so rules that the amendment is in order.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, speaking to the amendment that has just been proposed, I certainly would have no objection and in fact I would be all in favour of adding the Member for Churchill's name to the committee. I'm sure that he could contribute to the committee. When you look at the composition of the committee that is being proposed, out of the sixteen members proposed only three of them are rural members and I think we should look also to the matter of getting balanced in that way, that we have rural members and urban or city members as well and not have them unbalanced too much in that respect.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, may I indicate I think that the position of the government -- I'm sure that the position of the government would be that there's only one member really in the House that would qualify under the sub-amendment as proposed by the Honourable Member for LaVerendrye, and that would namely be, Mr. Speaker, the inclusion of the Honourable Member....

MR. BILTON: I wonder if the Honourable Leader of the House is closing the debate?

MR. PAULLEY: Not on the sub-amendment.

MR. BILTON: Oh, I beg your pardon.

MR. PAULLEY: The resolution is in my name and possibly my honourable friend, who was the Speaker of this House for a while, one of these days will realize the rules of the House. But, Mr. Speaker....

MR. BILTON: That was uncalled for.

MR. PAULLEY: Yes, but it was done in a spirit of facetiousness and goodwill to my honourable friend and I'm sure my honourable friend will accept it in that light.

MR. BILTON: I certainly will not.

MR. PAULLEY: Oh. Then I apologize to my honourable friend the Member for Swan River, because I said it and I said it in jest, and if my honourable friend is not prepared to accept jest in this Chamber then I apologize to my honourable friend. Need I say more? I'm indicating, Mr. Speaker, that as far as the government is concerned we realize that the purport of the sub-amendment of the Honourable Member for LaVerendrye is to include the Honourable Member for Churchill who also sits as an Independent like the Member for Rhineland. We have no objection to accepting the amendment proposed, the sub-amendment proposed to this resolution.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question on the sub-amendment?

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

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

MR. PAULLEY: Committee of the Whole House, Mr. Speaker, please.

HON. SIDNEY GREEN (Minister of Health and Social Services)(Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Cultural Affairs, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole to consider the following Bills: No. 36, No. 37, No. 38 and No. 39.

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

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is it the wish of the committee to proceed with the amendment and the sub-amendment? The Honourable Minister of Health and Social Services.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, the Legislative Counsel has prepared a new amendment

(MR. GREEN cont'd.)... which would, if we were to proceed with it, would involve the withdrawal of the two amendments previously put. Perhaps I'll explain the purport of the new amendment and then see whether we can get consent to withdraw the others. There are copies of the new amendment on the table. I wonder if the Page is available to have them distributed. Could we have these....

No, it's not here. Mr. Chairman, they must be going out to get the new amendment. Perhaps we could conclude with the debate on Bill 37 that the Honourable Member for Pembina I think was dealing with. How will that be? Okay?

MR. PAULLEY: Yes, Mr. Chairman, proceed with Bill 37. The Honourable Member for Pembina was speaking at the time. We will then have the amendments to the first bill on the Order Paper.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bill 37, an Act to amend The Social Allowances Act. The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. HENDERSON: Mr. Chairman, last night the Minister of Health and Social Services done a very good job of getting me mixed up, however I think probably that I made my point, that I thought that it was too easy to get and too generous when they did get it, and with that I'll let it go at that. I think I made my point and that's all I wanted to make.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I think the bill that is before us is very interesting. It is short, but I think the contents of it arouses interest. The other night I was watching the news as a result of the conference that was held in British Columbia and I saw the Honourable Minister of Health on this news telecast, and apparently one of the items mentioned that had been discussed was the very item that is before us. I would like to hear from the Honourable Minister about these discussions and whether the other provinces are in agreement with this and what are they doing. Where do we stand on this matter? I think it would be very valuable, since we are discussing this very item, have this very amendment before us, to hear from him as to the results of their discussions on it.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I find it surprising that I'm having so much difficulty with what I consider to be a small point. The amendment before the House now has nothing to do with changing any of the principles that are involved in our Social Services program. For some time the Social Services workers, the social workers and the case workers, in tabulating what a person was entitled to by virtue of social allowances took into account both the assets, that's the liquid assets, the physical assets and the income. A case went to the Appeal Board and the Chairman of the Appeal - and I'm hoping that I'm describing it as accurately as my memory permits me to - said that he would not take into account the liquid assets, he would only take into account the income from those assets, which meant that the liquid assets were exempted from the tabulation which meant that it would be easier for a person to obtain allowances even though they had a lump sum of liquid assets which were not taken into account.

Now I'm not sure whether the Chairman of the Appeal Board was right or was wrong. I'm not even going to venture a guess on it. All I know is that our department, and the department before us, does not agree that this asset would not be included in tabulating as to whether a person was or was not entitled to welfare. So the amendment is merely to maintain the status quo - and I'm not even sure that I agree with the status quo - all I know is that I agree that for the present, until we've had a chance to look at it, it should be maintained and that's what this particular bill does.

Now with regard to my honourable friend's question about my stay in Victoria and the question of assets. What was discussed with regard to assets at that particular conference was the difficulty that arises when a person who is possibly under short-term welfare need, and as a result of the regulations is required, in order to establish a claim for welfare, to start disposing of assets. And the question was raised by one of the task forces that in the interests of maintaining an individual who will continue to contribute and who will not be frustrated by the fact that he's suddenly faced with the liquidation of his assets, whether for a certain period he be provided with assistance on a short-term basis without disposing of those assets.

All that the task force said was that this point should be looked into, and my impression was that all of the Ministers agreed that it should. My impression from the entire meeting was that there were very few decisions made but a lot of examination as to what the future role of social assistance should be; how it should be more related, that the social assistance agency

(MR. GREEN cont'd.)... should be more closely related with the welfare agencies; how the social assistance procedures could perhaps be streamlined a great deal by asking people to fill out a declaration rather than have a social worker call on them, and how this would not greatly affect the credibility of the program. It has been found that people are fairly truthful in their declaration and that there are very few overpayments, even when we accept the person's statements to what their situation is rather than undertake a great deal of investigation.

The last, and possibly the most important problem which was discussed, which I can recall at this point, was the problem of the alienation of the social service recipient from the rest of society, and how a person in those circumstances has to find ways of taking a relatively normal life, if they can't find employment, in our society and how things should be made available for them to participate in. Now I'm very happy that my honourable friend is interested in what we have accomplished at Victoria. I'm sorry that we didn't accomplish more.

What I do feel is important is that the Federal Government through their assistance program, through the Federal assistance program, is now very much involved in the social assistance field. What concerns me with all the Federal meetings that I've attended thus far, or all the meetings, and what concerned me last year was that it appears that the Federal Government in view of its narrow constitutional position, which has only been recently advanced with the advent of the new Prime Minister, is seeking ways of releasing itself from cost-sharing programs, and up until very recently I think that most of the provinces were going along with this. It is seeking to release itself from participation in some of the hospital grants programs and some of the health grants programs. It's projected in the future, although I think that the talk has been quieted down, that the Federal Government would release itself from its commitment to the medicare costs. It's talking about trying to release itself from some of the other areas - urban renewal. We're worried about housing, although they haven't done anything.

I think that the major confrontation between the provinces and the Federal Government has to be on this issue, and I regret to say that I don't think Manitoba has a great many friends. Manitoba feels that the Federal initiative that has been displayed over the past 30 years in cost-sharing programs have been of great benefit to the country. They have, it's true, pushed the provinces to move into certain areas, but we think, on the whole, for the good of the country, and those are the areas that probably require the greatest discussion. But that, in brief, is what was done at the meeting in Victoria.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, just to follow on, I know we're more or less just defining the matter in this Act. I'm just wondering how many cases will be affected as a result of defining it in this way. Will there be quite a number of cases that will be adversely affected as a result?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, my understanding is that all of the cases have been dealt with on the principle which is now before the House. It may be that a few cases that have now been dealt with differently - in a very short period of time because this only recently came to our attention - would be reassessed as a result of this particular amendment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. MCKENZIE: Mr. Chairman, I have a question to ask the Minister. Maybe not so much as it relates to the bill that's before us today, but I'm wondering if -- I think three years ago I made an enquiry of the department if in fact an MLA can have the files of those in his constituency that are on social allowance, and I think the Minister recalls that there's a letter from my constituency now requesting the information again. Possibly it is policy that it's confidential in nature and we're not entitled to it, but I seemed to be left with the impression from the former Minister that I would eventually get the list of those in my constituency that were benefiting from social allowances. I'm just wondering if in fact today that this is the policy of the department, that MLAs are not permitted to, you know, scrutinize who in fact is qualifying for social allowances.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I'm in full agreement with the principle that the names of the people in receipt of social allowances are not available for public distribution. As to whether a member of the House should get that information for people in his constituency, I've only yesterday seen my honourable friend's constituent's letter, and I'm considering that. I wouldn't care to say at the present time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I had rather intended to file an Order for Return along

(MR. FROESE cont'd.)... the same lines indicating the names and the people in the various constituencies as to what assistance was being given. I think this matter should be open to members of the Legislature so that they have some indication, because I think they can be of assistance in controlling this whole matter of public welfare. We know from Public Accounts that all monies that are being paid to other people, they're made public, and I see no reason why this should be held in strict confidence, that this should not be open to members of the House. I feel that this is an area, if it was disclosed, that we could probably assist as members and assess matters on our own and advise the department and the government on various matters.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Chairman, I just don't want to let that go by without saying that I would certainly argue against making it the subject matter of an Order for Return, because that would not then be information for the members of the House, it would be open information. I'm arguing in my own mind whether I feel that it should be made available to members of the Legislature for their constituents, and that's the point that I'm presently considering.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Before we continue this debate, I am not sure that it's strictly related to this bill. It sounds to me more in the nature of a debate on estimates or question period. I think the point has been established.

The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. GORDON W. BEARD (Churchill): I would agree with you, Mr. Chairman, on this, and in fact before I was going to make any comments I would like to ask the Minister, this was the bill that he was speaking of where people would have some money put aside and the department is considering whether they should have to use that money, whether it be invested in a house or whatever it would be, before they would get assistance. Was this the point?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, this does deal with the general area that the member is talking about, but I tried to impress upon the House on several occasions, apparently without success, and I'll try again.

This is not a change in the present governmental policy or even previous governmental policy. The difficulty is that a ruling of the Appeal Board which hears welfare appeals took a position other than one that the government had been applying for years. The government feels that the position that did apply should continue to apply. It means that the social service administrators are entitled to look at the entire assets and income of a person in determining their entitlement to social assistance.

MR. BEARD:.... another question, or I'll make it in a short form of a statement, Mr. Chairman, and I promise not to take up very much time.

Generally speaking there is some thought in welfare that where a person owns a house or some money that they should have to spend this first before they get social allowance. And I quite frankly used to go along with that type of argument, but I can see now where if a person had a house, or in fact almost had \$10,000 in bonds and was receiving revenue from that, and regarding the age, if it was a person that was going to live for some time, then they would use up that money and then they would be on full social allowances, whereas if they were allowed to invest it, then they would only be on partial social allowance.

I would wonder if you are still going to go on with the program where if they could keep that house and keep the revenue off that house to help assist them, then they could just get the partial allowance rather than having to sell the house and use that money first before they get the full allowance. I would hope that -- what I'm trying to say is that I would hope that this will still allow the Director, or whoever it may be, to allow somebody to keep a sources of revenue so that they would only have to apply for a partial allowance.

MR. GREEN: Well, I regret to say to the honourable member that this particular bill is intended to maintain the old policy which required a person to dig into their own assets before they got social assistance. It may be that a change in policy is necessary, but it certainly won't be made on the basis that this particular change was made, that is a decision which overruled what the administration was doing.

The question that you raised is one of the questions that was raised at the meeting in Victoria. It's something that we are going to definitely look into but which I'm not prepared to change at this particular time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (Bill No. 37 was read section by section and passed.)

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. CHAIRMAN: Before we proceed to the next order of business, I would like to direct

(MR. CHAIRMAN cont'd.)... the attention of members of the committee to the gallery on my left where we have 40 students from the Mapleton Elementary School in Selkirk, a class in Grade 5, under the supervision of Mrs. Camac and Miss Czank. These students live in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Selkirk.

On behalf of the Members of the Assembly, we welcome you here.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

MR. GREEN: Will you call Bill No. 36 then. Is the amendment here now?

MR. CHAIRMAN: We now have copies of the amendment which will be distributed to honourable members.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, we've attempted, in what I hope to be able to propose as a new amendment, to take into consideration some of the points that were made by the Leader of the Opposition yesterday and still be enabled to do what we intended to do by regulation.

In the new amendment which I hope to propose we are adding on to Section 22 of the Act, a section which indicates that for the purpose of equalizing the effect on residents of the changes in premiums,....

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. Does this preclude that both the other amendments are withdrawn?

MR. GREEN: This particular amendment that I'm now proposing would, if acceptable, permit us to withdraw both of the previous amendments.

What it does is that it clearly states, without using jurisdictional language, that for the purpose of equalizing the effect on residents of changes in premiums - and then it goes on to say: "Different premiums may be fixed", and it's added on to Section 22 which deals with exceptions rather than dealing with the manner of fixing premiums generally. That would be the first part of the amendment to Section 22 (4).

And the second part, we've adopted entirely the principle that has been put forward by the Leader of the Opposition, in that we've included in the last few lines of the section that remissions could be made where any class of residents that have been charged or that have paid premiums in excess of premiums charged to or paid by other insured persons. In other words, the only time that we could remit would be where people had paid more than other people have paid. I'm prepared to accept that because this is the only time that we would be wanting to make that kind of remission, and I'm prepared to accept the first part because the only time we are talking of changing rates of premiums is so that we can equalize their effects amongst citizens.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, if it's agreeable to members of the other side, I would ask leave to have the amendment proposed by the Leader of the Opposition withdrawn, and also the amendment originally proposed by myself withdrawn and replaced by a new sub-amendment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Chairman, I think it might be more appropriate to the rules if I ask leave to have my own withdrawn rather than some other member of the House suggest that he have leave to have my amendment withdrawn. But may I hasten to add that I'm prepared to do that. I think that with the discussions that we have had, we have been able to come up with some amendments that really don't change the principle of what was talked at at Law Amendments committee. This was the purpose of the exercise that I had and it does leave the premiums being established under the existing regulations, regulatory clause within the Act, puts in the other area of exception and provides for the means under certain terms and conditions to pay back premiums right away, premiums in these specific instances.

So, Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to ask leave to have my amendment withdrawn and will support the amendments that are here when the Minister of Health moves them at the proper time, if in fact leave is given by the House, and then Section 28(1)(a) will stand on its own hooks when we've accomplished this.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does the Honourable Leader of the Opposition have leave to withdraw his amendment? The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, before this is agreed to, did I hear the Honourable the Official Leader of the Opposition say that 28(1)(a) would be independent of...

MR. WEIR: That's right. Yes.

MR. FROESE: Okay.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I ask leave of the House to withdraw the original

(MR. GREEN cont'd.)... amendment proposed and I'd like to move the proposed amendment to Bill 36 which is now before the members and before the Chairman, and I indicated yesterday the reasons for it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The motion of the Honourable Minister of Health that Sections 2 to 9 of Bill 36, as printed, be renumbered as sections 4 to 11 respectively and that the following sections be added thereto after Section 1: Section 2 of the proposed amendment, Subsection 22(4)— The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Should the amendment not be read into the record? Otherwise there'll be no record of it in Hansard.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I can read the amendment if necessary.

MR. GREEN: The amendment to be read into the record? All right.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Subsection (4) of Section 22 added.

2. Section 22 of the Act is amended by adding thereto, at the end thereof, the following subsection:

Different premiums.

22(4) For the purpose of equalizing the effect on residents of the changes in premiums, different premiums may be fixed in the regulations for such different classes of residents as may be prescribed in the regulations.

Subsection (1) of Section 24 amended.

3. Subsection (1) of Section 24 of the Act, as amended by chapter 3 of the Statutes of Manitoba, 1969 (First Session), is further amended by adding thereto, at the end thereof, the following clause:

(w) for the purpose of providing uniformity in the administration and operation of the Manitoba Health Plan, providing for the remission or repayment by the corporation, or the waiver, of the whole or part of the premiums paid or payable by any class of residents that have been charged or that have paid premiums in excess of premiums charged to or paid by other insured persons, and prescribing the classes of residents for those purposes.

(The amendment was read section by section and passed.) To avoid confusion, I will call the old numbers on Pages 2, 3 and 4 as they are presently numbered but they will be renumbered after the bill is passed. Page 2—Section 2(28)(1)(a)— The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I move that Section 28(1)(a) be deleted from the bill. In speaking to the motion, I think it was indicated to us quite clearly in committee by people who made representation that they felt that this should be a matter of negotiation between the parties, the employer and the employees, and that the government or that the Legislature should not impose this matter on them. I more or less agree that we should not be imposing this particular section on them, because I know of instances where negotiations were made or salaries were agreed to, but in addition there was also agreed that the fringe benefits would be such and such. This meant that the pay cheque would not show that any deduction was made for premiums under the medicare, and as a result this would not show. So in cases of this type, I see merit in that this section be deleted because I think it then stands open to negotiation and that it should be negotiated if this situation is to take place, that the employees are to receive the amount that the company would be saving as a result of the new premiums, and I don't think it is up to us to impose this regulation on them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Chairman, I want to say a few words on this. It seems that as we go along on this particular portion of the bill, or on this particular bill, that what we're doing is sewing together a bigger and bigger patchwork quilt. It tends to cover a number of anomalies in the bill, but can we by any means cover all of the conditions that are being created by the bill in respect to people who are now covered by a medicare program and who we felt by the amendment should be given reimbursement for their present medicare payments. I think that the Member for Rhineland certainly has a point in asking that this be deleted.

I do think that it's quite a different set of circumstances than when the amendment was originally brought in last spring to the original bill, and the basic change is that the corporation tax has been imposed since that time to pay in part for the added cost of medicare. Now if the Minister of Finance, if I recorded him correctly at that time, he said that in 1970 that corporation tax would raise an additional 5.4 million and that the following year this would go to \$8 million. What we have done in effect is say to the corporations that with respect to personal medicare we're asking them to make a corporate donation to this, and we're taxing corporations

(MR. CRAIK cont'd.)... right across the province who are eligible for corporate taxation, and that does not I suppose include the Crown corporations and other groups, co-operatives, government agencies who are very large employers of people. But for those that are eligible as corporations, we are asking them en masse to pay corporation tax towards the well-being of all employees in the Province of Manitoba.

Now some of those corporations have written agreements with their employees who work on an hourly or a salary basis, and those we can pass legislation to say that the employee will get back the equivalent of his medicare payments that he was making before. But then there are other corporations where there are no signed agreements. And then we have corporations where they do not work for salaries but may work on a straight commission basis or some such other basis where they get their medicare supplied to them by the parent company but get no direct salary. So it's impossible to pay to those people the equivalent of their medicare portion unless their commissions are increased.

All we find is that as we go on there are more and more cases that don't fit the legislation which we're attempting to pass. It certainly brings into question, in light of the fact that the corporations are on a blanket basis being asked to pay more money to the amount of \$5.4 million in 1970, and some corporations are in addition going to have to pay employees with whom they have specific written agreements for hourly and salaried employees, and then admittedly that even some of those agreements that are written contain clauses to accommodate any government action which may be either in favour of the employee or in favour of the government, which indicates that the agreements that are arrived at by free collective bargaining have in some cases accommodated and anticipated government action and therefore it is spelled out what happens in the event that a government takes action that affects the agreements that they've arrived at.

I think that really in essence what it says, although we don't know and we have no statistics - and this is the bad part, we don't seem to have sufficient research as to how many people were benefitting - but all the indications are (a) that we're going to assist some corporations more than others. Certainly we're helping Crown corporations and other people that don't pay corporation taxes more than those that do, but in addition to that, even those that pay corporation taxes in increased amounts are being segregated into those that have formal agreements of a certain type and those that don't have, to ask them to pay more to their employees. And then we've got employees who fall under a formal agreement and those that don't, and then those that work for salaries and those that don't, and when we really come down to it, the legislation would appear to attempt to rectify something that represents possibly a minority of the employees of the province, and only those that work on a specified agreement, signed agreement.

So I think in actual fact that we're probably not being equitable in our treatment, and in light of the fact that the corporation tax has been imposed on a blanket basis to pay for medicare that we should simply, rather than go through what we're attempting to do now in the recent amendment that the Minister of Health has brought in to try and get at national corporations, by the time all of this is done, if you think of the amount of bureaucracy it would be worse than the opt-in opt-out business on doctors, because you're going to have people opted-in and opted-out as individuals into the medicare program in payment of their premiums and you won't find a computer big enough to handle all this. It's going to be a real mess.

I think the best thing we can do is drop this clause, let it go a year until the round of negotiations is finished, keep a watching brief on what has happened and not attempt to make these changes which, as we go further and further, give every indication that we are only trying to legislate for a minority group at the expense of differentiating another group of employers and employees. I feel that this resolution, or this amendment on the bill, or Section 28 has reached the point where diminishing returns has set in and I don't really feel that it is nearly as meaningful as it was when it was initially introduced in the spring of 1969.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. BEARD: Mr. Chairman, it's not often that I totally disagree with the Member for Riel and the Member for Rhineland, but I see it in a different light altogether. For one thing, the new cost to the corporations really go into capital, are capital funds, and so government is always reluctant to say that one tax is specifically for one thing or another. They may at the time they're introducing it but within six months they always say, well this is just capital funds in which we dig into for looking after our estimates. So I can't find in my mind why we should

(MR. BEARD cont'd.).... associate a tax on either income or corporation into one particular area of expenditure.

But I did express my concern at the very first in the budget speech that I would hope that all people would get the benefit of the relief that the company had in the government taking over the cost of medicare and returning it to the employee. In fact the Minister got up and cracked at me at the very first, and I would hope — and he admitted then that he couldn't get around to looking after all of the defects in the philosophy he was trying to follow and I think that, as I understand it anyway, the amendment is to try and correct some of these problems.

But when you talk about the money that the corporation itself is going to have to pay back to the employee, it is not really money out of their pockets. As far as I see it, it is money out of the business that they would have spent two months ago looking after a verbal agreement to do something for an employee, and where it is not a union negotiated agreement, then correctly they can stop it at any one time. But my mind always goes back to the lower paid people, maybe waitresses or employees of a small group, that did have that concession and could have it taken away. As I see it, the Act says that if it was done before the Act was brought in then it has to continue after. Now maybe I'm wrong, but if this is in fact right, then whether it is in writing as a negotiated agreement or not, it would still have to continue because the inspector could come along and say — as he does with our income tax or unemployment insurance or whatever it may be — you have in fact been paying it up to a certain date and now you're not, because the refund wouldn't show on the cheque that was being issued at the end of each week to that employee, or at the end of the month. So I think it should be passed on to them.

Now when you talk about commission men, this is right, it may be a little problem there. But if that was the only one that was bothering the member then I think that this should carry on through and allow the people that really need the money to still carry on with that fringe benefit, because it just becomes a better fringe benefit for them and they're the ones that really need that type of assistance.

Now as far as computer service, etc., granted it may be a problem, but the problem always comes home to roost when the inspector comes around, whether it's once a year or once every two years. We don't know when the inspector for the Department of Labour is going to come around, but when he comes around he knows what to look for immediately, and when he asks for our books, then he just knows exactly what he wants to look for and he finds it, and if you haven't been doing what is right then you have to pay the penalty for doing that. I think that in this, if this allows the inspector to do the same in this respect, then it could quite easily be carried out. I don't know who would do it, whether it would fall under the Department of Health inspector or who it would fall under, but certainly somebody could do it. Maybe the one that inspects for labour could carry on and do the same thing.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: On this, perhaps I should have added when I spoke that it would be helpful if the Minister could in fact give us some information on how many people that we would call employees in the Province of Manitoba we might be benefitting, because to my feeling we're probably down to a minority on this now. In addition to that, the only way we're going to get at that minority is through a fairly complicated procedure. If the Crown corporations and so on go for their option, which he has indicated they may or may not, you could conceivably see all the employees of the C.N.R., Air Canada and C.B.C. and so on, that are national Crown corporations, receiving from the Province of Manitoba a cheque every month. That is, the money has to come from.....

A MEMBER: Under his signature.

MR. CRAIK: Well that doesn't — (Interjection) — that's right, only except that's once a year and it's to every household. But here you've got every employee and the company have to make their contribution, it comes in to the Hospital Commission and then the cheque has to go back out from the Hospital Commission paying him his rightful share to the employee, and I'm thinking of the bureaucracy of the thing.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, would the honourable member permit a question?

MR. CRAIK: Certainly.

MR. CHERNIACK: Would it not be much more practical on the basis that you describe as a bureaucratic problem for the employer to just pay it to the employee?

MR. CRAIK: Well in that particular instance, yes, but that's why we just adopted his resolution — or his amendment was to cover this case. But if that case occurs — and he must

(MR. CRAIK cont'd.)... assume it could occur or we wouldn't have had the amendment - in that case you are going to have to go through this fantastic bureaucratic procedure in order to give a person back that amount of money. And even if you collect all of them together - and I might be wrong, I might be right or wrong - but if the Minister would indicate whether or not I am then we'd have more to go on. But if after all of this we're going to bring benefit to a minority group of employees in Manitoba while the others that are not under a formal agreement are not going to get the benefit; and in addition to that the employers who pay corporation tax are going to be differentiated against because some are going to have to pay it to their employees, others are not; if we've gone through all of that we're better off to let the thing lie low until the next round of negotiations and ask the employers, send out a directive from the government that it is anticipated that at the next round that the benefits will be passed on, and I would think we'll in the total run get more equity.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Chairman, I have a few minutes. Perhaps I won't finish but let me assure all of the members of the House that this particular series of amendments is intended...

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would ask honourable members of the committee to keep their conversational levels down. It's drowning out the speaker.

MR. GREEN: This particular procedure is intended to maintain, and to the extent that it is maintainable, in my opinion does maintain the status quo for everybody. It puts everybody into exactly the position that they were before the regulations and before the Act was passed, and I would like to indicate to honourable members that the government that passed the original bill had exactly the same thing in mind, and in my opinion the only thing that they didn't do is do it successfully, because in the original Act there was a suggestion that where there was a premium payable by an employer under a collective agreement or under an agreement - and my honourable friend the Member for Rhineland suddenly finds a great deal to be revered in the sanctity of collective agreements - but nevertheless, in the original legislation it said that where a collective agreement provides for the payments of a premium, or part of a premium or 50 percent, the collective agreement was deemed to be amended by referring it to this legislation rather than to the other.

And I suggest, as I did last year, that that legislation intended to maintain the status quo. The trouble is that it didn't, and I'll use figures which are not accurate but which are easy to follow. If under the collective agreement and under the previous MMS scheme the employer was paying 50 percent of the premium and the premium was \$200.00, the employer paid \$100.00 for each employee. And let me assure members of the House that the employees knew it and they bargained for it. They could have got \$100.00 in wages instead of that premium but they took \$100.00 in premiums. After the legislation, if the premium went down to \$100.00 - which it was hoped originally it would go down to - the employer paid \$50.00, and instead of every employee working for that company benefitting to the extent of \$50.00 like everybody else in the province did, that employee lost \$50.00 and his employer gained \$50.00 per employee, and if there was 100 employees it meant 100 times \$50.00; if there was 1,000 employees it meant 1,000 times \$50.00 or \$50,000.00.

Now this particular amendment makes sure that the agreement is as it was before and doesn't stop them from negotiating a new position. What it does say is that you will negotiate from the position that you left off; you will not be put in a preferred position. The Member for Riel asks, well how many employees are affected by this? Well last year the Member for Thompson gave a figure that this year would apply, because if you have 3,000 employees at the International Nickel Company alone, 3,000 employees to the tune of \$100.00 per employee, we would be giving the International Nickel Company \$300,000 and the men would pay taxes to give it to them. That would be the effect if we did not pass this amendment. All right. Now you say....

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. You're precluding that there would be no further negotiations.

MR. GREEN: I am suggesting -- Mr. Chairman, I obviously can't finish but I'll go on. The fact is, Mr. Chairman, that we are talking about numerous collective agreements. We are talking about the City of Winnipeg; we are talking about collective agreements all over the City of Winnipeg; and furthermore, we're talking about different employers. We have employers now, some of whom pay this. Let the Member for Riel remember that not all of employers pay the medical care premiums for their employees. Some of them pay wages instead. And

(MR. GREEN cont'd.)... what would happen in the event that we did not equalize the situation, in the event that we did not keep the status quo for everybody - and I say this advisedly -...

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I hate to interrupt my honourable colleague but it is now at the hour of 12:30, the normal time for the rising of the Committee. I move that the Committee rise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise. Call in the Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Committee has considered Bill No. 37, an Act to amend The Social Allowances Act, and passed the same without amendment.

IN SESSION

MR. RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Flin Flon, that the report of the Committee be received.

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

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, may I indicate to members of the Assembly that it is the intention of the government to call Municipal Affairs Committee tomorrow morning at 9:00 o'clock for organizational purposes and that tomorrow afternoon at 2:30, at the conclusion of the question period, we would go into Law Amendments Committee with Mr. Speaker leaving the Chair in case the Law Amendments is completed prior to 5:30. I would ask the press who are not present, and I will ask them apart from that, to indicate so that representations may be given to the bills that have now passed to Law Amendments Committee.

MR. SPEAKER: The House is now adjourned and will stand adjourned -- Has the honourable member a question?

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, to the Honourable the House Leader. Will we be in Private Members' business this afternoon or not?

MR. PAULLEY: Oh yes, definitely. The rules of the House call for Private Members' resolutions this afternoon and we will not interfere with the rules of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The House is now adjourned and will stand adjourned until 2:30 this afternoon.