

## THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

8:00 o'clock, Tuesday, May 30, 1972

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. GIRARD: Mr. Chairman, when I rose this afternoon I suppose I was being a little naive thinking that I could tangle with the expert politician, my honourable friend the Minister, however it seems relatively easy because what I'm uttering is really not my own view but that of my people in my constituency.

I don't think it should go unchallenged to have the Minister tell us that I'm being divisive and then in his rebuttal he brings in matters such as highways, saying you know the cities are paving their own streets and the rural areas are dependent on the Provincial Government to pave their highways. I appeal to his logic, Mr. Chairman, in the hope that we'll be able to compare apples with apples, oranges with oranges, and taxes with taxes. When we speak of inequality, when I speak of inequality of taxation, I am speaking of the mill rates that are charged in one municipality as compared to the mill rates that are charged in the next municipality, and I'm not questioning the assistance that the city gives the rural areas or the rural areas gives to the city, because I know full well that in our society we are interdependent, and it would be a sad day when we have to have a government of Winnipeg and a government of the rural areas and not one provincial government, as close as we can get to that situation.

I spoke earlier of the \$50.00 rebate and the Minister did an admirable job of misconstruing what I said. I didn't suggest for a moment that we might be rebating the wrong people, meaning that we should be rebating business rather than rebating the homeowners, but what I was suggesting was that I would very much appreciate an answer to the questions I've been asking in the Legislature in the past. Of the \$50.00 rebate that we are paying, what percentage is going to urban municipalities, and what percentage approximately is going to non-urban municipalities? I pointed out that I've asked that question to --(Interjection)-- About half and half says the Minister. Well that's very interesting. I appreciate very much the answer. I would even appreciate if the Minister, the Premier wanted to come back in the near future and tell me even more accurately if he has more accurate information, but half and half sounds reasonable. --(Interjection)-- At the end of the year would be a little late, Sir. Well if we are rebating without knowing approximately where the rebate is going, then there's something wrong with our rebate system. Now again the Minister did an admirable job of misconstruing my suggestions that business enterprise might be considered in our tax structure. I point out to you, Sir, that though we might well laugh at the situation, we ought to seriously look at it sometimes and ask ourselves how much would Columbia Forest Products be paying in terms of taxes if it were located in the City of Winnipeg as compared to their present location. And what service would be available to that particular industry? Because it's not for the sake of Columbia Forest that I'm suggesting this, but we hear from the Minister of Industry and Commerce that we are trying to decentralize, you know, we are trying to decentralize but we're not doing it because we're killing any incentive by our tax structure.

I might suggest to the Premier that a few years ago I watched him on television with some enthusiasm. At that time he was campaigning, I believe, for his second time round for his Federal seat, and I can remember distinctly the program when he so convincingly and with, I'm sure, a good degree of sincerity, was saying it's about time that we arrest the depopulation of rural Manitoba, or rural Canada; it's about time that we do something for the family farm, and I can remember his using that term, the family farm. I was with him then on that particular issue, but he's left me now. He's left me now if he applauds this kind of tax structure that clearly is not equality. It cannot be equality when you're asking those family farmers that ought to be defended to pay even more, even more in terms of mills than the residents of the urban area with no services, no services to speak of.

Might I bring the example even a little more clearly for the Premier's sake --(Interjection) -- Yes, more mills. Now let me just clarify one point. --(Interjection)-- How many mills do I pay? Now let me clarify a little more for the Premier's sake because I know he understands this. You're familiar no doubt that last year we passed a bill in this Legislature that equalized the school taxes within the City of Winnipeg, and like I said before I applauded that measure in the hope that it would be extended to all the province eventually. Part of the City of Winnipeg, namely St. Norbert, is now receiving a rebate because of this equalization, such that their mill rate is lowered, I believe, 18 mills, somewhere in the area of 18 mills. That means that there

(MR. GIRARD cont'd.) . . . . is a line between the people who live in Metro Winnipeg and St. Norbert and those who live on the other side of that line who are also in the Seine River School Division but outside of the city limits.

MR. MILLER: Will the honourable member permit a question?

MR. GIRARD: Yes, I will.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, I wonder does the member not realize that what he's talking about exists in almost every rural school division in Manitoba?

MR. GIRARD: Yes, I realize fully but not to the same extent. Now let me clarify, let me clarify that on one side of that line the people live in Winnipeg. On the other side of that line they also live in Seine River, they're both in the Seine River area, but one side pays 18 mills of special levy more than the other side. Now I hope that situation is clear because what we are asking now to do, what we are asking those people to do now is, we're asking those who are paying the 18 mills more than the others to compensate those who are paying less because of the equalization costs. And we say this is in the name of equity, of equality. Mr. Chairman, I can't follow that kind of logic.

We are concerned about the growth of Winnipeg, says the Minister of Finance, because we don't relish the idea that it might grow as fast as projections show. But I venture to say that the people who are moving to Winnipeg, the increasing population in Winnipeg is not coming from Australia, it's coming from rural Manitoba. Why is it coming from rural Manitoba, Mr. Chairman? It's coming from rural Manitoba because of, in part, the unfair tax burden imposed upon the people of that community. Says, the Minister of Finance, show me which government has done more with the improvement of the Foundation Program. We are now paying 80 percent. Well I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that percentages of the provincial contribution to the Foundation Program is hardly the thing that puts the dollars back where they should be, because in fact you could increase the percentage of the Foundation Program if you at the same time decreased the general levy, and you will find that your grants to your schools will have to be less, and so the percentage alone is not the whole story.

I asked the Minister of Education a few weeks ago if there were any changes in the grant structure to our schools, to our school divisions this year. His answer was no, there wasn't. There wasn't. The most significant change in the last four years has been the \$18.00 per pupil grant paid, and that was passed at last year's Legislature. If the Minister of Finance suggests for any time that what they have done this far in education finance is more to equalize than any past government has done, he'd better do his homework, he'd better do his homework.

I was interested to find that when I spoke of mill rates affecting the area of Sprague it wasn't very long before the Minister of Finance could get the specific details of what last year's mill rate in Sprague was. My information by the way was that it was 77 mills. --(Interjection)-- No, I suggest that what you had was not this year's. Now my information was that in 71 the special mill rate was 77 mills. However it could well be that there's a difference between the balanced assessment and the actual assessment --(Interjection)-- Yes, the special mill rate, the special school mill rate. Special levy. --(Interjection)-- Yes, I know that the Minister has indicated to us it was 68.7. --(Interjection)-- Well it must be mental telepathy because I think I wrote that down. In any case, in any case, Mr. Chairman, it might well be that there is some discrepancy because of the difference between the actual assessment and the balanced assessment. However I might suggest to you that the people of the area of Sprague will in this coming year be paying at least 95 mills by your own figures, and possibly more, possibly more, because I suspect that what you gave me was the 1971 figures rather than the new budget. In any case it should not be comforting to the Minister, or the government, to find themselves in a position where they're asking some people who are now paying 95 mills of special levy to assist in compensating another area because that area is approaching 70. If the Minister was able to find those figures when I mentioned Sprague, I'm sure that he could find the rest of the figures for the municipalities of Manitoba, and before we leave, before we leave this particular article possibly pass them around to the members of this Chamber so that they know what they're talking about with regards to all municipalities rather than only those mentioned in urban Winnipeg.

Just in conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I think that the Government of Manitoba has to be responsible for the whole province. And I think that they should show the kind of response, the kind of intention, they should show some understanding of all of Manitoba, that part that is outside of Winnipeg as well as that that is within. I don't want to suggest that the Department of

(MR. GIRARD cont'd.) . . . . Urban Affairs only deals with areas of population over 450,000, but I do get that kind of impression, and I would think that it would be time that this government reassess carefully the position at present with regards to property taxes before they would venture to ask those who are paying more to reimburse those who are already paying less.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, normally I would not speak in the Estimates of a colleague Minister but the speech made by the Member for Emerson is such that I feel it does require some comment at this time.

The Honourable Member for Emerson has in some respects a quality which enables him I think to have a good appreciation of the range of problems that face the province as a whole. However for some particular reason he seems bent today to trying to strike a note of discord as between urban and rural communities in our province. Mr. Speaker, it would be simply inaccurate and irresponsible on our part not to challenge head-on some of the assumptions, some of the statements made by the honourable member relative to real property taxation and the impact of it, and the relative equity of it as between rural and urban communities. And it all depends on where one wants to start.

If one wishes to go back 15/20 years, one would have found a situation in which there was in fact a great disparity as between the level of education service, the quality of education service as between many, if not most, rural communities and the cities of the urban districts. That has changed over the course of the decade because of forward-looking education policies, the introduction of the concept of the school division and then subsequently the unitary school division. If I were to register a caveat with respect to the desirability of education policy of the last ten years it would be only that after the midway point in the 1960s we may have gone perhaps too far in terms of consolidation of elementary schools. But apart from that I don't think that there is need to regret the course of action taken with respect to education policy, particularly as it relates to rural Manitoba. But it has meant, Mr. Chairman, and it would be really dishonest for anyone to pretend otherwise, it has meant an escalation of real property taxes in rural municipalities, in rural communities generally in order to pay for the rather steeply escalating cost of education. The Member for Emerson would have one believe that the Provincial Government is being more generously inclined towards urban communities and urban school divisions than rural. The fact is if he had looked closely he would be aware of the fact that as it is there is a rather substantial, a very substantial transfer of monies from urban real property taxation sources to rural school divisions, and if he wants to play the part of the parochial politician and pretend that the City - and I'm not one to play the role of advocate for urban communities at the expense of rural communities, my whole background is rather the reverse - but in the interests of truth and accuracy itself, it simply must be told and stated clearly that under the present system of financing education in Manitoba and for some several years now, there has been an actual net transfer of something like 35 cents on the dollar out of urban districts, the levy at source in urban districts and into the rural school divisions. So that for every dollar of the Foundation Levy if it were all done strictly in proportion to population, and no transfer of monies in the interests of more equality of education opportunity, then on that basis the City of Winnipeg constituting approximately 55 percent of the population would be raising something like 60 cents on the Foundation Program levy and would retain 55 to 60 cents. But the fact is that for every dollar raised on the Foundation Program in the City of Winnipeg, about 35 cents is retained and the balance is transferred out through the mechanism of the Foundation Program into rural school divisions, so there is a massive, a substantial transfer of monies from urban source to rural application. Then at most that the Honourable the Member for Emerson could be complaining about is that there is a problem of insufficient degree, but he cannot in any honesty try to make the case that rural divisions are somehow being ignored as the poor country cousins, that there is no effort being made by senior government to try and equalize education opportunity and education spending in the province, because the reverse is true.

That doesn't mean, Mr. Chairman, that in the course of years ahead we may not find it in the interests of public policy to increase the percentage of transfer to those rural divisions with a lower tax base where education quality would suffer if there isn't some special mechanism of redistribution and transfer employed.

Having said that, Mr. Chairman, I really have to wonder then what the Honourable Member for Emerson was getting at during the entire period of his address. He makes mention of

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd.) . . . . Sprague and suggests that Sprague has a very high mill rate. Well perhaps it has but then again, Mr. Chairman, I don't know to what extent that is because the operators in recent years of the particle board plant at Sprague haven't paid their taxes - eighty thousand bucks in tax arrears because Great Northern Capital didn't see fit to meet their obligations - and so of course, there would be tax arrears involved and that would complicate the figures further.

The honourable member has suggested - what is he suggesting in fact? Out of all his remarks nothing is very clear, no more clear than when he suggested a few weeks ago that some extraordinary action was needed with respect to the operation of the Columbia Forest Products Plant; didn't really indicate whether he thought the Crown should operate it, didn't say the Crown shouldn't operate it, and in that way you play your odds in such a way that you win coming and going. That kind of a political approach, Mr. Chairman, is usually advantageous in the short run I admit but it's hardly the kind of approach that is likely to credit one in the eyes of fellow citizens over the long run.

I would like to take a minute or two if I might to put on the record a number of figures here which relate to total taxes paid in a rural municipality, because I think it will give the picture over quite a number of years. I can go back to 1933 and the particular parcel of land involved here is in the home municipality of Brokenhead. It's interesting to see the pattern of municipal taxation over the years; 1933, the heart of the depression, taxation of \$53.80 on a quarter section. Then the next tax bill 1950, after the war, the same parcel, quarter section, \$119.00 - quite an increase one would say between 1933 and 1950. But the increase in real property taxes was not nearly as great as the increase in per capita income. In 1956 \$140.00; 1958 \$190.00 - this is on the home quarter, the Member for Rhineland would be interested; 1966 \$212.00; 1969 \$221.00; 1970 \$234.00; 1971 \$223.00 - it really plateaued from 1967 on.

Mr. Chairman, I am not pretending that that particular parcel of land and the pattern of its real property taxes over the years is necessarily typical of rural municipalities. Certainly it's typical of that particular municipality and it does show a rather steady increase all through the 1950's through the 60's and in the last three years the pattern of increase is not in deviation at all from the rest of the 60's. So the Member for Emerson if he's trying to make a case that the pattern of real property taxation has changed drastically or in any significant way in the last three years as compared to the last ten years, then he is simply wrong.

But we recognize that because of certain forces at work in our economy, that for the last generation there has been a squeeze on net incomes in rural areas, fed primarily by the cold fact of declining net income in most years in the agricultural sector and so there has been alas, a depopulation from rural communities and that phenomena is to be witnessed in every rural area of the prairies and across Canada and across the United States and I suspect it's to be witnessed as well anywhere in the free world; and I suppose even behind the Iron Curtain because of the simple fact of industrialization which carries with it urbanization. All that can be said I suppose is that perhaps it's got to the point where not only should we be trying to resist and slow the economic forces, that for social policy reasons we should want to try to arrest if not reverse this trend. So the Member for Emerson need not shed tears of sorrow because of his false impression that I have in some way had a change of heart with respect to the desirability of trying to slow the trend of depopulation from rural areas. It is almost second nature to this government that policies that will be helpful and are realistic, that will be helpful in terms of maintaining a stay option for people living in rural communities, that we will adopt such policies and have in fact adopted some of these policies already.

I have said, not in rural communities but I say in the city, in the city communities that surely there should be a desire on the part of all our fellow citizens whether they be rural or urban a desire to want to stop, to slow if not to stop, the trend of population from rural communities to cities that are already large and in danger of becoming too large. I mean so large where really nothing is added to the quality of life in having those city communities become even larger. And yet you know I suppose it's part of human nature, there's this sort of compelling need to grow. So it is with communities and even if a city community be a million in population there will be those, and influential people at that, who will feel this compelling necessity to strive for even greater population, even greater industrial activity and so it goes. And that is why it shouldn't surprise the Honourable Member for Emerson or anyone else that in a brief last year presented by the former Metropolitan Corporation of Greater Winnipeg - I suppose it could just as well have been City Council as the Metro Corporation - they made a very strong

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd.) . . . . argument for the need for more attention by senior government to the economic development needs of the City of Winnipeg. That the City of Winnipeg like all other regions of the province did not have a provincially supported regional development corporation like East-Man, West-Man, Central Plains, Pembina, Norman, Parklands, the seven Regional Development Corporations receive some modest and significant degree of provincial support. In the City of Winnipeg there is no such regional development corporation, they make a case for one. All because of the felt need for increased population and industrial activity in the City of Winnipeg.

I cannot pretend that I understand that particular point of view was thus expressed, but in addition to that of course in that same Brief, people presenting that Brief made the case that there were massive transfers of public money through the aegis of the Provincial Government from the city to the rural areas for purposes of school financing, etc. etc., and they were making a case for the recapturing of those dollars or those portions of dollars to retain them at the source where they had been levied. That kind of thinking, Mr. Chairman, if it were to permeate Federal Government thinking would result in the immediate termination of our 30-year-old system of equalization payments in Confederation and would spell the doom of Canada as we know it.

So I certainly make it very clear that the thinking of this government is not such as to be panicked into any sense of wanting to cater to those who would like to retain money at source. We certainly recognize the need for substantial transfers of public monies from areas where it is less needed to areas where it is more needed in order to maintain some equilibrium and some equality in quality of essential services, education, health, etc. And then of course that is completely consistent with the philosophy that permeates government which is that of social democracy. And if the Honourable Member for Emerson is making such a great case for the transfer of money from one community, be it urban, to another community, be it rural, in order to maintain a definite range of equality then it seems to me that he too has been afflicted with the problem of being a social democrat in his time. Sometimes it is not easy to be that particularly in the face of intimidation and threats about being communist and soft and red and so on. Anyway it is clear that the Honourable Member for Emerson at least in some respects has shown that he has gone to a pretty progressive stage of the disease and he had best watch out for his colleagues.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE (Roblin): Well, Mr. Chairman, it's very seldom that I rise in my seat in support of the Honourable the First Minister and tonight he has in his remarks called the Honourable Member from Emerson a member of quality and that I support. The second thing, Mr. Chairman, that I think the people of my constituency would be very angry at me if I didn't rise in this debate in support of the remarks of the Honourable Member for Emerson.

But, Mr. Chairman, before I get off in the debate I'd like to welcome the Honourable Member for Point Douglas back into the House again tonight and hope that he's in good health. I well recall the days of the automobile insurance debate where I had the knife across my throat and my back so I well know what he's talking about and I'm sure there's other members in the House who can remember the experience of those days.

But, Mr. Chairman, in all sincerity, I watched television tonight during the supper hour and I saw the Honourable Minister of Finance speaking in great length and he said this document that we have in our hands today, this measure of tax structure and equality is before the House in the expectation and the hope that it will resolve itself. And this of course brings us back, Mr. Chairman, to the great debate of Bill 36. I think the members of the press and I think the members of this Chamber will well recall some of the great speeches that the Minister of Finance made in those days when that debate was going on. And my memory tells me of him making a speech in Fort Garry, I think in February 71, where he said there would be no tax increases period on unicity. He went on into Charleswood and he made speeches there and said that there would be no tax increases with this unicity . . . . In fact he even went into St. Vital if my memory serves me correctly and told the people in that jurisdiction that this unicity bill would not create any increases in taxes.

A MEMBER: That is false.

MR. MCKENZIE: Well maybe it is but I would hope that the honourable members will prove otherwise. In the whole academic exercise of this . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. A point of order has been raised. Point of order? The Honourable Member for St. Vital.

MR. JAMES WALDING (St. Vital): Mr. Chairman, the remarks suggested by the Member for Roblin were not made in St. Vital nor anywhere else that there would be no increase in taxes due to Bill 36.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: Well, Mr. Chairman, I daresay that you remember, Mr. Chairman, and certain members of the House no doubt will recall the debates of Bill 36 and here in this measure that the Minister has placed on our desks today we have the ghosts of Bill 36 coming back to haunt us. The ghosts of Bill 36 are coming back to haunt Manitoba.

The First Minister in his remarks - I regret very much that he took the attitude that he took. I raised this point in the House the other day on this certain measure and how it's going to affect rural Manitoba. The First Minister jumped up on his feet and he challenged me, said that I with a snide remark, and I was creating divisive tactics in this House.

The Honourable Minister of Finance has challenged my honourable colleague who sits beside me tonight on the same fact, he says we are trying to be divisive in this measure. But I say to you, Mr. Chairman, I say to the Members of this House that this is not Manitoba as I recall it. In the old days of Manitoba the rural people and the urban people met hand in hand and we were building one Manitoba for all the people of this province. But here they have a measure, Mr. Chairman, by the Honourable Minister of Finance who has placed it on our desks today and I challenge him to stand up and debate the remarks of my honourable colleague from Emerson and say it's not this government that's dividing this province with the tactics that they're trying to push across to the people of this province. It's not us that's trying to divide Manitoba, we never were dividing Manitoba.

Look to history, look at the history of this province, look at the governments of this province through the history, 100 years, 70 years, no government ever tried to divide this province like this government has tried to divide it and they're trying to ram it down our throats and say that we're the ones that are dividing. The First Minister says it's a snide remark for me the Member for Roblin to stand up in the House one day and ask a question on this very issue. The Minister of Finance has accused my colleague from Emerson; it's a snide divisory remark for us to challenge this document or this formula which is supposed to be a tax structure for the equality of the people of this province. I reject it, Mr. Chairman, I reject it, I don't think it's fair.

And let's go back through the history of it. This government, this Bill 36 was not our's, we're the Opposition. And Mr. Chairman, I hope you'll give us the privilege of attacking it because it is our job to attack it and try and get the people of Manitoba a better deal than this government is providing for them.

He says in his remarks today that 75 percent of the increase in 72 is going to be picked up by the people of Manitoba. Why didn't you say that in your speeches in Fort Garry in February 71? Why didn't you say it in Charleswood and St. Vital and all these other jurisdictions? --(Interjection)-- No, you didn't say 75 percent. --(Interjection)-- No you didn't say that. And the rural members of the House quarrelled in those days on Unicity Bill and we told you exactly what is going to happen. We said you're going to divide this province over that .ssue, over that Bill 36, and this is exactly what you've done.

Mr. Chairman, now it's come back to haunt them and they're claiming "dirty pool" over here because we're raising the issue; snide remarks coming from me; divisory remarks coming from the Honourable Member for Emerson. Is that fair, Mr. Chairman? Are those fair remarks when we warned them 12 months ago what was going to happen? --(Interjection)-- Most unfortunate. And again I ask you, how can this government stand up with this measure or this sort of tax equality that they're producing and say that you're going to develop rural Manitoba? That's a dream, that's a dream of the - - another, what do you call it? - - a red herring of the Honourable Minister of Finance. He's very skillful at dragging these things across the House; distracting the people from rural Manitoba; distracting the Honourable Member for Emerson; changing his remarks around to make them so he could make a speech on them.

Mr. Chairman, this is not what the people of my constituency want of this province or this government and I'm really alarmed that the Minister of Finance while we debate these Estimates of \$1,751,800 is one to tell us that this is the way we're going to build Manitoba, this is the way that we're going to produce all the equality for the people of Manitoba that this

(MR. McKENZIE cont'd.) . . . . government thought about.

It's a most regretful day, Mr. Chairman, because rural depopulation, rural development, where are all these things in the Minister's - it's likely in that \$45 million slush fund that he's got over there in his back pocket. And maybe some day we'll get it. We may some day. He keeps bringing back that \$1.00 an acre thing that they - that was a great deal, that was a great political manoeuver wasn't it? Four million bucks --(Interjection)-- and the plumbing, well . . . So he's got \$45 million bucks in his hip pocket to play around with these matters. Sure he has, we passed it the other day.

But I tell him in all sincerity he better go out and take a trip around rural Manitoba and see the number of people that are fed up with the type of taxation that this government is imposing upon them. And I don't blame them in all entirety because governments before and the Federal Government, it's a matter of sincerity to the people of rural Manitoba, but surely the Minister of Finance is not going to stand up and place this measure on our desks today, Mr. Chairman, and say this is a tax structure that will give equality to all the people of Manitoba.

. . . . continued on next page

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Chairman, much of the criticism that has been levied on Bill 36 during the last session stands up pretty good today. Because what the Opposition were saying at that time certainly is very true today -- what has happened. And naturally the members that were mostly concerned and probably had most to lose such as the ones from St. James-Assiniboia, the Member for Sturgeon Creek, myself and Charleswood, certainly that's the areas that had most to lose and they're going to be penalized the most. Because even the Minister himself has admitted by increasing the amount that was in the estimates for transitional periods from a million and a half to 3 1/2 million, he himself has admitted that the government were wrong in their figures, that there would not be a reduction in cost for 85 percent of the people in Winnipeg; but what has happened, there's an increase in tax for 85 percent of the people in the city. That's what has happened. But I know that the Minister has agreed himself by increasing, and I appreciate that -- my problem is, and I'm sure that most of the city people will feel the same way, that the increase is too small, it's not enough. It's way too small. I think that -- (Interjection) -- I'll get to that in a few minutes. The member, I believe, one of the other members that was speaking and he said, look what will happen in 1974 after your 25 percent, the third year while the transition grants will be exhausted. You know what will happen? There will be a 50 percent tax increase, a 50 percent tax hike. That's what will happen. The city dwellers in part of St. James-Assiniboia will have their property taxes doubled. That's what's going to happen.

I know the Minister and I agree with him and he's sincere, when he's talking about the city councillors, city aldermen, trying to keep the Budget down, trying to do everything possible have frozen any increase in staff or replacement of staff even and I know there's some complaints from the departments that there isn't replacement of staff, but I'll tell you that's not the words of the Attorney-General and it's unfortunate he's sitting so close to the Finance Minister. What did he say? No, Sir, he accused the ICEC members of the City Council. He says they're responsible for the hike, they're responsible for the increase in assessment, they're responsible for the increase in the Budget. That's what the Attorney-General said. And he accused his former colleagues and accused the City Council and he says they're responsible for the increase in the Budget. Unless the paper in St. James-Assiniboia had reported him completely wrong. But according to what the paper stated, the headlines, and it said that the Attorney-General Al Mackling -- (Interjection) -- that's what I get from the story in the St. James-Assiniboia News. Now if he was quoted incorrectly then if he wants to say that I'll accept this point, but he seems to have anyhow accused the City Council. On the other hand, the Finance Minister says no they're trying and I agree, I think the Finance Minister is very sincere.

The other point, the Member from Charleswood stated and the Finance Minister disagreed, he says, do you want the Charleswood people to live with open ditches. Well how does the Minister know if they don't want open ditches, maybe they want -- they got large properties, they got large lots, they have nice lawns, maybe they'd sooner have open ditches and culverts instead of have double the taxation. In St. James-Assiniboia, Armour Crescent, Harris Boulevard and there's quite a few other streets, the people said look we don't want side walks. We got very wide boulevards, we got wide streets and we would like to have the option on not having any sidewalks because there isn't too much traffic in there. And I believe that the people should have that right. I believe through probably community committees maybe they'll be able to exercise that right and I think it would be most unfortunate if they didn't have the right to exercise these privileges if they want to pay for them. So surely -- I'm almost certain that the Minister doesn't know what the people in Charleswood, what they'd want. I mean maybe they want open ditches.

The other factor and it's a serious one. The Minister talked about people paying for storm sewers and so on. Well Headingley will have to pay for storm sewers too in parts of St. James and they haven't got any storm sewers in Headingley. They will have to pay the same mill rate as the rest of the city. They haven't got transportation facilities, they haven't got water facilities, they haven't got sewer facilities and the telephones would cost a very, very small amount and still the members in the front benches have been denying them that privilege.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Urban Affairs.

MR. CHERNIACK: Now that the honourable member is talking again about Headingley



(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) . . . . would he answer the question I posed earlier as to what he thinks as to whether or not Headingley ought to be within or without the City?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Chairman, it's very easy for him -- if he would have had people from the City of Winnipeg and if he would have called his experts from the City of Winnipeg to work on Unicity Bill 36 last year I think he would have had the answers and he would have had a better Bill. But he called his experts from Montreal, he called people from Chicago to work on the Bill that were not familiar with the local problems. I'm saying to the Minister, have another look at it.

MR. CHERNIACK: . . . to answer my question or not want to answer. That's all.

MR. PATRICK: Yes I have a suggestion. I don't believe the people of Headingley should pay the same mill rate as the rest of the City of Winnipeg. I think there should be consideration given. -- (Interjection) -- What? That's what you said not me. That's what you said. What I'm saying, if they haven't got the same services, if they haven't got the same services they should not be subject . . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. It is getting very difficult for the Chair to hear the honourable members. The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Chairman, I will advise the Finance Minister, I hope the Headingley people will have an opportunity to present their case before the Public Utilities Committee on Thursday morning and we'll all have better information and we'll all have a better idea what the people -- I believe that the people should have a right to participate in a democratic process. I think it's only right that we don't impose the type of legislation on people if they don't like it. I think it's morally wrong of any government to impose something on people that's against their wishes. And in respect to Headingley I say they have not, they have not the same services as we have in the rest of the City of Winnipeg so surely we shouldn't expect to collect the same tax, the same mill rate, they shouldn't be assessed the same mill rate as the rest of the people in Winnipeg.

The Minister says that everybody has accepted and everybody is happy with the Unicity, everybody is happy with the assessment. -- (Interjection) -- Well, I think you sounded most hopeful and quite enthusiastic that everything was great. What I'm saying to the Minister, there is more people looking for five acres of land for lots, for properties out of the City of Winnipeg in the last while than there has ever been in the City of Winnipeg before. Everyone's looking for a piece of property outside the City of Winnipeg, and surely if the people in Headingley have to pay the same mill rate as the rest of Winnipeg and have no services, have no transportation facilities, have no sewer services, have no water services and even have no telephone services, well surely you're driving them out, you're driving them out. Why should they pay 72.9 mills if -- (Interjection) -- Well what's the difference, it's proportion, it's the same -- I say that the assessment should be reduced considerably because they haven't got the services.

My biggest concern is and I believe this is what the people are concerned about, the people are alarmed, that it's easy for the Minister to say we agree, we agree what the Opposition was saying last year. We agree that, you know, there has to be more money put into the transition period. And he has accepted that himself because he increased the transition grant from 1 1/2 million to 3 1/2 million. I spoke on a grievance motion and I said that the least the government could have done is put in at least six million dollars to make it worthwhile, but the big concern of the people is what happens after the transition period is over. What happens? Will the tax in St. James and Assiniboia will it be doubled, will the people that are paying 800 tax will they be paying 1600 in a matter of three years? And really this is what will happen.

I know the Minister says well there was a gradual increase, that we're not responsible for that. And I'm sure that one of the other members pointed it out to the Minister, and I'll quote you the mill rate for every year. In '64 it was 38 mills; 65 39 -- St. James-Assiniboia-- 66 41, so every year you have about one mill to two mill increase. In 1967 it was dropped to 36 mills; 68 you had 41 mills, there was increased back to what it was -- 68 and 66 was the same; '69 you had 49 mills; 1970 53 mills; 1971, 55 mills; this year 72.9 mills, for an increase of 17.3 mills or 30 percent increase, a 30 percent increase. And really the people in St. James-Assiniboia, Charleswood, will get crumbs, really they will get very little and still I think that you accept the fact that you had to do something because you've increased the transitional grants, you've doubled them, almost doubled them. I say to really make it worthwhile

(MR. PATRICK cont'd) . . . . you should have increased it to at least \$6 million, but the point is what happens in four years' time? It doesn't matter how hard the City of Winnipeg would try to keep the line down on costs, how hard they are going to try to keep the costs down, according to your figures, your own figures, the people will have to pay almost double or the tax -- it will be a 50 percent increase -- (Interjection) -- that's right, that's right.

Now, the Minister said that he didn't tell the people, that he didn't tell the people how many will have an increase. The Minister's own brochure, the green and white brochure that I quoted from a few days ago, and it stated in that brochure that 80 or 85 percent of the people will have reduced taxes as a result of Unicity.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs.

MR. CHERNIACK: On a matter of privilege. The member on the last occasion -- (Interjection) -- further privilege, there's a misquotation here. The member previously made this statement -- the member then was asked to read the whole thing which gave a different picture, and now he's again repeating a misstatement.

MR. CHAIRMAN: . . . speaking on a point of privilege -- whether it's meant for the honourable member's attention.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well, Mr. Speaker, may I get it clear again. I don't pretend to know the rules that well. My understanding was that when there's a definite misquotation then on the earliest opportunity the member misquoted has a right to rise on a matter of privilege. Now if I'm wrong, tell me I'm out of order, I'll sit down. But if I'm right, give me the opportunity to make my point of privilege.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister . . .

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, the member has just again repeated a statement which is absolutely untrue. I never stated in that brochure or anywhere else that there would be a reduction in taxation for 85 percent or for anybody in the future years. Never did I say it. I want a quotation to show that I did say that.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Chairman, I did not say that the Minister said -- but I said the brochure that he distributed at the meetings -- when you held public meetings . . .

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, on the same point the brochure did not state that, and the brochure is a printed document -- and surely the member can prove exactly what he's saying.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Chairman, I haven't got the brochure in front of me. I read it into the record about two weeks ago when I went on a grievance motion and the Minister asked me a question at the same time. He said would you repeat it. I got up and I quoted the paragraph that states where the people have a reduction in taxes. And I repeated it, and I repeated it, and I repeated at that time two or three times what was said in the brochure; I quoted right out of the brochure and there was no denials because I read it from the brochure. -- (Interjection) -- I did not have to retract anything, I just read what the brochure said. And it indicated or said that there would be a reduction -- (Interjection) -- Okay, if there wasn't a reduction that there would be no increase -- (Interjection) -- That's what it said, that's right. And what I'm saying what's happening now, 85 percent of the people have an increase in tax with an exception of East Kildonan and a very small portion of St. Norbert -- everybody else has a very substantial increase. St. James-Assiniboia has a 30 percent increase -- and the Minister cannot deny that the debates that took place here last year, and a lot of the points that were made and mentioned are correct today in view of the budgets that are now prepared by the City of Winnipeg. And surely the Minister can't deny that. He can also not deny that people should not pay the same mill rate when they haven't got the same services as the other parts of the City of Winnipeg. I think it's incorrect; it's wrong. I don't think that people should be subjected to that type of taxes; I think it's a complete injustice to the people. But we will probably not finish the Estimates tonight, Mr. Chairman -- I will get a brochure, perhaps we will have an opportunity to quote it to the -- (Interjection) -- No, I guess the Minister hasn't got one because he doesn't like it probably or doesn't like reading from it any more.

So my points are, Mr. Chairman, the increase much appreciated -- the increase is not high enough, not sufficient for the people in some parts that were going to be hit with a very high increase. I think that the Minister accepted there was an increase required for the transitional period; I think the increase should have been at least double that to what it is.

And the second point -- I don't think the people should be subjected to pay the tax when

(MR. PATRICK cont'd) . . . . they don't get the services to what other parts of the City of Winnipeg get.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. The hour being 9 o'clock, the hour for Private Members' Hour has arrived. Committee rise and report. Call in the Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply have adopted certain resolutions, directed me to report the same, and asks leave to sit again.

#### IN SESSION

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

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

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

#### PRIVATE MEMBERS' RESOLUTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: Tuesday night the first order of business in Private Members' Hour is private bills. Second reading of private Bill No. 26. The Honourable Member for Inkster. (Stand)

Adjourned debates on second reading of public bills. Proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie. The Honourable Member for St. Vital. Bill No. 19.

MR. WALDING: Mr. Speaker, I have nothing to add to the debate that has taken place up until this time. I'm willing to see this come to a vote.

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

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I would ask you to call ayes and nays, and if necessary a recorded vote.

MR. SPEAKER: Very well. Pardon?

MR. G. JOHNSTON: I understand there were "nays" mentioned -- that's why I asked for a vote.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

Order, please. The motion before the House is Bill No. 19, second reading of adoption. A STANDING VOTE was taken, the results being as follows:

YEAS: Messrs. Bilton, Craik, McKellar, G. Johnston, Froese, McKenzie, McGill, Jorgenson, Einarson, Patrick, Barkman, Girard, F. Johnston, Ferguson, Blake, Moug and Mrs. Trueman.

NAYS: Messrs. Schreyer, Petursson, Cherniack, Mackling, Uskiw, Miller, Shafransky, Burtniak, Borowski, Pawley, McBryde, Barrow, Boyce, Gottfried, Walding, Johannson, Malinowski, Adam, Turnbull and Jenkins.

MR. CLERK: Yeas 17; Nays 20.

MR. SPEAKER: In my opinion the nays have it and I declare the motion lost. The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. BEARD: Mr. Speaker, I just became paired with the Minister of Education. If I had voted, I'd have voted for the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rupertsland.

MR. ALLARD: Mr. Speaker, I was paired with the Honourable Minister of Health and Social Development. Had I voted, I would have voted for the resolution.

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion, second reading of the motion of the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre. The Honourable Member for Riel. Bill No. 30.

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, I adjourned this resolution not because I had any great plans or burning convictions to speak on it; nor do I stand now and speak on behalf of the members of the House on this side, because I fully expect that the vote on this particular issue will be entirely a free vote and therefore I can speak only on behalf of myself on this particular issue. I don't usually preface a few remarks with those remarks, Mr. Speaker, except in this case I'm sure that on this side of the House I'm probably in a minority when I make those remarks, and therefore I say them.

This bill has been with us, has been before us so many times before that I really don't think there is anybody going to switch positions or change their vote by anything that's said in the House at this time. Therefore my remarks will be short, and I rather hope that the other remarks that deal with the bill are fairly short as well. It's also been in the committee stage

(MR. CRAIK cont'd) . . . . and has been dealt with there at some length. All sides of the argument have been aired. Basically the two sides of the argument are: Other people with similar qualifications have had use of the "doctor" title. That use has been granted by acts of the Legislature, and on those grounds I suppose there are good reasons why people of the qualifications which the optometrist holds -- why they should be granted the use of the "doctor" title when they're compared with others such as the chiropractors who have had the privilege of using the title for some time. And without getting into the specifics I think, in general, that comparison can be made.

On the other side of the equation is the argument that the "doctor" title has been conferred and developed through a long history of the academic institutions, and therefore their recommendations and their granting of the title should be held with a degree of reservation and respect before it is granted elsewhere. In addition to that of course we have the academic institutions which do grant honorary degrees in addition to those that are granted through the earned type of degree and I use the quotation "earned" in terms of referring to academic pursuit. The honorary degrees are granted to people of course who have earned them undoubtedly, such as the late Dr. Tom Lamb in the Province of Manitoba who earned it despite the fact that he had a Grade 3 education -- and certainly he deserved the highest degree which this province's institutions could grant upon him. So I don't question that, Mr. Speaker, but I must say that I cannot support the present move just basically on the personal conviction that which basically this comes down to as one's own personal conviction. I think that the Doctor title in the field of Medicine should be restricted to the academic institutions who grant them to people who earn them through academic pursuit. We have a report that is available to the Members of the Committee and the Members of the Legislature and it's pretty clear from that report that there are strong reservations in Manitoba against the granting of that Degree.

As I say, I think that one's decision on this is quite personal and in my own case I've spent many years acting on bodies who had to examine foreign students and foreign people from foreign countries coming into Canada who had to be judged in terms of their academic qualification for purposes of entering university or for entering the professions. And having gone through that and spent probably days and months in total time screening through these applications of people that come through, I think that it's pretty fair to say that the academic institutions have over a long time developed a pretty solid way and method of determining the mechanisms by which, and the type of degree which is granted to those people. I think that unless they are prepared to back up and say that the Doctor title particularly in the medical or para-medical field is to be expanded for use by those other than those that are now designated, that it would not be right, particularly in my own case, in fact would be a compromise of my own past, if I supported it at this time. I expect that argument's unique, I don't expect anybody else in particular would have that sort of rationale for arriving at a conclusion. That happens to be mine and without saying very much else on the Bill I simply want to say that my feelings on it in terms of the overall are not terribly strong but in terms of my own position on it I will oppose this Bill.

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, because there are other speakers and I sense a desire for the members to have a vote on this I shall be quite brief in my remarks.

I believe a Bill such as Bill 30 has been before the House now for I think three years but I could stand to be corrected. The Member for Souris-Killarney has reminded me that a Bill similar to Bill 30 has been before the House for five years now. Surely a decision should be made.

Last year a similar Bill was referred, the contents of the Bill were referred to the Professional Services Committee for study with a recommendation coming back to the House. The recommendation really is meaningless because the House decides what shall or shall not be done by way of a majority vote. So just to remind the members one more time: What are the Optometrists asking for? They are asking for the use of the simple term Doctor of Optometry, not Doctor. It's quite clear what they have in mind and it's quite clear what they are allowed to advertise; and it's quite clear that "Doctor of Optometry" will not be a misleading term to the general public.

Let us examine the problems of rural Manitoba with respect to services, professional services: a shortage of Doctors, a shortage of Dentists, a shortage of Lawyers, a shortage of people -- (Interjection) -- Well the Minister of Education says he doesn't believe it.

(MR. G. JOHNSTON cont'd) . . . . Perhaps the Minister of Higher Education should go out in the province, to the small towns and the small communities and see the obvious lack of health care. Let us talk about the shortage of professional services in the rural areas of the province. You can see it in the children's mouths, shortage of dentists. You can see it in the health care that is supplied to the north. The Northern Commissioner, the new Minister will attest to this. That there is a shortage of professional people outside of the urban areas.

So by the passage of this Bill, Mr. Speaker, we will encourage graduates of the University of Waterloo to come here, whether they were from another province or whether or not they went from this province to that University. If this Bill is passed, Mr. Speaker, there will be an immediate improvement in eye care in Manitoba. The graduates who will be graduating this spring from the University of Waterloo will then look at Manitoba and say there's a place we can go with our diploma, but right now they will not. Right now they will not. So I suggest to members of the House, and I take into account the argument of the Member for Riel who is a professional in his field. I know how he feels about the subject, but I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that by passage of this Bill we will improve eye care in the rural areas of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, peculiarly enough I agree with both the Member for Portage la Prairie and the Member for Riel in much of what they said, and peculiarly enough they are apparently each going to vote in different ways on this Bill. The impression I have is that the Member for Portage la Prairie is voting in favour of the Bill and the Member for Riel is voting against it. So since I'm going to vote in favour of the Bill I want to just put on record what my view is on this and again it's a personal view.

I agree with what the Member for Riel said about the importance of recognizing only those who achieved a degree from an institution and studied for it and got it. And on that basis I think that they're entitled to the use of the term Doctor and in this case "of Optometry". They worked for it they got it. Now the present Act as I understand it has a section that says that they may use that prefix, if that's the word, yes prefix or title Doctor, providing the University of Manitoba is prepared to recognize the institution which granted that degree. That's my understanding. My understanding is the University of Manitoba never did want to get involved in assessing other universities or other colleges and therefore never gave their concurrence, and I don't blame the University of Manitoba. But I do think that people who have earned a degree should be entitled to use it. I don't think there will be confusion in the minds of people any more and I'm sure a lot less than there is confusion in the minds of people, whether a Doctor of Chiropractic or I don't know, of Podiatrists or what other areas are allowed to use the -- Chiropodists -- are allowed to use the prefix Doctor. I think that people who have gone to college, spent time, earned a degree are entitled to use the name. But I don't go as far as this Bill goes and that is that anybody who has practiced optometry can use the prefix Doctor whether or not he has received a degree. I know very well that there are Optometrists in the Province of Manitoba who've put in time and study and effort at colleges which didn't grant the degree of Doctorate, but granted a diploma of some kind, and I think that's too bad that that shouldn't be an entitlement to them to use the prefix Doctor.

The Optometrists when they came before a committee some years back said we want it for all or none. And I say okay if you Optometrists want it for all or none then my answer has to be none. But if you are willing to recognize that a man has earned a degree, or a person has earned a degree, and recognize that the institution from which he earned it is one that has proper standards for the practice of Optometry then by all means I think that a person who has earned the degree of Doctorate should be entitled to use the prefix Doctor of Optometry.

Therefore I support the Bill insofar as the first portion of it is concerned which recognizes that a man who has the degree can use the degree or the prefix Doctor. I oppose the second portion of the Bill which is a sort of a grandfather clause, and then automatically and to that extent I fully agree with the Member for Riel, if he has never earned it in an academic institution then I don't think that he has a grandfather clause right to acquire that.

The only other point I would make is that there is probably the opportunity for mailorder colleges to sell degrees for whatever they want, 25 bucks or so, and therefore I feel that the Optometric Society which I believe is a responsible professional body in Manitoba, which has proper attitudes, I think that they should have that authority which was in the present Act given to University of Manitoba that if the Optometric Society as such is prepared to recognize

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) . . . . an institution of higher learning which grants a degree, then on the recognition of that institution then any graduate who walks out with a degree should be entitled to use it. But I do oppose the thought that there is some grandfather clause which is in this Bill which says that if you practice Optometry and have not earned the prefix at an academic institution you can still use it. That's the position, for that reason I will vote for the Bill, but in Committee I would hope that we could knock out the grandfather clause and I hope that we can put in a power to the Optometric Society to decide which institution of higher learning is an acceptable one whose degree should be recognized.

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

MR. EARL McKellar (Souris-Killarney): Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say a word on this Bill 30. As mentioned by other speakers, it's been before this House for many years, I just can't relate but I think it's five years or longer and each time it gets kicked aside and passed back to the professional committee. Sometimes they have referred it back to the House. This last year I understand the Committee's report is pretty unanimous not to accept the Bill in the present form. But I have always been one of those who have supported this Bill, I supported it on the idea that a man who gets his degree in a University, be it in Canada, the United States, or whatever it may be, and he's allowed to use the name Doctor in that particular province or state should be allowed to use the name Doctor in Manitoba. And it's right that most of the graduates from Waterloo University are allowed to call themselves Doctor in the Province of Ontario so why in my opinion should we in Manitoba disallow them that particular privilege?

As mentioned by the Member for Portage la Prairie, we do have a shortage of professional people, especially Optometrists and Dentists in rural Manitoba. And it's going to get worse as the population decreases. But I'm not voting for the Bill for that very reason. I'm voting for the Bill because I think it's right and proper that they should retain the name Doctor when they arrive in the Province of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, in the University of Brandon this past year we had a Professor from an American University come there to teach psychology, with all the papers and all the recommendations and the name Doctor being used. He arrived in September, he left in April. He left for his own personal reasons. But he wasn't a doctor, he was a cab driver camouflaging as a psychology professor. Mr. Speaker, he got by, I don't know how the students did, but he got by for eight months in the City of Brandon, and if a cab driver can use the name Doctor what's wrong with an Optometrist using the name Doctor?

Mr. Speaker, in the Church which I belong, the United Church, many of the preachers are called Doctors. They are called Doctors but they are not Medical Doctors, they're not Medical Doctors, they've obtained the name Doctor from United College down here, down on Portage Avenue. The name Doctor is bestowed on many people at many convocation exercises, not only in the Province of Manitoba but all across Canada at this particular time at all the graduations. In Brandon this past Saturday a lady who works as a representative of the Children's Aid Society, it was conveyed on her the name Doctor, Mrs. Reisberry. And she is no Medical Doctor, she knows nothing about Optometry, she knows nothing about the United Church, all she's interested in her lifetime is the Children's Aid Society. And if Mrs. Reisberry can be called Doctor what's wrong with Optometrists being called Doctor in the Province of Manitoba? I think it's an injustice, as a legislator for the past 14 years I feel that I am partly responsible for this omission and this neglect, that Optometrists have been denied the right to call themselves Doctor. But only when they have the degree will I agree, and I agree, this is one time when I agree with the Minister of Finance. Very seldom do he and I. I must say that I agree with the member here to my left but I can't say that I agree with my colleague to my right. I am not in the same position as the Minister of Finance.

But we in this Legislature don't come here to be the same. We come here to express our own individual personal decisions and express them here on the floor of the House. I would like to say to all the members in this Chamber that I think it is our duty and our responsibility to stand up and vote for this Bill otherwise I think this Bill will be back again. Maybe back again and we'll have to face it once more. And there's going to be an election in another year and the characters will change as sure as I'm standing here. And some day they're going to get this Bill through. Some day they're going to get it through, some day. So let's be trusting, let's be patient and let's convey to the Optometrists of the Province of Manitoba our goodwill and thanks for all their endeavours and their work in our Province of

(MR. McKELLAR cont'd) . . . . Manitoba over the years.

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

MR. WALDING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We've seen some division of opinion on the Opposition benches so perhaps it would be in order for us to display some division of opinion on this side too.

Mr. Speaker, like the previous speakers, I don't intend to take up much time on this. I did speak last session when it came up and I believe that I made my position quite clear at that time. There were just a couple of points that I wanted to raise. Firstly, the Member for Portage la Prairie, claimed that the passage of this Bill would result in a large influx of Optometrists from other areas into the rural parts of Manitoba. He didn't give us any basis for that statement, and I would take issue with him very seriously and suggest that whether a man can call himself Doctor or not would have very little effect on whether an optometrist would set up practice in a particular area. An optometrist like every other person who makes his living, he's out to get the best deal for himself. An optometrist like every other professional wishing to set up practice does so by judging the possibilities of that particular area. If the area looks good and it's likely to be lucrative he'll set up shop there; if it doesn't he won't whether you call him Doctor or anything else.

The second point I wish to bring up was a statement of the Minister of Finance who stated that there was no confusion in the public mind between optometrists and eye doctors -- I'm sorry, correction, he said there would be no more than with chiropractors and medical doctors. I can assure him that as of right now there is a great deal of confusion in the public mind as to the difference between an optician, an optometrist, an ophthalmologist, an ophthalmologist, an oculist and a few others as well.

But one safeguard that the public has at the moment, Mr. Speaker, is that if they go to a man to get their eyes examined and he's called a doctor they know that he is a doctor. If they go to a man to get their eyes examined and if he is not called a doctor then they know that he is not a doctor. Very simple.

Now during the hearings by the Professional Association Committee, the optometrists were one of the groups that came before us and put forward their case. One question that we asked then, one question that was overriding all of our deliberations on that committee was: Is this in the public interest, or is this something which is in the personal interest of the persons at concern. And, Mr. Speaker, we were not able to get any clear answer from the optometrists that this was in fact in the public interest. For were it in the public interest it would surely act to remove some of the confusion that is presently within the public mind; and if it is a matter of personal interest to the optometrists then we could expect the sort of thing that would only increase that confusion.

Now as a result of these hearings, the Professional Associations Committee came up with a couple of recommendations which are very much in line with what the Minister of Finance has suggested; in that optometrists who had graduated from the University of Waterloo having earned that doctorate degree should be allowed to use it, and that other optometrists should not be granted the same right through legislation. To my recollection these recommendations were unanimous in the Professional Associations Committee and I have no doubt that if this bill passes second reading and goes to committee that I would support those two recommendations. However looking at this bill simply from the point of view of public interest I cannot see how this measure could in any way benefit the public interest, and I would oppose it on those grounds.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: . . . permit a question? I know that now that an oculist is both an ophthalmologist and an optometrist. What is an ocularist?

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

MR. WALDING: An ocularist is a term used for a man who fits artificial eyes.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, having heard several of the members indicating as to how they're going to vote on the bill before us, I think I should also indicate or qualify my vote as some have done. The Minister of Finance gave us his reasons why he voted a certain way. He also mentioned that he believed that the Association of Optometrists were quite capable of disciplining themselves. I was going to check the Act itself that we are amending. I haven't done so but I imagine the powers are there so that they can do this, that they have the power

(MR. FROESE cont'd) . . . . to exercise and discipline where necessary. I notice also as the Minister stated that the grandfather's clause in there -- that those that are practicing optometry this year will be entitled to receive the title of Doctor. On that basis I know honorary doctorate degrees are conferred on people every so often and maybe we should have Doctors of Politics or probably Doctors of Legislation. I think we've got members of long standing and we have from the preceding government members who are now drawing pensions, and therefore they must have been in office quite some time so that maybe there should be such legislation passed that such degrees might be conferred on certain people.

Nevertheless I think that the bill would entice certain people to come here. This has been the very fact that has been stated on past committee meetings when law amendments committee dealt with bills of this nature in past years -- that we were told that if this was done more candidates, more graduates from other colleges who would have the qualifications would come here and practice here. And if that is the case, Mr. Speaker, I don't think we can go wrong. I think we need more people practising in this field in Manitoba and especially in rural areas, and therefore I think we can support the bill and have it go to committee; and most likely we'll be hearing further representation this year again and then make a final decision on it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. BEARD: Well you're either for it or agin it and I guess I'm against it so, unlike the Minister of Finance I am not going to waffle on it. I don't believe he was for it at one time if I'm not mistaken. Didn't you vote against it at one time? -- (Interjection) -- I really haven't got too much more that I can add than I've said before. But I guess it has to be said again, because the Member for Winnipeg Centre seems to be just as obstinate as the rest of us as far as listening goes, and he doesn't want to hear it -- but I don't think this is the place that you make doctors. -- (Interjection) -- Universities are the places that you create doctors and give titles. We can make quacks here, and this is what I'm afraid could happen if we open the doors -- and maybe that's what we've got here -- (Interjection) -- the Member for Rhineland says -- and maybe he's not too far off at that.

But I think that one thing the optometrists must face up to, and that is if they insist on wanting to be considered Doctor in any way, shape or form they must be prepared to follow the medical policies that are laid down for MDs -- and that is that you don't prescribe, you don't sell what you're going to prescribe -- and they're not willing to do this. We've gone all over that with doctors in the past, and decided that doctors cannot sell the drugs that they're prescribing, etc. And in this case they want to follow through with this type of assistance -- and I don't believe it's right, particularly when they're talking about the eyes. I recognize that optometry plays an important part in rural Manitoba, and will continue to whether they're called Doctors of Optometry or not. And whether we stand here and make speeches about the optometrists from now to kingdom come, they will still be practising in rural Manitoba; whether they're called Doctors will not make a bit of difference. They'll still be there if there's a dollar to be made; but if there isn't a dollar to be made they won't be practising in rural Manitoba. So it depends entirely on the financial status as far as rural parts of the province are concerned, and I think that we have to keep that in mind because it's very very important. And I think that when the rural people come forward and say this is going to be the salvation as far as rural Manitoba goes; I can't follow through with this type of thinking. And always when I'm faced with this I look over to those people in the medical fields who have spent up to seven and nine years in medical universities studying, and I don't think that we should be putting ourselves on the line where we're taking the chance of having these people compared with those that have studied for many years.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The hour of adjournment having arrived, the House is accordingly adjourned until 2:30 tomorrow afternoon.