

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA  
2:30 o'clock, Friday, September 26, 1969

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed with the Orders of the Day for this afternoon, I wish to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery where we have 70 students of Grade 5 standing of the Mulvey School. These students are under the direction of Mrs. Fridfinnson, Mrs. Barlishen and Miss Rommelaere. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Wolseley.

And we have with us 50 students of the Golden Gate School of Grade 9 standing under the direction of Mr. Colby. This school is in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

On behalf of all the honourable members of the Legislative Assembly I welcome you here today.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' PUBLIC BILLS

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, there has been a consensus arrived at that you should be asked to call the second reading of the Private Members' public bills appearing on Page 13 before you proceed with the Private Members' resolutions.

MR. SPEAKER: The second reading of Bill No. 40, The Manitoba Centennial Lottery Act. The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood) presented Bill No. 40, The Manitoba Centennial Lottery Act, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, the honourable members who have had an opportunity to look at Bill 40, The Manitoba Centennial Lottery Act, will see in very clear terms that, at first glance at any rate, it deals with all the provisos for the maintenance of proper procedure, tabling of reports, auditing and so on, with all the technical matters. As to the purpose and intent of the lottery, I think that one requires some explanation in order to understand the intent of the bill.

The first thing that I would like to point out is that this bill will allow one, and only one, lottery in 1970 - it's a one-occasion bill. It will not permit, if and when passed, permission to any other organization to hold lotteries, so it really is a bill in the singular, "a lottery." It does not open up the whole question of allowing lotteries to any organization that wishes to hold one. This is for the Centennial year; in other words, it will take effect for 1970.

The Manitoba Centennial Corporation requested this bill, I think, for two basic reasons. I suppose that I was approached because I have done some work for the Centennial itself. Some of the honourable members might recall a couple of years ago I approached each one for a hundred-dollar donation to the Club of the Century. That may have pained them, but nevertheless that will remind them that I was active on several committees. The Centennial Corporation wishes to achieve two things, I think, with this bill; first, to raise funds for province-wide projects; and secondly, to involve the citizens of the province. On the first point, the proceeds coming from the lottery will be for province-wide projects; they will not be for example, to go into construction at the Centennial Centre on Main Street in Winnipeg. The funds will be distributed throughout the province. And secondly, as I said, it would in effect involve people.

The Corporation has raised millions of dollars through private citizens and corporations and various groups since its inception in 1962, and this has helped keep the cost of the Centennial down to the taxpayer and to the government. Many thousands of citizens have been involved. The bill is brought forward at this time because of amendments to the federal Criminal Code, which provides for the holding of lotteries or sweepstakes on a province by province basis. It's permissive legislation and the bill, of course, would meet all the requirements of the new amended Criminal Code. The province has the right to pass the enabling legislation.

The details of the lottery are yet to be worked out. I think one of the valuable outcomes of this debate, I hope, would be that some members will put forward some suggestions and I think that all suggestions will be taken into account, because the exact form and nature of the lottery are yet to be determined. If you refer to the bill, you will see that there is a section which calls for regulations which will be passed by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council to determine such things as the form of the lottery, the amount and value of prizes and so on. I don't think that the detail is important. It could be, for example, I suppose a simple draw,

(MR. DOERN cont'd.) . . . . that all the names could be put into a barrel and the winner (probably winners, plural) would be pulled out. It could be connected with some Centennial kind of event, something more exciting. If we, I suppose, had a canoe race, maybe certain people could draw -- we draw so many tickets out and they would get a canoe in the race and then the winning canoe would get the first prize and so on. Or a horse race, or any other project.

A MEMBER: Crown and Anchor.

MR. DOERN: Crown and Anchor. I'll put you down for that suggestion. I don't really think that the details have to be worked out and I'd be interested to hear what members opposite have to say in this regard. I think that the price too, for example, is not determined, because many things will be considered, but I think obviously if it is going to be a lottery, the price will have to be reasonable. It certainly couldn't be of the order of \$10.00 a ticket; I think it would probably be more of the order of \$2.00 or \$2.50, and the amount of the prize and the amount of the money raised is difficult to determine. I would venture a guess that we could probably raise several hundred thousand dollars on a lottery, bearing in mind that no other organization in Manitoba will in fact hold one and that all attention will be focused on this.

MR. Speaker, I have agreed to present this legislation on behalf of the Corporation because I agree with the aims of the Corporation, I support their activities, and I recommend this bill to the House.

MR. G. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Would the honourable member permit a question? Does this mean that anybody or any service club or group that conducted a lottery would be prosecuted?

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I am not a lawyer. I can only say that this bill will allow for one, and only one, lottery. That lottery will be conducted by the Centennial Corporation. I assume that this, as up to the present or, in the future unless special permission is being granted, that anyone who would conduct a lottery, this procedure would I suppose be illegal. This bill will not allow anyone to hold a lottery.

MR. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): . . . . the honourable member, there is a question I would like to be cleared, on the same line of question as from the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie. I'm not a lawyer either and -- do curling clubs and people of this nature, now that it's legal by federal government standards, have to come to have permission to hold the lottery for the draws and things of this nature? What I'd like to say: is this going to be like an Irish sweepstake sort of lottery and there will be the little ones held in districts as well? You don't mean that they're out, these smaller lotteries?

MR. DOERN: Well, I assume that anything that is legal now will be legal in 1970. Lotteries in the sense of, you know, these bigger things, they are not legal now and they will not be legal in 1970 other than in this one particular instance. I understand the Criminal Code has made some changes in regard to smaller draws and prizes under \$100.00. Thousands of raffles and so on are held now, and I suppose they will continue. This bill will only allow this one larger scheme and no other.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a further question to the member if he would accept the question. Will bets be accepted from those people who the government now consider are not able to pay their own medical care premiums?

MR. DOERN: Tickets will be available to anyone.

MR. GORDON W. BEARD (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, what would the Centennial Committee do if they lay an egg and they don't collect as much as what they've advertised for prizes? Who would put up the funds if they went in the hole?

MR. DOERN: . . . . all these details are worked out. I suppose there are two ways of handling a lottery. One is that you put up a certain prize, for example \$100,000, and that if you raised several hundred thousand on tickets, you'd get all the money over that. A second procedure would be that the prize varies in relation to the total number of tickets sold and the total dollar amount, so, for example, the prize might grow larger as the amount of tickets sold grows larger. I think these are details which will be worked out.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the honourable member would permit a question. He may have mentioned it and I may have missed it because I did come in late. Has he indicated an amount which would be the maximum amount that would be in fact raised by the lottery? Has he indicated to the House the maximum amount that would be raised by the lottery?

MR. DOERN: The maximum amount? There is no maximum amount. I don't think that we can predict entirely that we'll sell a million tickets at \$2.50. I don't think there's a maximum. Maybe you could clarify your question.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, it's very simple. There is going to be permission for a lottery for the one organization in the province. Surely there is some consideration given as to the amount of money that would be the maximum amount of money that would be intended to be realized by the lottery.

MR. DOERN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I can only give you a guess, that I imagine that the expenses for the lottery, you would require a certain minimum staff and a certain amount of expenditure for advertising and so on, and I think that this would undoubtedly be, you know, under \$100,000, but that the maximum projection that could be aimed for would be of the order of several hundred thousand dollars in ticket sales, so if you subtract the cost of hiring staff and advertising from the amount of tickets sold, I would assume a figure of a couple of hundred thousand. I can't tell my honourable friend how many tickets we will sell, but I assume that there would be a market for a hundred thousand tickets. If we sell 250,000 tickets we'll make more money.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, a subsequent question. Then I take it that for the purpose of this lottery the Centennial Corporation is only hoping or will only be raising a net figure of about \$200,000 - \$300,000.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, that is only a guesstimate. I think there is no limit on the amount of money that the Centennial Corporation could realize from the lottery. It will depend on how well the ticket sales go.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I have another question for the honourable member. He indicated that all attention would be focused on this lottery because there would be no other lottery in competition, but is he aware of the fact that the Civic Charities Endorsement Bureau do in fact endorse many fund-raising functions that will probably be taking place during the period of time, and which raise substantial sums of money.

MR. DOERN: . . . . see no problem there, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

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

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could have the permission of the House Member for Swan River to speak to this Bill.

MR. BILTON: Yes.

MR. SCHREYER: The adjournment stands in your name.

MR. BILTON: I'm adjourning it to stand in my name, yes. Yes, if the Honourable Member wishes to, he may speak on it. -- the Honourable First Minister, I beg your pardon.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, in this case the Honourable Member for Swan River was right the first time. This is a Private Members' bill; it is not being put forward as a government bill, and so I'm speaking to it as a member of this House and not as First Minister, simply to make the point, which I've already done, that this is a Private Members' bill and that it is hoped that all members in this House will take this to be genuinely so. The purpose of the bill would be to give the Centennial Corporation, which is really the Citizens of Manitoba Corporation, a means by which revenue can be raised for many of the good works and purposes which the Centennial Corporation has in mind.

I understand full well that there are many questions of detail as to how this lottery is to be operated and what happens to the funds if there be, in fact, a great surplus of funds. Or, as the Honourable Member for Churchill asked, what happens if the lottery does not succeed in raising enough to meet expenses? It would seem obvious in the latter case that the liability, if this ever happens, would have to be assumed by the Crown. That much seems evident, although we wouldn't be opposed to the notion that if there is some loss sustained, that we try by public as well as private subscription to raise the funds, Sir. All in all, the important point to note in connection with this bill, Mr. Speaker, is that it is really hoped that our Centennial celebration in 1970 will be one of maximum participation by the citizens of the province, and that it is hoped in that connection that the lottery will not only be a fund-raising venture, but that the event of the lottery itself will be a significant part of Centennial celebrations.

I realize full well that there are some in our society, indeed in this House, who are opposed in principle to the notion of lotteries being used for the purpose of raising revenues

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd.) . . . . for public purposes. And I tend to agree with that position. However, I argue with all the emphasis I can muster, Mr. Speaker, that when it comes to an event such as a Centennial, where the emphasis is on fun, unabashedly on fun and on celebrating, that a lottery does have justification. And I certainly do agree with those who say that a lottery in itself can be an event within a planned Centennial celebration program. I don't know to what extent I should go into details of how it's proposed that the lottery be worked. Some have suggested, for example, that the lottery if enacted here would be so programmed that there would be a draw some time early in 1970 and a number of prizes in the order of \$1,000 each, and in the following month a number of draws again, the winners receiving a couple of thousand dollars each, and that it progressively be staged upward so that at the time of the grand draw it would have been worked to the point where the prizes are quite large indeed.

It is hoped, too, that if Manitoba is to proceed with Centennial promotion campaigns in other cities in Canada that the sale of Manitoba Centennial lottery tickets could be carried out in conjunction with Manitoba Centennial promotion campaigns, for example in Montreal, Toronto, Ottawa and in western cities in our country. I find the notion of a Centennial lottery to be the kind of idea that works in very well with the kind of promotion campaign that is envisaged in respect to our Centennial in other provinces, and also works in very well with the planned celebrations for Centennial programming here in our own home province.

If members who are opposed to lotteries as a means of raising revenue could bring to mind this point, I feel it would help in persuading them to support this bill. They could bring this to mind; that we are not really proposing - not only in the government; when I say "we" I mean those who support the bill - we are not proposing this bill as a means of raising public revenues. We are proposing it, rather, as a means of providing revenue for a citizens' celebration program, the Centennial program itself. I think most members would agree that we should not regard Manitoba's Centennial and the costs thereof as a governmental thing. In fact, those who have worked so hard on Centennial planning are representative of every political party in this province. Partisanship has very little, if anything, to do with it. It is really a citizens' effort in the fullest sense of the word, and a Private Members' bill proposing a lottery to help, to assist the Centennial program, is very much in keeping with that spirit. So with those few words, Mr. Speaker, I merely want to emphasize, the Centennial is a citizens' effort, the bill is a Private Members' bill.

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

MR. BUD BOYCE (Winnipeg Centre) presented Bill No. 42, an Act to amend The Winnipeg Charter, 1956 (1), for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. BOYCE: Mr. Speaker, it's spelled out rather succinctly in the explanatory notes accompanying the printing of the bill, and I would solicit the co-operation of the House that this is rather an important matter to the City of Winnipeg because the situation which is wished to be rectified by the passage of this bill, if it isn't proceeded with, it will necessitate a by-election if not passed before October 1st, so I would ask the co-operation of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Official Opposition.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, . . . . indicate that as for our group we're quite prepared to see this go to Committee today - we understand that there is some urgency - and not hold the debate up at this point so that representation may be heard from those that are interested.

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, we in this group are in agreement with the principle in the bill. We understand the awkward position that the Council is in. By their present by-laws they would have to have a by-election now, and to make a change in their Charter to allow by-elections to be held in connection with their regular annual elections is quite an order. On the matter of the pensions for members of council, we are willing to allow this matter to go to the Committee where more discussion will be heard, and representations. But I would just like to make this one point: that the City of Winnipeg operates under a Charter, and I believe there are one or two other municipalities in Manitoba who do the same thing, and in order to have changes effected in their Charter they have to obtain the approval of this Legislature. Now, there are other cities and towns and municipalities who operate under the Municipal Act and they are governed by the sections of that Act and presently they do not have this right. So I would like to hear the government minister responsible enunciate the government policy in this respect; that is, if this House gives authority to the City of

(MR. G. JOHNSTON cont'd.) . . . . Winnipeg to change their Charter so that they may pay pensions to members of council, well then this same right should be carried through by government principle, government policy, where other municipalities have this same right. I note in the Act, or the bill as before us, which does not go into detail, there's no mention of a contributory pension plan. It just says that the City of Winnipeg may set up a pension plan and it mentions an upward limit of \$1,800 per year. -- (Interjection) -- Unless I've missed it there's no mention made of a contributory pension plan. This isn't a pension plan; it's a bonus or a gift. It's not a pension plan, as I understand it, if it is put into effect without contributions from the members who are going to benefit from the plan.

MR. CHERNIACK: I wonder, Mr. Speaker, just for clarification, if the honourable member would permit a question. Would the honourable member mind reading proposed Section 221 (6) which says: "The city may by by-law provide for the granting of contributory pensions."

MR. G. JOHNSTON: I apologize. I missed that so I withdraw my remarks in respect to the contributory pension plan. So, Mr. Speaker, we are quite willing for this bill to go to Committee.

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

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour)(Transcona): . . . . the understanding would be that we go on Private Members' resolutions, but may I before doing so, I understand, Mr. Speaker, that one of the honourable members of the Assembly today is celebrating a very important date, an anniversary in his life. I understand that today is the sixteenth wedding anniversary of the Honourable Member for Lakeside and his good wife, and I'm sure all would want to join in wishing him the best.

MR. ENNS: I thank the Honourable House Leader for his kind consideration and promise to be on my best behaviour for at least one week.

#### PRIVATE MEMBERS' RESOLUTIONS

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

MR. BEARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. When we closed last Friday, I believe it was - yes - we were considering the resolution in respect to air transportation for Manitoba and of course my resolution was concentrating more on the northern aspects of this important means of travel. On the outset I would like to remind members that this resolution had called for review in respect to Manitoba regional air carriers, also the federal air carrier policies in respect to northern isolated communities, and asking to consider the advisability of provincial governments requesting voting representation on the Department of Transport's Board issuing licences and a public review of northern services on an annual basis. And, for the information of members, I might once again point out that of course we're involved in two types; one, regional air carrier services such as TransAir, and the other northern charter services, particularly to the isolated communities. I would also again remind them that of course this is free enterprise systems and they're working on a franchise or monopoly on a public service, and I think this is very important to keep in mind because, of course, the fact that while we have been in fact, along with the Minister of Transportation, been attacked because we are looking into or asking government to look into free enterprise systems, certainly there is no request at this time to nationalize anything nor should it be asked that these be nationalized, only that there should be public review and certainly that government should have some control over what takes place in the province. And I think, as I go through this particular problem, you will find that half of this province at least has problems with this type of public transportation.

I have no particular axe to grind at this time with any one company or service, but I would say that all in all we are not progressing as fast as I would like to see this take place, and I would hope - and I emphasize this again, Mr. Speaker - I would hope that through a public debate such as this and through any publicity that it may get, that perhaps we can reassess air transportation in northern Manitoba, and we must keep in consideration following through this to the eastern Arctic, and this is a vast area, a growing area, and certainly it is as large or larger than anything that may take place between here and Toronto. If air service is going to be opened in northern Manitoba, then I think it has to come under public scrutiny and there has to be criticism, because there is discontent for many reasons on those areas which are being serviced.

(MR. BEARD cont'd.)

But let's take off and study TransAir for a little while. Now, we have just recently had publicity on the resignation of the president of TransAir, and in his resignation, Mr. Speaker, he emphasized the growth of this regional air carrier service this year, and he said there's been an increase of 39 percent in passenger service this year, 64 percent increase in charter service and expansion to northern service areas, and an increase in eastern Arctic rates and business. They have been able to reduce their flying costs through improved company productivity. So, on the other hand, we who live in the north and we, I think, who are the experts in at least the passenger service in having to use this particular vehicle, must point out some of the problems that they have had.

Four managers in four years. Does this sound reasonable to a transport system that is growing with the growth that has been announced? We say there's all the showing of lack of adequate finances. It still suffers from maintenance, proper maintenance and service problems within the industry itself. In fact, I am told now that TransAir have over 400 of staff which is larger than some of the other four regional air carrier services in Canada which have a greater number of vehicles than TransAir. Apparently there is inefficiency or unacceptable management in the company itself. I'm sure that some of this must come from the interference of directors in the airline's management itself and the projections which these people in management are trying to give to TransAir. There is no doubt about it, we in northern Manitoba have poor equipment far too often. I saw a piece in the paper the other day by a lady that chastized the Minister of Transportation in that she said the other day there were four Hawker Siddleys and two Y.S. 11's. Well, Mr. Speaker, I know that you're not too well acquainted with northern Manitoba but I can assure you that, as far as I know, as of today or yesterday, that TransAir only have two Y.S. 11's. We also suffer of course from the fact that there's a 24 percent surcharge on rates.

Now there was quite an article in the Tribune about - oh, I might say it was Saturday, September 13, 1969, and Mr. Mardon decided to commentate on the resignation of Mr. Norman and he finally said, "There has been criticism of the airline, some of it ill-informed ranting by some of the MLAs in the Legislature." I would say that maybe if he added, "also the ranting of many of the passengers which have to use this service," and Mr. Speaker, not only from northern Manitoba but I think that if he had gone a little further into his research and maybe did a little homework, he would have found that the Travellers Association in Winnipeg are not too happy about the problems here, so I would say that it isn't just because of the MLAs rantings that this man decided to resign.

I think that since air transportation has not satisfied the needs of the northern public, I believe that we should have the right of a public review of air services and an appeal on a yearly basis in the north so that services can be reviewed, and I think that this would iron out a lot of the problems that we do have, because no area in the world depends more upon air service than Canada's north and, as far as I am concerned, northern Manitoba.

The air carrier service within the province should be brought more under the jurisdiction of provincial authorities, because today neither the Minister of Industry and Commerce nor the Minister of Transportation has one word to say on franchises or charters, nor do they have a vote on it. Certainly it can be brought in front of, or talked and the government can present a brief, but we all know what happened when they presented a brief on Air Canada. They were just laughed at, and the same man that made the decision for Air Canada, Mr. McGregor, after he had resigned he said, "I have changed my mind on some of these things. Regional air carriers, instead of paying a percentage to Air Canada, should receive a kick-back or a commission from Air Canada for the feeder services they extend to them," so even he changes his mind, but too late - after he has gone.

Certainly federal transportation authorities have failed to provide adequate direction for air carrier services, as far as I am concerned, in the north. While the southern areas of Canada are given jet service, we still pay 24 percent additional charges for standard service over and above the jet service. We are not asking for jet service. We're just asking for lower rates and we are satisfied and happy with turbo props, and we don't want some big aircraft coming up on a once-a-day basis service because this does not answer the problems that are raised in communicating with northern Manitoba, and certainly it doesn't answer the problems of the traveller who wants to go up and do business and go back the same day. Certainly, in the past, it has shown that northern Manitoba is so far away that Cabinet can't spare the time

(MR. BEARD cont'd.) . . . . to go up and come back, and I am glad now that we have a man living in the north.

Historically, let's go back to Viscount days. TransAir got a Viscount; they got a scheduled service, Viscount service to the north and such on. We had it for one day or two days or one week, something like that, then they sent it down to a Saskatoon route where they lost money and they were subsidized by the federal government for a year, but we regenerated back, or degenerated back to DC 3 and 4 service. And then we were accorded Turbo Prop service, the new Y. S. 11's or the Siddley Hawkers or the Hawker Siddley or whatever it is, and they brought them up and showed them to us. They even came up one time and had a luncheon and I happened to be there at it, and they said, "We are up here today to ask you to help us decide what colour we are going to paint these planes," but unfortunately, again, we revert far too often back to DC 6's and 7's and so what difference is the colour? Quite often we don't see the plane often enough to know what really colour they made the decision on anyway.

But let's get back to today. TransAir have now had a change in their service policy, or rather in their management, and the financing coming from the east is going to inject \$1,600,000 roughly into the operation of TransAir. We question just why they are doing that because, on the other hand, a part of this financing company is injecting \$10,000,000 to buy a couple of Boeing Jets along with a request for a franchise between Winnipeg and Toronto. Now, to most of us, we are afraid that the injection of the \$1,600,000 was to keep TransAir alive so that they could bring about an east-west emphasis on this transportation system rather than the north-south which we are interested in, and we all know what can happen if you get a franchise into a community such as Toronto. Then you can charter out of that end service, and this means, then, that we will be flying all over the world, everywhere except northern Manitoba I suppose. -- (Interjection) -- and it would be cheaper too, that's right.

We don't like to see TransAir and the finance companies that are financing TransAir so closely interwoven that the directors of the companies who are financing TransAir along with the directors of TransAir are a piece of one parcel, and in fact two of the directors of TransAir - at least this information is only a week or two weeks old so I presume it's still the same - are directors of one of the financing companies, Little Long Lac. One's another one, both from down east; one is the president of Fry & Company investment firm from Toronto; another is a Hamilton lawyer, and at present there are still two Winnipeg representatives, but these are shareholders both in TransAir now, and directors, and directors of a finance company that can tell the TransAir just what and where and how they are going to do it, and it is taken now out of Manitoba and it is moving down east, and we all know what happens when that comes about. I don't think it's fair that we should lose complete control in Manitoba, in respect of TransAir, when it is so important to the development of the north, to eastern interests. Certainly the west has been stifled by this for many years and I don't think the drain-off should be allowed to continue.

We hear so much about the prophecy of the future of the north, yet both government agencies and industries are reluctant to appoint northern or base directors, or even Manitoba directors in this case, and I think that this is one thing that we must look into and consider in many respects, just where we go from here. I can't do it, but certainly Cabinet can take a look at this particularly. I am sure that there was a position made available for somebody in the north on Manitoba Hydro. I think there should be somebody from the north on Manitoba Telephone System, young people ready to grow with the system and orient a percentage of the thinking of both government and industry to what is going on in the north.

I suppose now that we have come over those, we say "What is the answer?" I think, first of all, the federal government has to stop studying and making all these studies on air transportation and make some decisions instead. I think the federal government control of all air decisions should be changed, because through these air policies, both past, present and future, we have gone backwards just because we haven't been able to keep up with the development of the north. In the USA, I might point out, we find there is a 50 percent over-all reduction in air service to the public which is attributed to federal direction and assistance, and this I get out of the regional air carriers' problem that was the study made in 1966, our major continental airlines such as Air Canada and CP should pay for feeder line service to these regional carriers to allow them to operate at a better profit.

I think there should be changes in Air Canada policy which has allowed them to slough off non-paying milk runs while the federal Air Transportation Committee allow under-financed

(MR. BEARD cont'd.) . . . . regional air carriers to greedily pick up these runs, just to keep out competition, and Mr. Speaker, if there is one thing that we find as we look further and further into the air transportation problem, the companies that already have it are greedily fighting those that want to enter into it to provide competitive services, and I think that there has to be a review of this problem because more and more we find, if we want to talk about this for a minute, that once you get a franchise apparently you hire the same lawyer that got it for you to make sure that the next guy doesn't get a charter or an opportunity, and this is wrong; this is very wrong; because the companies that have the franchises sit with the board and argue back and forward about it, but never are the people involved in the service encouraged to come to these meetings. They are held in Ottawa. They are held outside of the area which is to be serviced, and this is the wrong part of the whole thing. If they are going to argue about whether there should be a further service in an area, it should be done where the service is being applied for, not down in Ottawa where it costs an awful lot of money to go and make a presentation. I think that it must be one of federal government agencies' priorities to see that Canadians are properly served first, rather than to be worrying about world-wide services and, particularly as far as Air Canada is concerned, I think that they should be doing their fair share of contribution.

Now I turn to what it says here, Mr. Speaker, and it's not very parliamentary but it says, "Air Canada does give a damn." Apparently somebody said they didn't. And this is the Free Press of Saturday, September 20, 1969, and it's Mr. Sawyer who is the regional public relations manager for Air Canada, and he is protesting about the things that somebody had said about the service that Air Canada gives. But in it he is quite careful to point out that Air Canada is not subsidized in any way. It has shown a profit for 15 of the past 18 years. Air Canada's profit in 1968 was \$15,600,000. The taxes they paid on property, fuel, sales, service and such on was another \$7,100,000, and the airport user charge was \$11,700,000. Now this proves to me Air Canada is doing a good job of sloughing off the responsibilities of looking after Canadian regional feeder services and allowed to accumulate these profits to look after Canadian over-all transportation from the larger urban centers, and also of course enter into the overseas market, and I suppose I don't argue too much about this, but I would like to see a little of this \$15 million profit re-injected into private industry and possibly the five regional carrier services which are doing the job that Air Canada used to have to do - divide some of that profit or that cost amongst those, because I presume that this is profit after depreciation etc., and if it is, then I think the best place to use that is to give it over to the regional services that are doing the work for Air Canada. -- (Interjection) -- They've got their depreciation. They've got their write-off.

A MEMBER: They can float debentures too.

MR. BEARD: I believe that they must provide regional services, must provide a satisfactory service, not only to northern Manitoba of course but to the eastern Arctic, before they are granted the franchise to work between east and west service and, incidentally, compete against Air Canada and CP.

I won't go through too many of the things. We have a letter addressed to somebody by the name of the Hon. J. P. Borowski from the United Steelworkers, who backed the approach that has been taken. They say the first and most important complaint is, of course, the cost which is away out of line with air fares across Canada. They point out that the constant changes in schedule are not in keeping with the thinking of the people in Thompson, and now, apparently, they have eliminated the night flight from Thompson to Winnipeg and the writer says this was perhaps the most useful flight for the workers of Thompson. The flight from Churchill is scheduled to arrive in Thompson ten minutes after the flight for Lynn Lake has left. These are the things that just don't fall into line because your transportation services are called.

MR. SPEAKER: Five minutes remaining.

MR. BEARD: Okay. We'll go quickly through the other. There is one other part and that's the charter service, and certainly it is the one that really causes the confusion and the problems in the north, because, Mr. Speaker, the charter service in the north is one which I spoke a little earlier about people trying to keep out competition, and I don't want to get into the fish business right now, so help me, but the board has authorized Canadian fish producers to transport their products for them, and lo and behold, they can't get a permanent charter to look after this service because of the objections of three companies, and here they have the support of Mr. Corney from the Fresh Water Fish, who say, "We will be required to move fishermen, fish supplies and equipment into numerous isolated fishing areas and to transport



(MR. BEARD cont'd.) . . . . fish back and forward to points to available ground competition." He goes on to say - I haven't got time to read the whole thing because I've only got five minutes - but he supports -- this is a letter to the Air Transport Commission supporting the submission of this fish company. And then we go on to the communication back from the Air Transport Commission and it says that they would give temporary authority to carry supplies and fishermen to and from the area "with carriage of goods for general public expressly prohibited," and I wish I had some more time to study it and how much in the docks, the mail and people are left because of stupid regulations such as this.

Then we have one from Indian Affairs, Mr. Conley, Regional Director of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, who says: "Fish, being a very highly perishable product, it goes without saying that top priority for removal of fish from lakeside to proper processing or storage is most essential to maintain a saleable quality. In several instances, when it was necessary for our Indian fisheries to rely on normal commercial carriers, the wastage of fish due to poor quality resulted in the loss of many thousands of pounds, and in effect rendered the fishery uneconomical."

Then we go on to Mr. Halenowski, Chief Supervisor of the co-operative. He said, "In the Province of Manitoba we have been commissioned to organize and supervise development of Indian and Metis co-operatives in northern Manitoba. During the past number of years the co-operatives produced between four to five millions of fish, pounds of fish. The newly-formed Fish Marketing Co-operation will be purchasing all the fish produced and we will have to employ services for moving this product," and he supports again the Commission of Canadian Fisheries for this.

Now then we get into letters of opposition. We have one from TransAir, and they say the reason that they are opposing it, or one of the reasons is that they feel that they can do the job so they don't think that anybody else should get it, and they say the vehicles they have now are presently under-utilized. "TransAir Limited further submits that the applicant made available to TransAir Limited for further economic study, the agreement, if such an agreement exists, between the Crown Corporation and the Fresh Water Fish Marketing Corporation. So this means they want to study a contract between the corporation of the Fish Marketing and the transportation agency. Norcanair says that this would jeopardize by granting of such a license -- no. "Including in the areas named are numerous protected," mind you, protected - "bases or other carriers whose protection would be jeopardized by granting such a license as well as the loss of fish mail business which we presently enjoy."

Just one more, Mr. Chairman, and I'll sit down. We also have one from Lambair Limited. Lambair opposes the . . . . (Interjection) --.

MR. SPEAKER: The member may continue.

MR. BEARD: Well I'll wind it up in a couple of minutes. Thanks very much. Lambair opposes the application of Canadian Fish Producers Limited. They say that there are Class 4 and Class 3 aircraft companies based in Lynn Lake at the present time, with an aggregate fleet in excess of 20 different aircraft.

MR. MCGILL: I wonder if the member from Churchill would permit a question?

MR. BEARD: Yes.

MR. MCGILL: Does the member feel that the policy of the Canadian Transport Committee in providing base protection for charter operators in the north is a wrong policy, and does he favour complete elimination of base protection for charter operators in the north?

MR. BEARD: Yes.

MR. MCGILL: A subsequent question, Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. Is he aware that, under the former, one of the former federal Ministers of Transport, the Honourable George Hees, that this policy of eliminating base protection was tried and that it was found that it was unworkable, and that they then returned to the present policy?

MR. BEARD: It was half tried; half tried. -- (Interjections) -- They gave way, I would say, to -- it was a policy of political expediency and pressures. When you've lived in the north and had to deal with this, I think you would have a different impression of protected interests that provide public services, just the same as private business is not protected in a community where they're offering food for sale. There's no protection there. This country is saturated with operators now and another would not benefit the industry. Here is a company that has grown from one plane to many, and yet they say, "We have the service so you don't need anybody else." They have grown, all of them -- (Interjection) -- Which? This last one? Lambair. It's always been the case where people are starting out, they have to fight,

(MR. BEARD cont'd.) . . . not the community that wanted service - that's backwards. They've got to fight the people that are servicing the community, or say they are, and this is an untenable position as far as the people in the isolated communities are concerned, because they're not getting the proper service. And if the honourable member could take advantage of a trip, he would find for himself the problems that do come up in the isolated communities, large ones, where people can't get out for a week, sometimes two weeks at a time. The member can move out of this community of this House probably a dozen or twenty times a day, so I say no, I think that there should be charters made available on a competitive basis, and where somebody wants to stick his neck out in the private enterprise world today, then should he be protected against competition.

MR. MCGILL: . . . sticking their necks out.

MR. BEARD: Why would the public be sticking their necks out?

MR. MCGILL: . . . are going to ride with the charter operator who is unfamiliar with the territory and who sets up, as you say. . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order. It would be preferable for the honourable member to express his views and opinions by participating in the debate rather than in the dialogue which has developed.

MR. BEARD: Mr. Speaker, I would just refer to that part of it and then I won't take any more advantage of my extension of time. But I would say to the honourable member, keep in mind before he gets up to speak on this, keep in mind that the man that is going to ask for a charter service knows the area or he won't be asking for it in the first place. He has made his arrangements to purchase his plane, to have the mechanics look after it on a service basis as necessary, and just because you're a big operator, it doesn't assure the travelling public that the vehicle that you are using has been serviced properly, but on the other hand, I would tell the honourable member that you also keep in mind that there is an inspection service for these vehicles to make sure that they are up to standard. Now this is when their hours are completed in their log book, they have to have them serviced. But finally, the real one point, and the cruncher I would say, that the smaller the business the better service you get, because it's an owner-operated plane, whereas as you get larger you are employing, in many cases, people that have just had their license for a few weeks or a few months and they are the amateurs, not the small owner of the small charter service. He has already had, in most cases, his time to make him a veteran and he knows he's going to have a personalized service, not one that's spread out where people can't be serviced from one area of this province. Thank you very much.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Transportation.

HON. JOSEPH P. BOROWSKI (Minister of Transportation)(Thompson): Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to get into the debate but there are a few points I'd like to clear up, since it seems that I had something to do with getting a controversy on TransAir going. I'd like to, first of all, say that I concur with probably 98 percent of the things that the Member for Churchill has stated, and I'd like to take this opportunity to clarify a statement I made several weeks ago, where I said that fares were too high and the service was lousy. I want to say now that I think, if anything, it was an understatement, but what I would want to clarify is that it seems that some of the pilots and the stewardesses and the mechanics working for TransAir got the impression that somehow by saying this I was inferring that maybe their service wasn't too good, or maybe they weren't looking after their end of it. I would just like to make it clear that my complaint was not against them since obviously they don't purchase the planes, they don't set the schedules, and they don't run the airline; they simply carry out orders as employees. So my complaint was not against any of the employees; it was against the management of TransAir, and I understand that the people who injected new money into it have changed management, so hopefully from here on in we will receive better service.

There's been a great deal of discussion about why TransAir should have the sole right to fly into the northern areas. When you get a person, a free enterpriser like the Member for Churchill, wrapping the knuckles of the free enterprisers, I think the opposition, which are rugged free enterprisers, should take a look at it, because he's the last one that's going to say, "Let's bring in some, say, Air Canada or socialist airlines." He's the last one to say it, but here he's got up today and he's saying, "Let's get some competition in there. Let's get a government airline," or words to that effect.

And let's just take a look at this. We have TransAir who has got an area tied up, they're the only means for the people living in the north, the entire north, they're the only way to get

(MR. BOROWSKI cont'd.) . . . in and out of the north, and for a free enterprise society to tolerate a situation where an airline can get a franchise - and this is I suppose the fault of the Federal Government, I don't believe the provincial government has anything to say about it - but here we have a situation where an airline ties up a franchise and they can give any type of service they want and almost at any price, and in this case 24 percent higher, and we in the north are somehow supposed to sit back and say nothing.

I wonder how silent these members sitting on the other side would be, Mr. Speaker, if they had to fly in a \$2 1/2 million plane from here to Vancouver or to Toronto or wherever it was, and pay 24 percent more. I bet you every one of them would be up there screaming their heads off, but because it's us poor suckers living in the north they figure that's fine, you have no right to come in here and criticize TransAir. No rights at all. You people ride on \$15 million luxury jets that travel 500 miles an hour. -- (Interjection) -- Well, whenever you want to you can do it but we can't do it ever, and we're paying 24 percent higher for riding in planes that are worth \$2 1/2 million that fly at 180 miles an hour. So we have some legitimate complaints, and instead of you people getting up on the other side and criticizing this, you should get up and support it. And since you're so in love with the free enterprise, let's get some free enterprise, let's get some competition. After all, the essence of free enterprise is competition. They should be the first ones to get up here and support it.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, would the honourable member permit a question?

MR. BOROWSKI: I shouldn't but I will.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Have you ever considered what the service could be like if you had four or five airlines competing for business with that number of people in the area?

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, they have competition east and west. I don't see any bad service. I've ridden on these luxury jets. They've got quite a bit of competition and I see nothing wrong with the service they provide us, and if this is what competition will do for the north, and I suggest it would, then I say let's have more. Furthermore, TransAir is saying that in order to make money they have to get into the east-west run - and there is competition there as you all know. Now if they can't make money in the north where they're charging 24 percent more with no competition, how in "H" are they going to make any money in competition on the east-west run when they've had two competitors.

A MEMBER: . . . people, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FROESE: Would the honourable member permit another question?

MR. BOROWSKI: For you, Sir, yes.

MR. FROESE: Just what is there in the British North America Act or under our legislatures and the Parliament of Canada that prohibits the Manitoba Government from taking action and doing something in the way for the airlines.

MR. BOROWSKI: . . . socialist philosophy there. If he's suggesting that maybe we should expand our air services - I understand that the government does have eight or ten planes stationed at Lac du Bonnet and two I believe in Thompson - if this is what you're suggesting, I would recommend you bring in a resolution. You might be surprised who would support you. And this is a very serious thing. It's not just transportation we're talking about. Do you know there's people isolated in the north that wait for two months to get medicine in there, and old age pension cheques, and groceries, and if somebody gets sick. It's not just a question of the people in Thompson having service but there's people all over the north and they're a lot more isolated than we are, and I'd hope that when the members want to talk about TransAir that they take this into consideration.

Mr. Speaker, there are several items I'd like to talk about but I'm afraid every time I get up and I make a speech that I get into trouble, and I think the less said the better. I just want to make it clear - the two things I wanted to make clear were that my remarks were not intended at people servicing, working for TransAir, rather it's TransAir management. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Honourable Minister would permit a question. Well I wonder if he can indicate, since taking over the portfolio of Minister of Transportation whether any representations have been made to the appropriate federal authorities for competitive airlines to reach the areas that TransAir are now covering.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, as the former Minister of Industry and Commerce, he knows very well we have not had an opportunity yet. But we intend to.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, Mr. Speaker, then I'd like to, if I may, enter the debate now. It

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd.).... was not my intention to enter the debate nor did I hear all the remarks of the Honourable Member for Churchill, but in view of the remarks that have been made by the Honourable Minister of Transportation may I say to him that this attempt to completely admonish this side for failures that have occurred in the past rings very hollow unless there is some action from him in his capacity as Minister of Transportation. Now he and the government have a right to demand from the Federal Government additional service and other requirements to meet the needs that he suggests are not being met by the so-called free enterprises. And if in fact the Federal Government takes action, all well and good, but I think the time has come for the Minister to understand that there is no point in admonishing this side and standing up and making what I would refer to as almost a hysterical speech on one occasion and an apologetic speech today in connection with TransAir. The government has the authority to take action, and what we on this side would like to see is action on his part rather than just words.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, may I suggest to the member who just spoke to have a look at his disgusting record before he lectures me on responsibility.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. SPIVAK: ..... point, in connection with air transportation matters, I'll stand on my record; I wonder if he'll be able to stand on his.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, if no one else wishes to speak at this time, I would move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Assinibola and the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Labour in amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. BILTON: Mr. Speaker, I rise just to talk for a moment or two on this motion before the House. Being brought up in a home of trade unionists I, at first flush I thought the resolution had merit and I still do to some degree, and I rise to speak as I see it from a rural point of view and handling a small business under that heading. I can see, Mr. Speaker, with the adoption of the contents of this resolution, that it may in some directions create somewhat a hardship. It's been my experience, in my few years in business in rural Manitoba, that businessmen generally speaking are fair and reasonable with their employees insofar as holidays and all that sort of thing. Large business companies, of course, are in a category to themselves. Normally, unions will negotiate on behalf of their members and to a large degree many of the unions have seen to it that three weeks holiday with pay after five years have been provided.

But you know, Mr. Speaker, those small businesses that I speak of are in many instances just making it, and very happy to be carrying on a family business and to employ individuals that have been in their employ for many many years. I think immediately of my own company where we do provide the three weeks with pay without any hesitation at all, and in our town the stores close down on Monday but we in the newspaper business must be open on Monday so therefore we close down on Friday night. Then my mind goes to the statutory holidays which every month through the summer the first Monday of the month is granted. In our particular case, we close down on Thursday night to accommodate our employees for the most part. You might wonder why we do close down completely. Because of the fact that every man has his own particular slot in the plant and has his own particular work to do and we can't afford second help in order to fill in. So that's a four-day week with the same take-home pay. We have no objections to this at all. It all works itself out and works itself out very well. This was made mandatory and it probably will be made mandatory, and I would be the last in the world, Mr. Speaker, to suggest anything that would deny the working man a decent place in the sun which he deserves.

But I am thinking of those of us that are in business, striving as hard as we can in order to keep that business alive and also, more importantly, to provide jobs for people in our community. I think of the implement dealer, the garage owner, the small storekeeper and the restaurant people that must have help in order to carry on. Added features such as this just make their burden that much heavier. And I feel that I am speaking for the average individual that is employed under these circumstances, and I personally would hope that the Minister in his wisdom and those associated with him, if they are giving serious consideration to this motion, the amendment appended thereto, that these things be taken into consideration, that all aspects of employment throughout the Province of Manitoba be taken into consideration, and

(MR. BILTON cont'd.)... certainly on a rural level. There is a problem at the moment with organized labour in communities such as ours that they have these privileges, Mr. Speaker, and the other employees that are employed privately, as I've endeavoured to outline. In some instances they cannot afford to give this three weeks, and there's a consequence - there is that little differential of thought and it does create a problem in maintaining your employees when it is impossible to do these things.

I know it's simple to say that if an employer isn't capable, his business isn't capable of earning the money to provide these privileges, he shouldn't be in business, but I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that that didn't bring Canada to the stage it is in today. It is all of us together, working for the future of Canada, that makes it worthwhile, and I come to the defence of the small employer who operates a small plant that for years in the past and for years in the future will treat his employees decently and properly. Fortunately for us all, there are a good many of those people and I think their efforts should be respected. And again I say that I hope the Minister and his associates, in dealing with this matter in the future, that they will consider these things to the best advantage of all concerned.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. PATRICK: . . . . to speak on the resolution or on the amendment to the resolution, I will be closing. . . .

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. . . .

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

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia, and the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Labour in amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney.

MR. EARL McKELLAR (Souris-Killarney): . . . have leave to let this matter stand?

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

. . . . . continued on next page

**MR. SPEAKER:** The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose. Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Minister of Finance.

**MR. CHERNIACK:** Mr. Speaker, I have some comments on this resolution. It's rather timely because again the subject is being discussed and reviewed under the debate on the budget and the bill which is before us dealing with income tax increases.

My leader has already spoken on the general principle of estate taxation; expressed his views and that of our party on the validity of the principle of taxing estates by way of estate tax, or what was formerly known as succession duties. I don't intend to embark further on the philosophy involved in estate taxation because indeed I do not believe that the other persons who have spoken on this motion have really challenged the principle, which has been accepted in the, I suppose all the western countries, that government is entitled properly to tax on estates, to accomplish not only income but also a greater equalization of wealth and the redistribution of wealth within the country. The fact that estates can grow into tremendous powers if there were no such regulation is one that is accepted and I won't develop that.

The Member for Ste. Rose, who introduced this resolution, spoke of it that the purpose of the resolution was that he believed - and I'm quoting this - "that this is a tool for development in Manitoba," suggesting that we could provide more jobs for our people in Manitoba, more employment, more wealth and more development. And I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the only way it can be considered a tool is either by being first in the field of a giveaway or joining in the mad rush to giveaway in order to be able to stay abreast of what appears to be a changing situation. And the Member for Ste. Rose spoke about Alberta having benefitted by rebates of estate tax - their principle.

Not only the Member for Ste. Rose but the Free Press, in two editorials that I have before me, speak of the great benefits derived by Alberta and Saskatchewan. And I quote the Winnipeg Free Press which says: "The two western prairie provinces have been remarkably successful, and as long as they rebate taxes and Manitoba does not, they will continue to move ahead of this province." And I must inform you, Mr. Speaker, that I don't have evidence of proof of the great success that this has been, in the two provinces, directly attributable to this decision to rebate estate taxes. As a matter of fact, I believe that there is no experience in Saskatchewan to speak of because their legislation is very recent. Now there may be proof - I don't deny the possibility because the attraction appears to be there - but the fact is I don't have any proof, nor have the honourable members who have spoken furnished any. I have had calls from people, not many but several, who are concerned on behalf of their personal estate. And I have found in the main that, after discussing the problem with them, in most cases they have felt that this was not sufficient for them to change their homes, to run away from Manitoba to the other provinces, but I recognize that there is a temptation created by the giveaway program of the other two provinces.

The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell - and possibly I shouldn't leave the Member for Ste. Rose yet because he spoke also about the fact that estate tax affects smaller farms and induces capital away from family farms - and others have mentioned that and I will deal with that point. And at one stage he said something to the effect that he hung his hopes on free enterprise, and in this respect it would seem to me that free enterprise is relying on inducements, on bait - if one may call it that - which is operated in the other two provinces out of ten in Canada, that free enterprise will be successful by inducement, I'd say - these are my words - that that is the way he would suggest that we support free enterprise. And I wonder that he didn't go a little further and instead of saying let's give back 75 percent of estate taxes as is being done in the other provinces, which of course is 100 percent of the amount received by the provinces, that he didn't suggest that the province gives back 85 percent of the estate tax paid or 100 percent of the estate tax paid or 125 percent of the estate tax paid, because it seems to me that in this field he is talking about the degree, he is talking about the inducement that one can offer, or possibly if we really want to have these people come to Manitoba we should offer a cash prize. They say, "fly now, pay later"; maybe you should say "receive cash now, die later." Come to the province that will give you a bonus for settling down here; why wait until you die to derive the benefit. It has been suggested behind me that a free funeral might be another inducement, and for that we would of course need the support not only of government but of some legislators. -- (Interjection) -- I just heard an offer on a selective basis by one of our members.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the member for Birtle-Russell also spoke on this matter and he

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) . . . . stressed the present plight on the farms - and nobody will question what he said - and he said that the younger generation is deserting the farms. I think that's true, but to attempt to relate it to the imposition of the estate taxes, or rather the failure to rebate estate taxes, is so remote that I really don't think it's worth dealing with any further. But he did speak, and he spoke with feeling and with justification, about the fear of the heavy burden that is imposed by estate taxes on survivors who have the assets, the net worth assets that are related to farm ownership, both farm and equipment, where the values are high, although we know the returns now especially are low.

But again, neither he nor any of the other members who have spoken on this matter have indicated just what are we talking about in terms of dollars. How much is the estate tax on a farm of, say, \$50,000. Well, we know it is nothing; there is no tax on an estate of \$50,000. Well then, how much is the estate tax on \$100,000 estate. How much is the estate tax on \$150,000 estate. Or are we really talking about estates that are much larger than that, and then again, should we not relate the amount of tax to the amount of asset that is . . . And I want to say that in my investigation I have come to the conclusion that the smaller businesses, the smaller farms - and when I say smaller, I am still speaking in terms of \$100,000, \$150,000 - that the amount involved is not a heavy burden which is insurmountable, it is not one which will prejudice a person who is indeed an inheritor, who is not a man who has accumulated the wealth himself but is one who inherits from another who has accumulated wealth. And I would suggest that before we start talking about the exaggerated terms, we talk in more concrete terms. I don't believe that there is proof of hardship.

Again I come to an editorial by the Free Press which has been writing about this on more than one occasion, speaking about a family farm or small business passing on from father or mother to sons and daughters, and I quote: "Very often the estate tax is so heavy that the farmer business has to be sold to meet the tax." Mr. Speaker, I have no concrete evidence of this having had to happen for that reason alone, for the estate tax alone. I have heard people say that they know of such cases but I have not had any brought to my attention; I assume there are some. I can report that I have discussed this matter with the - I don't know his title - but the person in the income tax office, estate tax office charged with the responsibility, who checked back on his records for a number of years and found no evidence that he was aware of where assets such as small businesses and farms had to be sold, or were sold solely because of the estate tax itself. And yet I believe it is possible that there are such examples, but I have no idea of the proportion that they are to the number of estates that are taxed and pay tax. Then again of course the Free Press mentions that the other two prairie provinces benefit every month from their "enlightened" legislation. I don't think any of the members who have already spoken have spoken of it as "enlightened"; rather it appears that it is good business on their part.

But there is concern expressed, and I have heard it from people of wealth, as to the principle of estate tax - and I have already mentioned that; as to competition by Alberta and Saskatchewan. I would like to think that Manitobans and people who are thinking of coming to Manitoba will think more about the values of living rather than of dying; would think more that their lives should be worthwhile than their deaths should pay off better; and I think that if persons will equate life in Manitoba, it will be to more than the dollars involved.

The Honourable the Leader of the Official Opposition spoke on this matter - and I remind you and I am sure I need not remind him - that he had formerly expressed that he was not in agreement with what was being done in Alberta and Saskatchewan, that he did not feel that that was the right thing to do but that it appeared that Manitoba was being forced to do it in order to remain competitive, and at the last session of the Legislature he and the then Minister of Finance said that they didn't want to bring in their Bill to immediately create the opportunity to rebate estate tax, but they wanted to have the right to do so if their talks with Ottawa failed. And what they indicated was that they wanted to convince Ottawa to take over the full amount of estate tax and make compensatory adjustments of the tax structure so that the provinces would be taken out of that unfairly competitive position. But then of course during the election there appears to have been a switch in policy. The Honourable Minister of Finance at that time in his campaign said: No, we're not going to wait for that; we're going ahead to do it. Apparently that wasn't sufficiently convincing to the voters of Manitoba to be persuasive.

The Leader of the Official Opposition said that he thinks that many members opposite believe that tax havens of this type are not in the interests of our country, and he didn't himself say that he thought that they were or were not but said that it seemed that, but that Manitoba's

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) . . . . position was that a climate must be established that is competitive within this region of Canada. He conceded that this resolution before us can be almost - and I quote again - "a false taxation policy," but nevertheless he felt that it was necessary to do so. And then he too referred to small business and agricultural communities suffer an expropriation of the assets between our generation and the next because of unreasonable increase in the rates of taxation. He did not give any evidence of that either.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I want to indicate that I fully agree that there is a problem. I fully agree that we must express our concern about the problem and I fully agree that we should review the problem in the light of general tax policies, as seems to be the desire of our Liberal friends in any event, in order to assess the equity and the fairness of all our taxation means, and I am suggesting that we must of course take into account what is being done by the other provinces that would adversely affect our competitive position. But we must be very conscious that the impact of the giveaway competition should not be one that rushes us headlong into further competition, because I've already indicated methods by which we could improve the competitive position vis-a-vis estate tax by doing a little better than, or a little sooner than, or a little more than Alberta and Saskatchewan, and before we know it Ontario is going to enter into this competitive picture and then I can assure honourable members we'll be lost, because a province rich as Ontario can well afford to give away more than we can for the same kinds of principles of inducement to what the Member for Ste. Rose referred to as "free enterprise".

I think that we must review and consider the justification of the Federal Government's enactment as to the size of exemption; I think we must judge, as of course we must also do in the income tax field, as to whether or not exemptions are correctly set according to today's costs and today's cost of living. Certainly, if I may move away from the subject for a moment, indicate that it seems to me that the present exemption in personal income tax having stayed as low as it is for so many years needs review, and of course that's within the federal jurisdiction. And to the same extent I would like to review the exemptions enacted last year by the Federal Government in estate taxes and they may well be too low. And again, the federal issue is one which I think we should review and we should be prepared to both consider and consult with, and discuss with the federal authorities, and certainly I would want an opportunity to do that.

I think also we must recognize that the Federal Government in its recent legislation did acknowledge the problem that may occur to an estate where the tax is such that it cannot be paid out of liquid assets and one which has to be financed in some way. And there the fear comes up of a forced sale, and as I understand it, the present legislation permits payment of estate taxes over a five-year period which isn't bad - which isn't bad. -- (Interjection) -- Pardon? Well, the Honourable Member for Rhineland says: Is it still in effect? My understanding is that it was never in effect until it was brought in with the new estate tax legislation last year. He shakes his head, so he may be right and I may be wrong, because I'm not speaking with any more authority than a person who has read the reports and accounts and discussed the new estate tax legislation. I call it new because it's about a year old.

I'm pretty well satisfied that there is provision now which enables payment of estate taxes over a five-year period. -- (Interjection) -- My Leader indicates that that was the undertaking of the federal Minister and I'm accepting it as so. If it is not so I would say it has to be so, and if that is not enough of a time, bearing in mind the problem that occurs, and I'm quite prepared to not only to say consider, but to recommend that in proper cases there should be a postponement. As a matter of fact, I'd like to consider the possibility, and I think it's an interesting one, that where a small family business or a small viable farm is operating in such a way where the return is so minimal that there isn't even in the five-year period sufficient time within to pay the estate tax, I'd like to consider whether it wouldn't be feasible to postpone payment of the tax either until there is ability to pay on the part of the successor, or certainly when he makes a sale, because again we find in many of these farms, these small businesses, that a sale takes place at some stage and when that takes place then there is usually a very substantial capital return to the then owner. I think maybe we ought to be considering the possibility of not jeopardizing the maintenance of this kind of an asset by postponing payment, and certainly we all know that it can be done in law. As to whether it's practical or not, I wouldn't for a moment indicate an opinion now because I don't have one, but I can see that as a possibility that should be considered and which I would like to consider.

Another problem that I know occurs in estate taxation problems is the method of evaluation of the assets of an estate, and that can sometimes be a problem. One of the most obvious



(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) . . . . types of problem that may occur is the value of an asset at date of death, which asset, by the mere fact of the death, has shrunken in value because the person who carried the goodwill of the asset died at the time when the asset is evaluated. It may well be that there are cases where the estates are valued at such a price, which by the time it has to be paid, the tax has to be paid, the estate itself in value has shrunken. And again that's not an easy problem because there are some cases where estates increase in value between the time of date of death and the time of payment of tax.

So that there are problems and I think that they should not be dealt with hastily by this rush to give away, but rather with a proper review. And because of the fact that we are not dealing with immediate things, because people don't so quickly decide to run away from the province, I think we should take the time to consider this carefully and in consultation with the other bodies, both federal and the other provinces involved. It is a matter for discussion and I don't think we ought to be stampeded into making a decision such as is being suggested by the resolution before us. Having indicated that, I still say that there is nothing to derogate, nothing has been said actually by members of this House in criticism of the principle of estate taxation. It has all been dealt with on a practical basis and I want to deal with it on a practical basis, but one which is not a stampeding or a "me too" type of attitude which could be harmful in the long run.

And for that reason, Mr. Speaker, I propose to give an opportunity to honourable members who have spoken, and who have not spoken, to move an amendment to the resolution so that we can discuss further, in a manner which will be positive, this proposal before us. And in such a way I hope that we can take note, and if my amendment passes, will be of value to those who will be continuing the study and the problem that is set forth in the resolution for future consideration.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Attorney-General, that the resolution be amended by striking out all the words after the word "and" in line two, and substituting therefor the following words: "Whereas the Provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan have enacted legislation providing for the rebate of their provincial portion of the estate tax; Therefore Be It Resolved that the Government of Manitoba, taking into account the tax structure changes now being contemplated by the Government of Canada and all other factors bearing on this matter, investigate the implications that would be involved in the rebate of Manitoba's portion of the estate tax levied in this province by the Government of Canada."

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. J. WALLY McKENZIE (Roblin): Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. MOLGAT: . . . the member, in the early part of his speech, referred to this being as a "giveaway" to free enterprise. How does he feel about the program instituted by the Federal Government with regard to regional development where there are positive incentives to enterprise to locate in regions? Does he favour these sort of programs or not?

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I don't want to spend much time going into the whole philosophy of incentives, but I would say that this clearly is a giveaway; it's a give back of money that had nothing whatsoever to do with development, with expansion, with growth, as does the kind of program that is envisioned in the other. If the honourable member considers it differently, I invite him - and I know I needn't invite him - to make his own speech on his own time.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member did not answer my question though. Does he favour the Federal Government's program of incentives for regional development to industry?

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, naturally there are incentive programs that are of a positive nature which should be endorsed.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I was absent from my desk when the Minister of Finance rose to speak on the resolution. I might have missed some of the particular pearls of wisdom that he had on this subject and I apologize for it. I don't want to speak at any great length on this resolution and I don't want to repeat the obvious, that much of what the Minister of Finance has said sounds reasonable, sounds logical and sounds all right, if the matter of sales tax rebate could be dealt with in its singular form and not put together with some of the other directions that the Minister of Finance has taken just in the last 10 days - or the last few days, I should

(MR. ENNS cont'd) . . . . say - with respect to his budget and its -- (Interjection) -- Well, that's fine. Perhaps that may be a valid argument too, but I think the Minister of Finance is aware, and I think the First Minister will become aware of what I'm trying to say when he embarks on his trip to eastern Canada very shortly in the pursuit of business and the pursuit of attracting business to Manitoba and in the pursuit of attracting capital to Manitoba.

But I just raise that because I do believe that one of the problems that the government opposite has, that while the rather noble position taken - and it has always been, and I credit the members opposite with recognizing that my Leader and this party has accepted essentially their attitude towards the principle involved in the rebate of estate taxes. They don't agree with our conclusions that we have arrived at or the manner in which we have arrived at it, but essentially there's not that gulf of difference there.

But I do want to speak briefly for a segment of our population that, in my opinion, deserves some special degree of consideration by respective governments that are involved in the estate tax legislation. I honestly believe that while it's fortunate that some people have the capacity -- and the remarks I'm going to make now surround those remarks that the Minister made just as I came in about the fact that he would hope that we would be a little more concerned about the quality of living rather than the dead and so forth. But I would like to think that the Minister and the government opposite is aware of the fact that among, certainly high up on the list of priorities is that too many - to some people at any rate - have the capacity of passing on to their children a set of values, a set of spiritual values, other values that far exceed the values that could be measured in dollars and cents, so that the fact of the size of an estate or the kind of an estate that's to be passed on is really of little consequence in these circumstances. The thing is that there are other people in our group equally sincere who are not endowed with this facility, who have no other way of showing their sincerity, their love and their devotion for their offspring, and they do it admittedly in the more cruder terms of dollars and cents. So essentially I'm making a bit of a speech here in fact that goes against some of the policy enunciated by my own group; in fact I'm just about prepared to make a speech in defence of the abolition of the estate tax. I do not go that far, Mr. Speaker, because I do believe that the transfer of estates should not be used, or should not accommodate the build-up of an aristocracy in this democracy of ours, and this of course is what it has done in the past, so that I make this speech within specific limitations, within specific confinements.

The third point that I want to make is that I'm not so sure that in drawing up the legislation that deals with estate tax that the heavy machinery of government can appreciate and can differentiate the difference between how estates are built up. It normally takes a farmer a lifetime work to pass on a farm intact. The farmer's creed is that "the farmer lives poor and dies rich". But he does this for a purpose. -- (Interjection) -- Certainly.

MR. SCHREYER: If the Honourable Member for Lakeside is so kindly disposed to the idea of remission of estate tax, indeed he talks about abolishing it altogether, could I ask him why wasn't he insisting that the previous administration, the former Premier act expeditiously to do just that in the last session?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to inform the First Minister of the simple fact that I did this most vigorously, and I'm sure there are Ministers in your Cabinet who are insisting on certain things most vigorously right now that you don't act most expeditiously on. And of course were we in a position to bring in a budget -- and it wasn't included in the budget as you relate.

Mr. Speaker, I want to stay within my opening remarks that I would have only a short contribution to make, so I will desist from entering into the debate that is criss-crossing around the floor.

But I was on my third and final point, and that was to have those who are in charge of legislating or drawing up the framework of this legislation with respect to estate taxes to appreciate the difference and the manner and way how estates are arrived at. And as a rural member of course I speak principally about the farm situation. -- (Interjection) -- I'm speaking about, you know - I'm getting broke up - an estate that is worthwhile being passed on to somebody and how that's arrived at. In the case of the farmer it normally means the better part of a lifetime's work, and to have it judged in the same capacity as another estate whereas perhaps it just depends on the particular ability of a person to receive a franchise to do something, to be in a given position at the right time - you know, to be a manufacturer's agent while hoola hoops are in vogue -- (Interjection) -- Oh, there's an essential difference, a tremendous difference - and the Member for Elmwood shakes his head - because the farmer and the

(MR. ENNS cont'd) . . . . enterprise in rural Manitoba is such that it calls for a continual re-investment of earnings for the first large number of years. It's not possible to make the kind of accrued earnings that it is in rented office space, in rented this or in rented that. -- (Interjection) -- Well, the Honourable Member for Elmwood takes me on. All I'm suggesting to you is that a good number of the farm families of Manitoba, who by no stretch of the imagination live in opulent luxury, who live a very ordinary life, a good life other than these past few years where our grain fields are difficult, but who have amassed estates of some size when all is added up and who will be in great difficulty in passing these on to their children.

Now if it's the intent of the government through the estate tax legislation to bring about a degree of expropriation, in effect this will be the end result. If this government doesn't consider seriously to rebate, then this of course is what's going to happen. It's rather ironic that this particular government - and I regret that the Minister of Agriculture is not in his chair - because they have on many occasions espoused the very strong and firm belief in the importance of the survival of the family farm, the independent family farm versus the corporate farm structure and the likes of this, that they are closing their minds to one aspect here that probably is going to be much more significant in hastening the advance of commercial corporate farm structures throughout rural Manitoba than perhaps any other single thing.

Members here on other debates in other areas have pointed out that our average farmers are at that age of 55 or 56; many of these have but a scant few years remaining in the ownership of their farms. So I would suggest that in the next 10 or 12 or 10 or 15 years the kind of transfer that takes place with respect to farm ownership of land is going to be pretty significant as to the kind of pattern that will develop in these few short years. And in that sense the estate tax, although I recognize it's been modified since the initial announcement or the initial changes made by the Federal Government, but in that sense the estate tax is of great concern and grave concern to many individual Manitobans. Thank you.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, are not farmers involving themselves in estate tax planning?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, that's a question, a very legitimate question asked by a clever and intelligent lawyer who I'm sure is well involved in estate planning for his family, but for the average farmer of Manitoba I would have to say "no".

MR. CHERNIACK: He thought I was going to ask a question. And I do express surprise. Is there not some effort made to acquaint the farmers of the values of planning for estate tax purposes?

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Speaker, I would certainly have to say that certainly there has been in our farm management courses, and I would hope certainly maybe that these efforts would be redoubled during the tenure of this government's office, but the fact still remains that partly by nature of the occupation, partly - you know, you have to remember that one of the difficulties, as we find out from time to time when we embark on different marketing board structures and what have you - that the farmer prides himself on a degree of fierce individuality, that there's something more, that a farmer looks at his farm and his holdings in a different light than the businessman can who looks at it, you know, coolly and calculated from his accountant's books. I'm not suggesting that's the right way to look at it but I have to report accurately the way the situation is, and I know that in most instances, today anyway - and there's farmers dying today or tomorrow or the next day - today anyway the answer to the Minister's question is that there is, regrettably, far too little estate planning being done on the farms of Manitoba and generally through western Canada.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a contribution to this resolution which was presented by the Member for Ste. Rose and which has quite an effect on rural Manitoba along the lines of the points that were raised by the Honourable Member from Lakeside, and while I haven't got the copy of the amendment that was brought forth today by the Finance Minister I don't think it actually is necessary as far as my contribution to the debate is concerned, because I'm really concerned in this speech that the Finance Minister made today that he's absolutely disregarding what was said by the TED Report - absolutely taking the complete opposite opinion of the experts of the TED Report.

I would like to refer the Honourable Finance Minister to Page 360 of the TED Report where the commission, it says there in its Advisory Committee on Taxation, "and Manitoba management all agree" - two words - "all agree that the estate taxation is an important factor

(MR. McKENZIE cont'd) . . . . . in the business community and can be a deterrent in long range business decisions affecting the development and expansion of industry in Manitoba." And the report goes on and says, "Much of Manitoba's concern over the economic effects of the Estates Tax Act has been raised by the introduction in Alberta of the Estate Tax Rebate Act." And it goes on and says, "The relative position of Manitoba is further affected by Saskatchewan's decision to provide estate tax rebates."

Then it goes on, Mr. Speaker, and it says: "It is recognized that the Estate Tax Act does not directly affect those industrial commercial enterprises whose shares are widely dispersed among the public, or which are wholly owned subsidiaries of such corporations, or of corporations whose principal shareholders reside outside of Manitoba. The principle impact" - this is the part - "The principle impact of estate taxation on economic development for the province comes from its effects on family-owned business and local pools of investment capital."

And I wonder, I wonder as the First Minister takes off on his trip east looking for investment capital — and I can assure the Finance Minister I'm concerned because I hope some of that investment capital filters its way into my constituency where we are crying for investment capital to create some industries. With our help - and we're willing to do our best - how is he going to stand up and justify, by what he said today, that it is worthwhile in fact for the First Minister to go and seek that capital when we are by this particular resolution saying, you know, it's not the right thing to do at this time. It goes on there and says, "Manitoba cannot afford to withhold rebates of the provincial portion of estate taxes if such rebates are available to the residents of Saskatchewan and Alberta." And this, I think, is some very intelligent men that compiled this report, and how the government of the day can stand before us and say, "no, we don't buy the TED Report," this concerns me. I've heard other speeches brought into the debate where the government of the day said the TED Report is a fine document but we're not following the lines of it.

So I rise, Mr. Speaker, greatly concerned over the statements of the Finance Minister, particularly because I come from a constituency that is of a farm base and where industry is required and needed, and we need some form of incentive of a growth capital or a growth company to come and give us a hand, and I humbly submit that this would be a deterrent if we don't follow the lines of the estate tax rebate portion.

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

MR. McKENZIE: Certainly.

MR. CHERNIACK: Firstly, could the honourable member indicate whether there was any drop in growth in his constituency after Alberta brought in its estate tax rebate legislation about a year or so ago.

MR. McKENZIE: It's very difficult to say at the moment. I haven't got the figures before me at the moment. But I see concern of farm estates. As the Honourable Member for Lakeside pointed to the Finance Minister, how do you liquidate an estate today?

MR. CHERNIACK: The second question, if I may, Mr. Speaker. What is the average value of the family farm in the constituency which he represents?

MR. McKENZIE: Well, let's take a look at say a three-quarter section - a 480 acre farm which I think would be about an average. What's the value of the land - \$100.00 an acre? It was \$100.00 an acre, so that's \$48,000 just for the land. The building, the equipment, the property, I'd say could be 75 to 100 thousand dollars under normal conditions. Now it isn't today with the grain prices being what they are, but let's say the average would be in that neighbourhood.

MR. CHERNIACK: If I may continue, Mr. Speaker. Does the honourable member have some idea of what the estate tax might be, passing not to a spouse but to children of an estate the value of say \$75,000.00?

MR. McKENZIE: No, I'm not a legal authority on matters such as this, Mr. Speaker. I sense there's a percentage schedule in there but I'm not aware of the exact figures, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well if I might further ask the honourable member that if - and I'm guessing but I have some background to guess that - that if a \$75,000 estate will produce a tax of five, six, seven thousand dollars, would he say that that would be damaging to the estate?

MR. McKENZIE: Just to liquidate the property, this is the idea. My concern basically, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that the Minister is going against the TED Report. This is my concern first and foremost.

MR. CHERNIACK: You're reading it that way.

MR. McKENZIE: And the second thing, in my constituency we looked for great things to come, you know, in the development of my constituency from the TED Report. And one of the first things that's happened, Mr. Speaker, the Finance Minister is going against it.

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

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON (Rock Lake): Mr. Speaker, after listening to some of the debate on this particular matter I thought I would take a few moments to convey my thoughts on the matter. I too was very interested in listening to what the Minister of Finance had to say. And one who again is a farmer, and where I think to some extent of the situation, this is a matter that has been before the people for the past I'd say year and a half, or this past year particularly it has been a matter that has been drawn to the attention from the people of my constituency to their federal member of parliament.

When we are talking about estate taxes on estates such as farms, I think we go back to the time when a farmer probably starts out engaging in the business of farming, and after he has operated the farm for say maybe 40 years, it seems to me that in this whole debate that one of the things that escapes us is the fact that this farmer has paid taxes on the assessment, or the assets that he's accumulated over the years. I think that this is one thing that we should bear in mind, after a farmer farming for 40 years, building up assets in the way of a farm and the equipment that is required to operate that farm, he has paid taxes on that amount of money over the many years that he's operated it. And then suddenly when he finds that he is become deceased and his wife is deceased, it is turned over probably to his son, and one of the problems that enters into the picture is that government sends out an appraiser to appraise the value of the land, appraise the value of the entire estate that he has.

Now we have to also take into consideration the economic situation of the country. I could go back maybe three years when land was worth maybe \$200.00 an acre, but I want to say to the Honourable Minister that if he was to sell that same land today that was worth \$200.00 three years ago, he couldn't give it away today. I often wonder when this happens, when land is appraised by a government appraiser if it's really given the proper value. If the value of that property is not given realistically, what then can happen is that the person who was going to acquire this farm may have to liquidate a good portion of that farm to pay the estate tax, because, Mr. Speaker, that estate tax has to be paid immediately, and in some cases possibly he may have to borrow money to pay that estate. This is one of the fears that lies among so many people today. When we are talking — some of my colleagues have talked about the agricultural, that is the farmers, and because of the economic situation we find ourselves, I consider it's a very important matter.

And I want to say that I, as a member who was a member of government last year, we did take this into account. I don't think it's fair to say why didn't we do something about it. I want to say to the honourable members across — we did, I think we did. We did take into account that we were going to do something about the estate tax. We were going to do something this very resolution asks to be done. — (Interjection) — That's right; we prepared the climate. This is a good comment. — (Interjection) — That is beside the point, whether the people decided otherwise or not.

The fact is, and I want to say to the honourable member that there were many things that the NDP Party had said they were going to do in the election campaign, and I know in my experience — we bring in the Medicare program if I may digress for a few moments. Many people asked me what are you going to do about Medicare? The NDP are going to reduce it in half — the Medicare bill in half — and probably they've heard that they were going to reduce it completely. But you know I said to my people: Well, did they tell you how they were going to finance it? No, they told you merely that they were going to reduce it by 50 percent or maybe all. But they weren't being, I think in all fairness, if I may use the word "honest" with the people in telling them how they were going to finance it. To me this is very important, Mr. Speaker. And I can say that if we wanted to go on on the election promises they had, we could go on for quite some time.

But getting back to the matter at hand. The estate tax, I think, is a very important one and I want to say and register my views on this matter, that it's important to the people which I represent. — (Interjection) — You're quite right and I told my people so. This is one of the reasons why I am here, Mr. Speaker, today.

So I say to the Minister of Finance, if he wonders what hardship that it does to farm

(MR. EINARSON cont'd) . . . . people, I say it could make it very very difficult, and one of the reasons because of the implications when the land is appraised. You talk about educating the farmer to equip himself for this. Yes, this is a justified question. Some of the farmers have done this. I know I've done it myself. But you know, Mr. Speaker, you could become insurance poor, because this is one of the forms that the insurance companies suddenly come to find another form of insurance. You can take out insurance to cover you for estate taxes. Quite right, this is so true. But there are many farmers who are finding it very difficult economically, who are just being able to keep their heads above water to make a living let alone have to find monies for other things such as insurance protection against the liabilities that estate tax may have on their farms.

MR. CHERNIACK: Would the honourable member permit the same type of question that I asked his colleague?

MR. EINARSON: Well there were several questions, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well, I'll ask them again if he'll permit me. Firstly, do you have any concrete knowledge of specific cases of sales that had to be made because of payment of estate tax that could not have been spread over a five-year period?

MR. EINARSON: This is something that has been in force for only a short period of time. But when he says that could be paid over a five-year period, well what difference does it make whether it's paid in the first year or five years? The economic effect is still there, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CHERNIACK: What is the average farm value of the average farm holding in the honourable member's constituency?

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Speaker, from the comments that I made, this is a very hypothetical question, for the simple reason that I said, say three years ago, a farm was worth maybe \$200.00 an acre; today you can't even sell it. This is why I say, Mr. Speaker, that this is not a valid argument when he asks this question. And so I say two years ago a quarter-section of land might have been worth \$32,000; today you're lucky if you can get \$15,000 for it.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well is the honourable member aware that there is a flat exemption, that any estate is not taxable until it exceeds \$50,000 in value?

MR. EINARSON: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm not positive of the figures but I must go by memory and I stand to be corrected. I'm sorry when the Minister was speaking I meant to ask him a question but I was called out to a phone for a long distance call and with the result I didn't. But the question I wanted to ask the Minister, Mr. Speaker, was if he could give us the amount of estate tax that has to be paid on a \$50,000 estate; on a \$100,000 estate; and shall I say a \$200,000 estate. I'm only quoting from memory and I stand to be corrected, but I believe on a \$200,000 estate - the farm has a \$200,000 estate - I believe the estate taxes are somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$45,000.00.

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: If no one else wishes to speak, Mr. Speaker, 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.

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie and the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Youth and Education in amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. BARKMAN: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I adjourned the debate for my colleague the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague the Member for La Verendrye for having adjourned the matter originally for me, and to thank the House for having allowed it to stand in the meantime.

Mr. Speaker, on the face of it, it is somewhat difficult for me to suggest that I would vote against a resolution or an amendment saying that the government should continue its study of education costs with a view to revolving a more equitable system of financing education because that obviously sounds like a sensible thing to be doing, that is to review the taxation and to arrive at something that's more equitable.

The problem I find though, Mr. Speaker, in supporting the amendment to the resolution proposed by my Leader is that there is nothing at all said about the time at which the government might proceed to do the study or when the study might be finalized or when the government might take action on this matter.

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd) . . . . .

Now if this were an entirely new subject that had not been discussed in this House before, then I could appreciate that the government might want to take considerable time. But, Mr. Speaker, this resolution, in the same words, was in this House at the last session. It was a matter of discussion then, and the then Leader of the New Democratic Party spoke after I had introduced this idea and supported it with great vigour. He was very much in favour of taking this action, and I find it surprising now that my honourable friends on the government side, that what they are proposing is to continue a study. Mr. Speaker, this sounds to me almost like the amendment that my honourable friends on the right hand side used to give to resolutions that we had last year and my honourable friends complained about the very same thing then. They said every time we bring in a resolution giving a positive proposal, the government amends it to say, well we'll continue a study, or we'll do — (Interjection) — You've been the government for two months. Well, on that one again — my honourable friend says they've been in government for two months, give them time.

Mr. Speaker, I've been I think again very fair in this, not overly critical of the government for not doing everything at once. If the amendment that my honourable friends came forward with at this time was to say we will have an overall review of taxation; if the government will come forward and say either we'll refer this to the proposed standing committee on economic development or we'll set up a standing committee of the House on tax reform, this committee will be established now, we'll refer tax matters to it, we will ask them to have a report for the next Session of the legislature — maybe not a final report but at least a preliminary one; if the government will say this to me I will be prepared to wait, Mr. Speaker. I'll be prepared to say on taxation matters: fine, let's do that.

But, Mr. Speaker, this is not what this resolution or the amendment proposes. It simply says, "continue its study of education costs." And I don't think that that's good enough, Mr. Speaker. I think the proposals I've made in the budget debate are along this very line, that what we need is an overall tax review and . . .

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

MR. MOLGAT: Certainly.

MR. CHERNIACK: . . . review of tax sources of revenue?

MR. MOLGAT: I don't recall that there was a statement that any committee of the House for example would be dealing with this matter. — (Interjection) — Well, will there be a study committee set up? Will this be a body to which people can make representation?

MR. CHERNIACK: That's not what you said earlier. Now you're switching.

MR. MOLGAT: No, no, no. What I said was whether this committee, or this body would review the matter. If the Minister will stand up and tell me if this will be the case and there'll be this review, then I'll be prepared to wait. But that is not what I've heard so far. This is not what this amendment proposed. It is in my opinion merely a delaying tactic without establishing any definite date or any definite plan that the government has of tax reform and therefore I cannot support the amendment in this form. I think the government either should accept our original resolution or should come forward with a definite statement that some such a committee will be established for tax reform with report at the next Session. If that were to be the case, I would wait. On the present basis I cannot support the amendment.

MR. BUD BOYCE (Winnipeg Centre): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Crescentwood, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Leader of Official Opposition and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface in amendment thereto. Are you ready for the question?

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Portage and the proposed motion of the Honourable First Minister in amendment thereto, and the proposed motion which I had taken under advisement of the Honourable House Leader of the Liberal Party.

I had considered the sub-amendment, but prior to giving my ruling on the proposed sub-amendment of the Honourable House Leader of the Liberal Party to the amendment of the

September 26, 1969

(MR. SPEAKER cont'd) . . . . Honourable First Minister, I wish to remind the honourable members of the provision of our Rules 51 (1) and 51 (3). Rule 51 (1) states: "Subject to Rule 26 all motions except motions to adjourn a debate shall be in writing." Rule 51 (3) is as follows: "A motion to amend a motion shall be delivered to the Speaker at the time it is moved." I apologize to the House for having erred in presuming that a written copy of the sub-amendment shall be forthcoming forthwith. Instead, all I received at the moment was a copy of the Orders of the Day with some written in deletions and changes which appeared to spell out the general intent of the sub-amendment. It was on the strength of this that I took the matter under advisement. It wasn't until some time after having given notice to the House that I am taking the matter under advisement did I receive an actual copy of the sub-amendment, and upon the perusal of it it became evident that had Rule 51 (3) been complied with I could have given my ruling forthwith and not held up debate on this motion. Henceforth, I urge the cooperation of all honourable members in adhering to the two rules hereinbefore cited.

Although the preamble to the sub-amendment may speak of something different from kickbacks, and in particular of pay-offs, but the operative portions of the sub-amendment does speak of kickbacks. Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and Forms, 4th Edition, 1958, Citation 202(14) reads as follows: "An amendment which would produce the same result as if the original motion were simply negatived is out of order." In this instance, the adoption of a sub-amendment would produce the same result as if the amendment of the Honourable First Minister were negatived. Therefore, I must rule the sub-amendment out of order.

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

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Rock Lake, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek. Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. RON McBRYDE (The Pas): . . . the Member for Sturgeon Creek isn't here, I want to discuss this resolution in very general terms. I was somewhat confused initially at the resolution as it appeared that this resolution arose from certain comments made in answer to the Speech from the Throne by the Member from River Heights. At that time it appeared that the Member from River Heights was suggesting that we develop a program similar to what the Americans call their "Head Start" program. However, when the resolution came forward and the Member from Sturgeon Creek spoke on it, he was suggesting something more like, I think, Friendship Centres. I'm not quite clear on exactly what they hope to accomplish by their resolution.

This matter that's under discussion is something that I've been involved in myself for quite a long time and that's quite close to me. I'd like to just, as I said, discuss this in a very general way and really in a non-partisan way, I think.

I'm somewhat concerned -- the resolution, or the people who proposed the resolution made the original comment, I'm concerned about how much knowledge they have on this subject or, you know, what their depth of knowledge or understanding of the subject is. My very first reaction to this resolution was one that I think a number of native people might have and that is some sort of fear generated by the experience of residential schools. As the members are probably aware, when we first came to this country, when Europeans first arrived here, we weren't very impressed with the native culture. We didn't understand that it was a separate culture and a culture with value, so we attempted to take this culture away from the native people and one of the instruments we used to do this was the residential schools, mostly run by church groups. Now if you look at the pattern of residential schools, you'll find the children were taken to the schools -- not the closest one to their home but usually one far away -- and the main purpose of doing this was to keep the children away from their parents, to try and take away their culture and substitute a new culture. After this experiment has been going on a hundred years, we're starting to realize that maybe this wasn't the best approach, that perhaps this wasn't the correct approach, so this sort of influences my first reaction to the resolution.

Another concern I would have with the resolution is that it only refers to native children, and I'd like to stop for a minute and look at the Hall-Dennis Report on Education that was done in Ontario, if I can find the spot. The Hall-Dennis Report suggested that there were a number of areas of special concern, not just native children. They suggested we had to have special concern for the gifted and talented, for new Canadians, for Canadian Indians, for residents with



(MR. McBRIDE cont'd) . . . . strong identification with another tongue, ethnic or religious customs, for those in need of nursery school experience, for the social economically disadvantaged, for those undergoing severe crises, such as grave accidents, hospitalization, long-term home care, pregnancy in teen-agers, death of parents or young offenders, early marriage, school expulsion, severe economic change in family status, transfers from outside the province, transfers from school to school and a number of other categories. They suggested there might be a need for special concentration in terms of education.

Another reaction or feeling I have on this particular resolution is that it reminds me of the approach which is common in education - and I haven't even discussed this matter fully with my colleagues and they might hold this type of approach - but the concept of the culturally deprived as opposed to the concept of the culturally different. The culturally deprived assume that those of us who are in the mainstream of western European culture have the culture; another group therefore must be culturally deprived, they must somehow have a defective culture. I would suggest perhaps that even those people of similar backgrounds to ours who live in poverty areas have a distinct culture of their own even though it's different. This is why I prefer myself the term culturally different.

One of the best reports I've read on the culturally different is a study done by Jack D. Forbes called "Education of the Culturally Different - a Multi-Cultural Approach." And I would like, if I might, to just take a few minutes and quote from this article. "Reaction of educators to the problem of under-achievement, alienation and withdrawal as it relates to racial and cultural minority groups, have been in general to intensify the use of traditional approaches and to focus the blame for failure upon the minority group. The concept of culturally disadvantaged youth and culturally deprived youth have been coined and they serve to suggest the minority group pupil and his family are at fault. The pupil in his sub-culture should be manipulated, this line of approach suggests, while the traditional school is in effect a finished product which has served majority group pupils well and should therefore not be seriously challenged. Minority groups must adjust, must conform, must change while schools in their programs are basically sound and need no fundamental revision."

As Reginald W. Mayer, former Chairman of the Education Committee of San Francisco NAACP has noted, in "Nation" September 12, 1966, "By accepting the premise of cultural deprivation, school administrators and school boards delude themselves and the public into believing that special programs designed to compensate for inadequate home environment are all that is needed. Operation Head Start, the National Teacher Corps, and compensatory educational programs are generally based upon the above assumptions. The increased exposure to any school environment, coupled with an intensified remedial approach, will solve, or at least ameliorate the problems of the culturally deprived. It may be that those who wish to deal effectively with the culturally different child will have to revise their thinking about which end of the school-pupil continuum is disadvantaged. Are disadvantaged pupils attending advantaged schools taught by culturally enriched teachers or is it possible that some culturally different pupils are more enriched than their culturally deprived teachers and schools? Or is it that all are deprived, schools, pupils and teachers?"

"Cultural deprivation is not a new concept. For at least a century it has been an expression of Anglo-American racism, chauvinism and superiority. On the assumption that American Indian groups were backward or savage, young Indians were taken away from their parents and indoctrinated in white, middle-class values. The Indian child was assumed to have no culture except in terms of savage customs which had to be uprooted. The middle-class missionaries, secular or otherwise, were to civilize the aborigines by giving them a culture."

The . . . and Dumont Report describes the use of cultural vacuum doctrine as it is being applied today to both Indian and non-Indian children.

"Especially in the slums inhabited by the ethnic minorities, the tension of urban schools are markedly similar to those at the Pine Ridge Sioux Reservation School. Urban educators are isolated from the cultural and social milieu of the pupils, as are their reservation counterparts. Knowing little of their pupils' life, and terrified or appalled by what they do discover, they justify their avoidance with a vacuum ideology of cultural deficiency and deprivation which ignores or is derogatory to the values and knowledge that pupils have acquired in their home and neighbourhoods. The concept of cultural deprivation, as it has frequently been used, is simply a belief that Anglo-Saxon minority groups do not possess a culture which can be utilized or enhanced by the schools. The children of the minority group are deprived because they are

(MR. McBRYDE cont'd) . . . . not carriers of the Anglo middle-class heritage and the task of the school is to make up for this deficiency, or to put it another way, the school is to be used as a device for assimilation."

I'm sure honourable members are aware of the differences between integration, between assimilation, and perhaps even the differences between apartheid, which are all approaches which can be used to deal with cultural matters. It is my assumption that the native people and other minority groups in Manitoba would prefer the integration approach rather than the assimilation approach.

So we've established that we have some culturally different people. What problems does this cause? The first problem of culturally different is the difference in language. It seems very strange that some languages are considered to be beneficial while other languages are considered to be harmful to students. I think this matter was touched on very well by a teacher, a former curriculum consultant with the Department of Education by the name of Bruce Sealey. In a speech at The Pas on February 7, 1968, he made the following comment: "The second problem with which the teacher and pupils struggle is that of language. I will agree that a child knowing only the Cree or Sioux language is at some disadvantage in a Grade 1 classroom. Is it, however, as great a disadvantage as we sometimes think? In Canada we are striving to develop a bilingual people. In most cases we hope to introduce the French language to English-speaking children at the Grade 1 level. We feel that through a knowledge of another language the lives of our children will be enriched. If a knowledge of French enriches, why should we consider that a knowledge of Cree is detrimental? Perhaps the Indian child is at a disadvantage only because we see it as a disadvantage. Perhaps if teacher attitudes were changed, they would so modify their teaching and curriculum approaches that this disadvantage would become an advantage."

Another problem that faces a culturally different child is that the schools are basically - and I think we'll all admit this - the schools are basically a middle-class or a white Anglo-Saxon protestant system. It is a strange land to a child who comes from a different background or from a different ethnic group. This difference tends to alienate students. When I was working with the Attorney-General's Department in the interior of British Columbia, I first arrived in a small town that consisted of a mixture of white and Indian people. This was a very new area and at that time there were about 20 kids that were in trouble with the law, 13 of them who happened to be Indians. Nine of those had been involved in an isolated community in breaking into a school and damaging the school quite considerably. Another three were just before the court for doing the same thing in a high school in town. To me, this was dramatic evidence that there was something wrong, that there was a problem with the . . . school system, and groups that were different and who were forced to attend them to take part in this system.

The same article on the culturally different has some other quotations which might be useful. "What have been the reactions of minority groups to the little Anglo school house. For many years the typical school was both Anglo-American and Protestant. This type of school was rejected by Irish and other Roman Catholics in favour of a separate school system, many schools of which had and still have an Irish, Polish or other ethnic flavour. Still other groups such as Finns and Swedes took over the public schools in areas where they were predominant and altered their character somewhat. Oriental and Jewish-Americans either set up their own schools, or more commonly established supplementary schools where Chinese language and culture, Japanese language and culture, or Hebrew language and culture could be made available to the use of the community." -- (Interjection) -- I'm not sure what the French do in this article, it doesn't say. "Afro-American, Indian and Mexican groups have sometimes done the same thing but usually on an informal folk group or ad hoc basis."

Another problem facing the culturally different child when he comes to school is the problem of I. Q. tests. I. Q. tests, as most of my teacher colleagues will know, are based on the majority of students and they are based on the majority culture. For some reason teachers seem to put a lot of faith or a lot of emphasis on this pseudo-scientific instrument. As a matter of fact, you've probably read in the papers that one U. S. Professor is using the I. Q. tests to prove that Afro-Americans or negroes are inferior to the white people.

In regard to I. Q. tests, in the same speech by Bruce Sealey at The Pas, Manitoba, he made the following statement: "As Indian children enter the public schools the administrators, in order to determine how the schools could best serve them, gave the children batteries of

(MR. McBRYDE cont'd) . . . . tests. The key test in this battery almost invariably was the I. Q. test, and as a result of these test results teachers developed a set of expectations for the Indians as well as certain attitudes towards them. I would suggest that I. Q. tests given to an Indian or Metis child gives the teacher little or no information of value. The I. Q. test assumes that there are standard tasks that all individuals learn at about the same time throughout their development, and that an individual's intelligence can be judged by comparing his performance with the average performance of all individuals of his age." And Mr. Sealey went on to say: "I have no serious disagreement with this concept inasmuch as it applies to the middle-class white society, but when the middle-class white society oriented test is used as a criteria of the innate intelligence of a child from an Indian culture group, I reject its results completely. An Indian child is from a distinct linguistic language group. In a large Manitoba town the results of a Stanford Binet intelligence test indicated that 24 percent of the Indian children attending public schools fell into a range commonly referred to as mentally retarded. This extreme case points out the pitfalls into which the unwary administrator and the teacher may fall through the use of standardized I. Q. tests with cultural minorities.

Another problem facing the culturally different child as he comes into school is his self-concepts. When I was at a small community in Litton, British Columbia, there was a particular girl who was in high school - I believe it was Grade 10 at that time - who was doing quite well. One day when she was in a store uptown she was talking to some of the, what you would say the middle-class white ladies, and telling them of how she was doing in school. One of the ladies replied that it doesn't make any difference because you're only an Indian. After that point her grades went downward until she finally dropped out of school, and this is another sort of a dramatic incidence of how their self-concept can affect a person and their performance in school and in general their success in life.

Dr. Bryde in the States has done quite intensive studies on this situation, and he found out on studying an Indian reserve in the United States that the children did better in school, they did better in school up until Grade 4 or 5, and then somewhere about Grade 5, 6 or 7 they fell behind. His idea of what happened - and he has no way of proving it - is that this is the time a child begins to ask the questions, who am I, or what am I? And when the Indian child had negative feed-back from this, this is when he begins to lose interest in school and to have other matters dominate his thoughts rather than school work.

Again, if I might, I'd like to quote from the article on the Culturally Different. "More telling than any other argument is, however, the fact that Anglo middle-class people have had their own way for at least a century. For centuries Negroes, Indians, Mexican-Americans and other racial cultural minorities had beginning to take for experience experiments in the mono-cultural, mono-lingual, vacuum ideology compensatory education as many as five or more generations, and the record is not one to inspire confidence.

Another problem facing the culturally different child is the problem of the history he gets presented to him in school. This problem is not only common to native children, I know that many Negro professors in the States are very upset that their detailed history of their own groups are often ignored and gather dust in library bookshelves or get filed away.

The same Bruce Sealey when he was speaking at The Pas also touched on this point of history and gave special consideration as to how it affected Indian children. "As he, the Indian child, moves into higher grades and begins the formal study of his country's history, he will have impressed upon him the fact that his ancestors were barbaric savages. His first lesson will deal with the blood-thirsty Iroquois. Will he learn the benefits they brought to the early settlers? Will he learn that the French-Indian wars were begun by Champlain slaughtering unarmed Iroquois? Will he learn that the saving of Canada from American invasion during the 1812-1814 war was largely due to the bravery of Indian troops?

A number of culture minority groups have trouble facing up to their history in many occasions.

A MEMBER: Would the member permit a question?

MR. McBRYDE: Of course.

A MEMBER: Would you suggest that hitherto the school systems have been used as an instrument of brainwashing children in a particular way relative to the Indian population?

MR. McBRYDE: There's an expression I think that history is the property of the victor, and this has applied to Indian students as well as others.

Another problem facing students of culturally different groups are teacher expectations.

(MR. McBRIDE cont'd) . . . . In this regard an excellent study has been done which shows that the expectations of the teacher have more effect than anything else. This study was done in the United States but it was very simple. The study group went into schools and predicted that certain students would do better. They actually never figured this out, they just picked the students at random and told the teachers that these students will do better. When they came back for their retest a year later the students they had predicted would do better had done better, even though they were just picked by chance by the experimenters.

What are some of the possible methods of dealing with these problems we've raised? I'd say the first probable one is to eliminate I.Q. tests.

Another would be to adopt a program at the Manitoba University in northern and Indian education similar to that at the University of Saskatchewan.

Another would be to encourage a Manitoba university - probably the same one - to install an institute for Canadian Indian studies.

A fourth would be to review the presentation of history of Indians in learning materials now in use and establish a publication policy which will lead to creation of a realistic picture of early Indian life and the contribution of its cultural heritage. This same should be done for other minority groups.

Another is to undertake a recruiting and financial assistance campaign that will increase the number of Cree, Saulteaux, Sioux, Chippewyan and other minority group teachers, especially for the low elementary and kindergarten levels.

A sixth point would be to do studies on problems of cultural difference and develop variations to meet these problems within the existing educational system.

No. 7 would be to make a special effort to involve the parents of culturally different and economically deprived students in the education system.

No. 8 would be to allow teachers in schools to be more experimental and to reward experimentation.

No. 9 would be to give full credit at both the high school and university level for any second or third language, that is, recognize Cree, Saulteaux, Sioux, French and other minority languages as valuable assets.

No. 10 would be to hire more teacher aides who are from the same cultural group as the students. Indian Affairs Branch appears to be moving in this direction at this time.

Give greater financial assistance, financial rewards to teachers having special capabilities or experience in teaching in cross-cultural situations.

MR. PAULLEY: It may be a convenient time to adjourn the House and allow the honourable member to continue the next time we meet this order of business. Before the motion is formally presented, Your Honour, may I remind the members of the Legislature that the Committee on Statute Revision will meet at 9:00 o'clock on Monday morning, followed with the Committee on Law Amendments at 10:00 o'clock on Monday morning.

And also, Mr. Speaker, just for the information of the members of the House, there will be a notice in Votes and Proceedings which we will receive on Monday of the calling of the Committee on Law Amendments for Tuesday morning at 9:30 as well.

I give this notice, Mr. Speaker, in order that the members of the Assembly who are on the respective committees may accommodate themselves.

I now move, Mr. Speaker, seconded by the Honourable the Attorney-General, that the House do now adjourn.

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