

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Monday, March 16, 1970

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions.

PRESENTING PETITIONS

MR. MORRIS MCGREGOR (Virden): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the petition of Everett Williams praying for the passing of an Act for the Relief of Everett Williams.

MR. SPEAKER: Reading and Receiving Petitions. The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. CLERK: The Petition of The Institute of Chartered Accountants of Manitoba praying for the passing of An Act to amend The Chartered Accountants Act.

REPORTS BY STANDING COMMITTEES

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees. Adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General, The Honourable Member for Rhineland -- (Interjection) -- Leave to let the matter stand?

Notices of Motion; Introduction of Bills.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: At this point I would like to introduce to the Honourable Members 25 pupils of Grade 10 and 11 standing of La Broquerie School. They are here under the direction of Mr. Taillefer. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for La Verendrye. On behalf of the members of the Legislative Assembly, may I welcome you here today.

Orders of the Day. The Honourable Minister of Education.

STATEMENT

HON. SAUL A. MILLER (Minister of Youth and Education)(Seven Oaks): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I should like to make an announcement, an annual announcement, but one which will be of interest to members of the House as well as to all municipalities, school boards and I'm sure taxpayers, local property taxpayers, and it is in connection with the Foundation levy rates for 1970. As you know, the Foundation Fund which is administered by the Public Schools Finance Board is supported on a 70-30 basis by the province and the municipalities in unitary divisions respectively. In 1969 the rate for the foundation levy on municipalities was 10.9 mills on farm and residential property and was 34.9 mills on other property. That is a differential of 24 mills. For 1970 the applicable rates to be applied to raise the 30 percent municipal share of the cost of the Foundation Program will be reduced by 1 mill throughout all unitary divisions and municipalities in Manitoba. Therefore the rate on farm and residential property in 1970 will drop to 9.9 mills from 10.9 mills and -- that is on the balanced assessment -- and on other property from 34.9 mills down to 33.9 mills, a saving of one mill on all local property and I trust and hope, of course, that this saving will be passed on to the residents of the various municipalities and the taxpayers in the various school divisions.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Honourable Minister could indicate to us what this means in real dollar terms, the amount of capital represented by the one mill, and secondly whether the three year write-off period that was included in last year's budget actually was exceeded so that the deficit for the previous years was paid off, and if this one mill that they're adding now results from a surplus from last year's budgetting.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to advise the member that the one mill deficit incurred back in 1967 will now be completely paid off. There will be no deficit to carry on and therefore no interest to pay. We are eliminating that deficit and in addition to that there will be this one mill decrease that I mentioned.

MR. CRAIK: My first question, Mr. Speaker, was what it actually represented in real dollar terms.

HON. SIDNEY GREEN (Minister of Mines and Natural Resources)(Inkster): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I think after a ministerial statement that statements may be made by each

(MR. GREEN cont'd) of the other parties with regard to it. This is not the question period. After the proceedings with regard to the statements have been concluded I assume that questions can then be asked, but the procedure after a ministerial statement, that each party in the house can then make a statement commenting on it, then the question period follows.

MR. CRAIK: On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. If that is the case as the Honourable House Leader has suggested, the Minister should have asked leave of the House to make a statement.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, if my honourable friend wishes to go back to where the Minister was at the outset, the Minister got up and said he wanted to make a statement. That is usually a request for leave. If there were objections they should have been taken at the time. I'm merely dealing with the procedure now. On a ministerial statement each party is entitled to then get up and make a statement; the question period will follow in due course.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, are we not at this time into Orders of the Day, and are we not into the question period and was the Minister not speaking on that very point?

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, we are on Orders of the Day, a Minister of the Crown has got up and made a statement; my understanding of the rules is that on that occasion each party is entitled to make a statement in reply and the question period follows.

MR. J. DOUGLAS WATT (Arthur): On the same point of order, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Minister did say before the Orders of the Day and then rise to make the statement. We are now on the question period.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, we are in the question period if the statements that are permitted to parties opposite have been exhausted. Do I take it then that the statements that wish to be made by the Liberal Party and by the Conservative Party are exhausted? If they are then we are on questions.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, are we now in the question period? And if so may I ask my question?

MR. SPEAKER: A statement had been made by the Minister. The honourable members are well aware of the privilege extended to the parties to make a statement on behalf of the parties, and those statements were made. I presumed that it was the intention of the House to continue with the question period, and that being so I felt that the question put to the Honourable Minister was in order. At the moment, my recollection of the rules, I cannot recall that this must be done in any particular order. I do not believe that this in any sense precludes a party represented in this House from making a statement if any party chooses to do so.

MR. JAMES H. BILTON (Swan River): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I think it has been the practice in the past to follow the procedure that was followed today. The Honourable Leader of the House knows that very well, that when ministerial statements have been made before he has taken up a good deal of the time of the House in asking pertinent questions to do with the Minister's statement.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON (Rock Lake): Mr. Speaker, from what I just heard in the statement the Minister made, I think I heard him correctly when he mentioned the unitary divisions, I'm wondering where do the non-unitary divisions stand in this announcement.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, as the member probably knows, non-unitary divisions are not included because there is no levy made upon them for the Foundation Program.

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

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, if I could just ask my question which got lost in the dust there previously as to whether -- how many dollars does one mill represent?

MR. MILLER: One mill on the balanced assessment in the unitary divisions. It would represent this year approximately, as far as the savings are concerned, approximately \$800,000.00. I haven't got the actual total balanced assessment of Manitoba before me. I believe it's something like 1.9 billion dollars.

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

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM (Birtle-Russell): Mr. Speaker, would the Honourable Minister of Education please tell this House how much the balanced assessment has increased this year?

MR. MILLER: One hundred million dollars.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. HARRY ENNS (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, I think the pertinent question really that we want to ask of the Minister of Education -- does he feel that the announcement today would lead us to believe that we would not expect a rise in taxation increase in the province this year?

MR. MILLER: Since I haven't my crystal ball with me I couldn't possibly answer that, Mr. Speaker. However, I would hope that the drop in the mill rate as far as the local taxpayer is concerned will be reflected in municipal and school board budgets.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q.C. (Minister of Finance)(St. John's): Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the various Acts requiring filing of reports I ask leave to file reports: Public Accounts under the Financial Administration Act; Manitoba Hydro-Electric Board Annual Report under the Manitoba Hydro Act; return under Section 111(2) of The Insurance Act; Report on Examination of Accounts as required by The Mental Health Act for the year ending March 31, 1969; Statements prepared pursuant to Section 20 of the Public Officers' Act as amended by Chapter 56, Statutes of Manitoba, 1955, as at February 10th, 1969; the Annual Report of the Manitoba Telephone System under the Manitoba Telephone Act.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour) (Transcona): Mr. Speaker, if I may. In accordance with the provisions of the legislation I beg to lay on the table the Annual Report of the Manitoba Civil Service Superannuation Fund for the year ending December 31st, 1968; the Report of the Manitoba Labour-Management Review Committee for the calendar year 1969-- this is generally considered as being the Woods Committee Report. The Report of the Workmen's Compensation Act of Manitoba for the year 1969, and accompanying that report a statistical analysis of accidents reported during the year 1969.

Mr. Speaker, may I say that copies of these four reports and the appendage are available and will be distributed to the members of the Assembly this afternoon.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. GORDON W. BEARD (Churchill): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Last week there was an announcement in the paper in respect to \$200 million for assistance to depressed areas -- and I'm sorry the Minister of Industry and Commerce isn't here but I direct it to the First Minister. It states that in consultation with the provinces the direction for this money was set up. Was there no consultation in respect to Churchill because I see only The Pas has been chosen?

HON. ED. SCHREYER (Premier)(Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, at the time when the ministers of the provincial government and the ministers of the federal government met in Ottawa a few months ago relative to the question of designating certain areas, special areas in the provinces for purposes of that federal program, the Town of Churchill was listed by the Government of Manitoba as being one of three or four Manitoba communities we felt should be candidates for special area grants and loan assistance. There still remains the distinct possibility that Churchill may be accepted as a community for purposes of special area designation some time in the calendar year 1970. I wouldn't discount that possibility at all.

MR. BEARD: A supplementary question. I also noticed that the Honourable James Richardson noted that this program would help the Indian-Metis people. If this is within 100 miles of the area of The Pas I wish you would point out that the majority of the Indian-Metis people live outside of this area.

MR. SCHREYER: The member's point is well taken, Mr. Speaker.

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

HON. PETER BURTNIAK (Minister of Tourism and Recreation)(Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to bring to the attention of the House the fact that the world curling championships are taking place in Utica, New York, starting today, and I think that I can safely say that on behalf of all the members of this Assembly we would like to extend our sincere congratulations to the Donny Duguid rink who won the Brier in this our Centennial year and I'm sure we want to wish him every success in the world championship play-offs in Utica, New York.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. LEONARD A. BARKMAN (La Verendrye): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct another question to the Minister of Youth and Education. He mentioned that the assessment increased by \$100 million. Would this indicate that the biggest majority of this increase would basically fall on those people that have had the most recent assessment or equalized assessments?

MR. MILLER: No, I don't think you could come to that conclusion at all. There is a total increase of \$100 million but this is pretty well along the averages over the last few years. I think it's about 8 percent per year. I don't think it means that there's been a re-assessment but rather new additions to assessments, new construction and so on.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture. Is the government making a representation to the Federal Government on behalf of the farmers protesting against the acreage quota proposed by the Federal Government for the crop year 1970-71, and will it make an appeal to have special crops qualify for quota purposes?

HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Minister of Agriculture)(Lac du Bonnet): That's, Mr. Speaker, a very broad sort of a question. The Province of Manitoba has made a great deal of representation on matters pertaining to problems in agriculture and indeed we'll continue to do so. I want to say that Manitoba has made certain proposals which have yet not been replied to as far as the federal people are concerned to alleviate the cash shortage on the prairies. We are still ready to stand by those proposals, namely that we are prepared to enter into cash advance programs on a provincial basis providing that we have the co-operation of the Federal Government to do so. I can't say at this point what our reaction is going to be based on what kind of an answer we get from the federal authorities, but there is continuing dialogue as between the Province of Manitoba and the Federal Government on matters relating to agriculture. I might mention that current at the moment is the whole question of the feed grains issue and as you may possibly know the Standing Committee on Agriculture of the House of Commons is now dealing with the question. Manitoba will be making its position known within a day or two.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: A supplementary question. Aside from the matter of getting immediate cash for the farmers, is the government satisfied with the proposal that is being made at the present time?

MR. USKIW: Well I think it's overly simplified to say that we're satisfied or unsatisfied. I think there are good aspects of the program and I think there are some aspects with which we ought to be concerned; and as I pointed out a moment earlier, that we will have continuing discussions with federal people on the matter.

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

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs. As he knows, just recently the assessment branch of his department have drastically increased the fees to the municipalities for doing assessment work. For example, the R. M. of Portage la Prairie's assessment has gone up from \$23 thousand to \$28 thousand. Could the Minister give the reason for this drastic increase in assessment cost to the municipalities in Manitoba?

HON. HOWARD R. PAWLEY (Minister of Municipal Affairs)(Selkirk): I'll take that question as notice, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Finance. Recently there has been a change in policy in pre and post audit of Crown Corporations. I wonder if this was the request of the Crown Corporations to have the provincial auditors do their audit or was this the decision of the government?

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, the respective Acts provide that the audit shall be carried out by the - what was the provincial auditor who is the controller, unless the cabinet otherwise decides. The cabinet in considering the question when it came time to review who would perform the audit, felt that since the -- I'm sorry I forget his present title, is it controller? -- auditor-general -- that since he is now reporting direct to the Legislature and is a servant of the Legislature, since he has the capacity to handle all this work that it should be centralized in one office with one form of procedures and thus be accountable direct to the Legislature.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, the point that I think the Minister has not answered, did the Crown Corporations ask for this?

MR. CHERNIACK: . . . clear that the responsibility is that of Cabinet under the Act and that Cabinet made the decision.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. INEZ TRUEMAN (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question of the Honourable Minister of Education. Has the information been transmitted to the City of Winnipeg regarding the one mill reduction since they are in the middle of their budgeting right now?

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, the reason I made the statement today is that the Act requires March 15th as the deadline. The statement has to be made today; the letters will be in the mail probably within the next five minutes once word gets out.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. WATT: Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a further question to the Honourable Minister of Agriculture in regard to the Federal Government's policy on reduction of wheat based on acreage payments. Is the Minister now agreed that the basis -- (Interjection) -- I'll direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Government Services in a moment if he'll just be patient. My question to the Minister of Agriculture, is he now satisfied that acreage payments are in some respect an answer to our problems and is he satisfied with the basis on which acreage payments will be paid?

MR. USKIW: Well I think my honourable friend should know historically that I'm never satisfied, I never was when I was on that side of the House, and one can always say that more ought to be done. I think that we have to make the point though that when Manitoba made its position clear at the Federal-Provincial Conference that we insisted that if there is going to be the policy of withdrawing land or acreage from production it could only be done accompanied with an acreage payment to offset some of the cost.

MR. SPEAKER: May I remind the honourable members that questions calling for an expression of opinion are not the types that are allowed under our rules. The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask a question of the First Minister regarding the special incentive program which he replied a few moments ago. He mentioned that Manitoba has made application for, I understood, four points. Would the Minister be in a position to tell us which four points?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I can undertake to table the written submission which we made to the Federal Government at the time when we met with them on this question. Perhaps the honourable member would care to move an Order for Return.

MR. MOLGAT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I'll be delighted to do so. A subsequent question. I think since that submission a change has occurred in Churchill in that the announcement of the closing of the research base or the restriction has occurred. Is there a possibility of the province making a new submission to Ottawa in the light of the new circumstances?

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I have done so in the sense that I have written to the Prime Minister and to officials connected with the National Research Council pointing out that there are certain possibilities at Churchill with respect to the establishment of a northern research laboratory, and a number of other similar proposals which have been put together with considerable help of certain people at the University of Manitoba. As I say, I have written to the federal authorities, the Prime Minister in particular, in that respect.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. GABRIEL GIRARD (Emerson): I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Youth and Education. Has your department, Sir, completed its examination of school budgets that have been submitted to your department from the divisions in the province?

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, my department itself does not scrutinize the budgets; that is the business of the Finance Board.

MR. GIRARD: A supplementary question. Do you have information in that regard from the Finance Board that they have completed that examination?

MR. MILLER: Oh yes. As far as I know, Mr. Speaker, the examination has been completed. That is why the announcement today has been made so that the Finance Board can now order the municipalities to levy the 9.9 in order to raise the 30 percent required from the municipalities.

MR. GIRARD: Another supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Does their examination reveal to you that there will have to be, therefore, an increase in the special levies?

MR. MILLER: As I said originally, I have not seen the budget, I don't see the budgets, and so I can't guess what the budgets might forecast.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE (Roblin): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I'd like to direct a question to the First Minister. If during the visit of our Queen to this province this summer she shows interest in granting amnesty, would the government support same?

MR. SCHREYER: Matters of clemency and the like, Mr. Speaker, I don't believe are proper bases for questions here in the House; and in any case I must confess I didn't get the full import of the question.

MR. PAULLEY: Do you want to be absolved from . . .

MR. MCKENZIE: Am I permitted to ask the question again, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member's supplementary.

MR. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I was trying to get across the point that during the official visit of our Queen this coming summer, if she shows interest in granting amnesty to some of those that are serving time, would the government of this province support the exercise?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I don't think that would come under the purview of this administration, but in the event that it may indirectly, I would ask the Attorney-General to take notice of the question.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, usually in some jurisdictions there is amnesty given to political prisoners. I don't think there are any political prisoners here yet.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, before Orders of the Day are called I should like leave of the House to make a change with respect to the composition of honourable members that constitute the committee on committees, and with members' permission I would move that the name of Mr. Green be substituted for the name of Mr. Mackling, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Labour.

Mr. Speaker, I put that in the nature of a request by leave of the House rather than a formal motion.

MR. SPEAKER: Has the Honourable First Minister leave? (Agreed).

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable First Minister. The Honourable House Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, my reason for adjourning this most important motion is to remind the House that two years ago a similar motion was proposed to have the important subject of education added as a subject for a Standing Committee of the House. I refer members to the journals of 1968 in this House and I would like to read the motion proposed at that time by the then Member for Emerson:

"WHEREAS this House has no Standing Committee on Education; and

WHEREAS Education by general agreement is given top priority; and

WHEREAS the cost of education is constantly rising; and

WHEREAS changes in our educational setup are necessary and inevitable,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that a Standing Committee of this House be appointed for the purpose of education, which committee shall be empowered to examine and enquire into all such matters and things as may be referred to it by the House and to report from time to time its observations and opinions thereon with power to send for persons, papers and documents and to examine witnesses under oath."

Well, Mr. Speaker, since that motion was first introduced into this House we've had more increases in the cost of education. Where last year in the direct current operating budget \$149,457,000 were voted, a further \$25 million dollars to Manitoba Schools Finance authority was also voted and another \$2 million dollars to the University of Manitoba, making a \$176 million some odd out of a total budget of \$377 million. Mr. Speaker, there has been so much public debate on this important matter that I think that the public of the province and the interested people wherever they are in this province should have a chance to be able to speak to their legislators, and also the legislators themselves should have a chance to question the experts and have a hand in making policy on matters of education in this province.

In referring back to the motion that was presented by Mr. Tanchak at that time it would be interesting for the House to know who the people were in the House who voted for the motion. I will just recap briefly the members who are presently in this House who voted for the motion. --(Interjection) -- Well there's enough of them that if they all get together with one another I'm sure they can carry the motion and persuade their friends. Mr. Barkman, the Member

(MR. G. JOHNSTON cont'd) for La Verendrye is here. Mr. Cherniack, the Minister of Finance; Mr. Desjardins, the Member for St. Boniface is here. Mr. Doern, the acting Speaker of the House; Mr. Fox; Mr. Froese; Mr. Green, another influential member of the government; Mr. Hanuschak who holds a very key spot; myself; Mr. Miller, who holds an extremely important position in the government in respect to this motion; Mr. Molgat; Mr. Patrick; Mr. Paulley; Mr. Petursson; Mr. Uskiw. Mr. Speaker, these are members who supported the motion that was put forward at that time, so in order to give those gentlemen and their cohorts an opportunity to vote once again - and I hope the same way - I have prepared an amendment to the motion.

I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Assiniboia that the motion be amended by adding thereto after the word "purposes" where it appears in line two thereof the following word "education".

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I have a word to say without in any way commenting on merits or demerits of the position that's enunciated by the Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party. I would like to point out that the motion refers to these Standing Committees, and these Standing Committees are the ones that are set out in the rules, and they are set out in Rule 68 (1), and the motion is merely in compliance with the rules of the House. Now I have no objection to considering - and none of the members in the House would have objection to considering whether or not there should be another Standing Committee. My understanding is that the present committee on rules and regulations is looking into the entire rules of the House, is looking into the committee structure; so without in any way taking something away from the motion that my honourable friend has put, I must respectfully say that it is out of order in that the Education Committee is not one of the Standing Committees of the House as defined by the rules.

Now I'm sure that the honourable member can find another way of bringing the subject matter of that which he proposes to the House so there's no doubt that the question will be aired, but I rather think that on this motion which requires that the House deal with the Standing Committees formed by the rules, that the question of whether or not there should be another Standing Committee is really not in order and therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would ask that the motion be proceeded with on the basis of the existing rules.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, if I may on the same point of order, I anticipated my honourable friend the House Leader would be taking this position, but he should have read the rules because he will find that the rule and the motion that's before us are not the same. The motion that is before us has a committee on Economic Development. The rule on Page 31 has no committee on Economic Development. What happened was that last year this House -- (Interjection) -- I have the floor, I'm sorry.

MR. PAULLEY: No, if I may, Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege say to my -- (Interjection) -- I wonder if the rabble would just desist for a moment. What I do want to point out for the purposes of clarification, Mr. Speaker, to my honourable friend, the Member for Ste. Rose, to whom I have a great deal of respect despite some members, what I do want to point out to my honourable friend the Member for Ste. Rose is that while the printing in the Rule Book has not been changed, by a resolution of this Assembly there was included in the Rules the establishment of a Committee on Economic Development.

MR. MOLGAT: I don't deny that for one moment, Mr. Speaker, and I was about to come to that point, that what happened was that last year this House decided to pass a resolution in the House setting up the new committee, and so if the House was able last year to pass a resolution setting up a new committee by way of resolution, surely the House is equally able, at this point, to introduce an amendment to the rules. My only point is that I believe, Mr. Speaker, that it is in order for the House to make this step. The government may not want to do so, but I think that by the rules of the House the House is empowered to change the committees and has already done so in the course of the past session.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order, I've indicated in my earlier remarks that the honourable member has a way of bringing the subject matter of that which he wishes discussed to the House in the same way as the honourable member now says this was done last year. His resolution is not an amendment to the rule; his resolution is that the standing committees of the House for the present session be appointed for the following purposes, and then he adds to one of the standing committees one which was not there previously. Now I'm suggesting that is exactly what his amendment says, and all I'm suggesting is that if

(MR. GREEN cont'd) he wishes to change the rule or if he wishes to add another committee, he should do so by separate resolution. I would indicate to my honourable friend that the Rule Book which I'm holding, and which he says I didn't read, contains the notation that there is an added committee on Economic Development, and if the honourable member is suggesting that a new committee be added in the same way as it was done last year then I suggest that that be done, but in the meantime we are dealing with these standing committees and therefore this is not one of them.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, if I may draw further reference to the rules. -- (Interjection) -- Did you want to say something, my dear friend? -- (Interjection) -- I'm not a House Leader at all; I'm a member of the Assembly and one who has been around here for a considerable period of time and know a little bit about the rules of this House, and in all deference to my honourable friend from Morris, maybe he has a lot to learn. -- (Interjection)-- I beg your pardon?

May I suggest too that there is another consideration that has to be taken under advisement and that is the fact that following the change of the number of committees in the rules, we established a Committee of the Rules of the House who were charged with the responsibility of considering what should be the committees of the House. That committee, I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, in all due respect, has not made its report. It is in the process, I understand, of making its report and it may make a recommendation of the change of the committees, and may I suggest in all respect to the House Leader of the Liberal Party, that if his proposition is considered by this House either in the affirmative or in the negative, it would preclude us in this instance of considering the contents of the report on the Committee of Rules because it is well known -- my friend shakes his head -- it is well known that once a decision is made in this House at one session the subject matter thereof cannot be revived, and I would suggest in all due deference to my friend, the House Leader of the Liberal Party, it would be well advised for him to withhold this particular motion until the House is in receipt of the report from the Rules Committee, and if in the report from the Rules Committee the subject matter of his proposition at this time is not considered, it would be appropriate at that time for him to ask for the inclusion of this separate and special committee.

So I appeal to my honourable friend as not one who is thoroughly aware of all of the rules of the House, but this is a point that should be taken into consideration as well. We're waiting on the report of the Special Committee of the Rules of the House. If it does not contain the recommendation of my honourable friend, he will have the opportunity of presenting his proposition. If the committee does make its recommendation that there be a Committee on Education, and this one is defeated at this particular time, it will preclude my honourable friend from introducing the subject matter of his amendment.

MR. BILTON: Mr. Speaker, may I humbly suggest that you take the matter under advisement?

MR. SPEAKER: Honourable members will recall that as recently as last Friday we had an amendment to another motion of a similar nature, or at least had it been adopted the effectiveness would have been similar in the sense that it would have been tantamount to an amendment to a rule of the House, and at that time it was ruled out of order. I've examined the amendment before me and I find that if it were allowed the effect of it would be an amendment to Rule 68, subsection (1) of our Standing Rules, and I'm sure that honourable members are well aware of the procedure that this House follows in amending rules, because as I've just indicated a moment ago this would have the effect of an amendment of the rule. I therefore must rule the amendment out of order.

Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to say a few words on the motion that is before us. -- (Interjection) -- That's on the main motion, so I can still speak on the main motion and include this matter of adding an Education Committee to it. It doesn't bar us from discussing the matter further.

The point made by the former House Leader that if the Rules Committee brings in a report and if the matter is not included, certainly we cannot amend that report; the report would have to be turned back to a committee. First, the committee would have to be re-established and it would have to be referred back to that committee, if such a committee was to be added. But let it be as it may, at any rate I think it would have been advisable that such a committee be established because we know that if any department of the government has special committees of its own, it's the Education Department. We have so many different

(MR. FROESE cont'd) committees within the Education Department and I think it would only be proper to have such a committee so that we could call on these committees from time to time and hear from them as well as from the Finance Board.

MR. SPEAKER: . . . the honourable member to direct his remarks to the motion before us.

MR. FROESE: I'm not speaking to the amendment. The amendment was ruled out of order so I'm speaking on the main motion, but that doesn't rule us out from debating the matter whether we shouldn't have an Education Committee added, and this is the very point. I have repeatedly, when this matter came up on previous occasions, discussed this very point about the Public School Finance Board. I feel that this Board should appear before such a committee so that we could question it on various points. We have Hydro and Telephone appear before the Utilities Committee. -- (Interjection) -- Not lately? I hope we'll have them before us sometime during this session and I think the same privilege should be accorded to members of this House so that they could do the same as far as our Public Schools Finance Board because they deal with a very large amount of money, a very large allocation of funds from this House. I'm sure it's by far the largest and we should have some way of questioning them in getting some information that we would want.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for The Pas for an Address to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor in answer to his speech at the opening of the session. The Honourable Leader of the Official Opposition.

MR. WALTER WEIR (Leader of the Opposition) (Minnedosa): Mr. Speaker, as I enter the discussion on the motion for the approval of the Throne Speech, I would like my first words to be of congratulations and best wishes to you, Sir, on being back as the person charged with the responsibility of keeping law and order within this Chamber. I hope that you have a successful session and I know that your dedication to your job and your sense of fairness will ensure the cooperation of all of the members of the House which is what is required to make you carry out your responsibilities well.

I'd also like to extend my best wishes to the new Ministers that we have, the fellows that have changed responsibilities since the last time we met. There was one I wanted to address a few special remarks to - I'm sorry I don't see him, the Minister of Industry and Commerce - I think probably it's a difficult chore to be Minister of Industry and Commerce in a Socialist Government and to try and sell the merits of some of the things that have to be done. I'm sure that this is probably borne out by him when he recognizes what a small chunk of the Throne Speech that there was that was concerned with economic development within the Province of Manitoba. It was one of those areas that was pretty well missed.

At the outset, Mr. Speaker, may I say that I'd like to make reference to Manitoba's Centennial Year. 1970 does provide the opportunity for Manitobans, all of them, to look at themselves and at their province; to view ourselves from many angles; to see ourselves as others see us. Centennial has more of a meaning than just the hoopla and the celebration, important as that is and that's extremely important, but the opportunity of reflection on things which will serve as our mould during our second century. I'm sure that we all look forward to the visit of Her Majesty and members of the Royal Family and that they will be provided to have an opportunity to see at first hand the many sides of Manitoba and her people, and I know that all Manitobans will do everything possible to make their visit a memorable one.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that a country, a province, a city or a town would not be what it is without the contribution that is made by sports, and I would like to second the congratulations that were extended a little while ago now by the Minister of Tourism and Recreation to the Don Duguid Rink that are in New York representing Manitoba and Canada. Don Duguid, well he didn't just "do good", he did exceptionally well didn't he, if I can make a pun on the gentleman's name, and his rink, Ron Hender, Jim Pettapiece and Brian Wood, who recently honoured Manitoba with the winning of the coveted Brier. For those of you who may not be aware of it, Brian Wood touches a little bit in western Manitoba at a place called Justice, and for those of you who don't recognize that, it's a little bit north and east of Brandon and located in Minnedosa constituency.

I think we would be remiss if we didn't acknowledge as well all of those who worked so hard and faithfully in preparation for the Brier. The Brier will undoubtedly go down as the largest sporting event during Centennial Year and I am sure that all Manitobans say a sincere "thank you" to the host of people that were involved in the development of that sporting spectacle. We appreciate their vital contribution and I'm certain that no greater expression of appreciation could have been given than the record-breaking crowds which took in the Brier, and that better expresses the appreciation than any of us could.

I think that I might also acknowledge that I think all Manitobans share the disappointment of those who were involved in developing what was hoped to have been the World Hockey Tournament for Manitoba for 1970. The fact that it's not being held in Manitoba, we're all going to be equally sorry and we're just as sorry about the disbanding of the Nats, I think, which have been home-based here in Winnipeg and in Manitoba. I'm sure that that team over a number of years has found a soft spot in the hearts of many sporting fans in Manitoba. I think probably more in Winnipeg in Manitoba than in any of the other areas, there was probably an identification with the individual player on the team, something that I think, Mr. Speaker, lends to the enjoyment of the sport. We have to recognize that this is a difficult situation for us for the moment, but congratulations must go to those who worked so hard to try and make that tournament the exciting success that it would have been had it been allowed to continue.

Before I leave the significance of the Centennial, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to extend good wishes to all of Manitoba's communities and in their special programs which they will have to honour our province's birthday. Hearty congratulations to those events that have already taken

(MR. WEIR cont'd) . . . place and the same good wishes for those that are yet to come. It's this attitude so prevalent in Manitoba communities during 1970 that I think will lead our province onward and upward in the years ahead.

And now, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to deal a little bit with the Throne Speech. I'll maybe, if I may, attempt to abandon some of the old ideas, dogmas and traditions that we were advised of in the Throne Speech, and as Leader of the Opposition attempt to be brief, because this is one of the speeches that traditionally hasn't really been very brief in my experience in the House, but I'm going to see what I can do to be brief today. Before I enter into the Throne Speech I'd like you to know, Sir, and other members of the House, that as the session progresses the members of our party, the Progressiv-Conservative Party, will be introducing some positive recommendations that we feel are worthy of consideration of the members of the House at this Session of the Legislature.

The Speech from the Throne is a kind of a difficult document this year in terms of trying to analyze it in any great detail. The language that has been chosen is of such a general nature, Mr. Speaker, that it is very difficult to predict the extent of the changes that are being proposed. There's one thing I'm sure of, Sir, that it's a document that all of us, including yourself, Sir, should keep very close to us through the session because if we don't we will forever be in a position of anticipating legislation that is being proposed; there are such a wide variety of statutes that are mentioned within the Speech itself.

Some of the proposals would appear to be for the most part housekeeping and routine amendments to existing statutes, and others would certainly appear to have some fundamental significance to the Province's economic, its social and its political life. The judgment must await the appearance of the legislation, and may I say at this point, Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to await that appearance before I make further comment in areas of that kind.

An example of the legislation, I think, that can be expected to be presented without too much of an indication in the Throne Speech, is that on the statement that was included on automobile insurance. I kind of gather from what I see in the press of recent days that the reason that there seems to be for it not being definite is that the government hasn't yet made up its mind. Well, if this is the case, I don't know, Mr. Speaker, whether this is the case or the reason behind all of the general language that there is surrounding items in the Throne Speech, but if it is, now our wandering boys are back I'm sure the First Minister will be able to have full cabinets, and the cabinets are pretty well back in Manitoba and in Canada, and I'm sure he'll have an easier time in arriving at decisions than he may have had during some periods of time during the last number of months.

I think that there has been a concern in the minds of many people in Manitoba whether we do in fact have a government or whether we have a collection of individuals each going their own way. Examples of one minister contradicting another, or the First Minister either correcting or contradicting one of his ministers, are really not all that difficult to find. I might indicate an example of the Minister of Labour indicating that he intended to present some legislation which would include three weeks holidays with pay after five years' service and the Minister of Industry and Commerce, when I woke up the next morning, I heard him on the radio saying tain't necessarily so, tain't necessarily so. Another example that comes to mind is that of the Minister of Transportation at South Indian Lake indicating that there had been a decision made some three months earlier that South Indian Lake would not be flooded, only to be corrected within the next day or so by the First Minister to say that no decision had been made.

I think that this subject probably brings up the matter of the development of hydro power in Manitoba and the conflicting statements of the various people that are involved and the cloudy picture that it must be for all Manitobans to try and understand just how the development is going to take place. The conflicting statements, when you consider the statements of the Ministers, the First Minister, the Chairman of the Hydro Board and the actions of Manitoba Hydro itself, just lead one to the conclusion that the right hand doesn't know what the left hand is doing. So if I could, Mr. First Minister, if I could, without getting riled up or anything like that, encourage - encourage the government to call the Committee on Public Utilities as quickly as he can within the Session so that we will have an opportunity hopefully of reviewing the consultants' reports which I understand, or gather by the media, are in the hands of Manitoba Hydro and probably the government, and have an opportunity of clarifying the cloudy picture that appears to exist. Certainly it exists in my mind, and from talking to many other

(MR. WEIR cont'd) . . . , people, many other people I think that they feel the same way.

MR. SCHREYER: Do you want the reports?

MR. WEIR: Yes, I'd be happy to have the reports. Fine. --(Interjection)-- Good. Well, we'll be happy to see something that is consistent with this government. It's really about the only thing that I can imagine them being consistent at.

Mr. Speaker, the Throne Speech contains a list of principles on which legislation will be based, principles concerning the guarantee of civil rights and liberties. And may I say that with the broad outline that is there, I think that it's fair to say that there will be broad general support from our party in terms of considering this legislation in terms of the principle. We await with interest the details that will be contained and our main concern I think, Sir, will be to attempt to ensure that the civil rights and the civil liberties that are guaranteed under our government structure now, many of them contained within common law, that as they're further codified and identified in one form or another, that in fact they are either extended and guaranteed but certainly not limited or restricted in any way from what exists now under the present common law.

I think, Mr. Speaker, also I would like to commend the government - it sounds strange coming from me, doesn't it, Mr. Speaker - I'd like to commend the government . . .

A MEMBER: Don't get excited.

MR. WEIR: . . . commend the government on the sponsorship of the Cultural Congress that they announced in the Throne Speech. I would hope that this would provide the satisfactory forum for the different cultural groups to express their views on the contribution that can be made to a united Manitoba and a united Canada by all of the various cultures.

Mr. Speaker, the Throne Speech recognizes that a healthy agriculture is still one of the pillars of our provincial economy and it promises to take further measures both with additional programs, additional new programs and legislation, to assist farmers to make the necessary adjustments to meet changing market conditions and to take advantage of opportunities in the livestock industry. Well, Mr. Speaker, I hope that some place in this language is hidden something that I haven't been able to see in the Throne Speech so far in terms of detail. I'm not very optimistic as a result of the language that I saw of the benefits that agriculture was going to see, but I won't get overcritical until I have seen the measures, seen the measures that the Minister of Agriculture will be presenting at this Session of the Legislature. It's my view that many of our farmers, not all of them, but many of our farmers in Manitoba face a financial crisis that can only be described as being worse, being worse than that which was faced by farmers during the '30s. And the reason that it is worse is really because the costs have gone up. The change that has taken place -- it's true that in the 1930's nobody had very much money but they didn't have very many costs either. They did, even at a low price, have a market for some of their products; they did have an ability to meet many of their expenses in a way that they just don't have, that they don't have in 1970, and there are many of our agricultural people who don't face very bright opportunities in 1970.

Now during the question period there was some questions of the Minister, and I would like to ask the Minister at an early point in the session if he would stand in his place and attempt to explain to us maybe in some greater detail than we know what the implications are of the federal policies, the one in terms of payment of acreage payments for reducing wheat acreage and the other changes that appear to be forthcoming in terms of the quota system. As I talk to farmers in Manitoba there seems to be considerable confusion in their minds and they don't seem to be able to see where this program has the kind of application that they would have hoped it would have had in terms of Manitoba. I recognize that the Minister of Agriculture has had the benefit of discussions with the ministers federally and I presume with the departmental people as well, and he may very well be in a position where he can add something to the people, to the farmers of Manitoba in an explanation of that situation.

I don't think that I could talk about agriculture without expressing my concern about assessment, Mr. Speaker. For the life of me, Mr. Speaker, I cannot understand how there could be an increase in the equalized assessment for all rural municipalities in Manitoba in 1970. When you recognize that it's very difficult to sell a farm at all, let alone pay the taxes on many of them that are based on the assessment that the farmer is assessed at, and when you recognize the fact that we have been told over a period of years that the sale price of a farm has a significant bearing - or the sale price of anything in terms of municipal assessment - has a very significant bearing in terms of assessment, and when you recognize how rural some

(MR. WEIR cont'd) of our rural municipalities are. The Minister of Education indicated earlier that a lot of the increase, a lot of the increase was because there were new buildings in different places. We have many rural municipalities in Manitoba where this won't hold water. Any new buildings that they have are exempt buildings, exempt under the agricultural clause of the exemption of farm buildings. But in every municipality in Manitoba, every rural municipality, it is my understanding that there is an increase, an increase in the equalized assessment on which their school taxes are going to be paid, and for the life of me I just can't understand this logic if the terms of reference for the basis of equalized assessment pay any particular attention to sale of real property, to current day value of real property. I won't go any further into the agricultural situation at the moment, Mr. Speaker. Many of my colleagues will be taking part in the debate as the days proceed and they will want probably to go into more detail than I am going on many of these subjects today.

We're advised in the Throne Speech that there are going to be an extensive number of amendments in regard to labour legislation. I'm happy to see that the Throne Speech emphasizes again the excellent industrial relations that exist. May I say with that being a case in point, and I agree with that statement, that it behooves us as a Legislature to make sure that as changes are made that nothing happens, that nothing happens that will provoke a different situation in terms of labour management in the Province of Manitoba. I note of recent date where the Minister of Labour has indicated the continuation of the Woods Committee so that that dialogue, that opportunity for dialogue between management and labour can take place. May I say, Mr. Speaker, that I was happy to see that the government continued that committee because I think that it has fulfilled a useful function. I think it's that dialogue between the two sides that has allowed the government to judge some of the measures that can be taken in the interests of both sides. I think that the workers of our province believe that the single most important goal of government is to assist in the development of more and better jobs. Advancements that are made, whether it be increases in the minimum wage, whether it be legislation providing increased vacations with pay after given years' service or whether it be other benefits, these benefits don't mean much to the man who doesn't have a job. They don't have much application to the fellow that doesn't have a job.

So I must register my concern for the visible potential that I see in Manitoba in the immediate future and I am disappointed in terms of the Speech from the Throne and the scant indication that there was there about development. I noticed in one paragraph where it talked about a concentration in areas of greatest growth. In the same paragraph it said that assistance was going to be given to all regional development - seven I think it was in Manitoba outside of the metropolitan area - attempting to leave the impression, at least it left the impression with me that there wasn't a concentration certainly in that program. The Speech from the Throne really doesn't explain any of the programs very well and we will be hoping, hoping to get some more satisfactory explanations of the programs of this nature as the House progresses.

I noted the government's concern for the isolated communities in northern Manitoba. I noted it indicating the role that it had seen the Task Force plan. I'm not going to go into that now, there will be an opportunity when we're discussing the report of the Task Force to talk about that. But the one thing that I did notice, there was a complete absence in the speech, Mr. Speaker, of what in my view was the main recommendation of another report, a commission that had done an awful lot of study about northern Manitoba, and that was the Mauro Commission on Transportation. One of the major recommendations of the Mauro Commission was that there should be airstrips provided at certain specified isolated communities in terms of transportation and communication and it laid down a schedule, and I note that the Throne Speech didn't have any direct reference to this report. I would hope that the Minister of Transportation when we're dealing with his estimates will tell us that it just wasn't in the Throne Speech, that it's all going to happen in any event, and I'll be very happy to get that report when the time comes.

Reference was made, Mr. Speaker, to the committees of the Legislature, standing and special. Conspicuous by its absence was the mention of one committee, and I refer to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, whose terms of reference, Mr. Speaker, at the last session, partial terms of reference, were to enquire into and report upon desirable and practical measures to limit and control provincial election expenditures in the light of our Manitoba requirements and of the experience in other jurisdictions. Mr. Speaker, this committee was called for the first time on February 12th for an organizational meeting only.

(MR. WEIR cont'd) It was called again on March 11th to draft a report. It wasn't until March 11th that all the members of the committee received the federal book that was distributed at that meeting. I found it strange, Mr. Speaker, to note in the Throne Speech an indication that the government will introduce measures to provide for the disclosure and limitation of election expenses and revenues. Mr. Speaker, all I can ask is what was the committee for? What was the committee for? If there was a rush it could have been called earlier - it could have been called earlier. I don't know whether it's an indication that my friends are interested in an early election, I'm not indicating motives under any way, shape or form -- (Interjection) -- I'm always interested in elections, always interested in elections. Being an active politician, why if you're not interested in elections there's something wrong with you, you don't have the right kind of blood in your veins. But, Mr. Speaker, may I say did the government not intend to use that method of the committee to develop good legislation for the operation of elections in the Province of Manitoba? If they didn't they should have said so at the last Session. They should have said so at the last session. They should have put it in the Throne Speech at the last Session if they wanted to, but to play around with a committee and to call some hearings, the committee not getting down to work and to read in the Throne Speech that they intend to do it their own way, obviously without presentation to the committee, is not in my view the way you carry things on.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I wouldn't be me if I didn't get down to talking a little bit about taxes, I guess, and I'd like to express my concern that there was no mention in the Speech from the Throne about the White Paper. Certainly I wasn't able to find it if it was there. The White Paper you know, Mr. Speaker, is one that is being debated widely all across this country. There's evidence of concern by the government about fiscal arrangements generally between the Government of Canada and the Province of Manitoba and I think they're wise to have that concern. I'm not being critical of that concern in any way, shape or form, but there would appear to be a lack of concern about the effect of taxation at the federal level and the provincial level on the individual within our community and the impact that total taxation has on the future development of our province.

We can't talk long about taxation without arriving at a bit of a discussion of some kind on education. "Larger appropriations will be sought for education generally." Mr. Speaker, may I ask you, So what else is new? There is an original statement if I ever saw one. Anybody that has followed the estimates of this jurisdiction, or any other jurisdiction over the last number of years, would have to ask themselves, So what else is new? I see that it includes some increased financial assistance for students, students' aid. In principle I think that that is a good program. I see it identifies some possible new grants in specific areas but it would appear to ignore, ignore completely the basic question of the financing of educational costs. And, Mr. Speaker, may I say I was disappointed not to see a mention of some kind of tuition fees at universities in Manitoba. You know, Mr. Speaker, it was at the last session of the Legislature when documentation was provided to the House, signed documentation of the interest of many members of the government bench as it related to tuition fees, and I'm disappointed that there was no indication in there of what steps were being contemplated.

The Tax Structure Committee, we're advised, indicates the fundamental imbalance that exists between the federal government on the one hand and the provinces and the municipalities on the other. Something new, Mr. Speaker? It seems to me that the last Tax Structure Committee recommended or advised something similar, back about 1965 or 1966. Provinces and municipalities, their costs are increasing at a rate faster than the federal. Federal revenues are increasing at a rate much faster than the provinces and municipalities. Not new, Mr. Speaker, nor is it news that the costs at the municipal level for the most part, certainly if you compare both their opportunities of revenue and the responsibilities that they have, certainly the same imbalance exists between the province and the municipalities as exists between the province and Canada, and there appears to be no recognition of this.

I may say I'm happy to see that there appears to be an attempt to provide a relative moratorium on taxes at the provincial level in Manitoba and I'm happy that the same philosophy is being borne out at Ottawa. The thing that bothers me is that there appears to be a lack of concern at both levels, Mr. Speaker, at both levels, for the position of the local government and the real property taxpayer. And may I say from the indications that I've seen publicly in the press and from talking to various municipal and school administrators, I think that

(MR. WEIR cont'd) municipal governments and school boards within their limits have been attempting to do their best to keep this year's cost increases at a minimum.

Mr. Speaker, faced with similar circumstances a year ago, changes were made in the per capita grant structure for municipalities from \$3.00 per capita to \$8.00 per capita, or an injection of \$5 million between the province's growth in revenues and the municipalities costs; an increase in the percentage of the foundation grant from 65% to 70%, about another \$5 million in terms of the existing Foundation Programme. Mr. Speaker, last year most municipalities in Manitoba were able to either reduce slightly or hold their own in terms of the application of their taxes. It's true that not all were but the ones that had increases were very insignificant increases last year.

Mr. Speaker, last year we were chided by our friends - some of whom are occupying the benches on that side now - on this side from having not near enough. I imagine that some of the Minister of Youth and Education's speeches of one year ago would make some very interesting reading for the Minister of Youth and Education now in 1970. I would recommend that in some of his spare time that he's bound to have nowadays, that he takes time out and reads some of those statements that he made at the session of the Legislature last year, and I seem to recall some sessions earlier than that, that they're worth reflecting on.

MR. WEIR: Because if there's one message I can leave with the members of this Legislature today, Mr. Speaker, there's one message, that is, if there is one tax that is a burden for the low income people of our province, if there's one tax that is a burden on the fixed income people of our province, if there's one tax that is almost impossible for agriculture to meet, or much of agriculture to meet at the present time, if there's one tax that carries a heavy penalty, the penalty of expropriation if the ability to pay is not there, then that has to be the real property tax. There is no evidence at all to show that the government plans any measures at all to prevent significant increases in real property taxation and notwithstanding, notwithstanding the statement that was made today by the Minister of Education, the Minister of Youth and Education, may I say that it would be my view that the majority of the reduction in the mill rate is because of increased assessment, increased assessment based on the same foundation limits as they were last year, and that while there may be a reduction in the general levy in terms of mill rate that there may be an increase, there may be a significant increase, not likely to be a significant increase but it'll likely be the same amount of dollars, it'll likely be the same amount of dollars because that mill rate is placed against the balanced assessment or the equalized assessment and shows the growth. The fact that you've quoted, Mr. Minister, 9.9 mills and 33.9 mills doesn't say that because my assessment is \$3,000 that the mill rate on my farm or my home will be 9.9 mills, because it is based on the assessment of the municipality. If the municipality hasn't been reassessed, if there's an increase in the equalized assessment it may very well be a larger mill rate that is associated with it than the levy that has been announced here today.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would make a bit of a prediction, and I may be out but I don't think I'll be all that far out when all the bills are in. I would predict that the majority of municipalities in Manitoba will have increases in mill rates scattered from between 3 and 10 mills this year unless action is taken by the government to do something about education costs in particular. There are some other areas of costs, particularly in urban areas, for the most part related to the cost of borrowing money, for the most part related to the cost of financing capital projects which is a burden, particularly in the urban areas, but I would predict this is the type of an increase that the people of Manitoba, that real property taxpayer, the one who has the heaviest penalty, the heaviest penalty if he doesn't have the ability to pay.

So, Mr. Speaker, without saying any more, I would like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for River Heights, that the motion be amended by adding thereto the following words: But that this House regrets that the Government has failed to relieve the urgent economic pressures that currently face the real property taxpayer at the municipal and school level.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I'd like 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. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Labour - I take it the Order Paper is exhausted - I move that the House do now adjourn.

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