

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA  
8:00 o'clock, Wednesday, June 18, 1975

Opening prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions; Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees; Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports; Notices of Motion; Introduction of Bills; Questions; Orders of the Day. The Honourable House Leader.

HON. SIDNEY GREEN, Q.C. (Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management) (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I would like the House to recess for the purpose of waiting for deliberations to take place at the Committee of Law Amendments and that the Speaker be available upon that committee being ready to report to the House.

MR. SPEAKER: Will the Honourable Leader ring the bell for that Assembly?

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, in order to notify all members that the House will be back in session, we will ask the Clerk to see to it that the division bells are rung.

MR. SPEAKER: Very well. I'm leaving the Chair until the call of the Assembly.

\* \* \* \* \*

REPORTS BY STANDING COMMITTEES

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

MR. WILLIAM JENKINS (Logan): Mr. Speaker, by leave, I wish to present the Fifth Report of the Standing Committee on Law Amendments.

MR. CLERK: Your Committee met on Wednesday, June 18, 1975 at 8:05 p.m. Your committee has considered Bills:

No. 62 - The Statute Law Amendment Act (1975),

No. 65 - and Act to amend the Health Services Act and the Elderly and Infirm Persons' Housing Act.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Thompson, that the report of the committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

MR. THOMAS BARROW (Flin Flon): Mr. Speaker, may I make a non-legal announcement?

MR. SPEAKER: Is it agreed? (Agreed) The Honourable Member for Flin Flon

ANNOUNCEMENT

MR. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, it is my honour, it's an honour and a pleasure for me to announce that a young man from Flin Flon who has been an inspiration for every young athlete in this province has been chosen for the second time in two seasons as the most outstanding, the most valuable player in the NHL. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Would the honourable member tell us his name?

MR. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I neglected the most important part of the announcement. The gentleman's name is Bobby Clark.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

ORDERS OF THE DAY - GOVERNMENT BILLS

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I wish to proceed with third reading on bills. I'd like you to call at the report stage Bill No. 29.

BILL NO. 29 - PAYMENT OF WAGES ACT

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 29. Shall the report on the Standing Committee on Bill 29, The Payment of Wages Act, be concurred in? Is it agreed?

The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour) (Transcona): Mr. Speaker, so far as Bill 29 is concerned, following the report to the House - or following the committee, in accordance with our rules, I propose a motion by way of amendment to which I gave due notice. I

## BILL 29

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) . . . . have that before me at the present time. And if I may, Mr. Speaker, correct a statement that I made in committee in connection with the Payment of Wages Act, I indicated to the Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney that this Act did not apply to the agricultural industry. It does apply and a specific question directed to me by the honourable member was insofar as the time that's permissible to make payment to the employee. The reason for this amendment, Mr. Speaker, is to strike out the word "and" and insert the word "or", so that where there has been a custom established as to the time of payment of wages, that is the time - or where there's a collective agreement. At the present time, the indication is the practice and a collective agreement, that the purpose of this amendment is to make sure that the two stand separately. So I move, Mr. Chairman, that subsection (3) of Bill 29 be amended by striking out the word "and" in the seventh line thereof and substituting therefor the word "or".

MOTION on amendment presented and carried.

THIRD READINGS - BILLS - 29, 27, 28, 45, 46, 50, 51, 55, 56

(BILLS 29, 27, 28, 45, 46, 50, 51 (On division), 55, 56, were each read a third time and passed)

BILL NO. 57 - THE PENSION BENEFITS ACT

HON. EDWARD SCHREYER (Premier) (Rossmere) presented Bill No. 57, The Pension Benefits Act, for Third Reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. The Honourable Member for Riel - before it's passed.

MR. CRAIK: Yes. With regard to Bill 57, I just wanted to ask, Part 2 of this is being referred to intersession committee - Part 1 and Part 3 are being passed. Should reference not be made to that at this stage?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Riel I believe was present in Law Amendments when we dealt with Bill No. 57, and at the time I indicated that we would amend the Proclamation section, the last section of the bill, so that Part 2 could not be proclaimed until after April 1/76, just to make sure that there could be no mistake in terms of it being proclaimed at an earlier date. So that de facto Part 2 will be referred, and indeed there is a resolution on this Order Paper specifically referring to Part 2, to the Statutory Committee consideration.

(Bill 57 was read a third time and passed)

THIRD READINGS - BILLS 58, 11, 33, 36, 49, 59, 54

(BILLS 58, 11, 33, 36, 49, 59, and 54 were each read a third time and passed)

BILL NO. 44 - THE PLANNING ACT

MR. GREEN: Bill No. 44, Mr. Speaker.

HON. HOWARD PAWLEY (Attorney-General) (Selkirk) presented Bill No. 44, the Planning Act, for third reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek. The bill is not passed.

MR. F. JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to make some last few comments on Bill No. 44. Our position on Bill 44 has been throughout, since its introduction, that we agree with the concept of planning for rural Manitoba, and we are very pleased that the Minister has been doing some work in that regard. But the bill does really not do for rural Manitoba what we believe should be done as far as the organization and the planning for the rural area.

Mr. Speaker, after going through the bill clause by clause, I had many many references on the bill. This section was taken out of the Metro Act, and there is no question in my mind that the Metro Act really has no, no relationship whatsoever to the rural parts of Manitoba.

## BILL 44

(MR. F. JOHNSTON cont'd) . . . .The bill, Mr. Speaker, is such that it is going to create a regional situation in Manitoba.

The Minister of Municipal Affairs - when I was talking on his estimates last year, I was very concerned because nobody was mad at him or nobody was too concerned about him, as the Minister of Municipal Affairs, he was getting along with everybody. But unfortunately we find the same as Autopac, as has happened in this bill, that the bill has not had enough consultation with the people that it concerns mostly.

Mr. Speaker, I could visualize, if I drive by the corner on Main street and I see the old Metro building, and in the basement of that building I will see the inspectors - all the inspectors, the plumbing inspector, the electrical inspector and everything else - and that's what this bill will do, give these district boards the authority to set up that kind of an organization. On the second floor we had the planners and the people who delivered the licences etc. And on the third floor we had the experts who had to lay down and give all the opinions and drawings and expertise about planning of the Metro area. And of course on the third floor we had the secretary-treasurers, the directors and all those people that were involved in Metro, and of course a very large Council Chamber.

And that's really what has been produced in this bill for every district that's formal in rural Manitoba, and there's no way they can afford it at the present time. The consultation should be done in many ways with the councils and municipalities on this bill, and there's no question - no question that the consultation should be going on right now. The Union of Manitoba Municipalities have been holding meetings for the last three days - two days - yesterday and today - and they're holding some more. And while the Minister is sending people out there to explain this bill to them, we're here passing it tonight. The government is here passing it tonight. Mr. Speaker, we had amendments delivered to us three or four days ago, and last night we had more amendments on the amendments, and they've never seen those either.

Mr. Speaker, the principle of the bill when we first started out, naturally we didn't like the principle of the bill, and we said so at the beginning. We said so at the beginning and we said at the end and we say so now. And of course the Member from Portage la Prairie, any opportunity he gets to call down the Conservatives he welcomes. It doesn't matter to me. --(Interjection)-- You're right. I always knew I was right. He just said I was.

So, Mr. Speaker, here we are with a bill that rural Manitoba is not ready for, without much further consultation. It is going to be put upon them and the Minister says, "I won't proclaim it." But tonight if it's passed it will be law. It'll be law. It'll be another Metro situation in every district that sets up this, and we can't afford that or force that upon rural Manitoba without further consultation.

Mr. Speaker, therefore, I move, seconded by the Member from La Verendrye that the motion be amended by deleting all the words after the word "be" and substituting therefor the words "not now read a third time but be referred to the Special Committee on Land Use for examination, and reported back to the next session of the Manitoba Legislature".

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. I don't see how we're going to proceed if we're going to have more than one person speaking.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'm speaking on a point of order. I do not believe Mr. Speaker, and I respectfully suggest that such a motion is not in order on Third Reading. The bill has been approved on Second Reading, reported back to committee, and cannot now be unapproved by the House. It can be negative. But the only time that you can move a hoist or a referral is before the Legislature has approved the bill in principle, and therefore I respectfully suggest that a six-month hoist on Third Reading or a referral to a committee on Third Reading is not in order because the Legislature has approved the bill and it has been reported back from committee. It can be negative or voted for.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion of the honourable member - the amendment is not accepted. The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MR. LLOYD AXWORTHY (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make a statement on Third reading of this bill. First, because some members of this House have made it their point to establish the question of consistency in raising it to a high principle. I think it was Ben Johnson once said that 'consistency is a virtue of small minds'. I find it peculiarly

## BILL 44

(MR. AXWORTHY cont'd) . . . interesting, Mr. Chairman, that consistency is raised as a principle by those who are least able to practice it - or have practiced it in the past in either their vote, behaviour of speech or any other kind of activity in this House. I think that those in particular who are most vociferous in proclaiming their allegiance and honour to that principle of consistency, at least in the last month or two, have been guilty of some very serious omissions or sins of forgetfulness in maintaining a straight line of commitment and thought. And I wouldn't want to pull out some of the statements and voting records. But I think the members whom I'm referring to know exactly what I mean. --(Interjection)--Oh, yes, the Mining Bill, we mustn't forget that.

Mr. Speaker, the question of the Planning Act - our commitment to it began last year in the estimates of the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Two speakers, myself and the Member from St. Boniface, both rose and directly requested the other Minister of Municipal Affairs at that time for a provincial land use policy related particularly to cope with the problem of expanding growth beyond the boundaries of the City of Winnipeg. And we pointed out at that time, Mr. Speaker, that one of the most important requirements and goals of this House that we foresaw, was the need to reform and restore the Planning Act to a viable instrument in order to try to manage the tremendous expansion and movement of people beyond the borders of Winnipeg into a periphery of 20 or 30 miles beyond. Because we saw at that time, Mr. Speaker, and have consulted with and talked with a number of representatives of the rural municipalities in the additional zone and beyond about the serious problems of land speculation, of scattered growth, of the use of valuable agricultural land - all these problems that were continuing apace with a ferocity that was only going to grow as each day went by. I think the Minister would recognize that we spoke to that effect, and asked him specifically at that time that we establish first designated areas so that we could control certain ecologically and environmentally and agriculturally protected areas; and secondly, to change the mechanisms of planning so that there would be some ability to manage that area beyond the city in a more rational way. That, Mr. Speaker, was the beginning of his commitment a year ago. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, we look forward with great interest to the bill. And on Second Reading of the bill when it was presented for comment on principle, we indicated our basic support for that bill with reservations, because we felt that there were two or three major areas in the bill that needed refinement.

The first one was the question of the involvement of the private citizen. We felt that there was not nearly adequate enough opportunity or mechanism for private citizens to enter into the planning process early on, to make, not just objections known, but to make their wishes and concerns and needs known. That was objection No. 1, Mr. Speaker.

Objection No. 2 was the real question about compensation for property rights. We said, take a look at the old Planning Act and the new one. We felt that one of the most important dilemmas that anyone in the planning process had to deal with, was that they were in fact absorbing individual property rights for the sake of community rights, and therefore it was very important that adequate and proper compensation be able to flow back to those individuals when their property rights were taken over. Those, Mr. Speaker, if you look at the record of this House in Hansard - and I would suggest to certain members that they look at that record - were the two objections that we raised. Our vote on Second Reading, Mr. Speaker, was in keeping with that, because we said specifically we would agree with the principle of the bill, we therefore wanted the bill to go to committee, to hear the amendments, to hear the submissions, and to try to determine to what degree we could alter that bill.

For the last two evenings, Mr. Speaker, in Law Amendments, first we had representations from representatives of a variety of groups, both urban and rural, who suggested certain complaints about the bill but underlined continually their own sense of urgency that the bill come into force so that some property planning could take place. In addition to that, Mr. Speaker, we also made an effort to speak to representatives and municipal councillors who represent municipalities in the additional zone and ask them, is this bill necessary now, do you need it now, or can it wait a year? The answer came back, they wanted it now. There was no equivocation on that, Mr. Speaker, they wanted it now. They had reservations, but they wanted it now. --(Interjection)--We were talking of the rural municipalities within the border and fringe of this area. As for all these people who postulate themselves as being the spokesmen for those areas, I'm asking them, who were they talking to when they were asking about when it was coming? They sure as hell weren't talking to the same people we were, because we were talking to

## BILL 44

MR. AXWORTHY cont'd). . . .people from those municipalities.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the point is that we spent four to five hours last night going over a series of amendments. 27(1) clarified very directly the opportunity for representation of the public, and also the clear and undeniable right of the public authorities other than the municipalities to be involved early in the planning process. That took care of our objection.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, we asked - and the Minister acceded to - the holding back or the freezing of the whole sections related to compensation, which eliminated that problem, with the commitment - and I think the Minister made that commitment - that he would undertake consultation to understand the problems dealing with compensation and bring in amendments at the next sitting of this House. And on the basis of that commitment, Mr. Speaker, that second major objection of ours was dealt with.

Now when we're talking about consistency, Mr. Speaker, I think I have outlined a very consistent, very deliberate set of commitments by this group to that bill. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that it could compare very favourably with a somewhat varied course by a group of people who weren't even prepared in a committee to consider the amendments that might change and alter the composition of that bill; who wanted not even to hear those amendments or to consider them, or even to pay any attention to the representations that had been made the evening before. Now, if I call that an act of principle, I call it rather, Mr. Speaker, an Act of sheer pig-headed blindness, that's what I'd call it. And I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that our position at this stage is that we believe very firmly that this bill is a necessary bill in order to cope with a serious problem of urban growth and its expansion to the rural areas of this province. We don't say, Mr. Speaker, it is a perfect bill, not by any means. But it is a beginning. And all we can say, Mr. Speaker, in keeping with the consistency of principle that we have adhered to, that we are going to be keeping a watchful eye on how the bill is operated, the kinds of consultations that the Minister holds with the municipalities and the kinds of amendments that appear next session. That is our understanding of the legislative process, Mr. Speaker, where you undertake a piece of legislation, you are prepared as in opposition to maintain a watchful eye as to what's going on, and if there are problems you bring it to the attention of the public and to the attention of the House. That, Mr. Speaker, is the understanding of the rightful role of an opposition, not sort of implacable hostility, not total antagonism, not total rejection, but the willingness to entertain and look at how you provide the best legislation for this province, no matter who brings it in. And on that basis, Mr. Speaker, we're going to support this bill on Third Reading.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, at this 11th hour of the current session, allow me to make a confession. I am propelled to do so by the comments of my honourable friend, the Member for Fort Rouge. I confess to you, sir, Mr. Speaker, and to none other that surely I have to stand alone among the 57 members as being one whose consistency of position is most in doubt. Surely, Mr. Speaker, I must confess that my position vis-a-vis the ideology between those on that side and myself on this side is most times in doubt. I fail so often to express them in any meaningful way, in any way that members of the Fourth Estate could understand them. I'd be the last person, Mr. Speaker, to ever paint things in a black and white kind of a situation. I just have never done that. I just have never done that. You see, I've wishy washed around this whole scene. I've never known what a Conservative stood for. I've never fought for the free enterprise, you know, principles that I believe, you know, maybe some people in this province stand for. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, if my contribution in this last little while the Member for Fort Rouge has been in the Chamber - I've left that impression - then I suppose maybe he's right. I've failed dismally, dismally, in being able to at least - you know, if I can't show my consistency to my friend who sits much closer to me, how am I going to show it to my honourable friend the Minister of Mines who sits that far distant to me. --(Interjection)-- I'll holler, Mr. Speaker. Be that the case, let the Hansard show how people voted on the bill. Let the Hansard show how people voted on the bill and the Hansard --(Interjection)--

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. ENNS: The Hansard, Mr. Speaker - the Hansard, Mr. Speaker, is full of the speeches made by honourable members of the Liberal Party on certain matters in this House, and how in turn they voted for them. Mr. Speaker, on this particular bill, we have consistently voiced our objection to it. We voiced our objection to it on the basis that, first of all, they're

## BILL 44

(MR. ENNS cont'd) . . . . prepared to plan the development of this whole province, but the very first --(Interjection)--

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I'm going to ask the Honourable Member for Flin Flon to contain himself. If he can't, would he kindly leave. The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: You know, if for no other reason, one of the principle clauses in this bill is that the Crown be excluded from this Act. It was originally in the bill. By amendment they withdrew it. And this means, that while everybody else shall be bound by this Act, the Crown shall not be bound by this Act. Now, you know, maybe Mr. Speaker, it's because of the difficulties that past Ministers of Public Works have had with building out-houses in Memorial Park or building the kind of abortion that we have now beside the Law Courts Building, maybe we can understand why everybody else is to be bound by this Act other than the Crown. You know, that alone is ample reason why we should consider the consistency of our position in rejecting this Act at this time.

Mr. Speaker, members from the Liberal Party indicate that they're prepared to pass something. They're prepared to accept a 'pig in a poke'. They're prepared to see whether or not the municipalities will accept it once they see the Act. Most municipal people haven't seen this Act. --(Interjection)-- Never mind the amendments, Mr. Leader. Right now there are municipal meetings being held around this province that the Minister of Municipal Affairs is scheduled as the guest speaker, to explain this Act - well, not to explain the Act. Well, Mr. Speaker, at least then not tell us that the people that are directly concerned with the passage of the Act, the people that are going to have to live with the Act, are familiar with the Act, have seen some of the amendments and that you've had that kind of consultation with them.

Now the Liberal Party of Manitoba is prepared to buy that. They're prepared to say, as they've said to you long ago - you know, they said that to Mr. Trudeau in '63 and they're still saying it, "Really, whatever you fellows do is good enough. As long as we can slide in on some coattails, we'll slide with you." Well, Mr. Speaker, if it's consistency on our part, the Conservative Party, to object to that position, Mr. Speaker, I welcome it.

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Well, Mr. Speaker, I didn't intend to speak on third reading of Bill 44, but I made the mistake of answering a rhetorical question from the Member for Sturgeon Creek when he said that the Member for Portage la Prairie, if he gets the opportunity will oppose the Conservatives, and I said, "Yes, that's right."

A MEMBER: At any cost.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: I have had a great deal of practice in opposing the Conservatives, I might say, Mr. Speaker, because they give me the opportunity. When they were the government and I was in Opposition, they gave me so many opportunities that I found it rather easy to oppose them. And to refer to a few times that I opposed them as best I could, I recall that they placed what was referred to as a Heat Tax on hydro, all energy fuels and everything else, and I had the opportunity to oppose that at the time, and I might say I opposed it successfully - and I'm sorry to see that the Member for Lakeside is leaving the House because I had a few statements to make to him if he would stay. (Applause)

Of course, when the Member for Lakeside was fired out of his job as Deputy House Leader, I restrained myself to speak on principle there because I felt that was a party matter, although I had sympathy for his leader because it was a matter of principle there and the Member for Lakeside decided to act other than his leader wished and I suppose that he was acting on principle, but then perhaps he shouldn't have accepted the job if he felt that he was that far apart on the political spectrum within the Conservative Party. And I could recall a number of occasions, but only have to go back perhaps three weeks or four weeks when the Member for Lakeside spoke on principle on the new taxation bill as it regarded mines in Manitoba. And he made a rousing speech about how great the bill was and how he could support it. and then, lo and behold, on second reading he voted against the bill. So I'm confused when the Member for Lakeside speaks on principle because I just don't know where he is from day to day.

MR. ENNS: That's my problem. And why do people keep calling me a reactionary?  
A Right Swinger?

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Now, I'm surprised at the Member for Lakeside at this late hour. . .

MR. ENNS: You know, I'm the Red Tory in the party.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: I'm surprised at this late hour on third reading of bills when the

## BILL 44

(MR. G. JOHNSTON cont'd) . . . battles have been fought on principle on second reading, the battles have been fought over amendments and so on, but the Member for Lakeside decides to do some nit-picking on third reading of a bill that his party had worked so hard at in committee. But I must remember, or recall, that his party voted against this bill on principle in second reading, which the Member for Fort Rouge said, and then, lo and behold, Mr. Speaker, when we get in committee, the government distributed a day or two ahead of time about 60 amendments, said they realized there's something wrong and here's some amendments, lo and behold, the Member for Sturgeon Creek arises in committee, or he gets the floor, and he wants to move a motion right away. He doesn't want to hear the amendments. He's not concerned about improving the bill. He's only against it - and that's the Conservative position. He's against it. He doesn't want to improve the bill. He wants to get it out into a committee so he can raise Caine intersessionally about how bad the government is handling this operation. He's not concerned about the people who are affected.

We've heard from --(Interjections)-- We've heard at committee - and I'm glad I'm getting some response; it makes me feel better. I would feel very badly if some of the Conservative members weren't bothered by the events that have transpired with respect to Bill 44. because I know that some of them are concerned. Some of their areas are affected and they have problems, and they know it. But two or three members in the Conservative Party, I think usurped the position of the whole group and took the bit in their teeth and decided to say, "Well, here's a chance to shaft the government, to make them look bad." (By the way, I'm not averse to that myself if I get the chance.) But - Wait a minute. If it affects people's livelihoods and their futures, then we as legislators had better be very careful - had better be very careful - and I would challenge the Member for Lakeside and his leader - if he's still the leader at the next election - to come out to Portage la Prairie and get a candidate, and get that candidate to say that he supported the Liberal position with respect to Bill 44 in Portage la Prairie, because I have news for those gentlemen. The City of Portage la Prairie and the surrounding district want this bill. They want it. And I would like whoever the Leader of the Conservative Party is to come out to Portage la Prairie in the next election and state his stand on Bill 44, because it's a negative stand. It's a negative stand. It doesn't stand for anything. All they want to do is tear something down. All they want to do is tear something down, never mind what good will come out of it. If they can make some political hay, that's what they want to make.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I'm being pretty tough on some of the members of the Conservative party, but some of them are not that way, and some of them know in their hearts that this bill is good for the people affected in the Province of Manitoba. And there have been statements while I've been speaking, that members of the Conservative Party are in bloc going to vote against this bill on third reading, and I appeal to these members in the Conservative Party, who know in their hearts that this bill is needed, to stand up and be counted.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): Mr. Speaker, we have just heard a very rousing defence of the government coming from a group who have been elected to this Chamber, since they do not form the government, for the purpose of providing opposition to the government, and the whole system of government depends on them performing that function, but we have seen an example of the kind of responsibility accepted by the Liberal Party in not only this measure, in many other measures, and we have pretty good evidence of that just recently from the Leader of the Liberal Party himself, who is pleading with the voters of Crescentwood to vote for him, not on the basis of his ability to do things for the people of Crescentwood or the Province of Manitoba, not on the basis of policies that they have enunciated - because they haven't enunciated anything, the wet-fingered politicians who constantly test the winds to find out how they're going to vote on every issue - but the Leader of the Liberal Party is appealing to the voters of Crescentwood to vote for him on the basis that they will save the Liberal Party from becoming an endangered species. That's his appeal in the Crescentwood by-election. "Vote for me because the Liberal Party then might become extinct." Good riddance, as far as I'm concerned, because there's nothing there of any substance in any case.

But, sir, now to get back to Bill 44.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. (laughter)

MR. JORGENSEN: Our position on this bill - I enunciated it when I first spoke on the bill - we have said for some time that the Planning Act, or planning legislation, based on the

## BILL 44

(MR. JORGENSEN cont'd) . . . . need to ensure the preservation of agricultural land in this province, is necessary. I would have thought that the government would have welcomed an opportunity to present a White Paper of sorts and take it through the country for an opportunity to provide it for the people to express their opinions on it. That, obviously, is not going to be the case. And I can't understand the government's attitude in this because the Minister of Urban Affairs last night, when dealing with one of the clauses in which some objection had been taken, made this comment. He said: "Let this amendment go," - or this section of the Act go, and I forget which section it was - "because nothing is going to happen in a year anyway. There is really nothing that's going to take place. So let it go for a year and if it doesn't quite work out then we can amend it."

That's fine. I'll accept that. And we did accept that. But if that's the case, if nothing's going to happen for a year, then what would have been wrong to refer this bill to the Committee on Land Use and use the bill as a White Paper, as a means of provoking debate, as a means of getting ideas from people as to how that particular piece of legislation can be improved upon? I think it would have been the kind of an action that would have met with the approval, not only of the municipal councils of this province, but everybody who is involved and is concerned. And I'm quite sure that there are many groups in this province that are very concerned about the need for some kind of legislation to deal with the whole question of land use, so it would have seemed to me that in referring this bill to the land use committee, then that committee could have done something useful, because the function that it is serving is, in my opinion, not a useful one. It purports to go out into the country to hear the views of the people, and yet every time a view is expressed the government pounce on that poor person who expresses that view like a ton of bricks. They descend upon him and attempt to refute everything that he says, unless of course it just happens to coincide with the government's own views. So I question whether the purpose of that committee is really to find out the views of the people.

But here would have been a very useful function for that committee to perform: to take Bill 44 and present it as a basis for discussion. And I know that in my experience with encouraging people to present views on any subject, if you have a concrete proposal in front of them and they have an opportunity to examine and express their opinions, it's a far better way of getting some input than coming out with an abstract idea that we just simply must have some legislation dealing with land use. It would have been an excellent opportunity, in my opinion, for the government to really get some input into this bill and to ensure land use legislation which would be meaningful and which would enable the people who are concerned and affected by it, that they have an opportunity to take part in the planning of their own areas and their own destiny, and I regret very much that the government have not taken advantage of this opportunity, because, in the words of the Minister of Urban Affairs, nothing is going to happen for a year anyway. That year could have been very usefully spent by allowing the people of this province to have an opportunity to make comments on this piece of legislation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, I intend to be brief in my comment on this legislation. I haven't spoken on it up to this point. I think it's interesting that at this stage of the debate we have heard, in defence of the bill, from two members of the 34-member NDP government caucus in this House. The only persons who have spoken to defend it at this point are the two members who've spoken from the Liberal wing of the NDP party in this province, and I think that point should not escape the record at this stage of the session, Mr. Speaker.

You know, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Fort Rouge and the Member for Portage have talked about consistency and about the lack of consistency that they see in the performance of certain members of the Conservative Party. Well, Mr. Speaker, we have seen one thing in terms of consistency in this session. When we started out at the beginning of this session we weren't quite sure where the Liberal rump in this province and in this Legislature sat, although we knew they didn't sit on very many seats in this Chamber. But now, sir, after three and a half months of debate in this Chamber, we know where they sit. We know where they sit. They sit four-square behind the New Democratic administration of this province. That has become evident in the hypocrisy, in the capitalizing on opportunity, that they have seized upon it at every chance, on every crucial debate in this session. Mr. Speaker, the Liberal Party in Manitoba, except for one or two notables like former Premiers Douglas Campbell and Stuart Garson . . .



## BILL 44

A MEMBER: That's where you want to be. . .

MR. SHERMAN: . . . have in my opinion, sir, constructed for themselves the most dismal, abysmal record of failure of government the Province of Manitoba has ever had on its record in our history. You know, we criticize the New Democratic Party, the New Democratic administration for many things. There are many things they do that we don't like. But I'll say this for them, sir, at least they do things, the same as the previous Conservative administrations of this province have done. They may have made some mistakes, we may have made some mistakes. At least we do things.

A MEMBER: Right.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, the party that the three rump members to my left represent, worked and led and stumbled this party into the 18th Century in the 10 or 12 years that it was in office here, and they stand up in this House and have the gall, the audacity, with never having had the initiative, the imagination or the guts to give any leadership to this province, to criticize a party like this one, which in office may have made some mistakes, but which had the energy and the courage, as the present government does, to at least try things to advance the cause of the people of the Province of Manitoba. And I think those things, at this stage of the Session, have to be said for the record, and I take pride in personally saying them and putting them on the record.

Mr. Speaker, I haven't said much on Bill 44 in this debate, but I'll tell you one thing, Mr. Speaker, if I didn't know where I stood on Bill 44 --(Interjection)-- My colleague says, "No more Mr. Nice Guys."

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

A MEMBER: . . . a question?

MR. SHERMAN: I will when I'm finished. Mr. Speaker, I'll tell you this, Mr. Speaker, I may have had some doubt in my own mind as to where I stood on Bill 44 until the Liberals took their position on it - if it can be called a position - but now I certainly know where I stand on it, because they have done nothing but curry favor with this administration since this session of this Legislature opened, and if that's the case, then the legislation can't have very much to recommend it. Even though there may be aspects of it that require and deserve the support of all members of this House, if the Liberal Party is for it, then it's a very good reason for many of us to be against it.

Mr. Speaker, when that amendment came in today removing the Crown from obligation removing the provision that said the Crown was bound by the Act, that, I suggest, sir, is sufficient to recommend to any objective person in this Chamber that he vote against the legislation. When there's legislation at this time being introduced in this Chamber, being foisted on the people of Manitoba, to which the Crown is not obligated, under which the Crown is not bound, then I suggest that raises a very crucial and fundamental question about democratic government. On those grounds alone, sir, if the Member for Portage la Prairie is wondering where we stand and whether individual members of the Conservative caucus are going to vote against it or not, I can assure him that I, and I'm sure many of my colleagues, on those grounds alone are going to vote against it.

The basic objection we had to the bill was that it vested too much power in a new bureaucratic level of government; it vested too much power in the Minister himself. Now the basic objection I have to it is the fact that the Crown is absolved of responsibility and obligation, which it's imposing on everybody else in this province. If that isn't sufficient reason to vote against the bill, then the fact that the Liberals are for it is sufficient reason to vote against it.

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Well, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Fort Garry said he would entertain a question after he spoke. Now, I understand him to say that he admitted some mistakes had been made by the Conservative administration previously. Would he detail some of those mistakes because I may not recall all of them? Would he detail some of those mistakes?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: I welcome the opportunity, Mr. Speaker. The biggest mistake we made, Mr. Speaker, was on the night of June 25, 1969, when we gave up the reins of government.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I didn't intend to speak on this bill and really I don't know if I can out-perform the member who just spoke. But really,

## BILL 44

(MR. PATRICK cont'd) . . . . I am somewhat concerned because really what started this debate - and if the members to my right would just take count of what really happened in the last week or so. I've watched the members to my right, and I've never questioned them in the last six years since they've been on the Opposition side - and somehow they haven't accepted that they're in Opposition; they still feel they're in government, or they should be governing - but now they should accept that they're in Opposition. And I have watched them vote in this House. They voted on the Tax Credit Plan for; they voted against, they voted against; well I could question the principle. Did I question their principles? Never. You know, that's their right to vote the way they want. I saw last year where only three members, the leader and two other members supported them, the Member for - I believe he's sick; he's not in the House - and somebody else that supported the Leader of the Opposition, only three voted and everybody else voted against them, on a measure that was I believe a Private Member's Resolution, and I didn't question it. I didn't say that they have principles or not principles. And I can't accept that because you vote in a certain way, then somebody's compromising a principle, because really, we stated our objections to the bill, just like we did last year on the labour bill, we stated our objections.

The Member for Fort Rouge moved a couple of amendments. He got some of the amendments and the reservation that he hadn't got those through, and on those bases we were prepared to let the bill go. But this idea coming from my right continually for the last week or so, saying, "Well, you're hypocrites because you voted this way." Mr. Speaker, the only reason we get that is because there's two by-elections. If the members to my right check the Hansard for the last three or four years they'll find, at least on a dozen occasions, that they've split on different measures. Did I say they were hypocrites? No. I said that's their right. In fact I admire the Member for Lakeside, who by himself voted this Session, I believe, and that's his right. And I can't understand it. When the Member for Fort Garry, when he wants to talk . . . I can mention to him when the Conservatives were on that side, some of the measures that I proposed in this House - and I didn't propose any measures that were before this House the year before, or two years before, I only proposed measures that were new, not like some of the members on this side. When they were on the government side they voted against everything tax reductions or sales tax, and when they came on this side they started to move the same resolutions that I moved five or six years ago. That's their new program.

You know, they're moving the same resolutions that we moved, or I moved, five or six years ago and eight years ago, and I would like to point out to the member, when we moved, when we were in Opposition, that we should have grants for kindergartens in the whole City of Winnipeg, or in the whole Province of Manitoba, what did the Conservative Party do? They voted against it. And still the City of Winnipeg, at that time they did have grants because they used a technique that they said we need four classrooms for Grade 1, and they used one classroom for the kindergarten system. But in St. James we were turned down. We had a letter from the Minister at that time, Mr. Stewart McLean. Fort Garry was turned down. We could not have it. The City of Winnipeg had it. So I had a proposal that said, "Look. The money's coming, at least 50 percent from the revenue of the Province of Manitoba. It should be the same throughout the province." Did they accept it? They voted against it.

You know, when we talked about increasing the minimum wage, it was 75 cents - that's about \$22.00 a week. Can any member expect his daughter or son to live on \$22.00, pay transportation, cigarettes, coffee and everything else, and board and room? No, but they voted against it. So that's the kind of program they believed in. --(Interjection)-- Not too long ago. Not too long ago.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. PATRICK: So, Mr. Speaker, in this House I have taken issue with the NDP. I've taken a strong issue. I've taken a strong issue on labour matters, and I've said when the government was on this side, when they were in Opposition, they talked about many areas in the way of labour, and after the Minister of Labour was in his seat as Minister of Labour for five or six years and we still weren't getting action on things like 40-hour work week, on extension of holiday pay to three weeks, so how can anybody say that we haven't? This Session alone we voted against the government, I believe, on at least four or five issues, or on six divisions, so let them check. Perhaps when we get stuck on one bill or, you know, that there's a difference, and right away you get name-calling, surely that's not the height of intelligence of some of the

## BILL 44

(MR. PATRICK cont'd) . . . . members, because I have not in this House ever challenged anyone for voting any way, not ever said that he's a hypocrite. Because I saw them vote against each other many times. I didn't make any issue of it.

To here, our position's very clear. Who this year pointed out the lack of manpower policy in the government? We talked about it. About the energy crisis? We talked about it. About mining regulations? The first speaker on the mining bill was the Member for Fort Rouge and he said, "Look, the bill's no different than last year. It's only going to be by regulations." That's what he said, and the Minister of Mines and Resources said, "That's right." He said he realized that. The Member for Lakeside, he gave it a rousing welcome and said, "That's great." You know, we accept them. Now the Minister of Mines says . . . We've pointed out the problems in housing, and for the edification of the Member for Morris, I hope he would read today's paper and I believe that the Fourth Estate, both papers, give an assessment of this session, and there's quite a lengthy one. I'm sure that they have communication with the newspapers probably better than we have, and let him find out what the newspapers say - and I'm not critical of the other members, just strictly for the member - what the Fourth Estate had to say. They said the three members here provided more constructive criticism, and they said they provided better opposition, because the Opposition was fighting their own battles. --(Interjection)-- Well, the press perhaps haven't got any principles either.

So I just want to point these things out. --(Interjection)-- No, I think that what has to be done when there's a bill, when you don't accept it, when we've got the amendments through - the same thing happened last year; we got the amendments through in the labour bill that was before us and we said we won't support it unless we get some amendments. We got at least eight amendments through and we supported it. The same thing with this. We got two big issues, had the Minister remove from the bill, and that's the reason we're supporting it and I don't think that's hypocritical. Next year if the bill's not working, then we'd have to change it, because I remember quite well, we used to go to Law Amendments when the Conservatives were in power. We used to withdraw a bill, sometimes three or four times, to redraft it, and it wasn't perfect legislation. So just to say that you support a measure - I said we've split on the division six times this year already, and I'm sure that the members to my right haven't split more, with the exception of this bill. So I don't think there's any need for name-calling.

QUESTION put, third reading of Bill 44 passed.

THIRD READINGS - BILLS 62, 65

BILLS NO. 62 and 65 were each read a third time and passed.

CONCURRENCE

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Mines, that the Resolutions reported from Committee of Supply be now read a second time and concurred in.

MOTION presented and carried

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I've got to read the concurrence. Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$984,037,300, being the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1976, Resolutions 1 to 110, separately and collectively.

Resolved that there be granted to Her Majesty a further sum not exceeding \$18,112,500 for Supplementary Supply, Resolutions 1 to 6, separately and collectively.

Agreed? (Agreed) So ordered. The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I was holding Bill No. 40 for the Leader of the Opposition. Call Bill No. 40, or perhaps I'll call the Supply Bill first.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, sir, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Attorney-General, that you do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider Ways and Means of raising of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

MOTION presented and carried, and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Ways and Means, with the Honourable Member for Gimli in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gimli.

COMMITTEE OF WAYS AND MEANS

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Committee of Ways and Means. Resolved that towards making good certain sums of money granted to Her Majesty for the public service of the Province, for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1976, the sum of \$984,037,300 be granted out of the Consolidated Fund. Passed. The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. HARRY SHAFRANSKY (Radisson): Mr. Chairman, I'd just like to bring attention to one particular concern in my area. I don't know if this is in order. I will ask those people who are very much informed about the . . .

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I think that the member's remarks would be limited to the ways and means of raising money, and it is suggested that it be done out of Consolidated Revenue.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolved that towards making good certain further sums of money granted to Her Majesty for the public service of the Province for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1976. the sum of \$18,112,500 be granted out of the Consolidated Fund. Passed.

Committee Rise. Call in the Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Ways and Means has passed certain resolutions and has directed me to report the same.

IN SESSION

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gimli.

MR. J. GOTTFRIED (Gimli): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Emerson, that the report of the committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Labour, that the resolutions reported in Committee of Ways and Means be now read a second time and concurred in.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Radisson have some point of order? The Honourable First Minister.

BILL NO. 19 - CAPITAL SUPPLY

MR. SCHREYER introduced Bill No. 19, an Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the Public Service of the Province for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1976.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. EDWARD SCHREYER (Premier)(Rossmere)(by leave) presented Bill 19, an Act for Granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the Public Service of the Province for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1976. for second reading.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. SHAFRANSKY: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the assistance of honourable members. I have been waiting for this opportunity for some time. I have taken one occasion at the Committee of Supply dealing with the estimates of the Highways Department, and I was told at that particular time that the time to deal with the question which I have - and a certain concern of my constituents - is to deal with the estimates of the Minister of Urban Affairs.

Well, this morning I sat all morning, and unfortunately we had the philosopher from Fort Rouge who expounded at great length so we never really got to the clause which I wanted to just bring to the attention of members, that is, a particular concern of my constituents in the East Elmwood area - in particular to the very high traffic problem on Nairn Avenue leading from Transcona.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I don't follow the honourable member.

MR. SHAFRANSKY: Am I told not now?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I'd like to get some co-operation from all the members because I'm getting confused too. Now let us get it straight. By leave, I introduced Bill No.19, First Reading. I also introduced, by leave, Bill No. 19 for Second Reading and I asked if it was agreed to. It was. I thought the Honourable Member for Radisson had a procedural point and I can't understand what he's discussing. The Honourable House Leader.

## BILL 19

MR. GREEN: I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker. Then there was a misunderstanding because the Honourable Member for Radisson thought that he was speaking on the motion to give Second Reading to Bill No. 19. He did not know that you had passed the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Let's get together. By leave of the House we'll go back to second reading of Bill 19 and I won't accept the motion as having been passed as yet, until the Honourable Member for Radisson has said his speech. Agreed? (Agreed) The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. SHAFRANSKY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was informed that I was going to be given the signal at the particular time when I could speak. (laughter) However, the Honourable Member for Morris. . .

MR. BOB BANMAN (La Verendrye): Shafted again, Harry.

MR. SHAFRANSKY: They shafted me again (laughter) Well, Mr. Speaker, I was talking about a particular concern of the residents in the East Elmwood area on Nairn Avenue who have for many years been very much beleaguered by the problems of increasing traffic - vehicle traffic - on Nairn Avenue. I'd like to give a very brief description of the area. Nairn Avenue is a four-lane undivided arterial roadway. --(Interjection)-- I know most members don't know the area, so I think I should give a description. It's between Grey Street on the west and Stapleton St. on the east, there are single family residences which front the north side between Nairn Avenue overpass and Stapleton. Two schools are also located along this portion of the street. The south side of Nairn between the overpass and Panet Road contains a wide variety of commercial establishments mixed with some light industry. --(Interjection)-- Now, if the Honourable Minister of Health and Social Development would contain himself, I would conclude these remarks in very short order. (Applause) It's a deal.

Well Mr. Speaker, I must mention one of the major problems. There has been a vehicle classification count, and a traffic study on licence on trucks was conducted in May, 1974. At that particular time they concluded, having over a period of time looked at all of the traffic studies, found that there was a general increase in volume of traffic of some 7 percent per annum. On one particular day, on May 4th, 1974, from 7 a. m. to 7 p. m., they took a traffic count - and this was in 1974 - there were some 17,763 vehicles. Now, if you take that figure of some 7 percent increase per annum, there would have been in 1975 some 19,000 vehicles in a 12-hour period, which amounts to 1,600 vehicles per hour; broken down, comes out to about approximately 26.27 vehicles per minute, and that is like half a vehicle per second.

Now, Mr. Speaker, you can consider, of these vehicles, there were some 16 - pardon me, about 2,000 were trucks, and these were gravel trucks. I know the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge would like to talk about his philosophy and ideas of something that we have long advocated in the New Democratic Party. Now he's going to ask questions. But we have advocated on these things as 'me too' - 'me tooism'. That's all he is. He's just one of these people who is always - one of the people who is sort of a professional student and he feels he knows - I've never heard him shut up on any particular issue or topic entered before this House. He's an expert on everything and he even expresses some opinion today.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I like to listen to people who are down-to-earth. Sometimes I get very annoyed with these professional students who expounded on every issue that could ever be discussed - and that is the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge. Sometimes he does make sense - once in awhile - if he knows something. But if he doesn't, he still begins to continue expounding his ideas.

Well, Mr. Speaker, there have been several proposals made by the City of Winnipeg on various schemes to develop a system of traffic down Nairn Avenue, one of the thoroughfares that I would like to have seen supported by this government, because I notice that there was some \$35 million in the Highways Department appropriated for the purpose of urban transit. Of course it also referred to construction aids to cities, town and villages, work in unorganized territories, but in total there was some \$35 million. I'd like to have found out, and I just hoped that the Minister of Urban Affairs - who is not present tonight - would have been able to give me some figures, the actual amount of moneys that were allocated for the road construction in the urban areas. One of the roads that I'm talking in particular is the one which has for many years beleaguered the people on the street. The First Minister who used to be the Member for Parliament for Selkirk, I know has been acquainted with the problem. These people have even been more beleaguered by the problems of the ever-increasing traffic of

## BILL 19

(MR. SHAFRANSKY cont'd) . . . . some 7 percent per annum, which amounts close to 20,000 vehicles and I've given you the figures. But what the people there would like to see, is that there would be some changes made, where the truck traffic would be removed from Nairn Avenue and a bypass made. In the city's proposals, there were four schemes, and one scheme they advocated was the one that would take the truck traffic off Nairn Avenue to another street on the north side of the CN line leading to Symington Yards called Traverse Street and therefore reduce the problem of gravel and trucks that are the major problem to the homes. --(Interjection)-- I haven't made any deals. I've brought this question up and I was told that I couldn't speak in the . . . --(Interjection)-- Well, you see I haven't been given any opportunities to know what the inner sanctum's discussions are. If the Premier considers that to be blowing it, he blew it a long time on the basis that he was informed about this problem many years ago and he has not seen fit to bring this to the attention of Urban Affairs. In fact he was the Urban Affairs Minister. --(Interjection)-- You've never heard anything like that.

Well Mr. Speaker, just for the benefit of those people in Urban Affairs, I would like to bring attention that there are four schemes - scheme D which would promote traffic --(Interjection)-- I know you're trying to be funny, and I'm not going to be funny any more. --(Interjection)-- Well, you are being funny now. Do you want to be funny?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

A MEMBER: I think the government's falling apart.

MR. SHAFRANSKY: I was not attempting to be funny. If the Honourable Member for St. Boniface wants to be funny, then he's getting my dander up.

A MEMBER: We're going to vote with you, Harry.

MR. SHAFRANSKY: Well, Mr. Speaker, there is a lot of members who figure this question of the people in the area in particular I'm talking about, who figure this is a funny issue. Well, I don't consider it funny. I was never attempting to be funny. But I would, Mr. Speaker, like to bring it to your attention so that this particular question could be resolved. It has been a longstanding issue and in talking with various members, there has never been that type of concern, or there have been concerns about various parts. but the urban areas, to my knowledge, have never received that type of concern. Thank you.

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

MR. EARL McKELLAR (Souris-Killarney): Mr. Speaker, I hadn't intended to speak, but I think there's a plot around here. I understand the Premier decided about three weeks ago this session was going to end on the 19th. and I think maybe the Member for Radisson has helped him out maybe. We're getting awfully close anyway. --(Interjection)-- Yeah, Well, things got so hot for me here for awhile here. I had to leave, I was thinking so hard - that's why I couldn't think. I kind of got caught in a squeeze here for quite awhile tonight, seeing the Member for Lakeside and the Member for Portage, you know. I thought I was friends to both of them. But you can only stand so much, you know, and I had to move down there. I thought I'd made my last speech yesterday. But maybe it's just as well I kept . . . But I'm not going to be very brief. I was hoping the Minister for Tourism and Recreation was here because I sure get lots of letters, and we're going to take time out to get things off our chest. I'll just take about one minute here.

I'm speaking on behalf of the rural people of Manitoba regarding the library policies of the Government of Manitoba, who say to the rural people that unless you have 10,000 people in a library you cannot get the increased grants that were made available to the cities of Winnipeg, Brandon, Portage la Prairie, Dauphin and Thompson, and all the bigger centres. The problem in the rural areas, as they tell me, it's impossible to get 10,000 people in a library because you have to take in such a large area. I would suggest to the government and to the Minister, who is not in his seat, that if they're going to put a 10,000 population figure in there, that they have something of a lesser amount of people in the rural areas. It's impossible to get 10,000 people in a library, and I say to the government, before the next session I hope you reconsider the decision and say a figure of 3,000 or 5,000 for the rural areas. In that way they will be able to take advantage of the grants that you made available to the larger centres. It's very important, very important, because the people of the rural areas take great advantage of their library, but they are becoming very expensive to operate and they would only hope that they get the same advantages as the larger centers in the Province of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt Bill 19 on second reading? (Agreed) So ordered.

BILL NO. 39 - CAPITAL SUPPLY

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER by leave. introduced Bill No. 39, an Act for granting to Her Majesty certain further sums of money for the Public Service of the Province for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1976.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER by leave. presented Bill No. 39, an Act for granting to Her Majesty certain further sums of money for the Public Service of the Province for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1976, for second reading.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Attorney-General, that you, sir, do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the following bills: 19 and 39. Acts for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the Public Service of the Province for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1976.

MOTION presented and carried, and the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole, with the Honourable Member for Logan in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE - BILLS 19 and 39

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bill No. 19. Page by page? Agreed? (Agreed;  
(Bills 19 and 39 were each read page by page and passed.)

Committee rise and report. Call in the Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has considered Bills No. 19 and 39 and recommends them to the House, without amendment, and asks leave to sit again.

. . . continued on next page

IN SESSION

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

MR. JENKINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose, that the report of the Committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

THIRD READINGS - BILLS NO. 19 and 39

BILLS 19 and 39 were each read a third time and passed.

BILL NO. 40 - THE STATUTE LAW AMENDMENT (TAXATION) ACT

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, would you call Bill No. 40, standing in the name of the Leader of the Opposition?

MR. SPEAKER: Third reading of Bill No. 40. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK Q.C. (Leader of the Official Opposition) (River Heights):

Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure whether this is the last bill to be called, but I believe it is and the House Leader has indicated that's the case. Well, either way, it doesn't . . . My assumption is that it is one of the last bills to be called and I think it's really a coincidence that it is one of the last bills to be passed, to be discussed by this House. But it is a rather important bill in many respects because I think, if anything, it gives testimony to one of the concerns we've had from the very beginning with respect to the New Democratic Party and its operations.

Mr. Speaker, there's no need for a lengthy discussion on this. I would like to state the position of our party very quickly on this. The Statute Law Amendment deals with a series of taxation parts, dealing with taxation Acts. The most important one, from our point of view, is the raising of two cents a gallon gasoline tax for the purpose of subsidizing the government Auto Insurance Corporation. And, Mr. Speaker, it's taken several years for the government to finally come to a point whereby the people of the province will be asked to pay, through a gasoline tax, the amount that normally would have been required from a full premium tax to be charged to individuals for the service provided by government.

The debate of years ago is over, but the results of that debate are now being observed by the people of Manitoba, who now can re-read the statements made by the honourable members opposite in the debate, on the auto insurance debate, who now have the experience to judge as to how the government has handled itself and who are now in a position to judge as to whether the nationalization of the industry by the government was a justified one or not.

The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that the reason for the gasoline tax to be imposed now is simply because the government will not face up to the facts, or will not present to the people the proper facts with respect to Autopac. They are not prepared to face up to the people for the actual cost of the auto insurance administered by them for the people's benefit.

Mr. Speaker, we argued at the time that there was no need for the nationalization of the industry. We argued that it could be done by regulation. We pointed out, Mr. Speaker, that the promises of the members opposite would not be kept, and by this very Act, Mr. Speaker, the government has given testimony to the falsehoods with respect to the expectation that the honourable members gave at the time of the taking over of the auto insurance industry. So, Mr. Speaker, we say to the honourable members opposite: you know, you intruded into the business affairs of this province, you intruded on the basis that what you were doing was in the interest of the people, that in fact auto insurance was a utility, and once it was made compulsory it was necessary that the government run the operation because they could run it more beneficially than the private insurers, and the fact is, Mr. Speaker, that the experience in the last period of time has proven that the premiums that have been levied have not been sufficient to meet the requirements of allowing this to be a self-sustaining Crown corporation, and in fact it's necessary now to dedicate specific taxes for the deficit of this year.

Mr. Speaker, there will be additional taxes to be raised in the years to come. And, Mr. Speaker, the purpose of doing this is to essentially cloud the premium so that the kinds of comparison that could be made with other jurisdictions cannot be made, and all we will then have is the statement made by the members opposite that it is cheaper, and those who are the adherents to the New Democratic Party will argue that it's cheaper without any basis in fact of knowing whether the position is correct or not, and the people of Manitoba have no way in



## BILL 40

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) . . . . which to judge. Mr. Speaker, there will only be one way to judge, and that will be on the basis of competition and a rate review board, which would not allow any increase to take place unless there is a proper examination.

Mr. Speaker, this brings into issue the one other question. The procedures of this House, the manner in which audits are undertaken by the Provincial Auditor, the whole scheme of accountability in this corporation, as in many others, is not sufficient in the procedures we have in our Legislature to understand correctly what is taking place or to be able to understand and predict, with some degree of accuracy, the likely occurrences in the years to come with respect to the Crown corporations. And when a Crown corporation is a Crown corporation controlled by the Cabinet, with the Chairman being the Minister involved so that in effect there are political decisions in what is taking place within the Crown corporation, you're bound to have a situation where the political realities in each situation will dictate, not a normal course of action and not necessarily good business practice.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Manitoba do not want to pay an additional rise in the gasoline price. They do not want to pay an additional gasoline tax. They do not want to pay, at this particular time, an additional burden with respect to their cost of living. And the basic contradiction of the government's position when they went to the Energy Conference and said to the Prime Minister, "Do not raise the price of oil, because by raising the price of oil you are going to affect the cost of living," is found, Mr. Speaker, in the fact that at home they do exactly the opposite.

Mr. Speaker, we believe that the people of Manitoba oppose the raising of this tax. They oppose it because they believe that Autopac has in fact been a fiasco, and they believe as well, Mr. Speaker, that the government has not lived up to the statements that they made in the earlier years during those battles when they said that they knew how to run a business better than anyone else, and that they were in a position, Mr. Speaker, better than anyone else, to be able to tell the people of Manitoba what was really required for them. And so, Mr. Speaker, we have the gasoline tax raised this year and we will have increases in the years to come as the deficits arise, because the government will not face the moment of truth with the people of Manitoba and tell them what the auto insurance premium is really costing them, and what the whole intrusion by them into the private sector on the basis that what they were doing was in the interests of the people has, in fact, cost the people of this province.

Mr. Speaker, this gasoline tax is therefore objectionable, not only because it is a reflection, Mr. Speaker, on the way in which Autopac has run, but at this particular time when what was required in this province was a reduction of taxation, we have in fact, on the part of the government, an increase in taxation.

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I wish to say a few words on Bill 40, and I might remind you, sir, and others, that on second reading, the principle of the bill, we voted against it and we spelled out our reasons. We said in effect that this is a subsidization; it's lack of accountability in years to come. And I understand that some government members had said that they would not be adverse to raising the gas tax to cover more of the costs of Autopac. So the foot is in the door, Mr. Speaker. The government has found a way to keep from raising the direct premium to the people, and they hope in the future to increase this form of subsidization.

I might remind you, Mr. Speaker, that the government has broken its promise. When they introduced Autopac, they said that the Manitoba Government plan would carry itself. It would carry itself. The people would know what they were paying; they would know how to compare with other provinces. And my honourable friends opposite cannot deny that, because they've said it many many times. They've said it on the hustings, they've said it in the House, they've said it in debate of every kind, and they have broken their promise. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I must tell you that, even as late as today, one of the NDP candidates in the by-elections is calling on the Premier to reduce the gas tax. What hypocrisy! What hypocrisy! I asked at the 2:30 session, I asked the Acting Premier, does the Cabinet have any plans to reduce the gas tax because of the increased price of gas that all Canadians are going to have to pay, and the Acting Premier said no, there are no plans in Cabinet; there is no discussion about that. Yet on the hustings, one of the NDP candidates is saying that he's calling, he's asking the Premier to reduce the gas tax. And I say to my honourable friends

## BILL 40

(MR. G. JOHNSTON cont'd) . . . . opposite that they are not being honest when they bring in a bill such as 40, Bill No. 40, put two cents on to pay for Autopac's deficits. We know by reports, that it's not going to pay for all of the deficit of this year, let alone picking up past deficits. So I say, Mr. Speaker, that we are against this bill in principle, we're against the cynical operation of the government, when they broke their promises when they said that the people will pay, they'll know what they're paying. After a few years, Mr. Speaker, people will not know what they're paying for Autopac in this province.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. MORRIS MCGREGOR (Virden): Mr. Speaker, I would just like to add a few words. I think all members know the area I come from, and this bill certainly has a story somewhat for them. The bill does show relief for the small oil producers. I regret that it's not coming from general revenue, but I certainly oppose the two cents of gas tax for Autopac, because as a rural member I know it does cost more at any time to take our families to any kind of a professional show. This extra two cents is just another 20 or 30 cents, wherever you're going, be it 50 miles to Brandon, a 100 return, or whatever it is.

But I also have to think in the past, when I asked both the Premier and the Minister of Mines for a hearing on behalf of the oil people in my area and also people who were coming in from the States, and I remember on that occasion I was allowed to sit in that meeting. And I can almost quote Dr. Barry who had words to this effect: "I have appreciated doing business with this administration and past administrations" and at that moment I was proud to be a Manitoban, I was proud to be representing an area that people were coming in and saying that about our particular province. There were others that were bargaining for a better deal, they got a good hearing I think. This bill does show some action. And I want to make it positively clear I've talked this situation over with my leader. He understands the quandary I'm in - and I think as a member who uses very few words in here, I seem to be in a quandary a lot more times than probably my words would indicate. However, I do have to support the small oil producers, and the Autopac I have to oppose - if I was a gambler I would roll a dice to see which it could go - I think I've always said I represent the people first at all times. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I want to begin by thanking the Honourable Member for Virden for the very brief and candid way in which he has expressed mixed support for this bill. Mixed support is better than no support, Mr. Speaker. I can appreciate that he's in quandary because this bill has provisions in it that go beyond the dealing only with the matter of relief with respect to, in particular small oil well production.

The Member for Virden, I think, is perhaps in the best position of anyone in this House to know the relative position that Manitoba is in with respect to oil production. We are not, unfortunately, as well blessed or endowed as Alberta, Saskatchewan and British Columbia, in that order, with respect to oil production. Whereas the Province of Saskatchewan has in the order of 80 million barrels a year production, and one can imagine what that is worth these days; and the Province of Alberta in the order of 550 million to 600 million barrels of production per year; the Province of British Columbia in the order of about 20 million to 22 million barrels production per year; as opposed to all that, Manitoba's production is in the order of 5-1/2 million to 6 million barrels. I'm not complaining, sir, that is the nature of the geological facts of our province, and it is better to have Manitobans own 6 million barrels of production than none at all. But you see, that's just the point, sir, 6 million barrels - so we're not in a position of the 500 million barrel a year producer, nor even the Province of Saskatchewan or B.C.

Therefore, when comparing Manitoba's tax treatment with that of any other province in Canada, except the oil producing provinces, then indeed our gasoline and motive fuel tax is not the highest, sir, it is among the lowest. My honourable friends keep wanting to forget that. And I must question where the hypocrisy lies. What are we comparing 18 and 19 cents per gallon of taxation - we must, if we want to be honest, as the Member for Virden finds it easy to be and others find it difficult - we must compare it with the fact that in Ontario it is 25 cents or taxation. Why is it more there? Is it because Ontario is a poorer province than Manitoba? That's not the reason. That is their sense of priorities. So let us not pretend that Conservative priorities would somehow end up differently. Or New Brunswick or Nova Scotia -

## BILL 40

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) . . . . do they have lower motive fuel and gasoline tax than Manitoba? Most certainly not, Mr. Speaker. Therefore my honourable friends will not pursue that avenue, I am sure because they will be defeating themselves.

Then they may wish to compare with years gone by in Manitoba itself. And when you do that, sir, you find the irony that the Progressive Conservative administration of Manitoba had an 18 cent per gallon tax levied on Manitobans 11 years ago. They complain now that it is one cent higher. One cent higher in 11 years. They levied a 17 cent per gallon tax in 1964 when per capita disposable income stood at \$1, 656 as compared to \$3, 948 this year. Any child wouldn't even try to argue that 17 cents per gallon tax on motive fuel when the per capita average income was \$1, 656 was more generous or less onerous tax treatment than today, when it is one cent higher when the per capita income is, in current dollar terms, more than twice as much. My honourable friends will say - "Ah, but inflation" so, therefore, I want to use the uninflated constant dollar measurement. In constant dollars in 1964, in constant 1961 dollars, using it as a standard of measure, per capita disposable personal income, \$1, 580 as compared to \$2, 370 in 1974. So on that basis, per capita disposable income in real . . . in real dollars, not in inflated dollars, being almost \$800 greater, \$750 to \$800 greater, the tax, one cent per gallon more - which, sir, is the greater relative tax incidence - now or in 1964? So, Mr. Speaker, I don't think more need be said. The facts are stark and speak for themselves.

My honourable friends raise Autopac. And I do not want to go over the same arguments that were made by the Leader of the Opposition and by myself and others at the time of second reading, at the second reading stage of this bill and in the committee stage - the same arguments put over and over. So I am not going to repeat ad nauseam and to bore honourable members to tears by repeating everything that was said already two or three times. But at the last stage of dealing with this bill, Mr. Speaker, I did not make reference to, for example, the Edmonton Journal headline here of . . . dateline of April 5th: "Insurance Pinch Nips Drivers"; "Ten firms stop selling in Alberta". The Leader of the Opposition would have us believe and would have Manitobans believe that we have a problem with public auto insurance in Manitoba, only in Manitoba and that the rest of the insurance industry in Canada is healthy. Mr. Speaker, nothing could be further from the truth. The phenomenon of difficulty that public insurance is facing in Manitoba is identical in every significant respect to that which is faced by the industry generally in Canada and in North America.

Well, but you know, Mr. Speaker, it is not prudent to glance at a headline and to draw any definitive conclusions. So we made inquiries of the authorities in Alberta and we have here a letter, an official letter from the Department of Consumer Affairs. And they verify that the article is substantially correct - that 10 firms in the automobile insurance industry in Alberta withdrew from operations or withdrew from the sale of automobile insurance in the month as of December 31st, 1974, for reasons having to do with the general economic condition prevailing in the insurance industry. The article which I did not refer to before and which is therefore, I trust, not repetition, makes reference to the fact, and I quote, "Despite general increases of 15 percent to 20 percent last summer and 10 percent in January, Mr. Sadd expects a further 10 percent increase will be sought by companies in July." Fifteen to 20 percent, plus 10 percent in January, plus 10 percent in July of 1975. No matter how one looks at that, it means that in 12 months it's 15 to 20, plus 10, plus 10. And, Mr. Speaker, the reason for that is not because Alberta is in some peculiar position; like Manitoba, it is because insurance companies in Canada as a whole are in a position of looking at about a 250 million or one quarter of a billion dollar deficit plus. I find no comfort in that. But I do find it as a basis for a rational intellectually honest defence of a given position that we are in at this point in time.

Honourable members want to ignore the fact that in 12 months a general increase, according to the Journal, of 15 to 20 percent, plus 10, plus 10, and no amount of obfuscation will conceal that fact. And that fact is not peculiar, it is endemic to the insurance industry in Canada. Autopac's operation I wish that - the Member for Portage, I say in particular, that I wish it were somehow possible to convince him that the matter of the two cents on gasoline, I suppose, can be regarded - and I suppose there isn't much that one can say or do that will dissuade if one wishes to deduce that that is a subsidy from Consolidated Revenue Fund. But I do want - even if it is futile now, sir, it may not be within a matter of a few years, that it

## BILL 40

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) . . . . will come to be regarded as a charge which is offsetting for future increases in what we call the differential premium rate as between the categories of preferred, all purpose, those who drive to work, those who drive for pleasure, and because of that have a differential in premium. We feel that that is a rather arbitrary and a difficult kind of differentiation to administer. We are not abandoning it in toto, but we certainly do not feel it easy to accept the reasoning so much that we would like to extend it. And a quantification based on volume of fuel consumed is about as good a rational dispassionate measurement of amount of driving, whether it be to work or for pleasure, than an attestation system which works on the basis of one declaring whether or not one works - usually to work, most of the time to work, never to work, or some combination thereof.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that's basically the reason for the two cent charge. But I'm under no illusions that it will be accepted with alacrity by the Member for Portage. The matter of avoiding a conventional premium increase, which is what he suspects it's for, is not the intent or purpose of it at all. Because if that were the case, we could simply have proceeded with that much more of an ordinary general increase in premiums. And the member should not think that we feel sensitive that the premium increase in Manitoba is inordinate, because one need only look at the Toronto Globe and Mail, the Toronto Star, the Edmonton Journal, to see that in fact increases - not once a year, sir, but coming in twice and indeed three times in 12 months. And we have the Department of Consumer Affairs in Alberta confirming an Edmonton Journal newspaper article to that account. Why should we feel sensitive, sir, if in one province the industry increases rates three times in 12 months and we increase it here once to a percentage amount less than there and we start from a lower base? We're not that sensitive about the rate that we resort to subterfuge. That's not the reason for the two cent charge. It is to attempt to get it onto a different basis of rationale to some extent.

--(Interjection)-- Well yes, Mr. Speaker, it comes out because the truth always does come out, sir, eventually. And that is why on this issue some of my colleagues appear so serene.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, I only want to comment on this bill, on the comments made by the First Minister with regards to the two cent gasoline tax and its application to Autopac.

Mr. Speaker, the First Minister and, of course, his Ministers generally defend the principle of Autopac now on the basis of comparisons with the performance of other companies in Canada. The point was made, Mr. Speaker, when this bill was brought in originally and when Autopac was introduced - the greatest and strongest presentation made by people in the insurance, primarily those in the business of selling insurance as they appeared before the committee by the dozens at the time the bill was brought in - that really what they were doing was selling a service, and that the added cost that could go into the commissions was what the people were paying for service. And the strongest argument encountered to that by the government was that they would in fact be able to save a percentage somewhere in the order of 15 percent on the cost of automobile insurance. Mr. Speaker, what has really happened - and make no mistake about it - what has really happened is that the total costs of automobile insurance in Manitoba have risen at a greater rate than the insurance costs in the other parts of Canada operating under the private sector. Number two, Mr. Speaker, furthermore, there is no company that could operate under the Insurance Act of Canada that does control the other non-government plans in Canada; there is no company writing \$60 million of policy that could, under normal conditions, rack up \$10 million losses two years in a row and still meet the test of adequacy in the Insurance Act of Canada. --(Interjection)-- No, Mr. Speaker, the First Minister is dead wrong in that. The companies are not doing it every year. Mr. Speaker, the insurance companies of Canada whether they are the co-ops or the mutuals or the private companies or anything else have to meet a pretty stringent test of operations. That's a test of adequacy imposed by the Insurance Act of Canada. Autopac does not have to meet that and does not meet it.

MR. ENNS: Just like the Planning Bill.

MR. CRAIK: And they have not met it. Technically under that Act they would at this point be bankrupt if it wasn't for the fact that they were a Crown corporation. Well, Mr. Speaker, not bankrupt, they would simply be restricted in their business, put out of business probably by the Insurance Act of Canada. But they don't operate under the Insurance

## BILL 40

(MR. CRAIK cont'd) . . . . Act of Canada. They operate as an entity unto themselves, a Crown corporation. And now what we are, you know, at the present time, where we're at, right now, is that we're going a deviation even further than that. The yardsticks that apply to the operations of insurance companies generally, Mr. Speaker - and I want to make a distinction here. You know, the largest and most active insurance companies in Canada are not private companies, they are in effect public companies. They're co-ops and they're mutuals. They operate under the same laws as the co-ops in Canada, the only difference is that the mutuals pay a corporation income tax in a slightly different form than the co-ops do.

Mr. Speaker, let me tell you really now what has happened. That the government by this move and by taxing on drivers license and the penalties imposed on drivers with their infractions and now the move into the gasoline tax, removes all the yardsticks where we're going to be able to adequately compare the operation of Autopac compared to any other company. So, you know, the government's going to be able to stand up more effectively now and say our premiums are the lowest, they're the lowest from here to the North Pole, we've got the lowest premiums, Mr. Speaker. And technically they'll be right, because there's only part of it coming from the premium whereas everybody else has to take their entire livelihood from their premiums. So what does it prove? It simply proves that once again we have lost the accounting integrity that normally should apply to the yardstick by which we should be able to, as members of the Legislature, apply, Mr. Speaker, some measure as to how well that is performing.

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, again, in conclusion, I don't think there's any way, by the way that the mechanics that Autopac uses, the mechanics of their settlement of claims or techniques and everything else, there is no way they can ever come back and apply the pressures and the strictures that other private companies have to apply and forever, Mr. Speaker, we will collect in premiums and put out in terms of settlements more money than would ever have been done with automobile in the private sector.

Let me add one more factor, Mr. Speaker. Add that this government did not achieve a social objective when they brought in Autopac. What they did is they fulfilled a philosophical goal. That's what happened. As far as a real social measure is concerned, this just is not a social measure that's adequate. You know this idea that somehow it's the be-all, end-all to get into business and run it had its best demonstration today. For the first time I think in history probably a man barged in to this Chamber because he was unhappy with Autopac. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. CRAIK: Well, you know, I've got a perfect right, Mr. Speaker, to make the observation that the more government gets in and takes over the wheels of industry, which they're going to do, the more you're going to get this sort of thing. It's almost an anarchist type of a mentality that develops. We somehow get the impression, Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. The Honourable First Minister state his matter of privilege.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, on a matter of parliamentary privilege. The reference to the decorum of this House having been affected in one way or the other by the entry of a person into this House, it happens to be factually incorrect, sir. I was in the Parliament of Canada when a person did much the same kind of thing and it, I don't believe, was any reflection on the government of the day any more than the incident this afternoon. And I furthermore am quite prepared to allege that had the person been given the proper counsel by the MLA that he went to see, that the incident may have been avoided. Had I had an --(Interjection)-- Well all right, if you want to . . . Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. Would the Honourable Member for Lakeside kindly keep quiet. The Honourable Member for Swan River. Order please. Do I at this late moment have to name members to help maintain decorum. I would hope they would cooperate and assist me so that we can get finished in a few more minutes.

The Honourable Minister make his final point.

MR. SCHREYER: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I am quite prepared to withdraw the remark. I am trying to indicate to the Member for Riel that there may well be a problem, I have already met and am trying to do my best to ascertain the facts, without ascertaining the facts it is completely pointless to comment or speculate and I would hope that he would at least withhold

## BILL 40

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) . . . . comment till that is done. May I add, sir, that to not to wait until that is done is a little bit disgusting, sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Morris on the same matter of privilege.

MR. JORGENSEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am sure you will recognize that the First Minister intervened not to raise a bona fide question of privilege, a spurious one, for the purpose of making another speech.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I am not going to adjudicate in respect to whether the honourable member should have brought the matter up or not. I am simply going to apologize to the House personally because the security of the House is my responsibility and it did not happen to be carried out properly. Consequently in the future I shall certainly make an effort that the security of this Chamber will be carried out properly, and I do hope that it does not become a matter of debate whether we do have proper security or not, that we shall have it and it will be carried out forthwith. The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, if there's any suggestion here at all that somehow a move such as that would be aided and abetted by the members of the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, if there is any suggestion that a move such as that would be aided and abetted shows a pretty severely strained mentality at this stage of the game to draw that assumption.

Mr. Speaker, what I'm trying to say is that the more government . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, the point I'm trying to make is that the more government takes unto itself to build this pyramid of authority that says that, you know, our old society must have the goals of being one of 17 Cabinet Ministers, we're going to get more and more and more of this. I repeat, Mr. Speaker, that this is a pretty feeble defence of Autopac that's being presented with this two cent gasoline tax. I repeat again that it has not been a significant social measure and, Mr. Speaker, the NDP may well have achieved a philosophical goal in bringing it in but they can take no satisfaction out of the financial operations of it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour)(Transcona): Mr. Speaker, I would like to make one or two comments in respect to Autopac, the question of taxation, the question of the increase required for the conduct of the financial arrangements so far as Autopac is concerned.

For many years we attempted to have the then government of the day recognize its responsibility to the auto driver and those insured under automobile private insurance, we attempted for years to have serious consideration of the ineffective legislation that prevailed at that time, and if there were any rip-offs, Mr. Speaker, those rip-offs were given as a result of the ineptness of the Conservative Party of Manitoba to the automobile insurance companies for years. We may not have achieved all of the desires, but one thing we did achieve, Mr. Speaker, was a reduction in the premiums that were having to be paid particularly by the young driver under the age of 25. As the Leader of the Party at that particular time I pleaded time after time after time with the government of that particular day to even go so far as to set up an organization that would review automobile insurance rates. Did they accept that? They did not. They rejected it completely. And now they have the consummate gall, Mr. Speaker, to say that we should have done what they didn't do. I know throughout this whole session the members opposite criticize us because we make reference to the ineptness of the Conservative Party when they had the rights and powers to do something. They failed to do it not only in respect of auto insurance but others as well.

How well I recall the debates that took place in this House, the rejection of the reasonable propositions that we were making at that particular time for an assessment in auto insurance in the Province of Manitoba, and the agents of the insurance company one by one, who at that time were members of a government, were standing up saying that everything was all right by our Old Nell because they were paying us. That is the history and if my honourable friends opposite would only take the time out to read Hansard and their own debates of that day . . . We talk about deficits. The automobile insurance industry at that particular time that I'm speaking of were gouging from the people of Manitoba, the auto drivers, sufficient moneys to put into reserves for reinvestment which weren't shown as revenue. What they were doing, what they were doing was milking the public for reinvestment

## BILL 40

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) . . . . for the profits of the company. Sure they could show book losses of certain amounts of money, but the profit was being made by those particular companies by the investment of the automobile insurance payers premiums at that particular time. Now we have clean and open government. We have a clean report to the House and it does show a deficit. Of course it does. But we haven't had the advantage, thus far, as was the advantage with the automobile insurance companies of that day to use it for reinvestment outside and the money that came in as a result of that reinvestment going into the pocket of the insurance companies.

Reference has been made, Mr. Speaker, to the incident this afternoon, and I suggest to honourable members in all quarters of the House that they do not make any further remarks in respect to that till they find out the true circumstances. It had no relationship at all to Autopac because - it did in this particular case it's true - but it could have happened in respect of anything regardless of what government was the government of the day. I had the opportunity of speaking to the young man. He was disturbed because of certain bureaucratic approaches, the likes of that; as indeed the rest of us have been from time to time.

I recall another incident when somebody barged into this House who knew the rules of the House and attempted to take over and was asked to leave. I say, Mr. Speaker, that of a whole million people that we have here in the Province of Manitoba if one percent really knows that this is a holy ground, just for elected representatives and staff, that would be about the maximum. How is it that anybody knows that these doors around here are really to keep us in here and the people out? And it's suggested that because of Autopac we're going to have more - because of the incident this afternoon, we're going to have more. I'm going to say, Mr. Speaker, that if we, as members of this Assembly, use our common sense and accept the differences, accept the fact that people do from time to time have emotional upsets - I've had them and every other darn member of this Assembly has had them from time to time - and to indicate that because one individual out of a million people came in here this afternoon, that that's a reflection on the government's conduct of Autopac is a bunch of damn nonsense.

I say, Mr. Speaker, let them be judged on what they didn't do. We can accept their criticism, that's what we come in here for each session to have them criticize what the government is doing, and it's their obligation and their right to do it. But for goodness sake keep it on a decent and high level instead of dirt and muck that is constantly being raised this session by the Conservative Party in opposition.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I will attempt to keep the level of debate on that decent level that the Honourable Minister of Labour requested to be kept. Let me roughly paraphrase the words of the First Minister not so long ago when he suggested that a year or two or 12 months or 18 months from now Autopac would no longer be an issue in the Province of Manitoba - roughly those are words I think that the Minister at one time or another said.

Mr. Speaker, what concerns us and will continue to concern Manitobans at large is that despite those reassuring words of the First Minister, Autopac obviously still is an issue in Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, it's also simply a question --(Interjection)-- well that will be answered sooner or later. But, Mr. Speaker, you know at the time of the introduction of Autopac, at the time of the introduction of Autopac, it was not simply a question of competing with the then existing private insurers, it was the general position put forward by members of the government that a new Utopia would be arrived at with the introduction of Autopac and that there would be no ongoing debate or ongoing question as to the validity of the scheme and as to its rightness or wrongness or as to its competitive features of the scheme. And the savings would be apparent to all, the contributions, the efficiency would be apparent to all and it led the First Minister to making that remark that it would just not be a debate any longer shortly after its introduction.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we find several years after its introduction, four years after its introduction, the Premier debating and defending Autopac - on what basis? On how it's comparing to the private sector. The private sector raised its rates once or twice a year so that justifies Autopac for raising its rates once or twice a year. The private sector runs a deficit, that justifies Autopac for running a deficit. The difference of course is if a citizen has a complaint, he has no other desk to go to, and I think the government showed an over

## BILL 40

(MR. ENNS cont'd) . . . . degree of sensitivity to the comments made by my friend, colleague, the Honourable Member for Riel in the sense that what he was simply saying is that the frustrations of any individual that may be felt against any company, public or private, will be voiced and vented from time to time, as it was this afternoon, and what my honourable friend the Member from Riel was saying, as this government persists on moving more and more into the sector of general commerce that affects the lives of most Manitobans, you can expect more of that. Well, so maybe that's, you know --(Interjection)-- No, no, that's unless of course, that's unless of course you believe that the consumer should not have a legitimate complaint.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't want to prolong the debate except to say that that is not how Bill 56, how au to insurance was introduced in this Chamber. It was introduced in a manner of way that really and the Opposition at that time was illustrated, and it was demonstrated to be the kind of last ditch effort of a private sector fighting vainly to hold onto vested interests, that once over that hump, once the introduction of the public insurance corporation was brought into being that the debate in the words of the First Minister would cease and diminish.

Well, Mr. Speaker, to bring this to more directly to the rules of the House and to the bill that's in front of us, what I've said earlier on second reading on this bill, and I repeat again, what we now see of course is that the government is cleverly making sure that any honest comparison of rates will become more and more difficult. --(Interjection)-- Well, we're now collecting premiums on gasoline consumption, we're collecting premiums on how good or bad a driver I am, which the private insurance company couldn't do except on preferred risk. We're collecting driver's licences, insurance premiums for numbers of people that are driving, whether there's two or three drivers in a family, they're all paying to it. We're paying then the premium itself, so we've diffused the whole area of premium collection, and we can expect a greater diffusion of this premium collection, and it will become increasingly more difficult, increasingly more difficult to make that kind of an honest comparison. And you will invite, you will invite increasingly more criticisms on this particular point. Well now, Mr. Speaker, whether or not, you know, I'm not prepared to argue at this stage the acceptance or non-acceptability of the insurance scheme - I rather suspect the acceptability factor is pretty high - but nonetheless it does not take away from the reasonable honesty in some of the debates that took place on the question as to cost comparisons. It does not bring into question the kind of statements made on which the bill was introduced originally, and which Autopac was introduced originally on the basis of kind of savings that were going to be made to the private individual buying this insurance, and you, by introduction and passing of this bill, just ensure that it'll be made that much more difficult in the future.

QUESTION put MOTION carried. (On division)

### RESOLUTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Attorney-General, that:

WHEREAS the report of the Special Committee on the Rules of the House presented during the current session and concurred in by the House on Monday, March 17, 1975, recommended that the Special Committee be reconstituted with the same membership for the purpose of reviewing the application, effect and enforcement of the amendments to the Rules, Orders and Forms of Proceeding of the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Special Committee of Rules and Standing Orders of this Assembly composed of the Honourable Mr. Speaker as Chairman, Honourable Messrs. Green and Paulley, Messrs. Johnston (Portage), Jorgenson, Shafransky, Sherman and Walding be reconstituted to examine and review the application, effect and enforcement of the Rules and Standing Orders in the light of the experience of the current session, and to recommend any further amendments which, in the opinion of the Committee, are deemed to be in the interests of the orderly and efficient conduct of the business of the House;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED THAT the said special committee be authorized to sit during the present session and in recess, after prorogation, and to report to this House



## RESOLUTIONS

(MR. GREEN cont'd) . . . . at the next session of the Legislature.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I move . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The motion has to be made. It doesn't have to be read.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Labour, that

WHEREAS the Standing Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders was authorized, by resolution of the Legislative Assembly in the First Session of the 30th Legislature

(a) to undertake a study of and report to the House with recommendations respecting standards with which employee-group, or employer sponsored pension and superannuation plans should comply and methods by which such standards may be achieved or by which such plans can be brought to comply to such standards; and

(b) to examine the statutes and regulations governing the disclosure of assets and interests of members of the Executive Council, Members of the Legislative Assembly, and of public servants in Manitoba and to consider the advisability of enacting legislation to ensure proper disclosure of information on the subject;

AND WHEREAS the following Bills were introduced in the Second Session of the 30th Legislature:

No. 37 - An Act respecting Disclosure of Interests in Matters of Public Concern and Conflicts of Interests of Persons Holding Public Office; and

No. 57 - The Pension Benefits Act;

AND WHEREAS Bill No. 37 - An Act respecting Disclosure of Interests in Matters of Public Concern and Conflicts of Interests of Persons Holding Public Office; and

Part II of Bill No. 57 - The Pension Benefits Act

were referred, after Second Reading, to the Standing Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the Standing Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders appointed on March 13, 1975, for the Second Session of the Thirtieth Legislature be authorized to sit during recess, after prorogation, to consider

Bill No. 37 - An Act respecting Disclosure of Interests in Matters of Public Concern and Conflicts of Interests of Persons Holding Public Office; and

Part II of Bill No. 57 - The Pension Benefits Act

and to report to the House at the next session with any recommendations in respect thereto as are deemed necessary, and such other matters as may be referred to it.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: If I may, I believe it's been indicated to honourable members opposite that there is an amendment to move to this resolution so as to enable the committee to also take under consideration Bill 64, which we are not proceeding with, namely the Teachers' Pensions Act, an Act to amend the Teachers' Pensions Act, and the Minister of Education has the amendment to move formally.

MR. SPEAKER: Is that agreeable, that procedure, adoption of that amendment as well? No opposition?

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, I wish to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs, that resolution be amended by adding in the last paragraph thereof the following words: "including specifically Bill No. 64, an Act to amend the Teachers' Pensions Act introduced at the current session of the Legislature."

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. PAULLEY: Motion as amended.

MR. SPEAKER: Motion as amended agreed to? So ordered. The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Urban Affairs, that

WHEREAS the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba, on the 30th day of May, 1974, constituted a Special Committee of the House consisting of Hon. Messrs. Green and Uskiw, Messrs. Adam, Barrow, Blake, Bostrom, Boyce, Ferguson, Graham, Henderson, Johannson,

## RESOLUTIONS

(MR. USKIW cont'd) . . . . Johnston (Portage), Jorgenson, Shafransky and Walding to enquire into matters relating to property rights in lands within the province;

AND WHEREAS the said Special Committee, in its report to the Legislature recommended that the Special Committee be continued in order to provide the citizens of Manitoba with further opportunities to express their views on matters relating to the use and ownership of land in the province;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Special Committee appointed to enquire into matters relating to property rights in lands within the province on the 30th day of May, 1974, be reconstituted and re-appointed to enquire into matters relating to property rights in agricultural and recreational lands within the province;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this Special Committee shall consist of Hon. Messrs. Bostrom, Green, Toupin, Uskiw, Messrs. Adam, Barrow, Blake, Enns, Graham, Johansson, Johnston (Portage), Jorgenson, Minaker, Shafransky and Walding;

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this Special Committee be authorized:

1. to hold such public hearings as the Committee deems advisable,
2. to report its findings and recommendations to the House at the next session of the Legislature.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I think we were just awaiting the Administrator of the Province of Manitoba.

ROYAL ASSENT

The Honourable the Administrator of the Government of the Province of Manitoba, entered the House and was seated on the THRONE.

MR. SPEAKER: May it please Your Honour, the Legislative Assembly at its present Session passed several bills which in the name of the Assembly I present to Your Honour, and to which Bills I respectfully request Your Honour's Assent.

MR. ASSISTANT CLERK: No. 2 - The Interprovincial Subpoena Act.

No. 3 - The Extra-provincial Custody Orders Enforcement Act.

No. 5 - An Act to amend The Vital Statistics Act.

No. 6 - An Act to amend The Wills Act.

No. 8 - An Act to amend The Child Welfare Act.

No. 10 - An Act to amend An Act to Incorporate Co-operative Credit Society of Manitoba Limited.

No. 11 - An Act to amend The Agricultural Societies Act.

No. 13 - The Fatality Inquiries Act.

No. 14 - An Act to amend The Unsatisfied Judgment Fund Act.

No. 15 - An Act to amend The Summary Convictions Act.

No. 16 - The Metallic Minerals Royalty Act.

No. 17 - An Act to amend The Development Corporation Act.

No. 20 - An Act to amend The Heritage Manitoba Act.

No. 21 - An Act to amend The Horse Racing Commission Act.

No. 22 - An Act to amend The Horse Racing Regulation Act.

No. 23 - An Act to incorporate the St. Andrew's River Heights United Church Foundation.

No. 24 - The University of Manitoba Students' Union Act.

No. 25 - An Act to amend An Act to incorporate The Investors Group.

No. 26 - An Act to amend The Liquor Control Act.

No. 27 - An Act to amend The Municipal Act.

No. 28 - An Act to amend The Employment Standards Act.

No. 29 - The Payment of Wages Act.

No. 31 - The Public Servants Insurance Act.

No. 32 - An Act for the Relief of Susan Thiessen.

No. 33 - An Act to repeal An Act respecting The Town of Portage la Prairie.

No. 34 - An Act to amend The Real Estate Brokers Act.

No. 35 - An Act to amend An Act to Incorporate The Commercial Club of Winnipeg.

## ROYAL ASSENT

(MR. ASSISTANT CLERK cont'd) . . . . .

No. 36 - An Act to vest Title to Certain Land in The City of Portage la Prairie.

No. 38 - An Act Respecting Guaranty Trust Company of Canada.

No. 40 - The Statute Law Amendment (Taxation) Act (1975).

No. 41 - An Act to amend The Manitoba Telephone Act and to authorize the Expenditure of Moneys for Capital Purposes of The Manitoba Telephone System and to authorize the Borrowing of the same.

No. 42 - An Act to amend The Child Welfare Act (2).

No. 43 - An Act to amend The Health Services Insurance Act.

No. 44 - The Planning Act.

No. 45 - An Act to amend The Convention Centre Corporation Act.

No. 46 - The Gas Storage and Allocation Act.

No. 47 - An Act to amend The Social Allowances Act.

No. 48 - The District Health and Social Services Act.

No. 49 - An Act to validate By-law Number 3321 of The Town of Dauphin.

No. 50 - An Act to amend The City of Winnipeg Act.

No. 51 - An Act respecting The Rural Municipality of Morris, The Rural Municipality of Roland, The School District of Kane No. 2006 and The Morris-McDonald School Division No. 19.

No. 52 - The Dental Health Services Act.

No. 53 - The Dental Health Workers Act.

No. 54 - An Act to amend The Municipal Board Act.

No. 55 - An Act to incorporate La Centrale Des Caisses Populaires du Manitoba Ltée.

No. 56 - An Act to amend The Landlord and Tenant Act.

No. 57 - The Pension Benefits Act.

No. 58 - An Act to amend The Public Schools Act.

No. 59 - An Act Respecting the transfer to Federal Business Development Bank of all the Property, Rights and Obligations of Industrial Development Bank.

No. 61 - An Act to amend The Financial Administration Act (2).

No. 62 - The Statute Law Amendment Act (1975).

No. 63 - An Act to amend The Income Tax Act (Manitoba).

No. 65 - An Act to amend The Health Services Act and The Elderly and Infirm Persons' Housing Act.

MR. CLERK: In Her Majesty's Name, the Honourable the Administrator doth assent to these Bills.

MR. SPEAKER: We, Her Majesty's most dutiful and faithful subjects, the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba, in session assembled, approach Your Honour with sentiments of unfeigned devotion and loyalty to Her Majesty's person and Government, and beg for Your Honour the acceptance of these Bills:

No. 19 - An Act for Granting to Her Majesty Certain Sums of Money for the Public Service of the Province for the Fiscal Year Ending the 31st day of March, 1976.

No. 39 - An Act for Granting to Her Majesty Certain Further Sums of Money for the Public Service of the Province for the Fiscal Year Ending the 31st day of March, 1976.

MR. CLERK: The Honourable the Administrator of the Government of the Province of Manitoba doth thank Your Majesty's dutiful and loyal subjects, accepts their benevolence, and assents to these Bills in Her Majesty's name.

HON. SAMUEL FREEDMAN (Administrator): Mr. Speaker and Members of the Legislative Assembly: The work of the Second Session of the Thirtieth Legislature has now been completed. I wish to commend the Members for their faithful attention to their duties including many hours devoted to consideration of Bills and Estimates, both in the House and in the Committee. I convey to you my appreciation of your concern for the public interest and for the general welfare of our Province.

I thank you for providing the necessary sums of money for carrying on the public business. It will be the intention of my Ministers to ensure that these sums will be expended with both efficiency and economy by all departments of the government.

## ROYAL ASSENT

(MR. FREEDMAN cont'd)

In relieving you now of your present duties declaring the Second Session of the Thirtieth Legislature prorogued, I give you my best wishes and pray that under the guidance of Divine Providence, our Province may continue to provide the things which are necessary for the health, the happiness and the well-being of all our people.

MR. PAWLEY: It is the will and pleasure of The Honourable, The Administrator of the Government of the Province of Manitoba, that this Legislative Assembly be prorogued until it shall please His Honour to summon the same for the despatch of business. And the Legislative Assembly is accordingly prorogued.

(God Save the Queen)