

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

8:00 o'clock, Tuesday, April 27, 1971

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR, SPEAKER: Before we proceed, I should like to direct the honourable members' attention to the gallery where we have 30 members of the 1st Assiniboia Cub Pack "C" under the direction of Mr. R. Gijzen and Mr. A. Jones. This pack is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia. On behalf of all the honourable members of the Legislature, I welcome you here today.

The Honourable House Leader.

MR, GREEN: Mr. Speaker, would you call Bill No. 9 please. Adjourned debate on second reading.

GOVERNMENT BILLS

MR, SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Finance. The Honourable Member for Assiniboia. (Bill No. 9).

MR, PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I will be quite brief on this bill. I have no intention to hold it up and I will try and make my contribution at this present time. I think when the Minister proposed Bill No. 9 for second reading, he explained that if the House supports the proposed legislation it would really be making no concessions, that it really wouldn't mean anything. With honeyed words and sweet smile he explained the bill was intended merely to set things for a smooth takeover or total amalgamation of the Metropolitan area in the City of Winnipeg. I can assume, Mr. Speaker, that we do not take any bill presented in this House very lightly, and especially one that concerns total amalgamation of Greater Winnipeg. As the Minister explained on second reading, it consists of three parts. Number one was enumeration. The bill would enable the provincial authorities to undertake a Metro area census. This, the Minister explained, would have to be done anyway on an individual municipality basis so there is nothing particularly wrong with this element of the bill. In fact, it could save money, and if the final act of the amalgamation is defeated in this House, the enumeration would have to be taken in such a way that the figures would still be applicable to individual municipalities. So we have no quarrel with that section of the proposed legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the other principle in the bill, election control: The bill would halt any proposed municipal elections until the end of the year and that the existing councils would sit until then. Elections would be wasteful, said the Minister, because everything is going to change anyway. This section of the bill is, I would suppose, pre-supposition of the course this House will take. We're being asked to act as if amalgamation were already in effect, and I guess that the outcome of the bill on total amalgamation would make make no difference.

The third point that the bill deals with is the budgetary review and control. All municipalities would be required to stick by that. No new commitments to programs would be tolerated and no dissipation of accumulated assets would be allowed. If I understood the Minister I think this is what he said on second reading. This is the element of Bill 9 that we cannot support and that's the third point that I just explained, as the Minister was kind enough to explain to the House his intentions with a piece of legislation, and as I mentioned earlier, Mr. Speaker, this legislation presupposes the passage of final amalgamation legislation of the government which may be at the present time, I would like to say, wishful thinking. At any rate, it is a fact that we cannot and will not agree to this bill very easily.

The program for amalgamation of this government has not even been presented to this Assembly. We have not had any opportunity to see what the government is proposing in any detail, so how could we in all conscience pass enabling legislation, legislation that enables what? I say to the government, show us your plans, what the total amalgamation bill will be. Then we will see if you deserve the right to have passage of this Bill. What are you asking now, Mr. Speaker, what the government is asking at the present time, is a pig in a poke, really. But more important than this, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that the government had placed before the House in Bill 9 a piece of legislation that is retroactive.

Retroactive legislation, in my opinion, is not a good thing. I've heard members of the government, when they sat on this side, when there was ever at any time retroactive legislation presented by the then government, I know that the members of the present government took strong objection to it. They said they didn't believe in retroactive legislation. So I say it is probably not good legislation and probably a deplorable tactic. -- (Interjection) -- You still don't

(MR. PATRICK, cont'd.) . . . believe it. Well then, why is it before the House? It attempts -- Mr. Speaker, this bill attempts to rewrite history and this House should not accept legislation couched in such terms. I know on January 10th of this year, the Liberal Party of Manitoba at that time asked for an emergency session of the Legislature to deal with the CFI crisis and it was denied. I feel at that time Bill No. 9, if the House had been called into session, surely could have been dealt with at that particular time and there would have not been required to have any . . . (Interjection) -- when we asked to deal with the CFI, I believe it was around January 9th or 10th. -- (Interjection) -- I didn't hear the Minister. What did you say? I didn't hear what the Minister said.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I say if the government did not have the courage or the majority to present a piece of legislation four months ago, they should have the audacity not to present retroactive legislation at this time.

I think the most important aspect of the budgetary review and control section of Bill No. 9, Mr. Speaker, that it makes the intention of the government quite clear. Even though the details are lacking, what the government intends to do is quite clear, is to socialize the municipal governments.

Well, Mr. Speaker, perhaps I can illustrate for the honourable members across the aisle -- (Interjection) -- No, it's, you know, it's a known fact that the City of St. James-Assiniboia probably would lose the most in total amalgamation, because through good administration and saving quite a bit of money to have the reserves that it has at the present time and not spending it for certain things that was probably necessary and required in that city, now the government of this day will say. "All right. Just because you have built this reserve, we'll lump them together and you have no right to the reserve that you have accumulated." I say there should be some right. I know even at the present time the City of St. James-Assiniboia last year developed a swimming pool, constructed a swimming pool, and the plan was to continue and include a covered skating rink, and I understand under this legislation the City of St. James-Assiniboia would not be entitled to do this.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the House Leader.

MR. GREEN: I wonder if the member would permit a question? I wonder if the honourable member would care to advise as to what the residents of the City of Winnipeg got as compensation when the two major parks were included in Greater Winnipeg, the Assiniboine Park and the Kildonan Park.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, surely; maybe there should have been some compensation. I don't deny that there shouldn't be compensation. As well, I don't deny that there shouldn't be compensation for Winnipeg Hydro at the present time, but I think surely there should be some consideration given to any municipality or city that has accumulated some assets or paid for improvements in that area; there should be some consideration given because -- I will say it again, that I feel the City of St. James-Assiniboia will be paying the highest price in the total amalgamation, because in the total amalgamation you will have to pick up the deficit from some of the other municipalities or cities, and the large reserve that has been built up in our city will have to go into the pot without -- so I feel there should be some consideration given; that perhaps a portion of the reserves could be spent in this year, at least to carry out the program that was started in the last short while.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Would the honourable member permit a question at this stage? I'm wondering how much Assiniboia people paid to St. James when the amalgamation took place and St. James had accumulated reserves.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I don't know; I wasn't on the council, but I can explain to the Minister and tell him at the present time, I don't believe that this was forced on either St. James or Assiniboia; I think it was by mutual agreement, by negotiation, that these two councils got together -- (Interjection) -- Well, I believe if there were any people against it there weren't too many, very few in fact. -- (Interjection) -- Well, I could tell you how I know, because I understand the Council of today, that it had an open house in the City of St. James and asked anyone that was interested in opposition to appear, and I understand very few people -- a handful for so -- turned out, so I don't see that it's the same situation that we have at the present time.

The fundamental intention of Bill 9 is to prevent the municipalities that have assets accrued through their own frugality or their own tax policies from spending those assets as they see fit; they're trying to prevent these municipalities from spending their own money. This

(MR. PATRICK, cont'd.) . . . is exactly the same principle, Mr. Speaker, as if the government had decided to socialize private bank accounts. Some municipalities deliberately tax their residents high to build up cash reserves and for use for those municipal luxuries such as streets and storm sewers. Why should the savings of some municipalities be handed over to the government in a total amalgamation?

Mr. Speaker, I feel this forced merger of assets is wrong and Bill No. 9 is wrong until there is some consideration given that some of these assets could be used for the area or in the municipality that they have been accrued or accumulated in.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, let me make the point that any legislation that sets up retroactive sharing of assets, I think sets a precedent that would be disquieting to say the least, to many areas of our society. If it proves possible for the government of Manitoba to retroactively claim assets from a municipality, what would be the point of any municipality saving anything? No one would build up cash reserves if it proved possible for someone to take it away from them retroactively. This would discourage frugality and good fiscal judgment by making it more sensible to simply overspend. Deficit financing would become the order of the day and for good reason. So, Mr. Speaker, I -- (Interjection) -- what's that? Well, I know one of the members opposite says it's illegal deficit -- municipal deficit financing is illegal, but what's the sense of accruing large reserves if those reserves that were accumulated from these people cannot be spent in that area? Surely I feel that some consideration must be given. I know that some municipalities denied their residents probably by building the facilities that were required. It could be a new municipal hall; it could be a covered skating rink or a small community club, and I know there's many municipalities in the Greater Winnipeg area that have not the community clubs that they should have had. North Winnipeg, where you can go in a large area that there are no community clubs, and perhaps this is done because of financing, because of building up a reserve, because of not going into debt, and here, in the City of St. James, St. James-Assiniboia, where there has been a reserve accumulated, reserves accrued, I cannot see that why not even a partial of those reserves cannot be spent for the benefit of the people from where the money came from, in the City of St. James, instead of putting it all into the pot and say not only that you're going to put your reserves into the pot but you'll also have to pick up the deficits from some of the other municipalities.

Mr. Speaker, I think this is wrong and I hope that the Minister will be able to at least change his mind, if not totally, partially, to allow some of the municipalities or cities that have accumulated a certain amount of monies in reserve that they will be able to at least finish out the program that they had planned or intended to spend in the past couple of years which was the program that had not been finished, say this year or in January, February, probably that program was supposed to continue till the end of the year or early '72. So I hope that the least the Minister will do is give consideration to those points.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Minister of Finance will be closing debate, I believe.

MR. CHERNIACK: . . . prepared to, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. CHERNIACK: I rose to ask if I could ask a question of the honourable member

MR. SPEAKER: Proceed.

MR. CHERNIACK: Would the honourable member not consider that the final section of the bill would be the one that would not prevent elections from being held because it automatically would cut off the bill, would repeal the bill, and would therefore permit the orderly process if the proposed new bill doesn't pass? Would not that answer one of the objections he appears to have raised?

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Honourable Minister must have misunderstood me. I said I have no objections to delaying the elections as mentioned in the bill, that was one of the points. I had no objections to enumeration; but I do have objections to the last point which was the budgetary control. That's the only objection that I raised.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on Bill No. 9 and I think it's been made abundantly clear that the opposition of the Progressive Conservative Party does not intend to approve this bill, certainly the way it stands; and for the one main reason, I would say, that it is totally unnecessary. The only principle of Bill No. 9 is that the Minister of Urban Affairs will have complete control over all the cities and municipalities in Winnipeg. As my

(MR. F. JOHNSTON, cont'd.) colleague says, he will be the czar of Greater Winnipeg and the municipalities and cities will have to answer to him in every way, shape or form. -- (Interjection) --

Well, Mr. Speaker, let me carry on for a minute. First of all, on Page 2 of the whole bill, as far as the principle of the bill is concerned, it's totally unnecessary. The cities and municipalities are required, Mr. Speaker, to send their budgets to the Director of Municipal Budgets and Finance. Would you like me to read the section? The minister would -- the director then looks over the municipal budgets at the present time, Mr. Speaker. He examines them to make sure they are not contrary to the Municipal Act, and it says he would then forthwith contact the cities and municipalities if there is anything wrong. That is being -- (Interjection) -- No, the City of St. James, the City of St. Boniface and Winnipeg, you are covering in another area pretty obviously. This is done, Mr. Speaker, and frankly if the Minister has the budgets at the present time - he announced today that he has them all - was there anything wrong? Has he contacted them forthwith? Has he gone to them? Will he be going to them? This is a club over the cities and municipalities heads that is just retroactive legislation. It finally says in there "on or before the 1st day of June they will give final reading to their budgets."

Well the Minister at the present time, the Minister of Urban Affairs, and the Minister of Municipal Affairs, which is the way it legally is at the present time, has - under the municipal affairs it's legal - but at the present time the Director of Finance has had the opportunity to look at them and in this case, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Urban Affairs made a request to the cities and municipalities for their budgets; he received them. -- (Interjection) -- Well I'm mistaken then, Mr. Speaker. They were sent to the Minister of Municipal Affairs as it is usually done and what is legal, but this bill -- really, the one part of this bill that could be changed, Mr. Speaker, is to say that the cities and municipalities should submit their budgets to the Minister of Urban Affairs. That's about the only thing that would have to be done. -- (Interjection) -- That's right, that we can go along with.

Mr. Speaker, the sections of this bill say that the Minister will have complete power, or the cities and municipalities will have to ask for changes in variation of their budget. And I know what we are going to get from the government, Mr. Speaker, the usual argument, oh we don't mean that. If you don't, say it! Right now, the way that reads, if somebody had to appropriate some money for extra help in a civic centre or something like that and their budget was worn out, you would have to write the Minister to make a change. If you don't mean it, say it. That's what it says. The principle of the bill is complete control. And there is no necessity for it. You have the budgets at the present time, sit down, phone them up if you like, say I don't agree with something, the way the director does if he doesn't agree with something, but no, this is not the way it's got to be. It's got to be complete control over the elected members at the present time.

The first page of the bill in principle, Mr. Speaker, is not necessary whatsoever. Yes, the bill in principle asks that the City of Winnipeg and Metro become the same as the other cities, and St. Boniface. If this is so I don't know that we really have any too much objection to that, but again the City of Winnipeg, Metro and the City of St. Boniface have complied with the regulations as set out by the Municipal Act. They work under their own charters which has been granted to them by legislation, and as in the cities and municipalities, you are saying to Metro, Winnipeg and St. Boniface, we don't trust you; we don't think that you will continue to do what you have done for years. If you take a look at the budgets at the present time they are all slightly up or most of them down. The only one that is up the highest is the largest city which is the City of Greater Winnipeg.

So really, the cities and municipalities have gone about their business in the proper way as they always have done. I'll sit down with the budget I'm familiar with any time with you. Show me something wrong with it. I'm sure that if you find something wrong with anybody's budget they'll be willing to talk to you about it, but no, that's not the way they want to go. And this has been going on, Mr. Speaker, for months, that we've been seeing ads in the paper that we may have to do it, we may have to make them comply, and when the Minister introduces he said I may have to have this legislation because I may have to forcibly make them comply. None of the cities and municipalities, Mr. Speaker, have asked the Minister or even put him in the position that he would have to forcibly do anything like that. To my knowledge - and if they have, I say to the Minister right now, get in touch with them. You're putting retroactive legislation of a club over their head and you're saying, well, I'm passing this legislation and I may come

(MR. F. JOHNSTON, cont'd.) back at you later. Talk to them now. If you've got something on your mind, say it now, because I'm very sure that they'll be glad to talk to you.

Mr. Speaker, we go along with the situation of the enumeration. Again, it's not necessary. The Member from Winnipeg Centre was saying we would do it twice. That's not necessary. If you want to pay for it, pay for it, but the enumerations are carried on and many of the cities and municipalities, Sir, are presently doing their enumeration. They hire people, they're done. When they're done they can be turned over to you. You can computer them any way you like when you finally have the one city bill. You don't have to try and pull the wool over people's eyes that it has to be done in one area. We're living in a day and age where it can be done very easily and probably more efficiently when it's done in each area and turned over to you at lesser costs. They all have their returning officers, their electoral officers elected at the present time. They're required to by the 15th of February according to the Municipal Act, so there's absolutely no necessity to turn around and say it'll be done twice. Let the cities and municipalities do it.

But there's one thing, Mr. Speaker, in this enumeration. In the bill it says the powers of the governor respecting electors list, the Lieutenant Governor in Council; and (b) it says establish wards in the areas. Mr. Speaker, this now means if this bill passes, the wards for the new city can be made up in the Minister's office, while really we haven't even seen the bill in front of us. We just got presented with a report on wards and boundaries not three days ago and the Minister is asking for legislation. -- (Interjection) -- Legislation in 7 (b) says "establish wards in the areas." It can be done before we even see the uni-city Bill.

Now that is what I call legislation, Mr. Speaker, that is all powerful, and all with no say for anybody else but -- (Interjection) -- No, that part is not retroactive. That only means that had it said that we are all ready to send out these different things, we're all ready to send out the enumeration, we're all ready to get it all set up -- and based on what boundaries? As my colleague mentions here, it's done now. It must be done now because this bill gives that right. So again, Mr. Speaker, the bill is not necessary. The bill really and truly as far as the enumeration can be done, has been done, has been done for years and can continue to be done, and if you want to pay for it, fine, we'll turn the information over to you. I'm sure the cities and municipalities will do that as willingly as they have presented their budget under the legal manner to the Minister.

As far as the holding of reserves, it's downright theft. There's no question about it. Reserves in many areas, at the present time for some cities and municipalities to spend their reserves now they have to write the Minister, Mr. Speaker. They have to write for permission. It depends on the city charters. The one I'm familiar with is allowed to spend their reserves of the revolving fund under special legislation. Spending of reserves does not usually affect the mill rates. The reserves that they have are spent in community clubs as my colleague from Assiniboia said. -- (Interjection) -- Again, Mr. Speaker, to answer that comment, if you found something wrong, why don't you tell them about it. Why don't you hold your meetings? Our caucus held a meeting with them. You've never held a meeting with them, Mr. Speaker. The Minister hasn't even gathered them together and said, gentlemen, I think there's something wrong with your budget.

Now he's written the City of Winnipeg and said you can't hire any more policemen. Legally he can't do it, I don't think, until this bill is passed, but he tells the people of Winnipeg that they can't have any more policemen in this day and age. He tells the elected members what they want and he tells them that before there's even one city. He assumes that the crime will just stop in Winnipeg for the balance of this year. -- (Interjection) -- Well really, I assure you, Mr. Speaker -- (Interjection) -- nothing left in Manitoba, you're right. But as far as the bill is concerned, Mr. Speaker, there's absolutely no necessity for it except for the one change. The cities and municipalities of this area have run their business well. They'll run it better than any one city will ever be run. The Minister apparently, when he was involved in the council of Winnipeg, he felt that we bred off him and took from them and I guess he didn't like the battles that we used to have at Metro with them. But frankly it's a healthy situation, the battle for the people that elect you.

So this legislation, Mr. Speaker, I can assure you, puts the cities and municipalities in a complete control. By a whip of the pen the Minister can make all the decisions in the cities and municipalities. Regarding the September 1st, in principle of it, Mr. Speaker, really it doesn't matter that much if there's a new bill presented on the Uni-city Bill. Most of the cities

(MR. F. JOHNSTON, cont'd.) . . . and municipalities will not spend up to three-quarters of their budget until that time, but I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that the retroactive part of this legislation at the very end hangs a club over the cities and municipalities heads that is not necessary; the Minister can talk to them now. As far as this bill is concerned, Mr. Speaker, it is not necessary and we do not intend to vote for it. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, in speaking on second reading of Bill 9, I'm reminded of the year 1961 I think it was when the Metro Bill was passed. We had quite a life in this House at that time and now I think we'll have the whole thing over again. Certainly I would much rather see that Metro was done away with than to come up with legislation of this type. It puts up another Metro in its place. -- (Interjection) -- Oh no, it's not the same. By passing Bill 9 certainly we've set the stage, and not only set the stage but we've already approved the principles of whatever bill is going to follow, and I would like to mention a few of these in my brief remarks that I will be making here tonight.

Certainly as far as establishing wards under the new Metro Act, that will all be accomplished by Bill No. 9 because we read under the powers of the Lieutenant-Governor that they will be enabled to establish wards in areas, and certainly once you subscribe to that principle they needn't bother in future legislation about this part at all because the Lieutenant Governor in Council will be the one that will establish a number of wards and how the wards are going to be divided.

So when we will see the bill coming forward which is to set out some further matters as far as amalgamation is concerned, this no doubt will be eliminated. It will be necessary to bring that forward and I think this is one of the key matters in this whole process of amalgamation. This is one of the big objections, that there's not agreement on this point. From what I hear through the press, statements of the various meetings that were held in the latter part of 1970 and earlier this year, this is a very contentious matter. And sure enough, I would think the same, because if you're going to do away with all the different cities presently making up Greater Winnipeg that this is something that many people object to very strongly. We have cities such as St. Boniface and some others who are old established cities and there are very strong feelings on this point.

We find, too, that there's a very strong measure of control in this bill, and if we subscribe to it now, no doubt it will be continued in the legislation that is to follow. The Minister will have complete control over budgets. It says that -- well, we're not supposed to refer to sections, but when it comes to expenditures, operating expenditures, they shall not exceed the amount provided therefor, and then it says, approved by the Minister. This is for 1971. But you've established a principle here. The principle is control, complete control, and once you accept it in this bill no doubt it will follow in the other legislation that we will see. I can't see anything different, because once you lay down controls in one piece of legislation, it is bound to follow in the amalgamation bill.

The matter of the reserve fund has already been mentioned by previous speakers, how this reflects on the various municipalities and cities presently, and also the matter of selling assets presently so that the cities can take advantage before amalgamation takes place - this is all overruled in this piece of legislation before us, and I certainly, for one, do not go along with the idea of complete amalgamation of the cities and municipalities of Greater Winnipeg. Certainly there could be some voluntary amalgamation on the part of some cities and municipalities, and I think this would have happened without compelling or forcing them to do so under the present legislation.

Then, too, we find that various matters will be left to regulations under Section 10, on provisions that they not be set forth in an adequate way, under this bill that the Lieutenant-Governor in Council will be able to provide all this by way of regulation. And I've seen this happen on too many occasions and too much legislation that way, that we give too much power, excessive power to the Lieutenant Governor in Council in this way and they can do almost as they please without coming back to us and having the legislation ratified or concurred in by this House. And therefore, Mr. Speaker, I do object to these principles and therefore I will also object to the legislation itself.

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

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Could you call Bill No. 15, Mr. Speaker, please?

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General. The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON (Rock Lake): Mr. Speaker, I propose to speak briefly to the Bill 15, namely The Lotteries Act. May I say at the outset that when I heard about the government being interested in bringing in this type of legislation for another year, I thought possibly that it would be similar to what we experienced in 1970, and from a layman's point of view I have examined the bill to some extent and I've also read the remarks made by the Attorney-General in reply, in the address he made the other evening. I want to say too, Mr. Speaker, that I have conferred with a number of areas in the rural municipalities so far as this Lotteries Act is concerned and, having discussed with a number of people who played an important role in the affairs of this particular thing last year, they felt, the majority of them, quite satisfied that this type of legislation would be certainly forthcoming and would be interested in seeing it become legislative and law in 1971.

However, Mr. Speaker, I do want to say that in my own constituency - and I would assume that there are a number of other situations in other constituencies, particularly in the rural communities, whereby projects were started last year through the percapita grant, funds were raised in other forms to create Centennial projects, and I happen to have a few in my constituency whereby there are still some certain sums of money still owing to complete the payment of those projects; and I attended the opening of a number of them in the last days of 1970 and one, as a matter of fact, in the early days of '71, and my people were wondering whether there was any possibility of this legislation being brought forth for another year. There was no definite information given but the hope was left with these people that possibly there would be legislation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to refer to the comments made by the Attorney-General and I want to quote from the comments that he made here: "Now, the establishment of a provincial lottery will in large part reduce the number of organizations who wish to hold a separate lottery for fund-raising purposes for their own particular organization or a project that they have in mind, and I hope that, Mr. Speaker, through the introduction or the continuance of a provincial lottery in a responsible manner, that we will eliminate the extensive proliferation of lotteries that otherwise might take place."

Now, Mr. Speaker, one of the things that concerns me in this legislation and it is somewhat similar, I think, from the comments that I just listened to from the Member for Sturgeon Creek in regard to your one-city concept; and I become concerned as to whether local organizations in the various municipalities are going to be able to take the active part through this legislation that they did in 1970. I have a very strong feeling, Mr. Speaker, that this will not be the case, if I understand the words used by the Attorney-General in this paraphrase.

I want to now, Mr. Speaker, go on further where the Attorney-General says, and I quote: "I might say that the participating organizations are more than enthusiastic about the continuance of a provincial lottery scheme, because it means that they won't be involved in the extensive amount of paper work, book work, accounting and so on that naturally has to be carried out if a society is to be protected from those who might otherwise wish to use the lottery vehicle as a form to get rich."

Now I gather from that, Mr. Speaker, that the Attorney-General doesn't seem to have faith in the local communities or organizations, service clubs, etc. in the various parts of rural Manitoba. It seems to be contradicting in the comments that he says, as I've quoted in the last part of this paragraph. I can't understand how he could make those comments, Mr. Speaker, if he means that organizations throughout the rural parts of Manitoba are going to be able to take that active part to hold lotteries, to raise funds through their local service clubs, etc., to raise funds for -- it doesn't have to be a large project, Mr. Speaker, but there are many little things that people can do and, particularly when we have an economic situation that we have today, I don't think that this is a regressive form of legislation. But, Mr. Speaker, from the remarks made, as I said, from the Attorney-General, I am very concerned about this bill as it now stands.

I should also -- and I have noticed the Minister of Mines and Resources in a very jovial mood this evening, so I would like to quote, from Hansard, comments that he made in 1969 in regard to lotteries. The Minister of Mines and Natural Resources stated on October 10, 1969,

April 27, 1971

(MR. EINARSON, cont'd.) and this is comments insofar as the lotteries legislation is concerned: "Mr. Speaker, I find myself with some people thinking that there is a contradiction, and therefore I would like to briefly express my views in this connection. I have voted against this bill on second reading and I voted to report the bill to the House. I didn't consider that that vote was approval of the bill. Some people may have regarded that it is. Therefore, I want to make it clear that I believe that we should vote on this bill on third reading in the House, and I intend to vote against the bill. I intend to vote against it because the reasons which I gave on second reading were confirmed at Law Amendments Committee, when the main proponent of the bill - that is the Chairman of the Centennial Corporation, said that it's an excellent form of taxation and as a matter of fact, he would like to raise the entire \$380 million of the provincial budget in this way."

Well, Mr. Speaker, here is one of the Ministers of the Cabinet, the Honourable Minister of Mines and Resources, had his position at that time, that he was totally against lotteries. I think, too, that the Minister of Labour had a feeling very similar, that he was totally opposed to a Lotteries Bill. I believe also that the Minister of Finance felt very strongly in the same way.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it concerns me, and I wonder of the sincerity of the government. I'm not accusing them - yes, Mr. Speaker -- (Interjection) -- I was looking, Mr. Speaker, at the words that we are allowed to use and not allowed to use. But I can't help but wonder, Mr. Speaker, when I read the comments made by the Attorney-General, the very definite attitude that some of his colleagues made over a year ago insofar as the 1970 Centennial Lottery Act was concerned, how they would bring in legislation to this effect.

I also want to comment briefly, Mr. Speaker - there are figures that the Attorney-General made insofar as the Centennial Lottery is concerned in 1970, and he states that about 41.27 percent as commissions and grants to the various organizations who sold lottery tickets, the various organizations share comprised about 3.9 percent. Well, Mr. Speaker, the 41 percent, as I understand it, was the amount of money that was placed in the hands of the municipalities, that is the municipality was the agent, the local service clubs acted as selling these tickets and then they had the individual person who sold the tickets, and in this way the figures, as I understand it, the amount of money realized was roughly \$9.80. It wasn't all that much, but the point that I am very concerned about, Mr. Speaker, that if local organizations are not going to be allowed to carry out their function as they were allowed to in 1970, I cannot in any way support the bill as it now stands.

I am looking forward to receiving more information insofar as this is concerned. I believe that my colleague the Member for Brandon may have an amendment to this bill, but I want to say, Mr. Speaker, at this time with the attitude of the members of the government in '69, with the comments the Attorney-General has made in his remarks when he read on second reading of the bill, that I can in no way support the bill as it now stands.

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

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Could you call Bill No. 14, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: On The proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Youth and Education. The Honourable Member for Emerson. The Honourable Member is absent. Stand? The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I just thought that . . .

A MEMBER: Here he is now.

MR. GREEN: Could we have leave to go back to Bill No. 14, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson -- Bill 14.

MR. GABRIEL GIRARD (Emerson): Oh, excuse me. We have had an opportunity to look at Bill 14 and the essence of the bill is rather simple. In the past, it was necessary for the Minister to hold referendums and to have a referendum declared whether or not a school division was to become unitary or remain as it was, being non-unitary. The bill now gives authority to the Minister to make a declaration of a division becoming unitary on the basis of representation made by a majority of trustees representing a majority of students. We feel very strongly that the matter of local autonomy ought to be preserved wherever possible. We regret that divisions have to be declared without a referendum as being unitary divisions.

(MR. GIRARD, cont'd.) However, Mr. Speaker, we also acknowledge in a responsible way that with the continuing disparity in the grant structure, being a disparity that is increased every time the Foundation Program is changed because the Foundation Program increases apply only to unitary divisions, we realize that the tax structure makes it more and more impossible for school divisions to remain non-unitary. We also realize, Mr. Speaker, in a responsible way that school divisions that have remained non-unitary have in some way lacked the changes within their systems to provide students with the kind of educational system that they deserve as Manitobans. I feel that in no way can a one-room or a two-room, an ungraded kind of school in the rural parts of Manitoba, in no way can this kind of school offer the students of Manitoba the kind of education that other parts are granting their students. Unless those divisions that are non-unitary declare emphatically that they are not interested in the kind of education they provide their students, we ought to be concerned about what their facilities are today.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I emphasize that we regret that local autonomy to some degree will be lost by this kind of measure, but we don't intend to oppose the bill because we realize that providing equality of education in the Province of Manitoba is essential, and we also realize that under the non-unitary system structure of grants it is impossible for that kind of division to provide to their students the kind of education those students really deserve.

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

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, just a very few words on Bill 14. We've had many debates in the House over the years since the Foundation Program was set up, about how divisions should be created into unitary divisions, and there are pretty strong arguments always on both sides. I think at the present time with the change in the grant structure that the Minister is proposing, that is per capita grants, per student grants, for operating as well as for textbook supplies, that it's going to take some time to explain all this to the local taxpayer, and it's always a problem to explain the tangible benefits and liabilities of a particular program and the vote usually comes down to one which does not take this into account. I think under the circumstances that I support the Minister in his decision to at this time change the method of creating the unitary divisions and therefore would be prepared to support him on this bill.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Also, Mr. Speaker, just a word or two. I was through you, Sir, to my colleague the Member for Rhineland, impressed by his arguments for not reversing a decision that had been made at the local level when they initially turned down the unitary school division plan, but I would want to indicate to you, Sir, why I am supporting the bill; namely, that the action being envisaged in this bill is not first. I was part of an administration that, by a stroke of the pen - and Order-in-Council as a matter of fact - brought five unitary divisions into being, namely, those in the Interlake, as the Minister is aware of, again for reasons that we saw as being sound and good even though they did create considerable difficulties for me as a private member or as an individual member within that constituency or within the Interlake area generally. I only point out this to the House, Mr. Speaker, that this is not a unique action on the part of this bill, on the part of the Minister bringing in this bill. It has, in fact, been done before in the Interlake by Order-in-Council by a previous administration. For this reason, I find myself supporting the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Youth and Education.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I'll be closing debate if I speak, unless . . . I want to thank the honourable gentlemen for participating and being so unanimous, with the exception of one, in support of this bill. My colleague the Minister of Finance wishes he could say the same. The Member for Lakeside has taken the position that this is not really so precedent-shattering; this has been done in the past in the Interlake. The fact is that this bill doesn't even go that far. We are not over-ruling or riding roughshod in any way over people here, because in this case certainly the views of the various district boards are going to be needed, are going to be sought out, and it is by resolution of the various district boards representing a majority of the school boards, who in turn represent a majority of the students and a majority of the electors, that will determine the actions to be taken through the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council. I don't think that applied in the Interlake, and just to refresh the Member for Lakeside's memory on this. Perhaps if it's the desire of members opposite, I might be prepared to consider an amendment whereby they would be prepared to give me, through the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, authority to declare all non-unitary divisions unitary, and if that was brought in Law Amendments, perhaps we would entertain it. This bill doesn't go quite that far, as members are aware.

To the Member for Rhineland, I suggest to him that this isn't a matter of over-ruling referendums; that I am one of those that believes that people elected to office have a responsibility when elected to office to use their best judgments on what is in this case a complex matter, as pointed out by the Member for Riel, and that in fact because the school trustees are closest to the problems and know the problems in detail, they do speak on behalf of their residents and of their electors when they will be sending me - and they do - resolutions requesting the formation of unitary divisions.

Mr. Speaker, I've been advised by members of the department that there's some changes in wording which the legal counsel has felt should be introduced as amendments when we go into Law Amendments Committee, and I'll be bringing those forward. They don't change anything of substance but they're legal counsel's advice on some of the wording here and I'll bring those forward, as I say, when we go into Law Amendments.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Could we call Bill No. 13, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Youth and Education. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, in addressing myself to Bill 13, which is providing additional grants to the unitary divisions in this province, I must say at the outset that if this bill were to provide the same financial benefits to all the people in this province, I could support it, but not on the basis as it presently is before this House. I'm just wondering how a Minister of Education, a Minister of the Crown and Minister of the largest department of this government, to bring such a matter forward - just fancy that - that a person, I think, must have a warped mind in order to do a thing like this. -- (Interjections) -- To say the least. Certainly I can't, I just can't fathom how department officials would even recommend a measure like this. That's beyond me. Because the amount of discrimination, the added discrimination that this government will heap on what a former administration already did, it's just beyond me. -- (Interjection) -- You'll know before I'm through. I haven't said all I have to say at the moment. -- (Interjections) -- Well, I wouldn't even want to use some of the words that my Honourable the Minister of Labour has on some occasions in this House. I don't think this is just poppycock, like he used to say. We're dealing with legislation here that will be in effect, that will be binding on the people of this province, and when we see the discrimination that this bill provides, I just have to come out very strongly in opposing it. I think the Minister should answer. Why does he give the textbooks to all the pupils of the province and not the new \$18.00 per pupil grant? How can he distinguish in not providing the same grants for these same pupils? Where do you differentiate? What are the reasons for differentiating? Certainly the pupils that get the textbooks should warrant the \$18.00 expense, that is the money that is going to be provided for the students in unitary divisions.

The \$18.00 per pupil grant, this is a new concept. This is new legislation. It's not a continuance of the former administration providing grants for unitary divisions. There is legislation in there that will increase the formula that was established on a previous occasion

(MR. FROESE cont'd.) to provide funds for education in unitary divisions. But the \$18.00 per pupil grant, it's a new measure, it's a new grant, and it's a new concept, and would be acceptable in my case if it was not just being given to students in unitary divisions. I can't see people here to the right supporting a measure like this that will discriminate in this way. It's a departure from the previous structure and I'm just wondering: why did the government come out with a per pupil grant at this time? What is it that they saw that this thing -- the expenses in education is running away completely, and that we'll have to introduce a new measure for control and also probably in some way an incentive to economize, because if this \$18.00 per pupil is going to be applied, this will mean a saving to the taxpayers locally which will not have to come from special taxes. When the First Minister went out -- and this he's done right throughout the year now -- saying that there will be a revision in taxes in Manitoba, and here we come having this legislation placed before us and there's no such thing as revision in taxes in my area. So this is a blatant untruth. I should call it a lie but it's unparliamentary, so I'll say it's an untruth, and a highly inaccurate statement by the First Minister and by other members of the government who have made those statements.

How can he go around and say that we will have a revision in the taxes in Manitoba when this is not the case? And some of the areas that need it most will not be getting anything. The taxes in my area are very high. Land, agricultural land, is highest assessed in our area. Nowheres in Manitoba do you find land assessed at as high a rate as it is right in Stanley and Rhineland, and we as taxpayers are paying the general levy and this goes to government coffers, and against that, certain grants are paid. I feel that we should be getting this \$18.00 per student -- there's no doubt about that.

The injustice that was brought about by the previous administration is now multiplied; it is now aggravated through this Bill No. 13. It seems that people just have to bow to a socialist administration, not only a socialist administration but to socialism itself, in order to get the government grants. They have to accept centralization which is embodied in the legislation and it wasn't embodied in the previous legislation. We find that this government is so Indian-conscious; the people of Indian descent should have more freedom; they should have more money; they should have more this and more that. We find that they go all-out to the French people in this province, providing the money for language and so on.

A MEMBER: Nothing for the Mennonites.

MR. FROESE: But when it comes to -- and there are people besides Mennonites who are also in the multi-district divisions -- but when it comes to these people there is no compassion, there is no concern; they just enjoy, it seems to me, to castigate these very people. Yet these are the very people that built up this province. They have come here, have been here for 75 years or more, have built the province to what it is today, and here we're discriminating against them as much as possible. It seems to me the government says they're not worth a darn. We find that we have increased spending in the Education estimates; \$19 million of new money will be found by this government to hand out to the unitary divisions, but nothing -- not a cent -- to the multi-district divisions. How can you justify that? I would like to hear the Minister later on give us reasons for this.

How can he justify this situation? It is condemning, and I'm sure that this will follow them in days to come. We're not allowed to be free thinkers; we're not allowed to vote as we please, and if we do we're being penalized, and in my opinion, one of the things why this is happening is that the government cannot stand leaving a certain amount of autonomy with the local people, the forum that is provided in the School Act for school districts that they have annual meetings, they have legal status, they can take action which is binding, and this is something the government cannot tolerate. They want this done away with. The people in this province are to abdicate all their rights and give them to this government so that they can set up government-controlled boards and then delegate powers to these boards which they can control.

The Minister a few minutes ago, in speaking on Bill 14 closing debate, he says they have confidence in the trustees. Well, why eliminate these various boards, then, if you have confidence in them? Let them remain instead of the boards that are being set up and appointed. I have greater confidence in the elected people than in the civil service or boards of this type that are being named.

I find it also very peculiar that when this government is being so niggardly about this \$18.00 per student, we find that when it comes to the university that we have students there

(MR. FROESE cont'd.) that have attended university for seven years, and these students, some of these students are nowhere near yet of obtaining their degree. These people have repeatedly failed courses to avoid elimination from the institution and in this way we have been financing them year after year, and I think some of them would have cost us \$50,000 by now. We have monies for those people to waste and yet we haven't got \$18.00 for a student attending our rural schools. Can you beat that? And I would like to see the Minister explain that too.

We find that when the unitary system was brought in - many of you people were not members of this House at that time - there were remote areas declared, people never voted, they got the additional grants. There was no change in the administration whatever in those areas. We find that the Dauphin area, which was a larger area, objected, voted against the division plan, yet what did the government do? They gave them the same grants as a unitary division. -- (Interjection) -- No they were not, they voted against it and you just turned around and gave them the same grants. Then what did we have in the Greater Winnipeg area? The people didn't vote at all. They were automatically declared as qualified to get these larger grants. They didn't even have to vote and they were not given a vote. Then the Interlake area, we had five divisions there where the government imposed the system on these people, not giving them a right to vote, but there they had agreement with the Federal Government which was providing large sums of money and so this was imposed on these people and they got the larger grants that are provided under the unitary system. But not so for the people that exercised their vote and were not in accordance with giving up their autonomy, that they wanted to have certain rights left with them. And so this government now is continuing this very disparity.

I remember too well when the Roblin administration was in office that the now Minister of Finance who was sitting on this side of the House, he was actually the one that brought this proposition forward and he sold it to Mr. Johnson, Dr. Johnson who was then the Minister of Education, and some of his cohorts, and I think the other was the Minister of Agriculture. So Dr. Johnson just swallowed this whole lot, line and sinker and everything. -- (Interjection) -- You bet, Dr. Johnson, we all know, was a socialist. -- (Interjection) -- Don't tell me, because I've had discussions with him and he told me so himself. His family had been socialist for years, and here Duff Roblin come along one day and asked him to be a Cabinet Minister so he did it. So that was it. So what else could you think but he would accept it; something that was recommended by the socialists on this side was acceptable to him. -- (Interjection) -- Well, I think some of you people have more sense than to go along with a bill like this that discriminates so badly against certain people in this province. We just heard the other day from the First Minister the terrible sin of exploiting, and even in the debate on the Throne Speech that this government of theirs was not one to exploit people. Well what do you consider is this? Is this not exploitation for the people, the farmers in our area who are so hard hit, many of them going into bankruptcy, and here you're foisting another load on them and making it so much worse.

I would like to bring to the attention of this government another fact, that is the now appearing unemployment insurance that will be placed on the teachers of this province. We full know what the final end will be, because immediately when this comes in school districts will be asked to pay 50 percent of the cost. The following year the teachers will ask that this be part of the fringe benefits so the districts will pay the full shot. And where is this money going to come from? It's going to come from the special levies that the districts have to levy and it'll come from real estate taxes. In other words, the Federal Government is imposing a tax on real estate in this province through that very measure and this will aggravate the situation in Manitoba. Farmers will be hurt once more and I think we should take a good look at that and let our voices be heard in Ottawa on this very matter.

The First Minister on one occasion mentioned that the disparity certainly should not be increased when measures of this type are introduced. Now we find through this Bill 13 that they certainly will be increased. Disparities will be very much larger and this could mean thousands and thousands of dollars for a division and money that will have to come through special levies if the money is not coming forward for the multi-district divisions.

In recent days we find that the Manitoba Teachers Society is conducting various meetings across this province on the crisis of financing education in this province, and they point out the difficulty we're having and what lies ahead. According to what they say, certainly the

(MR. FROESE cont'd.) worst has not yet come, that we will be facing much larger expenditures in the next several years. If this is the case with the economy as it is, it will be very very difficult, and I can't see this government at this time bringing forth a measure of this type.

There are so many things that one could say in connection with education, especially now because of the economic situation being so poor and students coming out of high school and college with no jobs. Certainly this is very frustrating to these young people and no doubt this breeds dissatisfaction with society. And what are they to think? How can they make a contribution? Where can they make a contribution, these young people when they come out of school? They must feel unwanted. They must feel unneeded and this spells trouble. The young people must have something on their hands otherwise where are they going to leave their energies. And they must be directed through proper channels. I feel that we are not doing our job in this House in providing the necessary jobs and providing the necessary means whereby they can make something out of themselves. We could have been much stronger against Trudeau's proposition of fighting inflation when he came out with it a year or a year and a half ago. Certainly I have never subscribed to it and -- (Interjection) -- pardon? Oh, there's someone calling the Minister not to make any noise or not say anything because -- (Interjection) -- Oh yes. The reason I brought that in is because of Social Credit . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Order. I wonder if the member would address the Chair instead of having a crossfire across the Chamber. Thank you.

MR. FROESE: Certainly I'll address myself to you, Mr. Speaker, but I think you should then control the people on the other side who are interjecting.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I asked for a bit of co-operation, I didn't ask for a debate with the member. I should like to say this, that if the remarks he's making are directed to other members, naturally they're going to reply. If he will address himself to this Chair then we won't have that problem.

MR. FROESE: One of the reasons I bring this in is that we have operational costs in our schools, we have capital costs, and when it comes to capital costs this is where I feel we can also do something for this country and this province. We borrow large amounts of money when it comes to constructing schools and we are paying enormous amounts of interest, and here I've on repeated occasions mentioned that we should do something about it and make use of the Bank of Canada so that we could have lower interest loans. This need not only apply to capital expenditures, I think when we have monies to loan to other countries for fifty years and more with no interest, with no interest and this is done through the Bank of Canada, why cannot we do the same thing for our own people? Why can we not do these things for Canadians? Why must we pay exorbitant rates of eight, nine percent and even 10 percent on money that we can provide for ourselves through our machinery, the Bank of Canada, yet we find this government not making any effort whatever in trying to bring in monies of this kind. Let them laugh at Social Credit, but certainly -- (Interjection) -- you're not laughing, thanks - because I think it's about time because their leader that was . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I wonder if the members would all co-operate. I'm getting a lot of buzzing in my earphone and I'm sure it must be very hard to hear what is being said by the Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, in the former federal NDP Leader's final address, he mentioned that in 1939 a Federal Government had been able to bring about what Social Credit has advocated for many many years, that we should provide these monies through the Bank of Canada. That is, during the depression time there was no money and there was a drastic shortage, unemployment rampant, yet when the war was called we had millions overnight, we could employ a million people overnight and give them all the necessary requirements that they needed. And this was done in the same way, this was done through the Bank of Canada providing the necessary funds. -- (Interjection) -- The controls didn't enter into that, they came later. You didn't have controls in 1939; they came later.

Well, Mr. Speaker, coming back to Bill 13, I feel that this is going to be a very black mark against the NDP Party and the NDP government here in Manitoba. This will be a day that they will rue for many years. They've been championing, calling themselves the champion of the small man. What are they doing now? They've been priding themselves that they would bring in justice. What are they doing now? They're creating one of the biggest injustices ever -- (Interjection) -- you bet, it's worse than a joke, it's not even a joke. And the

(MR. FROESE cont'd.) amount that would be involved isn't nearly that large for this government. We're spending an increased \$19 million and I'm just wondering whether the total amount for these divisions that are not going to get it will probably be a million and a half, and yet you will not give consideration to this request. I think some of the members in the back row should prevail on some of their Ministers in the front row to bring about justice.

There's a further position in the bill, that this time it's brought before this House, but from here on changes can be then brought in without coming back to this House, that from here on changes will be made by regulation. The Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council will take control and -- (Interjection) -- Well, I certainly have no confidence in the front bench if they're bringing in a measure of this type. It could be much worse yet the next time. I think the Minister if he cannot do anything better than this, then he certainly should resign and let someone else take over who has a little more mercy and will have a little more compassion with the people of this province who need it so badly. -- (Interjection) -- Oh, I disagree with the Honourable Member for Morris that he says that he's the best. In my opinion, if he brings in a measure like this he's the worst. It's not only -- (Interjection) -- I better not read what the honourable member just passed on to me.

Certainly this is an act of unkindness, this is an act that will create increased hardship for the people not only in my area but in various other areas in this province, and I think the Minister has got his hands full without creating trouble like this. He must know some of the problems that he has in some of the divisions presently. I've received phone calls from other areas in this province that have the unitary administration and the problems that are existent in those areas. People want to retain some of their smaller schools and they've set up citizens' committees to fight the division board and the orders that the division boards receive from head office, from the city here, and trying to impose their policies on unitary boards.

And let me tell you that this is not idle talk because these people are telling me of the difficulties they have. We are, through this very kind of administration, we are disintegrating centres in this province, nice towns and villages who have been thriving communities up till now and now we are going to eliminate their schools, and once you take a school out of a community the community disintegrates. Values of property drop and the properties lose much of their value, and this is what many areas in this province are experiencing today. I think this is something that needs correcting. Certainly under Social Credit -- and I intend and we intend at the next election certainly to see to it the people will have a chance to vote on this very matter, that we will extend to the people of this province that every centre in this province will have the right to have control over their own schools. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, it was our intention to give rapid passage to the bill and I would hope that we will in fact be able to give rapid passage tomorrow, but in view of the statements of the Honourable Member from Rhineland and in view of other contacts with our caucus in connection with some matters that are contained within the Act, it will be our intention to caucus the bill tomorrow and then deal with it tomorrow if it is called.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Would you call Bill No. 18, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Agriculture. The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I want to make a few remarks with respect to Bill 18. I understand that my colleague who is now not in the House, Mr. Uruski from - pardon me, Mr. Speaker, I shouldn't be mentioning names - but the Member for St. George spoke on the bill yesterday and made a suggestion of obstructionism on our part on this bill and I want to refute that. I would also want to, while the Honourable the House Leader's drawing my attention to the rules that he circulated the other day, indicate to you that I want him to pay particular attention to the rule that he not indulge in a smile unworthy of a man, and if I find him doing that then I will be personally concerned about that matter.

Mr. Speaker, a week ago we made a suggestion to the honourable members opposite, particularly the Minister of Finance, that there was in fact a different way of doing the bill,

(MR. ENNS cont'd.) as he's quite well aware and he's outlined it to us, that we would provide, or we're certainly prepared to provide that kind of speedy action that he was looking for on this bill if he chose to take that advice. He has chosen obviously not to do so by not indicating to us in any way that the government is prepared to accept the advice, the good advice given by the Member for Morris, and is proceeding with the bill as they have initially intended to. This is of course fine, but, Mr. Speaker, then it's our prerogative and our position here to take whatever time is necessary to state what we consider to be very valid objections to the manner and the way in which this bill is being brought before us.

Now to suggest to our group, our 15 or 16 rural members, that we are not cognizant of the concerns of rural Manitoba, and to suggest to us in particular that we could in some way be insensitive to the needs of farmers in the Province of Manitoba by delaying passage of this bill for a day or two is utter nonsense and I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that certainly my constituents and the farm constituents of most members in this House would accept that point of view. We've seen far too many examples, Mr. Speaker, and we're running into them daily in this House, early in this session, about a situation that we find where we are being forced into a position of providing hasty passage of bills because of the lateness of this particular session. Now you see, Mr. Speaker, to many people, in fact quite frankly to me as not being one all that well versed in the many ramifications of timings, I wasn't particularly concerned whether the session started January 1st, February 1st or May 1st, but of course it isn't that simple and that there is a reason sometimes for tradition and the tradition is to have our session starting in January or in February or at least early March. Now we're running into some of them when we're worrying about budgets being struck for our municipalities, school board budgets . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The honourable member is straying from the subject matter. Would he kindly get back to it.

MR. ENNS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I accept your advice and I will. I am just suggesting that in essence what is being asked of us is to pass this bill hurriedly because of a time factor, and it's a deliberate attempt in my estimation to forego the kind of legitimate questions in debate that we should have on a bill of this kind as to, first of all, as my friend the Member for Morris made very clear in his presentation - unfortunately the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources wasn't in his seat at that time - first of all we have a reason to know how he of all people, as among others who likes to stand up and lecture us and tell us in a very clear and precise terms how logically and how on principle he approaches specific problems, we have some reason, because we respect the Honourable Member from Inkster, where that conversion took place, who just a year ago cast disdain on the thought of acreage payments - I see the Honourable Minister of Finance frowning - let me then refresh his memory. It was a year ago . . .

MR. PAULLEY: That was a smile.

MR. ENNS: Oh, that was a smile - that was a smile. April 2nd in fact, the Minister's own words was, "I strenuously disagree with acreage payments." Now, you know, there's a natural curiosity if nothing else on the part of the members of the Opposition to know just what brought about that conversion. Of course I won't repeat the speech made by my colleague the Member for Morris, but certainly the Minister of Agriculture underlined that already stated matter of principle with the gentlemen opposite, and quite frankly I find some difficulty to put the question of acreage payments into the business of principles to begin with, but it sure was with them a year ago. But we have some reason to ask these kind of questions and to hear some answers about why propositions, resolutions put forward, and indeed programs carried forward by conservatives, past administrations with respect to acreage payments were chastised, were looked upon with disdain, and now we're sitting in this House being asked to rush into an acreage payment program. You know, it stretches one's imagination a little bit.

The thing that has to be made very clear, and this is why if nothing else we want to take some time and make that clear, that don't argue with us on that matter of principle, we've accepted it, we've used it - and we're glad you're using it - but what you're obscuring by this particular process is that we object to a principle in the manner and way in which this thing's brought forward. The Minister of Finance indicated in a reply to the Member for Morris that the operating machinery was such that it couldn't be dealt with in the last fiscal year as far as expenditures were concerned. This was him speaking on April 19th on Page 211 of our Hansard. I would suggest to you - and I stand to be corrected, no doubt the Minister of Finance

(MR. ENNS cont'd.) will if he can - from my limited knowledge of how fiscal things can be done by a government is that, for instance, a special warrant was mentioned, could have been used. This special warrant has to be for these monies, it has to be spent in that particular fiscal year. That would of course put them in this difficult position, that they were quite prepared to make the promise of a dollar an acre during by-election time but really to actually send the cheques out during the election time, that would be going a little bit too far, that would be offending the sensitivities of even the voters of Ste. Rose and perhaps even the people of St. Vital.

Now, I'm just suggesting, I'm just suggesting that a course was open, as there always is open for unexplained expenditures or costs, if monies are available, to be raised by special warrant when there's no session on, to be spent in that same fiscal year or else they lapse and die, and then have to be brought back in as the Minister has already indicated by a special supplementary bill or into the next year's estimates. I'm suggesting to you, Mr. Speaker, that there are other matters that concern us in this particular bill, not the help that is being offered to the farmers of Manitoba through this bill but the manner and the way in which it is being brought about, and we are concerned that the precedent that is being set by accepting this - and it would have been very tempting and certainly we are accepting it and we will possibly receive some criticism for even raising the amount of objection that we are - but to suggest that we should just allow this to slide by us without making some remarks about what is possible and what is capable in precedent setting in this kind of a move is what disturbs us in this bill, Mr. Speaker.

In essence, a government - not necessarily this government alone or any other government - following this procedure can disregard the specific exercise that we go through in this Legislative Assembly when we approve of our estimates, approve of our spending, approve of our capital requirements, commit themselves to specific programs and the spending of specific sums of money at any time, but particularly in times of, say, before a general election, and then come into this Chamber and be put in a kind of retroactive position or posture of having, and indeed demanding - and of course getting away with it, particularly if it is a reasonably popular program or bill - to have the matter rushed through and approved by the House to put the stamp of legality on it. Mr. Speaker, this is the kind of precedent that we are concerned with. We feel that it has inherent in it the kind of a situation that could develop where some of our very basic approach to the expenditures of public monies and how they are being scrutinized, our whole debates on estimates, can to some extent be eroded and can to some extent be made considerably less meaningful.

Mr. Speaker, there are several other points that could be brought up at this time but I make this particular case to you, that I want to refute most vehemently the suggestion that we're not prepared to act expeditiously when it's called. Last night I understand we approved \$75 million within an hour. -- (Interjection) -- Or 60. Well, my figures are wrong.

A MEMBER: 64.

MR. ENNS: All right, \$64 million within an hour or so - first, second, third readings. There's no question of obstructionism, and do you mean to tell us or suggest to us that we're now not prepared to pass \$4 million on to our farmers if we didn't think that we had some valid reasons for concern in this particular matter? Mr. Speaker, I suggest the bill is not in its proper form before us, I suggest it has some grave implications in the future for us and for the people of Manitoba, and I raise my objections to that aspect of the bill, not to the aid that is being envisaged or extended to the farmers in this bill. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Moved by the Honourable Member for Rhineland -- (Interjection) -- Order, please. I'm in the middle of placing a motion. I wonder if the House Leader would wait until I've placed it at least. Would the Honourable Minister like to raise a point of order?

The question before the House - I'm sorry - is the one I was starting to utter. -- (Interjection) -- The question is open at the present time. Are you ready for the question? It appears there is no one at the moment ready to speak. The Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

MR. GREEN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I regret that there is some misunderstanding of what I was attempting to do. I merely was hoping that if the Honourable Member for

(MR. GREEN cont'd.) Rhineland was adjourning the debate and would be speaking the next day, whether he would object if I took the floor for a few minutes and spoke now. If there's been a misunderstanding on that account I regret it.

Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Morris and the Honourable Member for Lakeside both demanded an answer from me as to the previous position that I have taken with regard to acreage payments, and I think it should be significantly put on the record that both of the honourable members who have requested an answer have now left the House so that they couldn't have wanted it very badly. But, Mr. Speaker, nevertheless, even though they didn't want it very badly, I think that there is no harm in me putting on the record the various things that occurred during the last year - and I haven't looked back on this question, I just heard the Member for Lakeside mention it now and I'm therefore going to speak from memory.

It is my recollection, Mr. Speaker, that our side of the House, the New Democrats put on the Order Paper a resolution asking for price supports for the sale of farm grain and we asked that this resolution be adopted by the House and sent to Ottawa for the purpose of obtaining price supports for farm grain. I see the Member for Morris is back - I'm trying to recall the situation from memory as to what occurred with regard to the last resolution. So we had put the resolution on the floor relating to price supports. The government party, as I recollect, amended the resolution, suggesting that we not have price supports but that we ask Ottawa to provide for acreage payments, so both resolutions dealt with something that we wanted Ottawa to do. The House was being asked to choose between a price support policy for the sale of farm products or acreage payments which would be the handing out of payments to farmers on the basis of the number of acres that they had.

At that time, Mr. Speaker, I said - and I repeat - that I thought the acreage payments was a bad policy, that I thought that the farmer deserved a proper price for the product that he was selling, that just as we ask the entire community to support the price of commodities which are prepared by manufacturers on which they have a tariff, just as we ask the entire community to support minimum wages, what we should be asking for is a fair price for what the farmer sells, and the Conservative caucus, as I recall, voted against that. So there was two choices before me: one was acreage payments, the other was price support, and I argued very strongly for acreage payments. I felt that the -- for price support, I felt that the acreage payments was a bad policy; I still feel that the acreage payments is not a good policy. As between price support and acreage payments, I would still favour price supports which this government couldn't institute. As between acreage payments and doing nothing, I favour the acreage payments. There's no difficulty in my mind in supporting a program which gives something rather than doing nothing at all because I don't think it's the best program.

The Minister of Agriculture has made it very plain and the members on the other side of the House have made it very plain as to the condition of the farm economy because they are not getting a proper price for the sale of their commodities, and the only thing that the provincial government can do is to put into the farm community some of the money that they would have been getting if they got a fair price for their commodity.

So if that's the big problem for members on the opposite side, I can tell you that I have no apologies whatsoever. I don't feel it's a big problem for me. I repeat, as between price support and acreage payments, which is what we were voting on before, I still favour price supports. You apparently favour acreage payments. As between acreage payments and nothing -- (Interjection) -- You're finding the answer a little difficult to accept. As between acreage payments and nothing, which is apparently what you favour, I favour acreage payments.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Lakeside has already spoken. The Honourable Member for Lakeside,

MR. ENNS: Would the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources not agree that in the tenure of past Conservative administrations where acreage payments were used on only two or three occasions, did that not indicate a reluctance on their part to use that as a continual agricultural crutch and just an attempt to do precisely what this government is doing now.

MR. GREEN: . . . the difference, and I won't say that he knew it and didn't say it because that would be against the rules that we were given tonight, but he knows the difference. When they instituted acreage payments they instituted it at the Federal level where they could do something about the long range problem of the price of farm products. Where we instituted it, we did it at the provincial level where we can't really do anything else.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: Would the Minister submit to a question? He's done a beautiful job of rationalizing his position on acreage payments in the last five minutes and I wonder if he'd want to use the next five minutes on rationalizing his position on lotteries.

MR. SPEAKER: That is out of the question because we are not on that motion. Order. Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: I moved adjournment, seconded by the Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

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

MR. SPEAKER: I call it 10:00 o'clock and the House is adjourned until 2:30 tomorrow afternoon.