

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA  
8:00 o'clock, Thursday, June 22, 1972

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions. The Honourable Member for Radisson.

MR. HARRY SHAFRANSKY (Radisson): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the petition of the Brandon Golf and Country Club praying for the passing of an Act to amend an Act to incorporate Brandon Golf and Country Club.

MR. SPEAKER: Reading and Receiving Petitions; Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees; Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports; Notices of Motion; Introduction of Bills; Oral Questions.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. JOSEPH P. BOROWSKI (Thompson): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Attorney-General. I wonder if he's contacted Corporal Malone regarding a nudist ad that appeared in the Free Press tonight?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. A. H. MACKLING, Q.C., (Attorney-General) (St. James): Mr. Speaker, I think the Corporal Malone referred to by the Honourable Member of Thompson must be Colonel or sometimes known as Brigadier Malone of the Winnipeg Free Press. I, too, have seen the advertisement that he talks about and I, maybe my sensitivity is somewhat sharpened, but I'm rather offended by it and I'm going to ask my department to have a look at this ad and see whether or not it offends the Criminal Code of Canada.

MR. BOROWSKI: I have a question for the Minister of Finance. In view of the legislation just passed where the legislation is changed from the Provincial Government paying grants in lieu of taxes, now we will be paying taxes, why did they exempt the Convention Centre from all school and improvement taxes?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q.C. (Minister of Finance) (St. Johns): Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware of the impact of what the honourable member said in relation to legislation having been passed removing all exemptions, that's not quite the case in relation to Provincial Government grants in lieu of taxation.

If he's speaking about the Convention Centre, I'm not sure that legislation has been presented here in that respect. I'm wondering whether he's looking ahead to prospective legislation rather than existing legislation?

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, it's for clarification from the Minister.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Would the honourable member place his question?

MR. BOROWSKI: Yes, according to the agreement that was tabled today, the Convention Centre agreement by the Premier indicates in there that they are exempt from school and improvement taxes.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I'm not aware of any agreement that was presented today and I will certainly have to take it as notice if there is an agreement that is referred to by the Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. BOROWSKI: A further question for the Minister of Finance regarding the meeting we just had with the Labour Election Committee regarding the CPR. Is the government considering meeting with the CPR to renegotiate the 65 city tax agreement?

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I don't think I've ever met with the Labour Election Committee, certainly not very recently.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Attorney-General that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider Bill No. 55 an Act to amend The Income Tax Act (Manitoba) (2).

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bill No. 55, 4.1 (3)--passed. The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, having passed 4.1 (3), I move that the proposed section 4.1 of The Income Tax Act (Manitoba) as set out in Section 1 of Bill 55 be amended by adding thereto at the end thereof the following subsections: I presume, Mr. Chairman, I have to read the whole thing.

Payment where tax less than deduction.

4.1(4) Where the amount of tax otherwise payable under this Act for the taxation year by an individual resident in Manitoba on the last day of the taxation year who is a principal taxpayer is less than the school tax deduction of the principal taxpayer for that taxation year, the treasurer may pay to the principal taxpayer, an amount equal to

(a) the school tax deduction of the principal taxpayer; less (b) the amount of tax otherwise payable under this Act by the principal taxpayer for that taxation year.

School tax deduction where no tax payable.

4.1(5) Where an individual resident in Manitoba on the last day of a taxation year who is a principal taxpayer is not required to pay tax under this Act for that taxation year, the treasurer may pay to the principal taxpayer an amount equal to the school tax deduction of the principal taxpayer for that taxation year.

Return required for deduction.

4.1(6) A principal taxpayer is not entitled to a payment under subsection (4) or (5) unless he files a return under section 12 for the taxation year in respect of which the payment is made.

Authority to reimburse federal government.

4.1(7) Where, under an agreement made under section 54, the Government of Canada will permit deductions from income tax payable by principal taxpayers under the federal Act of amounts payable by the treasurer under subsection (4), or will rebate to principal taxpayers amounts payable by the treasurer under subsection (4) or (5), the treasurer shall reimburse the Government of Canada for the amount of the deductions and rebates that are permitted or made by the Government of Canada under the agreement.

Mr. Chairman apparently I had the wrong form in front of me and the correction that would be would apply on the fourth line of proposed 4.1(7) where the fourth line would read "or will pay to the principal taxpayers amounts payable by the treasurer under subsection (4) or (5), the treasurer shall make payments to the Government of Canada for the amount of the deductions and payments that are permitted or made by the Government of Canada under the agreement.

Deductions and payments under agreement in lieu of payments under subsection (4) or (5).

4.1(8) Where a principal taxpayer is permitted to make deductions or receive a payment in accordance with an agreement made under section 54, the deduction or payment is in lieu of payments to which he would otherwise be entitled under subsection (4) or (5) and he is not entitled to a payment under subsection (4) or (5).

Payments from Consolidated Fund.

4.1(9) Payments authorized under subsection (4), (5) or (7) shall be paid from and out of the Consolidated Fund with moneys authorized by an Act of the Legislature to be so paid and applied.

MR. CHAIRMAN: New subsection 4.1(4) (a)--passed; (b)--passed; 4.1(5)--passed; 4.1(6) . . . The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Chairman, under this particular section this makes it very definite that everyone who wants to get a rebate or get a credit will have to file an income tax return and as has been pointed out by some other members previously that most likely, and as has been pointed out on a previous occasion that some 35,000 farmers I think only about 29,000 filed returns.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Could we have a bit of order, please.

MR. FROESE: So this means that quite a substantial number have not filed returns heretofore, so this will mean that everyone who wants a rebate will have to file a return. Are there some other implications, is the government trying to get some other information in addition to what is required here: Are they after some other information that they are trying to get their hands on to implement some other program such as the negative Income Tax deterrent? Is there any connection here that this government is trying to get information which would assist them in such other programs? I certainly would like to hear from the Minister on this,

(MR. FROESE cont'd) . . . . because as we know the government has indicated that they will have some pilot projects in connection with the negative income tax in two different ways, one from a certain area, another from a certain group of people. I think we should hear from the Minister of Finance in connection with this section, whether there are other implications than just what meets the eye or on the surface of the amendment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member from Rhineland is a suspicious soul and he is trying to read into legislation what he cannot see. He now expresses surprise, maybe even amazement, at the fact that people who apply for a refund in respect of this bill will have to file an income tax return. Mr. Speaker, I don't know where he has been in the last number of weeks, maybe he has been away, although it seems to me that even in his absence his bodily presence seems to be with us, so maybe spiritually he is not with us but physically he has been.

The fact is we've always said that that's exactly the way you apply for the rebate. Now he starts to look for implications. If he is by any chance suspicious that people who are liable for taxation have been evading taxation by not reporting their income, if that is what is in his mind -- and I clearly state evading instead of avoiding -- then that's his problem not mine, because I will not accept the probability that any Manitoba resident is evading taxation.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I think the honourable minister is imputing motives here and certainly I have nothing of the kind.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, that's an interesting point, I'm certainly not imputing motives to the Honourable Member for Rhineland but I think that he was imputing motives of various taxpayers in Manitoba; and if he was, I would say that he's very unfair to many taxpayers. However, let's accept the fact that out of a million people there might be one or two who have failed to file tax returns in order to evade taxes, which is a crime in Manitoba, if there are one or two and if they want to get a rebate then by all means let them surface and ask for the rebate and report their true income and become taxable, if indeed that happens as a result of what we're doing.

The Honourable Member for Rhineland should be happy about the fact that that might be some sort of side result from what we're doing, that is that tax evaders will have to show their true colour, if in truth they have been evading and if indeed they want this rebate. Because they can't have it both ways, they can't get this rebate and at the same time continue, if indeed there are any such Manitobans, continue to evade taxation.

Now he suggests another point, and that is the possibility that we are trying to acquire information. Mr. Chairman, not only do we have Statistics Canada but we now have a Manitoba Statistics Bureau which is acquiring information about Manitobans and indeed Canadians and it would be a very complicated way to acquire information to pay people up to \$140 in order to acquire information about them. This is by no means, by no means is this an effort to get that information. But if as a result the side benefit is that we will get more information about people then the Honourable Member for Rhineland should endorse and support exactly what we are doing, which indeed he's doing anyway since he's endorsing and supporting what we're doing, so he should be with us all along the way from first reading right through to the end of third reading of this bill.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I certainly wasn't, when I asked whether there were other implications, talking about tax evaders, that wasn't the point at all in my opinion and what I was getting after. But I think the government is gathering information as to the income of the various people so that they will know exactly when they will bring in a program of negative income tax, a program of that type so they will have all the information at their fingertips. And this is one way of getting it. This is one way of getting it and getting it from the Federal Government with an excuse - they have an excuse for it now because they're having this program of tax credits so they have every right to know and this is why I asked the question, not because certain people didn't file income tax returns, that's beyond, that's not the point that I wanted to make. I asked whether there were other implications and this is the point I was trying to make.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I have no objection in principle to the concept of negative income tax. Why, the Premier of British Columbia is on record in support of negative income tax, and I would think that the Member for Rhineland is in support of negative

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) . . . . income tax although he's never said so. If we can add to his store of knowledge then that is a side benefit which would be worthwhile to him and certainly to anybody who is a member of this Legislature. There is no intent to acquire this kind of information, because as I said earlier it's a pretty expensive form of getting information, but if as a side benefit we get more information about Manitobans then by all means let's get it. And if we are inclined towards a negative income tax, I will not fight the thought that by acquiring information we can look into it. Indeed this government I think is the first — I believe it's the first Provincial Government that is now exploring the whole concept of a guaranteed annual income and I think that we feel that it is worthwhile and it so happens that the Liberal government in Ottawa, which I do not support, is nevertheless prepared to look at a guaranteed annual income as a practical approach to dealing with poverty in all of Canada, and if what we are doing is beneficial and helpful in the study, then by all means that's a good side benefit, let's support it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 4, 1(6)--passed; 4, 1(7)--passed; 4, 1(8)--passed; 4, 1(9)--passed. Clause 1 as amended--passed, Clause 2--passed, Clause 3--passed, Preamble--passed, Title--passed, Bill be reported, Committee rise and report. Call in the Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the whole has considered Bill No. 55 and has directed me to report the same with certain amendments and ask leave to sit again.

#### IN SESSION

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

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

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

#### THIRD READING - GOVERNMENT BILLS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING, on behalf of the Honourable Minister of Finance, presented Bill No. 55, an Act to Amend the Income Tax Act (Manitoba) (2), for third reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it agreed? On division? Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion? All those in favour please say Aye; against say Nay. In my opinion the Ayes have it, declare the motion carried.

MR. MACKLING: Ayes and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members. Order please. Motion before the House is adoption of third reading of Bill No. 55.

A STANDING VOTE was taken, the result being as follows:

Yeas: Messrs. Adam, Allard, Barrow, Beard, Borowski, Burtniak, Cherniack, Desjardins, Doern, Evans, Froese, Gonick, Gottfried, Green, Jenkins, Johannson, McBryde, Mackling, Malinowski, Patrick, Pawley, Petursson, Schreyer, Shafransky, Toupin, Turnbull, Uruski, Walding.

Nays: Messrs. Bilton, Blake, Craik, Einarson, Enns, Ferguson, Graham, Henderson, F. Johnston, Jorgenson, McGill, McGregor, McKellar, McKenzie, Sherman, Spivak and Mrs. Trueman.

MR. CLERK: Yeas 28; Nays 17.

MR. SPEAKER: In my opinion the ayes have it, I declare the motion carried. The Honourable First Minister.

HON. EDWARD SCHREYER (Premier) (Rossmere): Mr. Speaker would you call Bill No. 11 and then proceed in sequence through the Order Paper.

MR. SPEAKER: Very well.

MR. SCHREYER: The Minister of Finance suggests that we proceed seriatim.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

BILLS No's 11, 44, 45, 60, 7, 18, 31, 33, 36, 38, 43, were each read a third time and passed.

GOVERNMENT BILLS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. HOWARD R. PAWLEY (Minister of Municipal Affairs)(Selkirk) presented Bill No. 73, and Act to amend The School Tax Reduction Act, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried. The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, this bill contains a number of amendments which deal with matters of procedure and interpretation, which while necessary for the proper administration of the Act do not in themselves have broad policy implications. Maybe I should stop there. There are other provisions dealing with relationship between the landlord and tenant to whom the landlord is required to pass on the benefits to the school tax reduction. These provisions make it possible for a tenant who feels that he has not been fairly dealt with to take his case to the Rentalsman appointed under the Landlord and Tenant Act. It also provides that a landlord who is having difficulty arranging settlement with a tenant may pay the amount that he feels is due to that tenant into the Rentalsman pending settlement of the dispute. The bill then goes on to empower the Rentalsman to mediate the dispute. The order of the Rentalsman is binding unless written consent to appeal to the County Court is obtained from the Minister. The bill provides that in case of a vacancy in a dwelling unit the reduction that would normally be passed on to the tenant must be rebated to the Minister of Finance.

There is a provision in the bill whereby the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council may by regulation provide for the benefits of the Act to be passed on to occupants of mobile homes.

The bill further provides an amendment whereby the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council may in cases of hardship or injustice authorize payment to a person who is likely otherwise to be deprived of the payment to which he would appear to be entitled.

The original Act contains no penalty provisions. These are included in the bill.

A number of amendments are required by reason of the fact that the program will be terminated at the end of 1972 in favour of the Education Property Tax Credit Plan. I would continue on with the discussion of the policy implications but possibly if I don't do so, probably I will shorten debate on this bill, so I will sit down.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Mr. Speaker, this is a very straightforward bill regarding the policy of the administration and will help solve many problems that will arise between the landlord and tenant because of this Act. Of course naturally we wouldn't have any of these problems if there had been sense prevailed when the Act was passed.

Mr. Speaker, one comment that I have had from a person who, as a matter of fact phoned me today, he will be living in the apartment until the middle of August, and he has phoned the departments of government, and he has been told that if he was not the tenant as of September 1st that he would not be eligible to receive any of the monies. Now he's moving into a new home and because of arrangements of purchase and sale through his attorneys, that he will be able to arrange with the person he's purchasing his house from to participate in the \$50.00 rebate on that basis for the next four months of the year. But he has been informed that because he has moved, he does not have any claim to the \$50.00 coming to that apartment but the person that would move in and be resident there September 1st would. It would seem logical that he should really have the benefit of the eight months that he was there.

This could really become a bit of a problem, and I understand the problems that are inherent in this because somebody might move away in May and be claiming his set part of it, and you'd have no way of knowing where he is. So really I think in all fairness, because we now have this bill, that these problems will have to be overcome. They didn't wish this problem upon themselves and if the man has got a right to one-third, or one-half, or one-quarter, whatever it may be, I think that that has to be looked into.

So with that, Mr. Speaker, I think that we can pass this bill to Committee and discuss that particular point that there are people that will have some claim to money that will not receive it and I think this has to be overcome.

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

MR. McKELLAR: I've just got one question, Mr. Speaker, and I was reading on Section 9, the School Tax Reduction Act is repealed and then it's -- that's in March 73, and so the people in various municipalities because of the fact that they haven't got sufficient monies to pay their taxes on time, some of them are one year overdue, and some of them just -- there

(MR. McKELLAR cont'd) . . . . are some cases just keep it out of tax sale every year. Now if the 1972 taxes aren't paid until 1974, does that mean that they will not be eligible for their school tax reduction, and I just wonder if this was looked at at the time. I'm not familiar with how you're going to pay the municipalities. If you don't pay the money to the municipalities till the taxes are actually paid by the individual taxpayer, it will mean that some of the people in the various municipalities because it's impossible to keep up with their taxes, that they will be left out of the school tax reduction. I wonder maybe if the Minister when he's closing debate could explain how these people that are one and two years overdue will fit into this particular bill.

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

MR. WILLIAM URUSKI (St. George): Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I just want to ask the Minister a specific question on this bill in view of the amendments that are coming up. It was raised during a meeting I attended this morning, as to whether or not interest would be charged on tax arrears on the tax credit that would be received by the individual. In other words, if I was overdue in my tax bill this year and received my \$50.00 would I be charged interest on the \$50.00 or just on the remaining amount. This I understand, I was informed, was the case when a similar plan was in effect a few years ago that they did charge interest on the reduction plan if that person was in arrears. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I just had one brief question to ask and it was raised to me on several -- The Rentalsman in regarding this bill, is this going to be a new department of government, all the responsibilities and duties that's been put on the Rentalsman, and how many additional staff is he going to have to get himself involved with with this and other legislation, so maybe the Minister could give us some idea what's going to happen with the Rentalsman.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, if no one else wishes to speak, I would move, seconded . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable Member for St. Vital.

MR. JAMES WALDING (St. Vital): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I just had two points I wanted to bring up here. First I'd like to congratulate the Minister for including within this the provision for making this rebate available to the owners of mobile homes. They seem to be a forgotten group in our society and do not as a rule have anyone to speak on their behalf.

Another part that I wish to comment on, Mr. Speaker, and I hope that the Minister will answer this when he closes debate just in case I've misread it or failed to understand it, but one of the principles in the bill seems to indicate that where this tax rebate is paid to a landlord where one or more of the dwelling units contained therein are vacant, that that portion of the rebate shall be returned to the Minister of Finance within 60 days. As well as being practically unenforceable it does seem somewhat unfair that the principle behind the Act in the first place is that there shall be a rebate, or a partial rebate, of the school taxes paid in respect to that particular dwelling unit. And where the dwelling unit is vacant then obviously the landlord must have paid the education taxes on that particular unit, it would seem therefore fair that any rebate on those units should remain with the landlord and not be returned to the Minister of Finance. Now it might be argued that that particular dwelling unit has not been vacant for the whole of the year, that it might only have been vacant for a month or two. But by the same token any tenant moving into a suite by that particular date would get the full year's benefit as being the tenant on that particular date. Similarly other tenants who had been in that particular dwelling unit for the preceding twelve months and moved out just prior to September 1st would lose that benefit, so it seems that some would lose and some would win, and if we're going to accept that principle then surely we should accept the principle that some units will have been vacant for just one or two months, some will have been vacant for others, and that where a rebate is applicable on a vacant suite then it should be retained by the tenant and not returned to the Minister of Finance.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. J. R. FERGUSON (Gladstone): I just have one brief question for the Minister, Mr. Speaker, and that would be, I'd like the definition of what constitutes a mobile home under this Act.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 85. The Honourable the Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING presented Bill No. 85, an Act to amend The Provincial Police Act, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, the bill that is before the House, and Bill No. 85 is an extremely short bill, and it really encompasses two very precise questions. One will make provision that when there is a hearing the public may be excluded from the hearing of an appeal, or from any part of the hearing, if in the opinion of the Commission the interests of public morals, the maintenance of order, or the proper administration, or the ends of justice, so required.

Mr. Speaker, when the Act was before Law Amendments Committee a suggestion was made by way of amendment that the hearings be public. The original bill as prepared by a counsel had not made provision for the hearings of necessity being public hearings but I could see no problem in that, and I acquiesced in the amendment. As it's worked out there is a problem, or there can be a problem, and as indicated there may be situations where because of the particular nature of the hearing it's considered to be in the interests of the administration of justice to exclude the public either for part of for the whole of the hearing. And I might point out to honourable members that the like provisions prevail in the Criminal Code. This is no departure, it's no attempt to have a star chamber sort of situation. This is literally the wording of the Criminal Code with but slight change, but it is still the same intent and basis.

The other one, the other provision of this bill is to give the Commission the powers and privileges of Commissioners under the Manitoba Evidence Act so that they can in a given case subpoena witnesses and take evidence on oath and so on, and that really was an omission in the original Act. And so the principles of this bill are straightforward, very simple, very reasonable, and therefore I commend them most earnestly to the members of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. JAMES H. BILTON (Swan River): Mr. Speaker, we have examined this bill and we're quite prepared to let it go forward, but I would like to make one comment and that is that last year when the original bill was adopted, it's rather significant that this particular section, that is 25, was not included at that time. It seems to me that once legislation is passed the meat comes along a little later in which one can only take objection to but little can be done with the original bill.

I appreciate the comments of the Attorney-General. There are times when it is necessary to hold hearings in camera but I'm afraid there are times also when one wonders why the public are expected to stay beyond the door and not know what is going on behind that door. I'm always a little afraid when the public are excluded from public hearings, particularly when it has to do with justice. One can hardly find too much fault keeping in mind that problems do develop from time to time that it requires it. But I would ask the Attorney-General to be ever vigilant and see to it that this particular section is not used at the expense of the people, denying them the right to hear what they ought to hear in public hearings, particularly when it has to do with his department.

With those few words, Mr. Speaker, we're quite prepared to allow this bill to go forward.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion -- The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour)(Transcona): I wonder, Mr. Speaker, whether or not we should go down the Order Paper pretty well in order unless the Honourable the Minister is not here, or the honourable member who has the adjournment is not here, and then we'll go down, so therefore the Honourable Member for Rhineland on Bill No. 12.

A MEMBER: You can speak if you want . . . somebody will adjourn it.

MR. PAULLEY: Pardon? I'm prepared to allow you to speak, Sir. We'll take note of what you have to say.

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Health. The Honourable Member for Rhineland. Bill No. 12.

MR. PAULLEY: You can stand it if you like Jake.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I'll proceed but I certainly would have liked to have the Minister here to hear what I have to say on this particular bill -- (Interjection) -- Well I'd like to speak, it's just that . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, Bill 12 is an Act to amend The Pharmaceutical Act and while the bill is very short it deals with a very important matter and it results from a recommendation that was made by the Advisory Committee on central drug and drug purchasing and distribution. This was a commission that was established, and the terms of reference are found on Page 11, and I would like to read a few of those terms of reference.

The first one, and I think this is a very basic one and, Mr. Speaker, if you think that I'm not speaking to Bill 12 other speakers have referred to the report, and in fact the bill is based on the recommendation of this particular report, and I feel that I would like to discuss this report in connection with Bill 12 because I take very strong exception to what is being done and the legislation that is being proposed. The legislation looks very innocent. It's a very innocent bill but yet it's a foot in the door, and when you find that the recommendation later on in the bill says that we are to establish a Crown corporation for the distribution of drugs in Manitoba, I think this hits at the real core.

And what do we find in the way of terms of reference in the report. The first one is, it says: "No. 1. The type of administrative and/or legal organization that should be responsible for central drug purchasing and distribution on a self-sufficient non-profit basis."

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Mr. Speaker, the honourable member is now dealing with the report itself. No one will take any objection to him arguing in respect to the provisions of the bill as it relates to the report, and where the report relates to the subject matter of the bill, but we're not dealing with whether or not the report is reasonable, or proper, or anything else, we're dealing with the provisions of the bill, and he certainly can refer to the report and quote from it where it somehow directly refers to the provisions that are being recommended in the bill. But the report isn't before the House and we're not debating the report, so he's out of order in having a general debate on the basis of the report.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. If the Honourable Member for Rhineland is out of order then my entire speech on this bill a month ago was out of order in its entirety, and you certainly didn't rule that out of order, Sir. If the Member for Rhineland is speaking on the principle of the bill, and the considerations of the committee, the commission that were set up have a great bearing on the single fundamental principle of this bill. My speech was not out of order therefore the Member for Rhineland cannot be out of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please. I should like to say in regard to relevancy, I always try to give as much latitude as is possible but I would concur with the objective taken by the Honourable the Attorney-General. I can also agree that the Honourable Member for Fort Garry did have latitude but he always referred to the principles of the bill, and if the Honourable Member for Rhineland will do the same he will stay within order. If he just debates the report, I shall have to rule him out of order. The Honourable Member for Rhineland. The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. BILTON: The Attorney-General has a very very bad habit of interrupting and taking for granted what an individual might place before the House . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Would the Honourable Member place his point of order?

MR. BILTON: My point of order is that I feel that the Honourable Member for Rhineland should have the privilege to quote from any material he so desires in his comments to do with this bill, and he shouldn't be interfered with by the Attorney-General. He had hardly spoken for a second or two when the Attorney-General was on his feet to interrupt, and I think this is wrong. It's been going on for far too long, Mr. Speaker. I've sat here for three months and have seen nothing but this and it's got to stop . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please. I would suggest that the point of order the honourable member raised would have some validity if he had not carried it too far. The last remarks were a reflection upon the Chair, or upon the Speaker. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.



MR. FROESE: Well, Mr. Speaker, in order to point out that what I am going to say has relevance and is pertaining to the report as well. If we take a look at recommendation 5, what does it say? The availability of alternative sorts of drugs, including generic sources that should be considered for use by the proposed agency. These recommendations, or these terms of references, point out the various things that this Committee should consider. The next one: the requirements for warehousing and distribution to institutional users and retail outlets, including identification and evaluation of alternative distribution practices, which would be applicable to the proposed central agency. Another one: means by which maximum participation in the proposed central purchasing and distribution scheme can be obtained among retail druggists. These are all very relevant points to the report and these have been considered by a Commission chaired by A. A. Klass, BA, MD, and the other members are listed. I don't know these people, and most likely they were well qualified, but I have been wondering after reading the report on what basis they were chosen, whether they were chosen for their philosophy background, or the philosophies that they held, because that is the way it appeared to me from the report that is written, that certainly, in my opinion, they are pussy-footing with socialism and Crown corporations very badly.

Another point that they were to study the impact that introduction of a Central Drug Purchasing and Distribution Agency would have upon the existing wholesale distributors located in Manitoba and upon present retail drug practices. The whole thing is . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please. Will the Honourable Member for Crescentwood state his point of order.

MR. CY GONICK (Crescentwood): My point of order is that the member has yet to show the relevance of his discussion to the bill in contradiction to your own suggestion to him.

MR. SPEAKER: The point is well taken. The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSON (Morris): . . . a point of order. I don't know what has got into my honourable friends opposite. The bill that is before us, Sir, is a bill to amend The Pharmaceutical Act. -- (Interjection) -- That covers the entire area of drugs, the entire area of the subject of pharmacy. My honourable friend he is quoting from a report from a commission that was set up by this government to study this whole question. Everything in that report is relevant to the contents of this bill in dealing with the principle of Bill No. 12. And how my honourable friends opposite can suggest that the remarks now being made by the Member for Rhineland are out of order, is pretty difficult to fathom unless a further imposition of closure is their desire. We've had an experience with some of this this afternoon and we don't want to experience any more of it tonight, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia on the same point?

MR. PATRICK: On the same point of order, Mr. Speaker, surely the Honourable Member for Rhineland should have the right to speak about what's in the bill, to speak what's not in the bill, what he feels that should be in the bill that's not in there. I think he should have right to make recommendations, he should have the right to criticize, and surely this is what this is all about. So I cannot see why he shouldn't be able to debate the report.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: On the point of order. When this Assembly first started we elected a Speaker, that Speaker was subsequently changed to you, Sir. I think that you have it within your competence to rule whether or not that the honourable member is in order without admonitions or speeches from the Member for Morris, the Member for . . . --(Interjection) -- I wonder if the former -- would the former Speaker kindly adhere to the rules that when a . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please.

MR. PAULLEY: I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if the Honourable Member for Swan River would give me the courtesy that is deserving to all members of the House. At one time he was the presiding officer. What I am suggesting, Mr. -- Oh, stop your rambling. You know the only time my honourable friend airs his brain is when he stands up, and I suggest that he should remain seated.

Mr. Speaker, what I am suggesting to colleagues and members of this Assembly on all sides of the House, I did mention the Honourable Member for Morris, the Member for Assiniboia, I will mention also the Member for Crescentwood, the Honourable the Attorney-General, that I think, Sir, that after we elected you as the presiding officer, we placed confidence in you to decide whether or not an honourable member, including the Member for

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) . . . Rhineland, was straying. You spoke a few moments ago on the matter of a point of order, and the Honourable Member from Rhineland, I am sure, listened to what you had to say and unless you -- (Interjection) -- Yes, pass. I think some of you should pass because you haven't got the intellect or the intelligence to . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please. Order, please. Order, please. I should like to thank all the honourable members for their contributions. I am sure they were pearls and they were all very necessary to this Assembly. I should only like to indicate to the Honourable Member for Rhineland that my latitude will be wide so he can encompass the area that we are discussing, but I shall not tolerate him discussing the report only for the report's sake. It will have to be in conjunction with the bill that is before us, and that is the point I wish him to realize, and I wish all honourable members to take into consideration, The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I certainly will relate this report to the bill that is before us in what I have to say, it's relative, but let me first finish the first recommendation or the first terms of reference because it has a bearing on the whole thing and I wasn't able to complete it before.

The first term of reference says, "the type of administration and/or legal organization that should be responsible for a central drug purchasing and distribution on a self-sufficient non-profit basis. This could include a Crown corporation, a co-operative enterprise, a joint public-private organization or other type of organization." And later on I wish to comment on that in connection with what I'll have to say.

I am just taking a few things out of the report because some of the members might not have read it, some others no doubt have studied it, but I would like to give my observations of the report when I discuss the bill. And the sixth recommendation that came out of the Committee was: "Establish a Crown corporation for the purpose of central purchasing and distribution," and then they refer to certain pages in the bill.

The tenth recommendation: "Undertake a special study of economic, medical and social role of the community pharmacy before assessing its position regarding the cost of prescription drugs." That's what we're referring to in the bill.

And No. 13: "Afford protection to the pharmacists by appropriate wording in the statute which bring in the principle of substitution." Another very relative point. "Exonerating him from the liability when substitution takes place under the provisions of the statute. See Recommendation 4 on Page 71."

So, Mr. Speaker, then in discussing the Committee findings and how they went through and studied the various types of organizations, the various structures that possibly could be brought in, I feel that the reasons given first not going for a certain type of a structure are very flimsy and certainly in my opinion don't hold water at all. I certainly would not come to the conclusion even by reading the report that a Crown corporation should be set up for to deal and for the distribution of drugs. I certainly don't go along with that recommendation for one instance. I feel that when we are bringing in a substitute prescription by generic name that we are opening the door. It seems very innocent the bill before us, just probably like if someone stole 25 cents no one would really take the bother of really reprimanding him, or thinking that it was a serious crime, or that it was something that someone should be taken to task for, it's a very small thing. And this is what Bill 12 appears to be. It appears to be a very small thing. I should if I may, Mr. Speaker, read Section 46 which is --(Interjection) -- Well if the House Leader objects okay I will then not read it, but it provides for prescribing drugs by their generic name rather than by the brand name, and in this way opening the door for drugs other than by their brand names. I have pointed out that this seems very innocent.

I certainly also feel that the recommendation that they finally came up with on Page 52, I think it was. Yes, Page 52. This is the final recommendation they came up with. "We conclude finally that the best form of organization for the government's central purchasing and distribution agency would be a newly created Crown corporation." That's the recommendation of the Klass Report and this is what has been referred to by other members speaking in the House on this bill and just the other day the Member for Fort Rouge spoke on the bill -- it's on Page 3144 of Hansard, and then following that the Minister of Universities spoke, and what did he have to say? And I think this is very important what the Minister said in connection with this particular bill. He says among other things, Bill 12 is not the beginning nor the end of the world. Certainly he feels that this is a very initial thing only and that they intend

(MR. FROESE cont'd) . . . . to go much further at a later date. I may read some excerpts on Page 3147, and here he says, "I am delighted to hear both members now say that they are not in disagreement with this but really they feel it isn't going far enough, and we are not moving fast enough." He is referring to the Member for Fort Rouge and the Member for La Verendrye. He continues, "The study that was made in Manitoba under Dr. Klass' Committee did recommend a number of steps and many of those can be done without any need for legislation." And this is very important, Mr. Speaker, because what does he actually mean by this? We have The Development Corporation Act. Part 2 of that Act allows the government to set up any kind of corporation for any purpose they so desire. And this is what the Minister is intending, that from the report that we have from the recommendations they now have an endorsement that a Crown corporation be set up. They have the legislation without coming back to the Legislature to do that very thing. And I am sure this is in the minds of honourable members to proceed along that line, and I certainly for one would take very strong objection to proceeding in this way. He goes on to say in a later paragraph; "And so I welcome the remarks made by the Member for Fort Rouge, and earlier by the Member for Fort Garry, and I want to say to them that we are just as anxious that we move as quickly as possible to achieve the desired goal which I now realize we all share." Later on he says, in connection with bulk purchasing: "Bulk purchasing - so that we can get the benefits of bulk purchasing which aren't available today - and that these costs should be passed on to the consumers." In a later paragraph he goes on to say: "Now I hope that when this government moves in this direction, and that the members opposite who today and two weeks ago got up and chided this government for not moving fast enough or firmly enough or without enough determination - and I want you to listen - that they will stand beside us when the powerful lobby of the Manufacturers' Association comes storming into Manitoba, because they will. I fully intend and hope that they will now stand beside us to meet this onslaught, because I predict it will happen." That's the end of the quotation.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable Minister of Public Works.

HON. RUSSELL DOERN (Minister of Public Works)(Elmwood): On a point of order. It seems to me that all of us subscribe to Hansard, and it's not necessary for an honourable member to get up and read us ten or fifteen minutes' worth of previous debate. I think that he should allude to them, but I think it's rather imposing on the House to simply stand there and read us back a previous debate.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: On the point of order, Mr. Speaker, the reason I read those excerpts was for the very reason that I pointed out before, that I am sure that they are planning to set up a Crown corporation for that very purpose - and I take very strong exception to that and I want to have them know before this ever happens my standing on the situation, so that they will know that they can figure on that I will oppose such things to happen. I feel that there are other alternatives that we can do rather than set up a Crown corporation for the distribution of drugs in Manitoba. Why can't we control prices? Why can't we control the mark-ups so that private business can still be in the business, because once we set up a Crown corporation we know from experience that they acquire monopolistic powers and that there no longer will be competition after that. That the competition is then no longer there. I think we can control the margins and the mark-ups rather than to go about and set up a Crown corporation.

The committee considered other forms of central purchasing. They considered an independent foundation, and here they mentioned the difficulty in financing of drugs, that the financing would be a problem. A second difficulty would be the cash flow requirements, and they doubt whether the government would be willing to advance funds without control of the use of these funds.

The bill mentions here that alternatives to the present system that we have should be instituted, and I'm talking of alternatives. So -- (Interjection) — I'm discussing the alternatives. It also mentions that an independent foundation would have an advantage in that it might be considered independent, such as the university; universities that we have today where the monies are being provided by government, but that an independent body would be in control. But I don't think this is going to happen because the recommendation isn't for an independent foundation, it is for a Crown corporation.

I asked the Minister of Health the other day whether he would provide us with some of the studies that have been made by sub-committees, and he said he would take the matter under consideration and advise us. I still haven't heard from him whether this is going to come about

(MR. FROESE cont'd) . . . . or not, whether we are going to get those reports. I'd be very interested to read up on this.

I have received correspondence or writings from other people who are very concerned with this bill too. And naturally they refer to Dr. Klass' report, and if I may - I certainly would like to read some of what these people have to say. This is part and parcel of my contribution, and I'm certainly willing to table whatever I'm reading from later on, Mr. Speaker, so that members can read for themselves. I know this is very critical of the government, and they may take very strong exception. Yet these very people have said that they are quite willing to appear before a committee and testify on their own. So I would like to read some portions into the record. And I'm quoting now: "The Dr. Klass report is just so much eye-wash, which recommends the formation of a Crown corporation to purchase for the Crown all major drugs used in this province. The Crown corporation would sell to the drug stores. The Crown corporation would have one quantity price for the cheap rate drug stores who bought in big lots, as compared to the small drug stores who bought in small lots. And no doubt the Crown corporation would be NDP controlled, and the NDP druggists would get some "X" drugs for the same money that the non-NDP drug stores paid. Even without the Crown corporation one of the cheap drug stores was purchasing drugs at hospital prices" - and then in brackets - "(which are much cheaper than the druggists pay at the wholesales)." That's the end of the quotation - "real cheap - and sold to the hospitals at charity prices which in turn in some cases bought from their friends, the administrators of the hospitals in and outside the city. These cheap drug stores could sell cheap since they bought them for next to nothing, and of course made a good profit and were worshipped by the public for not robbing them like the other drug stores."

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable member has five minutes.

MR. FROESE: "The ordinary drugs are being sold cheap - for instance penicillin - which have recompensed the drug companies who will put money into the research of this drug and found out by research all the indications, counter-indications and dangers of this drug. Now the newer drugs, which the pharmaceutical companies have spent millions on in research and should be encouraged to spend millions more on research to give the public the very latest and best product. Life is worth more than money. On a two-month jaunt the Schreyer Government sent a man and his wife to a certain country at a cost of \$25,000 to the people of Manitoba. The ostensible excuse was to buy certain drugs in bulk and bottle them in a building purchased by the government in Greater Winnipeg. I would suggest to Dr. Klass to form a Crown corporation to mass perform operations so that the public could get the operations through our insurance scheme for one-quarter of the present cost, since according to Dr. Klass cost is the only criteria in the Crown corporation drug buying and selling pools. But most of the surgeons would be real cheap like the drugs. Who would want to spend 22 years or more in a pre-medical school and then five to eight years of post-graduate work -- post-graduate work for cheap medical costs. It would be better to spend time learning the carpenters' electricians' and plumbers' trades." -- (Interjection) -- I'm going to table it so that you can satisfy . . . It's not mine. "The Klass report is worthless because none of the commission know anything about pharmaceutical research and manufacturing. The limit of their knowledge is to act as parasites and copy the hard expensive research of the real pharmaceutical companies" and he goes on to say "cheap meat is only for pigs" - "The present government as usual mixes into things it knows nothing about. If the whole of the Schreyer Government had gone for a year's holiday to Hawaii or Acapulco, they could have saved the province a lot of money even if the people of Manitoba had paid their expenses - and especially if they had taken the so-called expert with them that is bound to raise the level of the whole of Lake Winnipeg." Well those are things beside the point. I probably won't have time to complete the total amount. There are other references here. But if the Page girl wants to take it to the desk, I'm quite happy to lend it to her.

I certainly want to, Mr. Speaker, before having to sit down . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order please. The Honourable First Minister on a point of order.

MR. SCHREYER: The Member for Rhineland has indicated a willingness to table the document, but the usual practice as well is that he identify the author before he tables it. Would he do so now please?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Yes, he is a doctor from the City of Winnipeg.

MR. SPEAKER: Name, please.

MR. FROESE: If I can complete the statement, I'm willing to read the name as well.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please. There is no negotiation in respect to our rules. The honourable member will state the name of the document, the signature on the document.

MR. FROESE: If I'm allowed to read -- (Interjection) -- Oh, you said you were not the Speaker; the Speaker was ruling. "It won't be long before we won't have any decent drugs just like in the Communist countries where it is difficult . . .".

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please. Order please. Order please. The honourable member's time is up. Would he name the signature on the bottom of the document?

MR. FROESE: There is no name on the document, but the writer is Dr. M . . .

MR. SPEAKER put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.  
(On Division).

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable the Attorney-General. The Honourable Member for Assiniboia. Bill No. 13.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Chairman, I wish to . . .

MR. GONICK: Mr. Speaker, on that previous bill . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 12 was adopted on Division.

MR. GONICK: The motion to accept the bill on second reading?

MR. SPEAKER: Correct. On Division.

MR. GONICK: I would have wanted to adjourn it, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: I don't feel we can go back on our procedure. I gave everyone the opportunity. I asked if the honourable members were ready to proceed and they were.

. . . . continued on next page.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia. Bill No. 13.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Chairman, I wish to make my remarks on Bill 13, an Act to amend The Expropriation Act, and I rise to support the bill. However, I am not completely satisfied with the bill; it doesn't go very far; it doesn't do very much, because I feel that it is very silent, this bill about the effect of expropriation and by that I mean the right to expropriate. The Act assumes that every expropriating body may do so without question and in my opinion we have today very many expropriating bodies, they include the Crown, utilities, municipalities, school boards, and there is very many of these. I feel the days are gone when expropriation was the prerogative of the Crown, the government, or any expropriating body. I think there should be a concern and that concern, the first concern, should be, really does the property have to be expropriated. And I think that's the first criteria we have to concern ourselves and in The Expropriating Act, or in this amendment, this is not what is said or intended. We should question, is it a right, or is it necessary, that landowners must submit to expropriation just because an engineer, a land surveyor, a planner decides that this is where the road will be, or where the bridge will be built, or a school will have to go. I think we can take a specific example, and I'm sure that most members are familiar with this example. If a school board decides it needs a certain parcel of land, there happens to be probably land on all four sides of this property where the school could go, an old couple living on this piece of land in a house they probably built 50 years ago. The school expropriated; the old couple will have to move on. And in my opinion no amount of money can compensate them for what they have lost. Or take an example of an old farm, a family farm kept in the hands of the family for many years or generations. Must a new road cut this farm in half? Must a yard be reduced to the size that it loses its usefulness?

What I don't see in this Act that the expropriating authority in every case be required to justify a particular expropriation. I believe the procedure to be very simple. The expropriating authority makes the expropriating order but before it takes effect the matter must be advertised and owners and tenants would have a right to object. The matter would come before a tribunal and would only hear certain objections. If on a preliminary examination in its opinion an objector could be compensated by money alone, then it would not need to hear the objection. I'm sure that the volume of valid objections would be very small. The objector with a valid claim that cannot be compensated by money should be heard, and would be heard. The tribunal would weigh the private interest against the public interest and would decide whether the land in question would be expropriated. It may be that certain expropriation has to proceed without delay. In such cases they would be undertaken only after approval of the Minister who would certify as to the urgent nature of the work.

I believe there is some precedent to what I am saying because this is the case in some other countries. I believe this is the procedure that now takes place in England. I believe that this is the procedure that is practised in the Province of Alberta --(Interjection)-- Well the Honourable Minister beside me says Cuba and Russia, well I'm not familiar, perhaps he's much more familiar with what takes place in Russia or Cuba, but I am not. But I know that in Alberta this is the practice that the expropriating authority must show cause that there is a need and that they cannot buy any other property, expropriate any other property, they must show cause why the expropriation should take place.

Now I know that in this bill what the Minister is doing he makes it appear that this is what will happen, but that's not so. What happens in this bill is actually that it shows, or will have to confirm, that all the practices and procedures have been followed. That's all that this bill does.

I understand the procedure as set out in Schedule A sets out the steps that the expropriation authority must serve the owner. They must publish notice of intended expropriation in the newspaper in the area. The owner may object to the intended expropriation, that is within 30 days from the service of the notice serving the confirming authority. If it is not objected, then after 30 days the confirming authority shall confirm the expropriation. If the owner has made his objection the confirming authority shall request the Attorney-General to appoint an inquiry officer. The Attorney-General can appoint a suitable person who is not an officer, an employee, or a member of the Council, or of the expropriating authority. The inquiry officer shall hold a public hearing and serve notice of the public hearing on the owner. At the public hearing the inquiry officer shall inquire as to whether the intended expropriation is fair and reasonably necessary for the achievement of the objectives of the expropriating authority. I understand these

(MR. PATRICK cont'd.) . . . . are the procedures that are followed.

Now what we see in this amendment is that the confirming authority shall consider the report of the inquiry officer and make its order in respect of the declaration of expropriation, and where the owner is not in accordance with the opinion of the inquiry officer then it shall state its reasons for making the owner and all it does, the bill, is to make sure that the proper procedure has been followed. If it hasn't, then it has to do that again.

So my reason is that certainly this bill doesn't go far enough. It must show cause why there should be expropriation. I think there should be the right of appeal from the order confirming the expropriation. So what it really does in a way it gives the right to question that the procedural steps taken between a time of the declaration of expropriation and a confirmation was that proper notice was given, that a proper hearing was held, and that's all, in my opinion, that this amendment does. So, Mr. Speaker, I feel that it doesn't go far enough, and really the Minister is not doing very much except setting out to make sure that the procedure for expropriation has been followed.

I think at a time when the government is involved in going into businesses in many corporations, setting up corporations, and as the government grows larger we have the school authorities, the municipalities, the government, the Crown corporations, they are all expropriating properties. I feel that it's not good enough just to make sure that the proper procedure has been followed but I think it's necessary to make sure that expropriation was necessary.

I'm sure that - and that's the first point that has to be proved, and I think that this is not what takes place under our Expropriation Act. I know that this is done in Alberta, I'm told it is done in some other countries as well, and I'm referring to England, not to some of the countries that was mentioned by the member on my right. But I feel that we have more and more Crown Corporations, more and more government authorities, the school boards, and the City, involved in expropriation of properties, and I feel that the Expropriation Act does not go far enough. There must be proof, there must be justification, that expropriation should take place.

I'm sure that the Attorney-General is aware of the case in St. James where a couple was expropriated. I believe they had lived in that property for over 40 years and I don't have to relate that to him, I'm sure he is very much familiar with it. So I say to him the legislation does not go far enough, let's show real cause that there has to be expropriation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General shall be closing debate. The Honourable Minister.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to be able to now address myself to the remarks of the Honourable Member from Assiniboia. And I have to say to myself, Mr. Speaker, where in the devil has the Honourable Member for Assiniboia been? He sat in this Chamber when this government, when this government enacted a comprehensive Expropriation Act which makes provision for the very things that he's saying we should be now doing. And if he cares to examine the Expropriation Act he'll find that there is provision there for an inquiry to determine whether or not an expropriation is necessary, and then the inquiry officer makes a report, and the report is then considered by the authority, and the authority may, despite the report, continue with its expropriation, but that hearing, the inquiry officer's report, is a public instrument, and as a matter of fact the honourable member should know that one of the most notable examples occurred in his constituency, or certainly in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek, just recently when this government or, at least I in the capacity of Attorney-General responsible for the Expropriation Act, appointed an inquiry officer in the person of now Judge Cramer, who made an inquiry, and his report has been made public. But despite that recommendation apparently the Unicity Council is still leaving its options open in respect to the development of the beltway. But he recommended that the property be not taken and used for the beltway; be taken but held for public purposes, and now as I understand it the City of Winnipeg Council has done that. They've taken the property, expropriated the property, but they have not designated it for a beltway. There is an example, Mr. Speaker, of an inquiry officer having considered the whole merits of the question and made a report, which is public, and so on.

Now in the case of the school expropriation, that expropriation took place before the coming into being of this Act. --(Interjection)-- Sure I'll permit a question.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Would the Minister permit this question? What if the people on Sturgeon Road did not want to be expropriated?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member asks this question and he thinks he's got a blockbuster. What if the people don't want to be expropriated? Public authority has to determine whether, despite the wishes of individuals who own land, it is in the public interest to expropriate their property. And that has to be done after due consideration, examination of all of the alternatives, the ability of the individual whose land is going to be expropriated, to insist upon the appointment of an inquiry officer, make application for the appointment of an inquiry officer. And then if the inquiry officer still - he may recommend against the taking of the land but if the authority says notwithstanding all of the recommendations we want to take that land, then the authority has the capacity to proceed and it's judged by the people in accordance with its performance, and it can be voted out of office if it is exceeding its powers. But surely in the interests of the public there must be that overriding ability to take land, which after all is part of the public domain initially and it's to be utilized for public purposes.

The protections have been built in, Mr. Speaker, in the Expropriation Act. And the particular bill that we're dealing with arose out of an anomaly that existed, and I explained that when introducing the bill, because the Land Acquisition Act made reference to the Minister, and the Minister in charge of the Land Acquisition Act, and deeming him to be the Minister for the purposes of the taking of the land and that he would be in knowledge of the work and undertaking, which isn't a reasonable basis of operation. So therefore the amendments that are presented in Bill 13 don't in any way take away from all of the protections and all of the rights that we afforded in the Act, which is E 190 of the Revised Statutes, which is a hallmark in the history of expropriation procedures in this province. It doesn't erode any of those protections. It merely remedies this technical difficulty that existed where the Minister who was actually, or the authority that's actually taking the work, taking the land for the work, can actually sign the documents. But the way it presently provided it had to be the Attorney-General who is responsible for the Land Acquisition Act.

Bill 13 rectifies that anomaly and validates those takings that were otherwise based upon the signing by a Minister who might have been the Minister of Highways, he might have been the Minister of Tourism, the Minister of Agriculture, any one, the Minister of Mines and Resources --(Interjection)-- wait till I finish - and where it was for a public drain, a public highway, and so on, and they've entered into agreements perhaps, and the expropriation order is but to simplify the procedures. He knows the particular nature of the work and not the Minister who's charged with the Land Acquisition Act. So this rectifies that anomaly and then gives notice, provides for notice, that in the event that there is going to be any approach to court on a technicality that it has to be brought within a reasonable time.

And those are the simple substance to this bill. And there's nothing far-reaching about it at all.

MR. PATRICK: Would the Minister permit another question? Is there a right of appeal after the confirming authority made its decision?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, if the honourable member would like to study the Expropriation Act, which is not being amended now in total or in principle except for the minor matters which I have alluded to in my opening remarks, and as I indicate now, he'll find that the taking authority may, notwithstanding the inquiry officer's report, confirm its taking of the land, and when it does that then the person whose land is taken has the right of action in court and in the event that that happens, then the taking authority is obliged by the Act to pay the court costs, and now a fixed determination of certain additional damages, and in addition to all of that the land owner who has lost his property has a further right of appeal. It's all there in the Act, and we put it there, and we're proud of it.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General. The Honourable Member for Brandon West. Bill No. 39.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, I think Bill 39 is an extremely interesting piece of legislation and it's one that has a fairly simple purpose. That is to clear up a misunderstanding, or some confusion that has existed for some time in the category of sand and gravel in respect to mineral rights on properties. The purpose is clearly one to eliminate that confusion and to make it abundantly clear now and henceforth that sand and gravel is not a mineral. And I think in that intent and that purpose, this is a useful piece of legislation.

The first thing that we notice about the bill is one that perhaps takes away a little bit from our enthusiasm. There's been a lot of critical comment from this side about



(MR. MCGILL cont'd.) . . . . retroactivity in legislation. It came up very recently in some tax bills. The government side is never very proud of the retroactive features of its legislation but usually has explanations for it. Nevertheless it is an undesirable feature of any bill I think to provide for retroactivity in law.

Now this bill surely has to be the grandfather of all retroactive bills because it says that if this bill passes sand and gravel shall be deemed not to be a mine, mineral or valuable stone, but shall be deemed to be, and have always been, a part of the surface of the land.

Mr. Speaker, always is a pretty long time, and so we have a bill now that in Manitoba history goes back 100 years. I've no doubt that the Minister's legal advice and his research in this matter has assured him that this will not be a difficult problem, and that this is in fact the proper way to accomplish and overcome a problem that developed in the early 1950s, I believe or at the late 40s and early 50s in southwestern Manitoba when there was a great deal of interest in mine and mineral leases because they included the rights to hydrocarbons, gas and oil, exploration, and in that haste to acquire leases, and in the contracts that were written, I'm told that there was no attempt to separate or detach sand and gravel from the mineral leases that were signed by many of the farmers in that area. And so this bill would attempt to correct that difficulty where sand and gravel title has become confused because it was not clearly identified in the leases that were granted to certain oil leasing companies.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, I think it's important to correct that problem. We have no difficulty with the intent of the bill; we think that's a proper direction in which to be going, but the technique involved is one that I think deserves some further scrutiny. And in order to properly understand it I think we've got to rely a little bit on the research that the Minister has done prior to bringing this bill before the House.

There's some assurances I think that it would be reasonable to ask for, and one that occurs immediately would be to have the assurance of the Minister that this bill, if passed, would in no way challenge the prestige of the Torrens Title in Manitoba, which I understand and I believe is one of the pillars of our Real Property Act. And if there is in fact any challenge to that title in this bill then I think we need to look at it very very carefully indeed before proceeding.

If the intent really is to provide for the problem which arose a number of years ago, and which I don't think is part of any recent contracts for mineral rights, I think the inadvertence which led to the confusion on sand and gravel in the early 50s and mid 50s was recognized and is now taken care of by specifically detaching the sand and gravel rights from any mineral rights that are sold by the owners of the land. So that it's not a problem that continues up to this day, and if it is a problem at this time it is not nearly as great a one since the experience of the early 50s has given warning to people making contracts that a specific detachment should be applied to any mineral leases. The alternative to using this method of correcting the difficulty would be to provide the legal machinery whereby people who feel that they have been - who have suffered a loss by reason of the confusion on the definition of sand and gravel could appear and place their case before the courts. And those who might defend any actions taken by these people might be given reasonable time to appear and if they didn't, then the case might then be settled. That is one way of doing it. The Minister has chosen this way of doing it so I presume he feels that there are not too many cases that would involve damage claims against any contracts which would not be voided by the intent of this legislation.

Now it was mentioned, Mr. Speaker, that the Province of Manitoba might be considered as one of the principal buyers of sand and gravel. I'm wondering if the contracts that over the past 10 or 15 years entered into by the province for the purchase of sand and gravel might in any way be upset by the effect of this legislation. Certainly there'll be a few contracts that will be made invalid and there will be a few claims. The Minister has assured us that these claims can be made to the Registrar General and that if they are valid claims that there is an assurance fund which will provide some damages. There is a companion Bill No. 51 which will make some amendments to the Real Property Act.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like the assurance of the Minister that there will be no limitation on the amount of claims that can be accommodated by the Registrar General. As I read the Real Property Act, it seems to me that there is a limitation of \$5,000 in claims of that type. It doesn't take much sand and gravel to make up a \$5,000 claim, and I would think that if this limitation does exist then it would be very necessary to look at that and possibly to amend it before this proposed bill becomes law.

If the retroactive feature of this bill is to affect contracts which may have been made

(MR. MCGILL cont'd.) . . . . throughout the history of Manitoba, it might certainly provide a very interesting field for young lawyers to travel about the country looking at abandoned gravel pits and then searching out the contracts and deciding whether or not those contracts would now be invalid as a result of the changing of the definition of sand and gravel to remove it from mineral rights. Even the Province of Manitoba's contracts should certainly be reviewed very carefully before this bill is proceeded with to make sure that there are not major claims possible as a result of the change.

Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, I think we have a problem. The Minister is presenting a bill which is intended to take care of that, and in principle the bill has merit; the technique is somewhat dubious. We think it needs to be examined very carefully. And perhaps the real test will come when after due announcement representations are invited when this bill reaches the committee stage.

Now I've no doubt there'll be a number of other honourable members will speak in respect to this proposed legislation because there are a variety of subjects which relate to it, and I've dealt only with the straight legal aspect as it occurs to me. But I think it's very important that adequate lead time be given that the bill be well advertised and that all representations are invited so that we can have some idea of the impact of this legislation upon contracts which have been written in the past and which now exist. Thank you.

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

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM (Birtle-Russell): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The sentiments expressed by my colleague the Member for Brandon I think don't have to be duplicated. However, there are one or two areas that I would like to touch on and in doing so, Mr. Speaker, I realize that it's very difficult to talk about the Sand and Gravel Act without making reference to the Real Property Act because the two are very closely tied together, as is the Municipal Act amendments in Bill 47, I believe, there's a couple of references there to it as well.

When you look at the Sand and Gravel Act by itself it looks fairly simple and straightforward but when you tie in the other Acts you find that there are some other significant factors which I sincerely hope are not as dangerous as what one might suspect if they are willing to conject, or project, intention of government. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the problem of ownership of sand and gravel rights is not as important right now as it was 20 years ago. The problem is a diminishing one to some extent and yet the Minister intends to bring this forward at this time, and you have to ask the question, why?

We also know that the Minister of Finance, who is behind us here, is quite concerned about any revenues that the province can get in one form or another and yet we may very well be eliminating a royalty on sand and gravel if we remove it from the, or we clearly define its content or what section it comes under. We are dealing with a diminishing resource, Mr. Speaker, and the importance of that resource in one area of the country as compared to another is entirely dependent on the availability of quantity as well as quality. So a gravel pit that was situated in, say ten miles from Churchill, or two miles from Churchill, with a quantity of 50 million yards would not have any great significance as compared to Bird's Hill gravel beside the City of Winnipeg where there is an annual need in the neighborhood of 10 million yards per year.

It makes a person wonder whether it will be the intention of the Minister of Municipal Affairs later on to assess the gravel for taxation purposes. Once we have clearly defined that it is a surface right and comes under the department of Municipal Affairs for assessment and taxation purposes, one begins to wonder whether this is the real reason for the change, so that they can in fact assess it and tax it as such. I sincerely hope that that is not the case. In fact if I thought it would be the case I would be very much inclined to vote against it for that very reason. If he was assessing it, I would like to know the criteria he would use for assessing it because the quality and the availability of other sources would be dependent on the price that would be achieved.

I would think also, Mr. Speaker, that perhaps the Minister should look at changes in the Real Property Act where the limitation, as we understand it anyway, is \$5,000, the limitation for settlement, because I can see, I can quite easily see a gravel pit being worth far more than \$5,000 if it's located in the right place. And a person may be very unsatisfied with the present agreement he has and feel quite justified in appealing, but with a limitation of \$5,000 he would be rather reluctant to proceed.

One of the things that concerns me about it is not so much what the Act says, but what it

(MR. GRAHAM cont'd.) . . . . does not say and here I wonder whether it comes under the Sand and Gravel Act or under the Municipal Act. And this is the question of the cleanup and the landscaping which I feel should be carried out in abandoned gravel pits. I'm sure every member of this Assembly at some time or another has driven through the country and seen the eyesore that has been left by the establishment, or the abandonment of gravel pits, without any attempts being made at landscaping and levelling, and it has left an unsightly sore on the horizon and provided a weed trap which is almost impossible for the owner of the land to have any effective control of noxious weeds. And in that sense I feel that perhaps we should be including in either the Sand and Gravel Act or the Municipal Act, or government should be moving in the direction of making some attempt at establishing guidelines for the operation of sand and gravel pits.

Mr. Chairman, I'm sure there are many others that want to add further comments. As for myself I feel that existing agreement as they are outlined in the saving Clause 7 should be honoured. I'm glad to see that part is included in the contract. I won't say any more at this time but I look forward to hearing representations at Committee and I'm sure that there will be both views expressed when we get to Committee stage.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I think that the inclination is to call Bill 47, and then if it's disposed of to perhaps call it an evening.

MR. SPEAKER: Proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs. The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek. Bill No. 47.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will be brief after that encouraging announcement from the First Minister, because there's been many words said on this by our side of the House, our party, and certainly it's been made very well known that our objection to the Municipal Bill (No. 3), or the amendments to the Municipal Act (No. 3) are basically that the power of the municipalities is being taken away in regards to the distributing of welfare. There is no question that those of them who have decided to opt in to the program and are paying welfare should have the opportunity to make the decisions regarding who should receive welfare and who shouldn't. I have chaired a welfare committee and at no time did I ever see a situation as the Member from Inkster described, which was if you knew an alderman maybe you'd get a little more consideration, or if you knew somebody in the City Hall maybe you'd get a little more consideration, and I assure you that both the Attorney-General and myself were chairman of welfare committees, and certainly they were not run on that basis, and I have much more confidence in elected members than the Member from Inkster seems to have because I don't think they operate that way.

Mr. Speaker, I know the rules of the Federal Government and the Provincial Government regarding welfare, and like the Member from Morris I am not in agreement with their particular laid down rules because nobody at a long distance can really decide whether the welfare should be given or not. And I would like to say that in many cases I would love to go into the constituency of Logan probably and take ten hard working men in Brooklands, who I know personally, who are probably railroad workers and work under a union agreement, and I would love to have them make up the welfare committee and decide who received it and who didn't. And I assure you those working men, who are probably all NDP supporters, would make it very well known how this welfare should be taken out. The same thing would apply in St. James-Assiniboia, and many other areas. There is no question that it is becoming very very loose and I think that people of that nature of the people who are daily going to work every day, if they were to be the ones administering the welfare, we might see quite a bit of change. If you don't like it being done by some people let's get the working man to do it, let's appoint him.

Mr. Speaker, this system of saying everybody's now got to opt in and they cannot turn down welfare. I could visualize a fellow, you know, travelling around Manitoba from community to community and going home from Kenora for the weekend and picking up welfare. This is loose; it is not going to benefit the people of Manitoba, and it's going to be costly, under the rules that are laid down by this amendment that only creates a situation where welfare can be further abused, and I don't think it's a very good idea.

(MR. F. JOHNSTON cont'd.) . . . . In fact the local municipality has the best, has the best idea, or the best insight, as to who should receive it and who shouldn't. I believe there can be an appeal board, I don't disagree with that. But I can assure you that I would like to see us set up a welfare committee made up of people that work every day, come home, that are in the working class that you speak of, and I would say that even if they were all supporters of the NDP Party you'd see a drastic change in the welfare costs of Manitoba. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, just one or two very brief questions and I'm going to refer only to that part of the bill which involves the transfer of responsibility for non-resident indigents to the municipality and I want to make it clear. I'm not absolutely clear on the financial responsibility. As I understand it now a municipality, the City of Brandon for instance, would take care of non-residents in respect to their needs and would bill the province under the old regulations. Now do I understand that if this bill passes that the City of Brandon will absorb all of the costs for the non-resident indigents and that this will increase their welfare costs to that extent. Now I'm told that in Brandon there is slightly more than half of the welfare costs are allocated to non-residents so that the passing of this bill would mean that there would be a considerably larger total expense for the City of Brandon for welfare than is now the case. I don't think that the city is clear on this matter, and I think it's a rather important one for not only the City of Brandon but for all municipal jurisdictions, that they are now going to be faced with this additional cost which up to this time they've been able to pay and then receive reimbursement from the Province of Manitoba. The total bill in Brandon I think last year for welfare was about 300,000, of which more than half was for non-residents, so that the City of Brandon, if my understanding is correct, is now faced with that additional cost in respect to welfare.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister will be closing debate. The Honourable Minister.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to --(Interjection)-- Oh relatively short . . . Minister of Transportation. I would like to just outline a little bit in answer to the comments that have been made across the way in respect to this bill, some of the background that led to the introduction of the bill itself.

The government is very much aware that at the present time in the province there is a need for a total re-examination of the Social Assistance Program. I think it's obvious to many Manitobans that the present system is not a perfect one, that there are many areas in fact where there should be substantial changes. The issue really insofar as this bill is concerned is not the Welfare Advisory Board, that is a different matter, it is simply a matter of preventing municipalities from rescinding existing welfare by-laws, and to require those municipalities that have rescinded their welfare by-laws to reinstate welfare by-laws. That is the sole issue insofar as this bill is concerned.

Now what is the reason for introducing this at the present time? As I indicated there is a concern about the present system of social assistance in the province. We have to be aware of this concern and attempt to examine it. It's for this reason that the government set up a one-man commission under the leadership of Professor Barber in order to inquire into all aspects of social assistance, and I might just simply state here, Mr. Speaker, that I have a great deal of confidence that a man of the stature of Professor Barber will be able to take a very objective analysis of the present system and be able to make recommendations. Arrangements have been made that this one-man commission will sit down with the representatives of the municipalities in the province in order to obtain from the municipalities their suggestions for improvements in the present Social Assistance Program. I fully expect that the executives of both the Urban Association and the Union of Manitoba Municipalities will be taking advantage of this opportunity very shortly.

I want to also just gently rap the knuckles of the Winnipeg Tribune. In yesterday's Winnipeg Tribune in the reports in respect to this particular bill, there was a quote of the address by the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell in which he quoted myself as having said that the Union of Manitoba Municipalities had agreed to this bill, and there was no reference in the article to the fact that in fact the honourable member agreed to withdraw those remarks, that in fact I had not so indicated. I think it's very important that for the purposes of Hansard that it be made very clear that at no time did I represent to the House that the Union of Manitoba Municipalities had agreed to the material before us at the present time.

(MR. PAWLEY cont'd.)

Now although they have not agreed to the material I also however can report that they take, I think, a little different attitude to the bill than the honourable members opposite. We had a discussion in respect to this bill. I do not recall them indicating either agreement or disagreement, either in my office or at the district meetings that we have been holding, the last six meetings in respect to the particular issue of this bill itself. They have indicated to me their concern about certain aspects of the Welfare Advisory Committee Board and what they feel is a need for some changes in respect to the regulations pertaining to it.

I would like to make reference to some of the remarks by the Honourable Member for Emerson, and other members attempted to introduce the thinking that some way or other the government was interfering with the autonomy of municipalities by introducing this legislation. I just cannot understand for a moment, Mr. Speaker, where there would ever be any thought that this in fact was the intent of this legislation. In fact it is the very opposite. It is saying to the municipalities that we wish to prevent a trend that has commenced, and prevent that trend from leading to a situation where the majority of municipalities might in fact rescind their by-laws. If that happened then the province might very prematurely and possibly unfortunately find itself involved in the administration of welfare insofar as unemployable employables were concerned in the province, and I for one, I agree with honourable members opposite that the municipal government is able to do this job more economically and I think with, in most cases, better social concern than could the province do this, and therefore I would not want to see us lead ourselves to the situation where the province was handling this area of responsibility for all the municipalities of the province. But in fact if we pursued the position taken by honourable members opposite to its logical conclusion we would reach the result that in fact the province would be doing this, and then honourable members opposite would be suggesting that we had taken over responsibility from the municipalities, and with the honourable members opposite you just can't win sometimes, especially if you follow their logic to a natural conclusion.

The Honourable Member for Emerson also introduced some rather strange logic into the debate by suggesting in some way or other that this was being done in order to save Winnipeg taxpayers money. I just can't understand that reasoning. I could point out to honourable members that if in fact the City of Winnipeg did rescind their present social assistance by-law that overnight you would have a situation whereby over half of the population of the province would be under the jurisdiction of the Provincial Government insofar as the administration of welfare was concerned. And this would in fact increase the total cost to the total province, rural and urban, so that rural taxpayers could overnight find themselves faced with substantial additional costs if we failed to pass this legislation, and if that particular contingency occurred. I don't think for a moment it would but at the present time it's just as possible for the City of Winnipeg to rescind their by-law as it would be for the smallest municipality of the province to do so under the present loophole in the legislation.

The Honourable Member for Brandon West asked a question in respect to whether or not this would introduce additional costs to the City of Brandon. There would be no additional cost. There is no change in formula of cost-relationship under this bill so that the Honourable Member for Brandon West need have no concern in this respect. No cost formula change.

I want to also just report that this is a bill that I think probably has been introduced and discussed with the majority of municipal people in the province because we've been very fortunate in that we've been able to attend district meetings throughout the entire province and speak to most of the Reeves and Councillors of the province. I've been able to outline the contents of this bill at length at every meeting and I have not found the municipal people to be at all unreasonable in respect to this bill, and contrary to the impression that honourable members opposite may wish to leave there has not in general been a disagreement with the bill.

The Honourable Member for Swan River has indicated to me a municipality that disagrees with this legislation. I could indicate to him other specific municipalities life being as it is and one man differing in view from the other, it would be also very strange if all municipalities agreed on the same subject. So I'm not suggesting for a moment that all municipal people are in agreement, or disagreement with this bill. And neither do I think that honourable members opposite should attempt to leave the impression that all municipal people are in disagreement with this bill. I think however that when the bill is explained to municipal people that they agree that it is a responsibility of the province to prevent the present trend and to attempt to

(MR. PAWLEY cont'd.) . . . . . correct it. They are pleased that the government has set up the commission under Professor Barber; they welcome the opportunity of making their views known to him, and they fully expect that there'll be some constructive recommendations follow from that commission - I'm sure there will be - in order that there can be an improvement in the situation.

In conclusion I want to just mention very briefly, very briefly the fact that I'm convinced that the solution to the problems facing society today relating to welfare and social assistance is an important challenge to us all and I think we do not remove the problem by patchwork solutions. I think that the best way of resolving those problems are by introducing those in our society that suffer from a disadvantage financially, skillwise, trainingwise to programs in our society so that they can feel that through the development and learning of skills that their potential, that their capacity for contributing to the community and to the province is in fact an important one. And the type of programs that I have in mind are the sort of programs that this government introduced in the little community of St. Laurent; a little community in which we introduced a program of having the people themselves in the community build their own homes. They built their own homes; they elected from their own midst who would live in those homes. They elected the foreman that was to oversee the construction of those homes. They had a community meeting in which they set up a co-operative stepladder plant and they now have a stepladder plant in that little community in which there are over a dozen workmen employed, people that would have been a few years back likely on social assistance but now are employed. It's a happy community and an active community. This is the type of thing that I think is so important. I say to honourable members opposite that this is the real meaning of social democracy, is to introduce programs like that in order to maximize the potential and the ability of individuals to make their contribution to society, and that is the goal and the emphasis of the social democratic philosophy, and it is not the type of philosophy that honourable members continue to wish to suggest it is. That is the goal, the aim, the improvement of the quality of life.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I think that the hour of adjournment has been reached but before moving the formal motion, Mr. Speaker, may I remind the honourable members that I believe that I announced the other day that there would be no sitting of the House tomorrow evening; there will be no sitting of the House on Saturday in order - there will be no sitting tomorrow evening; there will be no sitting at all on Saturday morning, afternoon or evening; there will be no sitting on Sunday. And I want to also remind honourable members that there will be committee meetings on - Economic Development on Monday, on Public Utilities on Tuesday. I've instructed the Clerk to put into Votes and Proceedings a meeting of the Law Amendments Committee will be held next Thursday morning. There will be a sitting of the House next Wednesday. Now it's normal that this is done on Friday afternoon in accordance with the rules of the House but I'm giving prior notice to my friends and colleagues in the Assembly that this is our intended procedure.

So, Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by my colleague the Honourable the Minister of Finance that the House do now adjourn and stand adjourned until 10:00 o'clock tomorrow morning.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House adjourned until 10:00 o'clock Friday morning.