

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Friday, May 26, 1972

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution 95 (a). The Honourable Member for La Verendrye. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The assignment that I took on at the time that the Committee rose, Mr. Chairman, is an extremely heavy one because of the volume of material that is on the record from the debate on Bill 56 during the second session of this Legislature, and the volume of comments that have been made both inside the Chamber, inside the meetings of the Public Utilities Committee, and outside those forums, in the public arena, on television and elsewhere, and I must say, Sir, that the time that was available to me at noon hour was not sufficient to thoroughly examine the entire record. There are four volumes for example of Hansard from the second session, much of the extent of all those volumes is taken up with consideration of Bill 56, or different aspects, or comments with respect to the bill that came into other phases of the proceedings of the House. There is a voluminous file of transcripts from the Public Utilities Committee itself, and I must say to you, Mr. Chairman, and the members of the committee, that in the time available to me it was only possible to do a cursory examination of the record. In that time I found many references by government members to the private automobile insurance industry that I consider to be hypercritical and damaging in their effect. As for the specific term that I made reference to, the term "parasites" and "parasitic", the only written record I can find of it, Mr. Chairman, is contained in a brief that was submitted to the Public Utilities Committee by a presentation made to the committee by Mr. Art Coulter and the Manitoba Federation of Labour in December of 1969. There is a Free Press newspaper report of the give-and-take, the question and answer exercise that went on between Mr. Coulter and the Minister of Municipal Affairs at that time, during the presentation of that brief, and the Free Press story which carried the headline: "Get rid of parasites in insurance - union" ...

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. PAULLEY: If I may, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Chairman, in all due respect, I don't think that we are really concerned in any remarks that Mr. Art Coulter may have made, and the reporting thereof. As I understand the proceedings this morning, a reference was made to an honourable unnamed member of the Assembly, and that we did agree that the Honourable Member for Fort Garry would have the noon hour to establish that fact being a fact, or otherwise, and I suggest, Mr. Chairman, to the honourable member that he should only, should contain reference only to an honourable member of this House not to an outsider. I have given him a chance. I gave him a chance, Mr. Chairman, before the House rose, and if the honourable member can establish that a member of this Assembly made that statement, that's fine. I don't think we should go through the exercise of what Mr. Art Coulter or Mr. Joe Blow happen to have said. Reference was made to an honourable member of this House, and the Honourable Member for Fort Garry, as I understand it, Mr. Chairman, said that if he couldn't find it he was prepared to withdraw his remark alluding to a member of this Chamber. I suggest, Sir, that that's all we are concerned with.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think the point is well taken and that was my understanding of the commitment that the Honourable Member for Fort Garry gave to me when I suggested that he spend the noon hour to find the remark. I think he alluded that some member, some honourable member of this Assembly had made a remark that the insurance industry, or its agents, were parasites and I would suggest unless the honourable member can produce that statement that he withdraw that remark.

The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, I am fully prepared to withdraw the remark as I told you if I can't produce that statement but I did put the caveat when you offered that instruction to me, Mr. Chairman, that the noon hour was a very narrow period of time in which to examine the voluminous records of testimony and remarks that were made in the course of that debate, and with all due deference to the point that the government House Leader raises, I said that there was criticism and character attack, bordering on character assassination, that was levelled against private members of the industry during that debate.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. It is my distinct understanding that the honourable member would withdraw the remark if he couldn't substantiate it. Now I'm asking the honourable member to withdraw the remark or substantiate it, one thing or the other. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, ...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. I would suggest to the Honourable Member for Charleswood that if he wishes to speak on a point of order that he be gentleman enough to rise in his place and be recognized by the Chair. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm prepared to withdraw the remark if I can't substantiate it but what I'm saying to you, Sir, is that the noon hour period was not sufficient to cover the whole record --(Interjection)-- but it had that caveat on it. I had said at the time, it's a very narrow period. --(Interjection)-- What I'm saying, there was a reference to the industry as being comprised in part of parasites and it was made before the Public Utilities Committee, and the record shows that no government member disabused the members of the committee of that impression. No government member challenged it.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, in all due respect to my honourable friend, there was an undertaking given prior to the rising of the committee at 12:30. As I understand the Honourable Member for Fort Garry, he now admits that he cannot find any reference to a member of this Assembly making such statements. I believe that the honourable gentleman indicated that he was prepared to withdraw his remarks and I suggest, without assist from the backbench or the front bench, I suggest, Mr. Chairman, in view of the undertaking that was given prior to our rising at 12:30 by myself as House Leader, the Honourable Member for Fort Garry, all that's required at this time without any further delay in the process of the House is for my honourable friend to say that he withdraws the remarks because he hasn't been able in the time allocated to him to substantiate what he said. And I would suggest in all due respect - I do respect the Honourable Member for Fort Garry - that if he can establish it at some other date when he has a longer period of time, let him do it then but --(Interjection)-- Will the Honourable Member for Roblin shut up? I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that that was the undertaking given that he would as of the hour of 2:30 this afternoon retract his allegation and I give him the right, and I'm sure all members of the House will give him the right, that if after further investigation he can substantiate the point that he raised, he can reintroduce it, but let's get on with the business of consideration of the Estimates, and I respect and admire the integrity of the Honourable Member for Fort Garry and I don't think, Mr. Chairman, that I'm being unfair as House Leader to suggest to the Honourable Member for Fort Garry that he retract the remarks in absence of any firm evidence to the contrary. That's all that's required.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Well, Mr. Chairman, let me just say in response to the Government House Leader, so that the record is straight, I think he said that the Member for Fort Garry cannot find the reference to which he referred. I would prefer to have the record read that the Member for Fort Garry has not found - not that he cannot find - but that in two and a half hours, or two hours, of searching the record, which is voluminous, I have not found a specific reference outside of that made in a brief and a question and answer appearance before the Public Utilities Committee. So on that basis, Mr. Chairman, I will withdraw the accusation that I made in the Chamber before noon, or before 12:30, with respect to the use of the term "parasite" in the private automobile insurance industry.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. CHAIRMAN: I wonder before the honourable member proceeds if I could just prevail upon his goodwill to just introduce to the members of the Assembly on the loge to my right where we have four members of a Special Intersessional Committee on Liquor Regulations in the Province of Saskatchewan. The Chairman is Dr. Don Faris, the MLA for Arm River; the Honourable John E. Brockelbank, the Honourable Minister of Government Services and Telephones in the Province of Saskatchewan; the Honourable Member for Melfort, Kinistino, Arthur Thibault; and the Honourable Mike Tedgniuk, the MLA for Turtleford. On behalf of all members of the Assembly, I bid you welcome to our proceedings.

The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY (cont'd)

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Chairman, let me conclude, and I will be brief, by repeating what I said when I got up to speak before the lunch hour break that it was really the comments of my friend and adversary the Honourable Member for Osborne that brought me into the debate because I was struck by the significance of the recall that he has of the automobile insurance

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd) agonies that he should focus upon one particular isolated incident in the allegations in connection with that that he reported to the House when there was so much of a far more agonizing nature for the people of Manitoba on both sides of the question during that long hot summer of debate, and I think it's particularly significant and meaningful that it should have been that that should stick out in the mind of the Member for Osborne rather than the anguish and the tears, and there were tears, on the part of people who had built up livelihoods and then were in danger of seeing them swept away and taken away from them arbitrarily without either a reasonable compensation in their view, or even a reasonable chance to be heard.

The other point that antagonized me in the remarks of the Member for Osborne, Mr. Chairman, had to do with his reaction to the statements made by my House Leader this morning with respect to participation by government members in debates and deliberations on departmental Estimates, and specifically the Estimates of the Department of Health and Social Allowances. The House Leader of this Party was not saying, and he doesn't need me to speak for him but I'm going to say it anyway, he was not suggesting as the Member for Osborne obviously inferred that government backbenchers, middle benchers or front benchers should feel that there are any constraints upon their right to participate in debate at any time, of any nature, but what he was saying was that the Estimates are primarily, and I think the First Minister would agree, primarily for the examination of government spending and government departmental policies and programs by the Opposition, and that there is ample opportunity for government backbenchers and other members on the Treasury Benches to participate in debate when government business is before the House. We have seen very limited examples in this session of government backbench participation in government bills, in the debates on government bills. There have been some significant contributions but basically there's been pretty limited participation by government backbenchers in government business, in debates on government bills, and it was not without some cause and justification that the House Leader of this Party, and the rest of us in this party, were unhappy with the time that was taken away from the Opposition in the deliberation of certain departmental Estimates that we were keenly interested in, and that we've been waiting to examine for two years, namely, the Estimates of the Department of Health and Social Services, and we felt that the tactics of the governments, and its own members, and its own backbenchers, at that time in participating in the deliberation on those Estimates to the extent that they did was somewhat contrived, Mr. Chairman, to say the least, and this is the inference behind the remarks of my House Leader, and the Member for Osborne knows that full well. If he wants to participate in debate there are many many opportunities that he has on government business and government time --(Interjection) -- Well including Estimates, the First Minister says, and I agree with that except that the Member for Osborne was -- the members who participated in the Health and Social Allowances Estimates debate on the government side were by no means either limited to a very small number, or did they appear to have much regard for imposing limits on the amount of time they used, and perhaps on the government side this is the normal attitude, I don't know, but I would hope that the Member for Osborne will have an opportunity after the next election to serve on the Opposition side and he will then --(Interjection)-- that expression leaves itself open to two or three interpretations, Mr. Chairman, and perhaps I should clarify it, that if we in the Conservative Party should be so unfortunate as to be unsuccessful in an attempt to recapture that seat, that then the Member for Osborne, being the present member, will be on the Opposition side of the House at any rate and not on the government side, and will have an opportunity to experience this specific position that we are in in Opposition to which the House Leader on our side was making reference. That was the sole purport and direction of the House Leader, of our party's House Leader's remarks, and the Member for Osborne knows that, and there was no attempt on the part of our House Leader, or on the part of anybody else on this side, to muzzle the Member for Osborne, or any other government member, in fact we've been amused by the references continual by government members during this session to the fact that they feel there is little opposition coming from this side. The clear implication of that being that Opposition should be coming from their side of the House and with one notable exception, or two notable exceptions, being the Honourable Members for Crescentwood and Thompson, there has been as I suggested not only no opposition coming from their side of the House, but no participation from their side of the House at all except on Opposition time. This is what we object to, and I would think that the Member for Osborne could understand that.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. LEONARD A. BARKMAN (La Verendrye): Mr. Chairman, I will be brief. Much of what was on my mind a day or two ago has been taken care of by what members have been saying in this Chamber. I wish to start off though by congratulating some of the staff that I know personally, and I'm sure most of the members in this House do, and I think we are grateful for having the kind of Deputy Minister we have and I only feel sorry at this time that an Assistant Deputy Minister has not been found yet.

I was just thinking, Mr. Chairman, while listening to the debate for the last couple of hours. I'm not really ready to congratulate the Minister as being one of the better Ministers of Municipal Affairs, but I can easily go along with his work as far as his municipal work is concerned. But I am beginning to feel very sorry when I see that he has to perhaps spend, oh, maybe from 60 to 75 percent of his time on Autopac instead of some of the other things that are also important, as far as the municipalities and as far as municipal life is concerned in Manitoba and I am sure that he would wish that some of that load would become a little easier over the next year or two, because I think his heart is with Municipal Affairs. I've noticed that his heart and his mouth is also with Autopac but I think actually his heart is basically with Municipal Affairs. So I cannot suggest with everything going up in cost as far as government, or living is concerned, I cannot suggest that we should have two Ministers, but I do hope, I do hope that -- first of all if these two gentlemen on my right would be a little more quiet, and secondly, I do hope that his load will be lessened.

Mr. Chairman, it was good to hear that the Minister announced certain amounts that would be taken off some of our education cost, or the school tax burdens, that that have been very heavy on the people of Manitoba for some years. And I don't know if the figures that he mentioned are going to, that he'd be able to keep them, but I hope he will, and I hope, I think he knows that even if we are going to reach the ratio of a 20-80 ratio in regards to education, or tax, or school foundation tax, I think he knows that this is really not enough on the long run. However, it was good to hear him announce that there will be an amount of about 10 million available as far as unconditional grants are concerned, instead of the 7.6 that we had prior to the last census, I imagine. I do feel sorry though for some of the municipalities that are fast losing their population and already find themselves in economic problems. I do feel sorry for those because the going will even be tougher with them getting less money.

I was happy that he mentioned a few of the LGD problems. I think most of us that were on that committee would have to agree that we learnt quite a bit from the people that presented their briefs, and I think we came home with one very clear message. I think they put it to us very clear that they did not want to be gulped up or taken into other municipalities so that they would lose their - call it what you will, but they were concerned even if their problems are of perhaps minor nature compared to many of the other municipalities, to them those problems were just as genuine, and just as large, as many of the larger problems to other municipalities. And while perhaps their basic beefs were drainage, wildlife damage, and road building, and the like, I think we got the message clear that they needed a little bit more money; they wanted a little bit more financial help, but they were willing to carry on at very minimal costs, or indemnities, so that they could keep their way of life, and I think that message was put very clear to us.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I said I would be brief. I want to bring up a few things. One of the things that concerns me is the fact that some of the municipal people that are elected today regardless - and very often they get elected because they are a popular person in a certain municipality, or well known. Whichever way they get elected is not my concern, my concern is once they get elected if they are really qualified as far as dealing with the many problems that beset a municipality today. And I would like to suggest to the Minister, Mr. Chairman, that perhaps ways and means could be found where there has been a start already made as far as a training for secretary-treasurer and the like. I think this is good, but I think we should go further because we have to go further I believe because some of the people that get elected with the best of intentions, and I've seen councillors in one or two years, with the best of intentions, do not understand many of the problems, and I don't mean the local problems, I mean the over-all jurisdiction problems, that I think somewhere down the line whether someone be paid by the municipality, or somebody Provincial Government, I think more effort should be made that a setup, a type of education, or a type of training be made available to these people because they mean well, they are genuine people, and I think they would like to be better informed so that

(MR. BARKMAN cont'd) they could handle their jobs in a better way.

I would also - I was going to before, I'm not so sure if I should or not, I realize there's not too much time left, and perhaps there's others that want to speak, but I want to make this very clear to the Minister, and I'm sure he is aware of the fact that the things that municipal people have to do to keep communities together today, the responsibility is becoming frightening in certain municipalities. And I know that he's aware of this, and I know that very much could be said on this subject. I don't know how much time I should take. I believe that he is aware of some of the conditions that will have to be changed; some of the responsibilities will have to be taken off their backs, or they cannot exist. I think we all know that as far as the Federal Government's responsibility, or for that matter the Provincial Government's responsibility, somewhere seems to fall back and land up at the last doorstep of the municipal doorstep, and somehow the municipal people are held responsible to some extent regardless of what breed of government may be in power either federally or provincially, but somewhere the last complaint seems to fall into the hands of the municipal people.

Mr. Chairman, I was going to bring up one fact - the Member for Rock Lake who touched on it slightly - there still is a concern, especially rurally, in the rural areas as far as the possibility of the change of boundaries. I know there hasn't been much said about it the last year or so, and perhaps it is better that we don't talk about it, but if there are intentions I wish the Minister would elaborate on that point, and if there are no intentions I wish he would again verify that at this time whatever the condition or situation may be.

I was going to bring up one point, and that refers to annexation of properties around certain towns. I do not at this time intend to bring up any specific problem of any particular town or village, but I think generally speaking when you look at Section 13 of the Municipal Act, I think you'll find that when you talk of 750 people for 480 acres, or when you talk of 1,500 people for 640 acres, I believe it is, and 100 people for each additional 20 acres, I think in our modern day of planning that should at least take place, and our modern day of some of the problems that befall some of these villages and towns, I think that some consideration should be given in the near future to take a close look at this. I don't believe that this can be done overnight but I think there are many cases where a town could have been better planned for that matter; well this section doesn't refer to city, so I can't say city, so I must say town or village. I think some of the towns when they start off, or the villages start off, they just aren't aware of some of the problems that they're going to be falling into a little later. And I believe that it isn't only a matter of the acreage being too small, or the number of people being too large for the small acreage, it's a matter of overall planning. And I sincerely wish that the Department of Municipal Affairs would take a look at this, and I think we could avoid a lot of hard feelings between rural and so-called urban municipalities in the future. And I think the Minister is aware, and I'm sure many of the members here are aware, that this has been causing a lot of ill-will between people that really usually get along together fine, are no problem at all till somebody is supposed to give up some of their revenues they received.

So with this, Mr. Chairman, I have a few questions that I want to ask as we go along. I think some of the other fellows' feet are itching so I shall sit down.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE (Roblin): Mr. Chairman, thank you. Very briefly, Mr. Chairman, I shall not respond to the arrogant illiteracy of the Member for Osborne. I don't think it's worth a reply. The boorish tactics of this Member for Osborne are not even worth debate and I shall not respond at all because he named me today as one, and I shall not respond because I don't think it deserves . . .

Mr. Chairman, I think we are in one of the departments that deserves a lot of serious consideration, in especially rural Manitoba. We are trying to debate the Estimates of this Minister who proposes to spend some \$90 million, and I don't think in the years that I've been a rural MLA have I seen more problems amongst the municipalities of this province than I have today. And it's quite simple the reason that the municipalities have got no leadership from this Minister today because he is devoting all his time to Autopac and housing. And I think everybody in this province knows that. Since the day that Minister took office he's never gave the municipalities of this province any guidance, or a leadership, or wisdom, because he's been hung up from day one on Autopac and Housing, and every reeve that I spoke to in my jurisdiction says the same thing. And again I appeal to the First Minister, let's get yourself a full-time Minister of Municipal Affairs. Get somebody that will help the people of rural Manitoba -- and

(MR. McKENZIE cont'd) I'll document my facts. And here we have the first one. The church in Ethelbert's up for sale, a tax sale. The Minister knows about that, but there it is on the tax - it's up for taxes. Now what guidance or wisdom has this Minister gave to those people in this difficult problem they have to resolve. He apparently hasn't responded at all. I have had occasion to have correspondence with the Minister over the various little halls out in my constituency. Elks hall, the Masonic hall, these places are all going up for taxes because there's no way that these people can afford the luxury of the taxes that have been charged to them today. And I happen to be a member of some of these clubs. I pay taxes on my store; I pay taxes on my house, but why do I have to pay taxes because I have to belong to a lodge or a club. So I'm paying maybe four or five times school taxes. And this is - I got the replies from the Honourable Minister and he said, we are not prepared to open up the Assessment Act this year, ta da ta da, and that's fine. --(Interjection)-- Oh, when I'm finished I would, because we haven't got much time, another what? 30. But it's only 30 minutes, and we're never going to get a reply from the Minister, and this this is the unfortunate - and if the First Minister will bear with me, this is what we are trying to get across to the government today where your back-benchers are taking up the - I think in the Estimates we are the ones that should examine the Estimates of the Minister, if you'd give us the time to do it, but no, they react over there like just everybody stands up so we never do get a chance to - and it's most unfortunate, because we'll never get the policy of this government on the table because the Minister doesn't get a chance to respond to all the many questions we like to ask. I'll talk on a bill . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: A question has been raised by the Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Chairman, I understand that the Honourable Member for Roblin is referring to a letter which was written by the Minister of Municipal Affairs dealing with the question of taxation on non-profit organization buildings, Elks Club halls, and so on, and I'm wondering if the honourable member will table that letter since the matter of taxing, municipal taxation of Elks Club Halls, and Lions Club Halls, and so on, was a practice initiated by the previous Conservative Government, was it not?

MR. McKENZIE: I have no quarrel with the statement of the -- and I'll certainly table the letter. I've got a lot of my stuff wrote on it and queued in. I've no quarrel with that, but in those days these people didn't have those problems, Mr. First Minister. You did --(Interjection)-- Did you hear in those days that the church in Ethelbert's up for tax sale? No, you didn't. Did you hear in those days that the Elks' Hall and the Masonic Halls and the Curling Clubs these various clubs were up for tax sale? No, you didn't hear it in those days. You didn't hear it in those days because that government knew what was going on and provided those people with a tax base they could afford. And it's quite --(Interjection)-- No. And you'll have your chance to respond. Again, Mr. Chairman, there is another example of why we can't get the policy of this government on the record. It's impossible. Cause they will not let us be heard. They will not let us ask our questions. It just keeps coming up, and coming up, so we'll never get the record of this government on, or their policy. I again appeal to the Minister of Municipal Affairs for gosh sake get out around this province, forget about Autopac and housing and look after some of the problems of the municipalities in this province that are that high because they got no Minister.

He's running around like a redeyed socialist with his housing philosophy and his Autopac philosophy. Spending all his time - in all sincerity, the record is right there in the Gazette. The last issue of the Gazette, if that's not enough evidence that we need a new Minister of Municipal Affairs, then I don't know what you can understand, Mr. First Minister, I really don't. Or this response that I got to this problem. And sure all these little halls and community and church . . . So what's going to happen? They're taxed out of business, so the town is going to have to take them over. The town can't take them over, the city, or the village. Because they are going to have to pay all those taxes that are charged abainst that property. That's going to come out of Tom, Dick and Harry that lives right in that village. And they're going to have to pay all the services that are provided for those buildings. And it's got to a stage today that it's - it's unbelievable that this Minister, three years sitting over there, hasn't done a damn thing. Absolutely nothing. He sends me a letter here and he says, since there was a revision of the Municipal Assessment Act last year it's unlikely to be subject to minor amendments this session. Now what kind of a Minister is that, that's not prepared when we have the most serious problems that we've had in this province for 20 years. He's not prepared to open up the Act this session. For why? Are you scared? Are you scared to deal with these problems

(MR. McKENZIE cont'd) that are real and country people are so concerned about it. Go and talk to these people that I wrote the letters to. Go talk to them some day instead of chasing a wild dream of public housing and Autopac, and get with the problems of the people of this province. And, Mr. Premier, in all sincerity I say to you go someday and have a talk with this Minister and get him off those wildeyed dreams that he's got and deal with the municipal affairs of this province, or otherwise disaster. Certainly. Let me ask you, Mr. Minister - I'll ask you on the matters of these municipalities. How come the Advisory Board of the Welfare Department overrides the decisions of the municipalities? Have you told him how to handle that one? No, he hasn't said a word. Not one word. The Welfare Appeal Board can override the decisions of a Municipality, Mr. Chairman, and I regret that. What about the small municipalities like the Municipality of Ethelbert with the unlimited problems they have today. Has the Minister been out to help them solve them? No way. He's chasing housing, drains and Autopac all over the province and answering questions and trying to solve that problem. What about the school divisions, the problems with small school divisions in this province, where the Minister should be giving those some guidance? No, he doesn't appear. Again he's hung up on a housing program on an Autopac question or something that he doesn't even know anything about in the first place; and here we have those people trying to solve those problems by themselves. And he has a good staff in his department, Mr. First Minister; the Department of Municipal Affairs is one of the best staff that we've had in all the civil service of this province but you have got to put a Minister in that desk to give those people the wisdom and the guidance that they need.

What about assessment? I don't think there is a member in this Legislature today that isn't concerned about assessment, even our friends from Saskatchewan - may I welcome my friend from Saskatchewan, Mr. Chairman, - I was born and raised there and I was over and spoke to the gentleman briefly - and I welcome you to Manitoba and have a good time in this great province.

But, Mr. Chairman, in all sincerity, I will not delay any longer with my remarks, we need a Minister in this province that will help the municipalities to get out of the problems they are in today and they are manifold. Just go around and visit them and see the special meetings, the extra meetings that are held to try and handle this tax base that they are strangled with today. How long can we pay all these school taxes and the assessments that are going on in these municipalities? But the Minister sits back and he chuckles over there and he smiles and he dreams about his housing program and his Autopac philosophy and he's forgot about these people who are real country people, Mr. First Minister, and I submit if you can't get this Minister to do something, get yourself another Minister.

Now I'll deal very briefly with Autopac and of course the way that the Minister smiles, he talked about you know this new plush - and I'm reading from the Hansard, Page 20 - expensive and plush, that's where he's going to go - first class. And I invite all the members of this Chamber to go down and take a look at that pad he's got down in 330 Portage Avenue; that's expensive, boy, and that's plush. That's what he wants - first class. We don't know what it cost, but I'll tell you the carpet's that thick and it's a real plush expensive place and you read Hansard page 2143 where he used that terminology at great length, and I understand his wisdom.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. PAWLEY: The Honourable Member for Roblin is attempting to leave the impression by taking three or four words out of Hansard that I referred to the central offices of Autopac as being expensive and plush - no such reference was made by me; my reference was to the offices of the Insurance Bureau of Canada.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Chairman, I only have two more remarks before I sit down. Again the Honourable Minister, if he had been out dealing with the problems of the municipalities of this province, but here he gets off in a dream the other day - and he said the delegations from Quebec and Nova Scotia came here for one reason only, that's to deal with this great Autopac wisdom he's raised up - what a dream! Those guys have been all over this country - they've been in the United States and they have been all over the world and they are not going to table reports for another what - 15 months. He tried to put in the record here deliberately the other day, Mr. Chairman, the fact they came to Manitoba for one reason only, and that's to listen to him - what a dreamer. What a Minister, Mr. First Minister - what a Minister you've got over there.

(MR. McKENZIE cont'd)

Mr. Chairman, in all sincerity, those are a few questions I'd like to ask and I'm sure they'll be in the record.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister ...

MR. PAWLEY: At no time did I indicate in this House or other places within this province that any representatives from the Province of Quebec came to this province to speak to me about Autopac.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Roblin. The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. ARTHUR MOUG (Charleswood): I just have one or two brief ...

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. The Honourable First Minister. Does he have a - wish to answer a question? The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, I wanted to ask the honourable member - since apparently I will not have an opportunity to speak at this time, I would like to ask him if he is aware that the members of the executive of the Union of Manitoba Municipalities have been most definite in their request that the incumbent Minister of Municipal Affairs be retained as Minister of Municipal Affairs because of their satisfaction with his performance.

MR. McKENZIE: I am not aware of that statement. I haven't got a copy of it. I'd like to examine it. If the First Minister has some evidence of it, I'd like a copy of it very much.

MR. SCHREYER: I'm telling the honourable member in a flat-out way right here and now that I have been conveyed such a request from the officers of 1971 of the Union of Manitoba Municipalities including Messrs. Chapman and Bob Adrian.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Chairman, I'd be pleased if the First Minister would share that document with me. I really would.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, I have just indicated that to the honourable member and as he well knows if you make a categorical statement without the equivocation and qualification and he under parliamentary form should take my word for it.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Chairman, on the same point of order ...

MR. CHAIRMAN: ... any member in this House should doubt the word of another honourable member.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Chairman, on the same point of order, the First Minister asked me to document my facts about a certain letter which I have already put in the record. So I asked him to put his record on the table so that I can read it as well.

MR. SCHREYER: I am quite prepared to deal with taxation patterns over the last 20 years. I have some here from the home quarter in which I was born. It would be interesting. I'm sure the honourable member would find it very ...

MR. McKENZIE: ... point of order again. I'd like the First Minister to document this letter, or so-called, that he's got from the Union of Municipalities of this province and I'd like a copy of it very much, Mr. Chairman.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman ...

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable First Minister on the point of order.

MR. SCHREYER: Perhaps I shouldn't attempt to find fault with the Honourable Member for Roblin but the very clearly understood form of parliamentary procedure is that when an honourable member makes a flat, unqualified categorical statement as to what was imparted to him by another gentleman then under parliamentary form the honourable member is obliged to take one's word for it.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Chairman, I tabled my document. Now the First Minister, has he permitted to table his?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Do you think it would be possible for some arrangement to be made to acquaint the honourable member with the long standing forms of parliamentary procedure.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, I shall endeavour to find a section and draw it to the attention of the honourable member. I am sure that honourable members are well aware that a statement made by any honourable member in this House is accepted as ... The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. MOUG: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I intend to be brief - and undoubtedly after those several exchanges of words between the First Minister and the Member for Roblin I think I can deliver what I have to in less time than they took to straighten out who was going to be who.

(MR. MOUG cont'd)

I was out of the House when the Minister introduced his Estimates in regards to the \$10 million on unconditional grants which is an increase of \$2,500,000 and I hope that he'll give us another word on that as he is up answering, just a brief answer to this. I know it's to do with the University of Manitoba for instance where they get -- it's somewhat like a grant in lieu of taxes. I want to mention a word on the grant in lieu of taxes because for the fiscal year that we're dealing with for 73 the grant in lieu of taxes is four million seven hundred and some odd thousand dollars. I asked this question last year, tried to get it clarified from the then Minister responsible for Urban Affairs, the Finance Minister. It was in the grants then; there was \$1,750,000 in the Urban Affairs estimates and in the Municipal there was \$3,289,000 for a total of five million and something like 40 thousand dollars. Now I questioned why that great increase came in there for one year, and the answer I got from the Minister of Finance at the time was because with the new City of Winnipeg being created that he wanted to make payments throughout the year, month by month rather than make them wait for one payment at one particular time. And I did ask the Minister of Municipal Affairs why it had increased from 1971 to 1972 figures of 1971, the grant in lieu of taxes was just under the three million dollar mark, so close to three million dollars that it doesn't matter. And I can understand the ten percent increase up to \$3,289,000 because ten percent in twelve months is easy to understand with today's inflationary style of things happening. Everything is going up ten percent. So I would wonder why in 1972 we're looking at a figure of \$5,039,000 and 73 suppose you added ten percent to that you'd be up to five and a half million, but we're down to \$4,700,000.00. So I wonder why at that time the Minister of Finance couldn't explain to me. He said to the Chairman that he's having trouble having me comprehend. Well I have as much trouble trying to get him to comprehend as he has getting me to comprehend so on that basis maybe this Minister can explain to me if he has the three estimates; that why the great increase in the 72 fiscal year, and it's dropped back down now to less than \$5 million.

The Minister and myself have had some little dispute over housing and I just glanced through the housing and rules -- Corporation statutes and it says in here: "Limitation on Board's recommendation". And it's very brief, Mr. Chairman, and I want to read it into the record: "The Board shall not" -- 26 subsection 2 -- "The Board shall not recommend that a low rental housing project be undertaken unless it is satisfied (a) that the proposed project is required." Now should we have housing and should we be out buying property? Should we be building more low cost housing when we have empty low cost housing now? That is my argument and I say that we shouldn't take these people that seem to gather in low cost housing and seem to -- I don't want to say breed laziness into an area like that but they somewhat give the appearance by the way they let the housing they're living in deteriorate; they don't cut the grass, they don't paint the fences, they are inclined to let it slide a little bit because the entire area, the area they're living in is somewhat less admirable should I say to that that you and I live in. And I say that if we would take these people, mix them throughout the several municipalities throughout the city, throughout the province and put them in a position where they can look at the fence on your place that has been painted and the fence on my place that has been painted and possibly give them some initiative to do something with theirs.

We ran through this cycle years ago - we ran through this cycle years ago - we ran through this cycle years ago right from Main Street right over to the Mall here where this building sits on everything from the river right through to Portage Avenue. We go into the Point Douglas area of today, there's still a good many of those terrace buildings sitting there. And I wouldn't be surprised if you dated them back to 1950/1920 that they were probably put together by some government housing and the people that moved in there had no respect or showed no respect for the outsides of their buildings and those buildings have only disappeared simply because commercial and industrial people have moved in there and bought these buildings up and torn them down. And we're going back into the same cycle now. You look at Fort Osborne Barracks. And if the Minister -- I don't answer questions while I'm up speaking, no, under no circumstances. You'll have your time to stand up and if you're going to make statements like you've been making in the past then I'm going to dig out a Hansard here as soon as I can find them and redder your face by the time you're up speaking. And go into Fort Osborne Barracks and I'll guarantee anybody within ten years with all the money that's been spent in there exactly what's going to happen.

The Minister and his department moved out into Charleswood there - about five sites and

(MR. MOUG cont'd) one of them's on the riverbank, and it's a damn disgrace to think that they go in there alongside of a 45,000/50,000 dollar house; they go alongside of a million and a quarter investment in a special care home for senior citizens; and they want to build on ten acres of property something like they've put on Fort Osborne Barracks and just downgrade that area something terrible. The people who are there hoping to live out their last few lives in those senior citizens' homes and special care home with some quiet and some enjoyment, and they're not going to get it. There's booze being moved into there now - and fortunately they were a little late on their rezoning; they by-passed all the regular channels; they never went near the municipality of that day; they never went to Metro with it. They simply went right behind the whole thing and tried to have it rezoned behind the blinds where the public wouldn't know anything about it. And I hope that the Minister gives second thoughts to this. Municipal Affairs Department is a big enough department without shooting housing and Autopac in there. There's no way the Minister can handle those three jobs. He's goofed on two of them and let's hope he keeps at least the Municipal Affairs section of his department buoyant and going. Certainly Autopac has proved to be a failure - and housing he's just running wild with it and willing to put it in any area. Mr. Chairman, while I was in this House sitting in this chair the then Minister of Highways, the now Member for Thompson got up and accused this side of the House or some of its members as being a pimp for the insurance industry and accused the insurance industry of being parasites on the people of Manitoba. And I sat here and heard it - I have not had the chance . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order. We have just concluded a statement that the Honourable Member for Fort Garry has not been able to document. Now is the Honourable Member for Charleswood prepared to document the statement that the Honourable -- some honourable member of this House said that the members of the insurance industry were parasites?

The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Chairman, on that point of order. Just a moment ago the First Minister said that when a member makes a statement in this House it must be accepted by all honourable members. That is a principle that has been adopted for a long time in parliaments across Canada. That was a statement just made by the Premier.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. Can I just -- I have looked up the section and for the Honourable Member for Morris and the Honourable Member for Roblin I wish he would take heed -- the Honourable Member for Roblin -- Citation 145 of Hansard! It has been formally ruled by Speakers in the Canadian Commons that a statement by an honourable member respecting himself and peculiarly within his own knowledge must be accepted. But it is not unparliamentary to temperately criticize statements made by a member as being contrary to the fact. But no imputation of intentional falsehood is permitted. A statement made by a member in his place is considered as made upon honour and cannot be questioned in the House or out of it. But that does not deal with statements dealing with what other members said. The Honourable Member for Charleswood I would suggest that he withdraw that remark.

MR. MOUG: I intend to, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek wishes to make remarks to the Chair, I wish he would stand in his place and be recognized and make them. The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. MOUG: I would certainly, Sir, take heed to what you say undoubtedly and . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: That is not the point. I said to the honourable member he withdraw the remark that some honourable member in this House said members of the auto insurance industry were parasites. He either produce the facts or withdraw the remark. I'm asking the honourable member to produce the facts or withdraw the remark.

MR. MOUG: I'm going to have trouble answering you, Mr. Chairman, if you won't be quiet, but I'm going to say to you that I will . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order! Order!

MR. MOUG: Shut up!

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am asking the honourable member once more, is he prepared to withdraw the remark? ORDER! The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. MOUG: Do I have a minute to explain to you when . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am asking the honourable member to withdraw the remark.

MR. MOUG: I can't.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: May I suggest to the Chair that the Chair was faced with precisely the same problem at 2:30 and at that time I thought the matter had been adequately resolved in the sense that the Member for Fort Garry had indicated that he would withdraw the remark, and if he did find specific evidence in Hansard to substantiate his remark he would then be free and it was agreed, would be free to introduce his charge or contention de novo and I should have thought that this would be an appropriate arrangement insofar as the acceptable to the Member for Charleswood to the Chair of course as well. However, I see that the Member for Charleswood has withdrawn and so therefore perhaps the matter is no longer a moot point.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, ...

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I could ask for a privilege here. I have to appear with one of the members of the government very shortly and I had a very few minutes on one item I wanted to introduce.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, the only thing I would say to the honourable member so we have an understanding, many many points have been raised and I have yet to have the opportunity to respond to those points. I believe the time for my Estimates close at 4:15. I don't know how long the honourable member intends to --(Interjection)-- only half an hour apparently left. I can only speak 30 minutes, I don't know how long the honourable member intends to speak.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Chairman, thank you very much. I don't intend to speak at any length. I do however have one matter that I wanted to introduce during the Minister's Estimates. It is a matter that has come up in the House before. There's been made reference to by a member of the government's backbench with regard to my position on Public Housing and I have been taken seriously out of context, but I do not want to deal with that problem. I want to deal with the true context of the problem which I raised in my own constituency and which has been examined and commented on by a number of people.

Mr. Chairman, the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation has done some valuable work that all of us recognize particularly in supply of housing for low income people. We know that there are some abuses of it, this is probably bound to happen. We do have some concerns to the extent that the public sector is taking over the private sector in this respect. But the point that I want to raise that I think should be brought to the Minister's attention is the fact that I think that his Housing and Renewal Corporation has in some respects gone too far. We have a particular example in St. Vital where the Housing and Renewal Corporation with autocratic authority went in and purchased 18 acres of land, probably the most beautiful river property that's available in St. Vital -- well outside or outside at least the service area of the city. And, Mr. Chairman, the property was not purchased, the property was not purchased for public housing.

What the Housing and Renewal Corporation did was that they took the land, they paid \$100,000 roughly for this piece of land, they went to the Planning Division of the Metropolitan Corporation and met with opposition from the local city council, the local school board and the local citizens, none of whom had been consulted on this. They went to the Planning Authority of Metro and asked them to rezone this land for development purposes. It would have required bus service, added schooling facilities, added municipal services and would have put some tax onto the local municipality. This was in 1971 before the Unicity came in. With the protest of the local citizens, the school board and the council, none of whom had been consulted with, the Metropolitan Corporation turned it down. Well not being satisfied the Housing and Renewal Corporation came back and realized that they now had the authority to bypass everybody. They had the authority to bypass the Planning Division of Metro and they could go to the Municipal Board and get this approved and they approached this step with the conviction that they were going to get this approval. They halted at that point.

But the point is, Mr. Chairman, that that land was not for low income housing, that was a middle income housing project, it was land that was purchased by the government agency with financial support of the Federal Government and was to be turned over in total once all the hurdles were cleared to the private developing co-operative that was going to develop it. Well, Mr. Chairman, the co-operative, so-called, that was going to develop it is really no different than any other group of people, that they are just a group of people with an interest, a personal interest in building a home, which is the same as everybody else is in that so desires to build

(MR. CRAIK cont'd) . . . his own home. But it was not low income. The income bracket was seven to ten thousand dollars which in Manitoba qualifies as middle income. And the government was running interference for this group, went so far as to buy the land, try and clear the hurdle, bypass the municipalities, bypass the school board, were prepared to walk over the protest of the local citizens, develop the land or not develop it, when it was all done, turn it over to the group for development.

Mr. Chairman, this is not the role of the Housing and Renewal Corporation and this is my one criticism that I wanted to level at this time, is that the Housing Renewal Corporation has bought up acres and acres and sections of land in the Metropolitan area. This is only one example. They also had land in the service area of St. Vital, well within the service area of St. Vital, packages of land that were just as big, more readily available but had that one missing feature, it wasn't the most beautiful piece of river property that could be found in the area and this was. But there was land, there was good land available. It wasn't necessary to go outside the planned area of the city but they did it and with no reference, with no real reference to any of the bodies that had been built up with hard work and hard effort for the planned location of schools, playgrounds, busing facilities and municipal services. No real look to see whether any of these things that had been planned over many years of hard work by the local governments would be adhered to.

This is the request I want to level to the Minister. I know he's a person who brings a great deal of zeal to his work. I don't say I agree with him in the direction that he takes, and in this particular case I would ask him to look at this seriously because I think that the Housing Renewal Corporation is not playing a legitimate role when it is running interference for the development of land for other than the low income group. The middle income group can look after itself and he's distorting the logical development pattern that was set up through the Unicity, through the Metropolitan Corporation and through the local school board authorities and I would ask him to seriously ask his people to draw in their horns in purchasing all this land and then turning it around for purposes which might be similar to this particular example. Because I think it's outside the intention of the Housing and Renewal Corporation to be providing this sort of service to prospective home builders.

..... continued on next page

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Chairman, I want to deal at some length with various comments that have been raised. Before I do start though with my comments I want to say that I find the remarks by the Honourable Member for Charleswood vulgar and I would prefer not to deal with them at all.

Insofar as the various aspects are made, I hear another interjection from the Honourable Member from Morris, it was only a short time ago that he was trying to put me in place. I would suggest rather than point his finger at members opposite, that he ought also sometimes to point the remaining four fingers back at himself.

The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek last night dealt at some length on various aspects of the program pertaining to this department and two main areas of criticism emerged insofar as the Housing Program was concerned. I was rather surprised that the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek should in fact take the stance that he had without properly eliciting information. He made reference in the House last night to the fact that we had some way or other proceeded with work under Section 26 (2) of the Housing Act and that work had proceeded under that section without any reference to the Board of the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation. He made a great play about this last night. Let me say to you, Mr. Chairman, that it's just astonishing these type of remarks because not one unit, not one unit has been built under that section of the Housing Act and for him to have spent ten minutes or more suggesting that large massive housing projects had been built under Section 26 subsection (2) of the Housing Act is just pure nonsense. Not one unit has been built under that section.

Insofar as St. Norbert, this was also very interesting reference by the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek. He said that we had built large numbers of units in St. Norbert and criticized those units. He said that they demonstrated the weakness, the poorness of the entire program of the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation and the government of Manitoba. Again the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek failed to do his homework, not one unit of housing has been built in St. Norbert by the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation. I would like to make that very clear, very clear, mistake number two.

The fact is that the St. Norbert example that the honourable member made a great deal of brilliant reference to last night is a reference to another project that was built in St. Norbert; a project which was built by private enterprise which was built under a program of the Federal Government under its \$200 million innovative Housing Program. A private enterprise project, that's the project the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek was attacking so vehemently last night, thinking that he was attacking the program of the Manitoba Housing Renewal Corporation. And let me point out that the project in Park La Salle in St. Norbert, which the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek made reference to, is a clear example of the type of housing program that I would hope this government would never attempt; a program in which 212 units were built, 40 of those units still remain unsold since 1970, that's where your vacancies are. Of course there are vacancies and the vacancies are in respect to those type of projects. The honourable member went on with great vigor in the House last night to say that we had all kinds of vacancies in our housing projects while he's looking at the St. Norbert Housing project, the La Salle project. Sure there's 40 vacancies out of 200 and some, not Manitoba Housing Renewal Corporation vacancies at all but vacancies in a project built by private enterprise. And I would be very interested that the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek somewhere along the way would attempt to explain his remarks of last evening in respect to this particular program. The only regrettable thing, Mr. Chairman, that sometimes statements such as this are taken seriously by members of the public thinking that honourable members know that which they are talking about.

Now if I could proceed - some references have been made to projects being undertaken. The suggestion has been left by some members opposite that some way or other the Manitoba Housing Renewal Corporation proceeds in some strange sort of way that they don't respond to the normal processes of law and that buildings are undertaken without proper zoning and what not. And the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek made reference to this last night - and let me tell the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek that no building, no building whatsoever has been undertaken in Charleswood, as he said last night, or in any other area without proper zoning having been completed, without proper zoning. To date very few of the projects undertaken by the corporation have required any rezoning prior to construction. The corporation has throughout abided by zoning regulations and requirements, the same requirements as would be expected of any other private entrepreneur that would be proceeding with any housing development.

(MR. PAWLEY cont'd) I can't help but note that when the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek was making reference to empty units, I think I should advise him that at the present time there are no empty units. The only empty units we have are units that are involved in transition periods in respect to turnovers, notice requirements by tenants moving in or pending cleaning or repairing of units themselves. We have a waiting list of close to 2,000 people who are wanting to move into low rental units but there are not rental units for them to move in at the present time, and that that total is increasing by approximately 200 per month. So any suggestion that there are massive vacancies is just pure nonsense.

Reference was made to - suggestion that we had overbuilt. The fact is that in the period 1961 to 1969 under the period of responsibility by the former government, some 27,000 units, living units were constructed in the Province of Manitoba; much of this construction was done in the period 1968/69. Of those units only 1,000 were units that were designed and built for purposes of serving low income people. It was in 1969 that as a result of pressures from the -- namely from the Federal Government of that day, that the banking institutions released sizeable sums of money so that there could be a rapid increase in the development of high rises, luxury apartments, in the Province of Manitoba. The present vacancy rate insofar as those type of projects are concerned from the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation survey of December 31st, 1971, show that apartments completed between July, 1970, and June, 1971, have a 15 percent vacancy rate, whereas all units built prior to July, 1970, have a vacancy rate of 4.3. The survey shows that high rise apartments built with 200 units and over had the highest vacancy rate, 17.2 percent. Apartments with 100 to 199 units have a vacancy of 8.3, and this can be contrasted to a vacancy of only 3.9 insofar as apartment blocks with less than 100 units. So the walk-in apartment blocks have the smaller rate of vacancy. What there is lacking presently in the province, in the city itself, is units of three, four and five bedrooms with rents of a reasonable level that can accommodate low income people. The market was overbuilt insofar as one and two bedroom apartment units that were designed to -- with high rentals, the market was saturated during that period. And I want to say this because there's been quite a bit of comment about housing, that I think this contrast, probably the approach in attitude of two different governments, the government of 1961 to 1969 days that permitted a massive building program in this province; a building program that well over 90 percent of the units were units that according to Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation standards would only be feasible for those earning 8,000 and over in income to move into, compared in that same period of time of only 1,000 units for those of low income, as contrasted to the present policy of this government. And I think it's rather astonishing that the directions, if we were to take them seriously, from members of the Opposition would take us back to those old days of 1961-69 and the resulting high vacancy rates in an area of housing that would not serve the great need of housing that presently exists in the province. I want to say last night, for instance, as the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek spoke, eight people were in the gallery that were members of a tenants' association, and they heard the honourable member make reference to the fact that we were overbuilt, that there were a lot of vacancies about the City of Winnipeg. Shortly after 9:00 o'clock that same group met with me and one of their opening remarks was their sheer amazement, sheer amazement -- talk about somebody living in a dream world -- that the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek was living in such a dream world. They were living in no dream world, Mr. Chairman, they were living in the world of reality. They knew the problems that low income people were having presently in finding accommodation in the City of Winnipeg, and they didn't need the remarks from the Honourable Member of Sturgeon Creek suggesting to them that there was no problem now, that there was an over-abundance of buildings and vacancies in the City of Winnipeg.

The Honourable Member for Rhineland asked a question insofar as the subsidy that would be paid -- what was that subsidy costing the Province of Manitoba. The total subsidy cost - 1972 to 1973, \$2.8 million. The provincial share of that subsidy, \$1.3 million. Now I think I should mention to the honourable member that there are a number of things that should be considered at the same time that reference is made to that subsidy. The first is that 90 percent of all capital costs of course are derived from the federal people and that of each million dollars spent on housing in the Province of Manitoba, in the neighbourhood of 70 to 80 jobs are created, and the resulting income tax and corporation tax returned to the province as a result of housing construction. The second thing is that the units pay full municipal taxation and thus do make available substantial revenues there to the municipality. So that not so speak, not to speak of the other hidden factors that exist, cost to society as a result of poor housing, and I suggest

(MR. PAWLEY cont'd) to you that the subsidy that is paid out is far offset by economic and social factors as a result of the housing program.

I do take exception to the remark of the Honourable Member for Rhineland, no-owner things are not looked after. This is not true. The Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation is the owner and as a public corporation must maintain the dwelling units at least as well as a maintenance program of private owners, and in most cases in excess of that of which will be done by absentee landowners, absentee landlords.

The Honourable Member for Rhineland asked a question as to housing authority members. And just so that I can remove any thought that there is any secret about who the housing authority members are, I'd make reference to Winkler, the members are -- and I'll provide the honourable member with these names afterwards, I have them here, rather than take up the time of the House, except to repeat that they are appointed as a result of the participation of the municipality, the province and the tenants associations. Managers are remunerated at the rate of \$4.00 per unit per month, and I would like next week to have available a complete list of housing authority committee members for members of the House.

I want to say this in closing so far as the Honourable Member for Rhineland's comments are concerned, that there has been quite a bit of interest in his area in public housing and approaches have been made to the province and I would trust that we would have his support given to the local people in his own area through the many requests that have come to us for housing in the constituency. The same thing insofar as the remarks by the Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney. The housing that has taken place in Killarney that he made reference to was mainly senior citizen housing, and I would like to just draw a contrast between the senior citizens' housing that has been provided in Killarney with the rents in the elderly and infirm persons' housing projects. The previous rates under that form of housing, as good a program as it was, in many areas averaged out to \$63.00 for a single person and \$79.00 for a couple. The housing that the Member for Souris-Killarney is making reference to in Killarney, the rental is \$35.00 per month for similar accommodation as the type of accommodation that is provided for senior citizens under The Elderly and Infirm Persons' Act. I am sure that the Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney would agree that this has been a worthwhile step insofar as housing is concerned in Killarney itself.

Last evening the Member for Sturgeon Creek had made references to planning in the Brandon region: I think that a word or two should be said in regard to this. He criticized the Provincial Government for not having implemented the recommendations in the Dulmage Report and he went on to speak of the Municipal Board decision on the proposed trailer park, and reference was also made to that trailer park by the Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney. I might mention that in June of 1971 Reeve Chapman of Daly Municipality, and others representing municipalities in the area, requested a meeting with me in order to discuss planning in the area itself. At that meeting those present took strong exception to being included in the planning area that had been recommended in the Dulmage report. I can say to the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek that if the recommendation in the Dulmage report had been found acceptable to the municipal people in and around Brandon, it would have been acted upon. But they did take strong exception to this. At all times the Municipal Affairs Department is prepared to sit down and to discuss with any number of municipalities the possibility of developing regional planning schemes, and will do all that it can in order to encourage that type of development.

The Honourable Member for Rhineland made some references to the grants system in British Columbia as compared to the grant system here. What he failed to mention to the House, a very very pertinent point, and that is that the grants in British Columbia are only paid to registered homeowners. The grants are not paid to tenants. So that let me say to the Honourable Member for Rhineland that if that program was applied to the Province of Manitoba, he'd be eliminating a very large percentage of Manitobans from receiving any benefit at all in Manitoba from a program that would be similar to that developed in the Province of British Columbia, and I would hope that the Honourable Member for Rhineland was not making that type of recommendation to the government.

The same thing is true in respect to the grant that the honourable member made reference to insofar as senior citizens are concerned. Senior citizens only receive that senior citizen's grant if they are registered titled homeowners in B. C. The senior citizens living in elderly persons' housing or renting, tenants, do not receive that senior citizen's grant and again I'm sure that the Honourable Member from Rhineland would not want to recommend to members of

(MR. PAWLEY cont'd) this House that they should devise a scheme by which the majority of older people in the Province of Manitoba would be eliminated from receiving the benefit. And I want to say this, Mr. Chairman, when I'm on the subject, that despite the wealth and prosperity of the Province of British Columbia, that the honourable member made reference to, it's very much of a surprise I think that any scheme should be devised that a majority of senior citizens should be disenfranchised from taking advantage of. But that's what has happened in the Province of British Columbia in the program that the honourable member made reference to.

The Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney made mention of the assessment of all municipalities in a school division and I think I should point out here that the equalized assessment is designed to look after the differences that may occur during the period when the various municipalities are being reassessed. The increased frequency of assessment will tend to minimize the differences between the equalized assessment and actual assessment arrived at upon reassessment itself. On the question of relating assessment to income from each farm we can only conclude that this is really a form of income tax arrived at through an almost impossible process. And I would suggest that it's much more effective to develop a system of income tax rather than to attempt to experiment with any form of assessment that would relate income of a farm to assessment, that we're better to develop improved methods of developing the income tax, taxing according to ability rather than attempting to mix assessment and tax policy.

The reference was made by the Honourable Member for Rock Lake in respect to the intentions of the government in respect to rural municipalities. I have indicated this on a number of occasions to the municipal people, and I did at the last convention of the Union of Manitoba Municipalities and I think there is no misunderstanding there that the government has no intention of proceeding with legislation that would realign, or increase, or alter, the boundaries of the municipalities in the Province of Manitoba. We encourage the municipal people to discuss this among themselves, to have seminars, and they are doing this at the present time, in fact the word back to me . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister has five minutes.

MR. PAWLEY: The word that I receive is that they are seriously looking at this but from their own point of view, and I think there's been a clear understanding there insofar as the municipal people are concerned in the province.

I want to simply make some very quick remarks here to some of the comments made about public insurance. Before I do the Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney -- I have so many notes from different comments here -- but the Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney made reference to tax sales in Local Government Districts. It's my understanding that tax sales of land in Local Government Districts do not automatically fall to the Crown but in fact the process is similar as tax sales in organized municipalities.

Reference was made to uninsured motorists, that there were still uninsured motorists. And again and again during the process of the insurance debate, repeatedly, we said there would still be uninsured motorists with any system because people would be driving without a driver's permit, without a licence plate. But let me say this to honourable members that the percentage of uninsured motorists in Manitoba has decreased to less than one percent compared to a figure in the vicinity of five to eight percent prior to Autopac, so there's very substantial reduction in the number of uninsured motorists. I doubt whether any other jurisdiction in Canada could point to as low a percentage of uninsured motorists, unless that was Saskatchewan to the west of us.

Reference was made to -- by the Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney -- to Wawanesa. What I would like to comment here is that very little has been said about the extension, or the additional insurance, the insurance when people had the opportunity to choose between whether they purchased from Portage la Prairie, or from Wawanesa, or from Canadian Underwriters' Association, or any one of the other companies and/or from Autopac. The fact is, Mr. Chairman, that in the neighbourhood of 75 percent of the motorists who bought insurance in the Province of Manitoba indicated their preference for coverage from the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation, in the vicinity of 75 percent. I want to also say this, that it was very interesting insofar as the commercial business written by the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation that the large commercial companies in the Province of Manitoba, Autopac obtained the greater percentage of that business. In fact though I'm unable to spell the names of the various companies that did buy on the voluntary basis insurance from the Manitoba Public Insurance

(MR. PAWLEY cont'd) Corporation, the fact is that if those names were read out in this House it would read like a list of Who's Who in the world of commercial business in the Province of Manitoba. So that I say that the commercial, the people that are in the commercial and business life of this province are not taking too seriously the type of comments that we hear across the way, because they're indicating by their choice that they would prefer, insofar as their additional coverage is concerned - a large percentage the majority of their business is being written through the Public Insurance Corporation. I only mention this because the impression is always left that nobody would be dealing with the Public Insurance Corporation hardly at all except for probably a few bomb-throwing socialists, except for the fact that we made insurance compulsory. And I think that honourable members should know that again they're not really speaking in terms of the world of real life insofar as the province is concerned.

I regret very much the aspersions that were cast upon members of the Board of Directors of the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation. I could I suppose cast an aspersion upon a Member of this Legislature that's sitting on the Board of Directors of Wawanesa Mutual Insurance Corporation, the Member for Riel, and ask what experience he has in insurance. I prefer not to do that but I want to say this to honourable members, that the Board of the Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation is an exceptional one. The amount of time that has been devoted by these members to the cause of making it possible for the Province of Manitoba a smoothly running effective program of public insurance is certainly one to be commended and I regret that Sylvan Leipsic was singled out for what I think was a vicious attack by the Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney. I regret very much that he should be exposed to this type of attack based on innuendos. The firm of Aronovich and Leipsic were the exclusive rental agents for the Bank of Montreal Building, appointed by the Bank of Montreal in order to handle the rental of offices in that building. And it was in that way that Manitoba Public Insurance Corporation acquired offices in that building through the exclusive agents for the Bank of Montreal, and no attempt should be made by any members to suggest that the firm of Aronovich and Leipsic had some way or other received some sort of special treatment here.

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

MR. JORGENSON: Mr. Chairman, that's been a rather interesting half hour that we've spent listening to the Minister attempting to justify his opening statements in the face of the criticisms that have been registered by members of this side of the House.

He went through some great pains to attempt to discredit the Member for Sturgeon Creek in relation to comments he made about housing development at St. Norbert. The housing development in question is one that is north of St. Norbert and unless I read the signs incorrectly does contain on a board - indicating that it was a Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation that was involved in the development of that project. In fact there are two of them. There is one west of the highway out near the Fort Garry Fire Hall, or the Municipal Offices; and one east of the highway, and I don't know about the one east of the highway because it's too far away from the road to be able to determine who is responsible for building it. But the one west of the highway, and I'll check it on my way home tonight - I'll check it on my way home tonight, but if it isn't the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation it is some government sponsored housing project. I don't want to quarrel over that; I just want to say that both of them, if they're an example of public housing projects, one looks like Belsen and the other one looks like Dauchau and I've never seen housing developments that looked so much like concentration camps in all my life. But that's neither here nor there.

I was interested in listening to the Minister attempting to justify the government's involvement in the housing development - and the criticism that comes from this side of the House in his involvement in housing is not as he attempted to imply, criticism that comes from members on this side of the House only. Some brief reference was made last night in a two-way document that was presented to the Minister and to the government and on the - on that document is the name of one Jake Schultz, and the people responsible for the writing of this document have some very pungent comments to make about the Minister's program. I just want to put a few of them on the record so that the Minister can be very clear that it is not just the members on this side of the House or just a few people that he has singled out that is in opposition to the Manitoba involvement in housing at a time when according to these people who are supposed to be experts - and I wouldn't for a moment want to question the father-in-law of the Premier whose knowledge in these things would appear to stem from some pretty extensive involvement in the real estate business. And here is what Mr. Schultz had to say: "As the vacancy rate increases apartment

(MR. JORGENSEN cont'd) owners will reach the point of losing money and the pressure on the market will increase. With a vacancy rate being 10.22 percent in Zone 5, 10.79 in Zone 3, and 24.79 in Zone 42 the market price of apartment buildings will reach the point of total collapse in the not too distant future." Well, Sir, I've had some experience with some of the extreme language of Mr. Schultz and that sounds very familiar to me, but nonetheless I sat very quietly while the Minister took up his 30 minutes. I've got five minutes left and I don't intend to be diverted by the Minister. . . And if there ever was an example, Sir, of a government, of a government who refused or deliberately sought to prevent - sought to prevent debate in this Chamber or sought to prevent other people from participating in debate you see it every day on the part of honourable gentlemen opposite.

There was a reference made here today by the Member for Osborne that they were going to take their share of the debate in this Chamber and nobody is denying them that. Except there was one thing that maybe the Member for Osborne doesn't know; and maybe a lot of other members on the other side don't know that when the rule was drawn up dealing with the consideration of Estimates and the allocation of time for Estimates, I did raise that point in the Committee: What if the government members, what if the government by deliberate action sought to, sought to control the debate and prevent criticism of the Minister by getting one member after another coming up and debating. I raised that question in the committee. --(Interjection)-- Well, the Minister, says he assured me it wouldn't have happened. Sir, it has happened. It happened during the consideration of the course of the Estimates of the Department of Health and Social Development. And it happened during the consideration of the Estimates of the Department of Industry and Commerce. And I can tell you right now, Sir, that rule will not remain on the Rule Book during the next session of this Legislature. Because the only way that rule will work, the only way that rule will operate is if the government members recognize that in this particular instance there is a responsibility on their part and a responsibility that they have abdicated; because they have attempted to monopolize time in these debates, debates that admitted by the House Leader himself, and by the Member for Inkster during the course of the consideration of those Estimates on the rules - that that time in essence was time to be allocated to the Members of the Opposition.

Now, then, Sir, Sir - I've only got a few minutes and I don't want to be distracted. I want to continue - I want to continue the remarks on this brief presented to the government. The Minister said that the government were doing such a wonderful thing. Here's something else that was said by Mr. Schultz: "There's just no reasonable explanation why the government should provide high cost new housing with subsidized rent for anyone. Who will live in the old? It cannot supply the low income group with expensive new houses and expect the middle income families to live in the old without protest. And I suppose that's the reason why he has such a high rate of applicants for housing because the ones living in the middle income group are applying for subsidized housing. Or is our Manitoba" - and then he goes on to say this: "Or is our Manitoba society so rich that we can afford to let houses stay empty while we are mortgaging our future. This is exactly what we are doing. The ever increasing vacancy rate is valid proof. This is a waste of resources." Sir, this is the father-in-law of the First Minister that's speaking. A man that one would think with the number of relatives that they've appointed to government positions, one would think that they would have some regard for the opinions of their relatives. But apparently they are very selective in the opinions that they choose to believe, very selective in the representations that are made to them, even by relatives. Then it goes on to say - it's a question: "Is the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation public housing activities in competition with the regular apartment block builders?" And he answers his question this way: "Why is the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation asking such a question in this report? There's no doubt that the activities of the Corporation aren't competition to the building of the rental industry. It has created the following condition." Then he goes on to outline the condition that it has created, and then he finishes up by saying: "It's a waste of resources at an extremely detrimental . . ."

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. Order, please. A point of order has been raised.

MR. PAWLEY: I want to say this, that I have information to the effect that the . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Point of order has been raised. What is the point of order? Order, please. Order, please.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, my honourable friend has been giving us an admonition as to the procedures and the rules of the House. The Honourable the Minister of Municipal

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) Affairs rises on a point of order. You recognized him - then in accordance with the rules that my honourable friend the Member for Morris contributed to arriving at, should sit down.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Chairman, the Minister rises simple to interject into my debate to prevent me from . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. Order, please. Order. Order, please. Order, please. Time allotted for this Department has expired. Committee rise. Call in the Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has directed me to report progress, and asks leave to sit again.

IN SESSION

MR. SPEAKER: 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.

MR. SPEAKER: Private Members' Resolutions the first order of business.

The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, the hour of 4:30 is not arrived at at the present time. We are still under government business. Will you kindly call Bill No. 11.

GOVERNMENT BILLS

MR. SPEAKER: Proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs. The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. PAWLEY presented Bill No. 11 an Act to Amend the Local Authorities Election Act, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would love to proceed on a point of order but I judge it's out of order. The bill before us is mainly one of technical and housekeeping changes to the Local Authorities Election Act. The meaning of "Owner" in the Bill is extended to an occupant of a co-operative housing development in which he is also a shareholder. This will affect his right to vote only in cases where he has been a resident for less than six months but he will be shown on the List of Electors as an owner and not as a tenant. The Revising Officer will be required to sit for the purpose of revising the list of electors during the period between 1:00 o'clock in the afternoon and 9:00 in the afternoon, instead of between 1:00 o'clock in the afternoon and 10:00 o'clock in the afternoon. The statutory three days during which the Revising Officer's required to sit may be reduced by by-law of the local authority to two days or to one day.

This is in response to the urgings of municipal organizations that feel that in many cases a three-day period is much longer than what is in fact necessary.

The Act is brought into line with the Election Act insofar as the appointment by the candidate of an official agent is concerned. An elector who has been appointed Deputy Returning Officer, Poll Clerk, to attend at a polling place other than the one at which he is entitled to vote will be entitled to obtain a certificate allowing him to vote at the polling place where he is to attend on Election Day as an alternative to his present right to vote at the Advance Poll. This reinstates a provision contained in the old Municipal Act.

The length of time that election documents must be held and the nature of these documents is clarified in the Bill.

A candidate for alderman or councillor of a municipality divided into wards will in his declaration be required not only to state the place of his residence but to state that he is a resident of the ward in which he seeks election. Aside from some other typographical corrections this is the full import of the bill before members at the present time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, we have looked at this bill - and the Minister has said it is a housekeeping bill; and there's certainly no objection to the changes regarding the Election Act and we've agreed that anybody who has shared in a condominium should be allowed to vote as an owner because he is basically purchasing a unit which he has the right to sell. So we would agree with this Bill No. 11 and pass it on to - as far as this Party is concerned - on to the Law Amendments Committee.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, would you kindly call Bill No. 15, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING presented Bill No. 15 an Act to amend the Summary Convictions Act for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, the contents of this bill are largely technical and necessary as a result of the extensive amendments that have been made to the Criminal Code of Canada and the purpose of the amendments largely in this Act is to co-ordinate the summary conviction procedures that are followed under the Summary Convictions Act with those now available under the Criminal Code.

A section of the bill deals with definition of parties and in fact incorporates a section of the Criminal Code by way of reference. There's a technical change in respect to the name of the City of Winnipeg. There is an updating of references, two sections of the code, the Criminal Code of Canada. One of the sections in the bill sets out in definite terms the period during which a convicted person is on bail and that time is not to be computed as part of the term of any imprisonment. Largely therefore, Mr. Speaker, the provisions that are embodied in the bill that is before you, Bill 15, are technical and administrative only and in keeping with the changes in the Criminal Code.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We have also examined this bill and I must say it's a bill of necessity. This bill brings the Summary Convictions Act more into line with the Criminal Code; the technical changes of name are all there and I would say as I said before, it's a bill that is of necessity and should be passed on to committee stage.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, would you kindly call Bill No. 32.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING presented Bill No. 32 an Act to amend The Court of Appeal Act for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, earlier on this session, I introduced a bill which has since been passed which embodied similar provisions to Bill No. 32 making provision in the Court of Queen's Bench for a new category of judges known as supernumerary judges. And like provisions are found in Bill 32; and I think that I have indicated the basis on which these changes were made arose from a decision of the Federal Government and passed by parliament changes there to permit supernumerary judges to hold office during the age level of 70 to 75 provided that they had been in office for certain periods of time and so on. I don't think I need to dwell at length.

The other basic change is to make provision in the Court of Appeal for a practice which is now available to the Court of Queen's Bench and that is the delivering of judges without the necessity of there being a formal court convene for the purpose. At the present time the Court of Queen's Bench - the judge may reserve the decision of the Court and subsequently he arrives at a decision, his reasons for judgment are embodied in a typed form and they are released to council when his reasons for judgment are ready. At the present time in order to provide for the giving of judgment, it is necessary for parties in a Court of Appeal action to be formally summoned, that is the council have to be formally summoned and gowned and the judgment has to be delivered in open court. It creates congestion, delay and so on, and the Court of Appeal judges have requested this amendment which seems to make eminent good sense. The only concern that we did have was that any judgment given in respect to an appeal in respect to sentence we felt, I indicated to the judiciary that we felt that the accused person or the person who has been convicted and has appealed his sentence should be personally in court when a decision is made in that kind of an appeal. And they have agreed that as a practice that will always be the case. So the amendments here although rather technical are highly useful and necessary for the good functioning of the court, and I commend them to the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, this apparently is a companion bill to one that was introduced earlier in the session concerning the Court of Appeal. We at that time took no exception to the passage of that bill and we take no exception to the passing of this one in second reading. One has I presume the understanding that this bill will be passed on to Law Amendments, and anyone who may wish to make a representation either for or against the proposals contained in this bill will have the opportunity to do so in Law Amendments - and I presume that the people who would choose to do so would be much more qualified to pass judgment on the contents of this bill than we in this Chamber. So with those few remarks, the Official Opposition is prepared to allow this bill to proceed on to Law Amendments for consideration by the committee and those who may wish to make representation at the time that it is being heard.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, we may go into Private Members' Hour.

MR. SPEAKER: Very well.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR

MR. SPEAKER: Proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for La Verendrye, the Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. BARKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, scolded by the Honourable Member for Assiniboia: "WHEREAS effective January 1, 1972 all Manitoba residents will be required to pay in addition to any succession duties levied by the province a Capital Gains Tax upon their death which will be levied even if their property is not sold; and whereas the operators of small businesses and the owners of farms who wish to pass their farms and businesses to their relatives without being forced to sell same will be seriously impaired on this objective and may be forced to sell their farms and businesses in order to meet the tax bill; and whereas 42.5 per cent of the Capital Gains Tax so collected will be the Provincial Government's share of the Capital Gains Tax; Now THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the government consider" - and I wish to add two words if I may - 'the advisability of' the enactment of a Capital Gains Tax rebate system for farmers and small businessmen estates are required to pay the Capital Gains Tax even though their assets are not sold, and that the Capital Gains Tax rebate be framed in such a manner that the provincial portion of the tax will not be paid until the assets of the deceased are actually liquidated."

MR. SPEAKER: I had intended to indicate that the resolution was not in order but the honourable member offered to include the words "the advisability of" and that would make it in order. The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, may I suggest to you that even if the words "consider the advisability of" were contained in the resolution, it would still be out of order. I raise that question, Sir, because at the present time on our Order Paper we have a bill, Bill No. 5 which is under consideration or has been referred to the Committee of the Whole House to consider and report on that bill. The preamble to the resolution introduced by the honourable member indicates this very fact that we are giving consideration to imposing a Capital Gains Tax which is contained within Bill No. 5. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that one of the rules of this House and other jurisdictions as well, that here a member has an opportunity to raise propositions such as a rebate the application of a Capital Gains Tax is already before the House, that honourable member or the resolution of that honourable member is not in order because he has the opportunity by way of amendment in the Committee of the Whole House to effectively have the House to consider of the proposition. And I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the Honourable Member for La Verendrye will have that opportunity dealing with the consideration of a rebate as proposed in this resolution, he will have the opportunity by proposing an amendment to Bill 5 to achieve his desire. It is historic in respect to death, Mr. Speaker, that there should be no repetition and I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that even with the inclusion of the words "consider the advisability of" in this particular resolution, it is still out of order because the whole proposition of Capital Gains Tax has been referred to the Committee of the Whole House at this present sitting for consideration. I appreciate very much the endeavours of the Honourable Member for La Verendrye, Mr. Speaker, but I must on a point of order raise the question as to the admissibility of the Resolution No. 12 of my honourable friend.

And may I suggest too, Mr. Speaker, that if the point that I am raising at this particular time may in your opinion cause some question as to the admissibility or otherwise, that in all due respect you take the point of order that I now raise under advisement. I am convinced in

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) my own mind that the proposition of the Honourable Member for La Verendrye can be considered at third reading of Bill No. 5. And that - again to repeat the inclusion of consideration of the advisability is not acceptable in a resolution of this nature, because the proposition is before us for consideration and my honourable friend has every right as a member of this Assembly in Committee of the Whole House on consideration of Bill No. 5 dealing with the Succession Duty Act to raise the proposition contained in Resolution No. 12.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. BARKMAN: Mr. Speaker, on that same point of order, first of all the Honourable House Leader mentions the fact that Bill 5 is still on the Order Paper. I think he will also have to agree that it has already been announced that that policy will take place - it will be effective January 1st, 1972. So I don't think that that changes the thing at all, and if it does then we should not have a Bill 5 and a Bill 6. But on the other hand, I think also, Mr. Speaker, that if he reads the resolution quite closely he will find out that as far as Bill No. 5 is concerned it refers to all the people of Manitoba; here, I'm referring to the small business person and the farmer. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I hope that you see fit to allow this resolution.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order, I believe you have already accepted the resolution. You've read it and I feel that the resolution has been accepted.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, on that very point, I was very careful that I rose on my point of order, Sir, before you presented the motion to this Assembly. The mere reading of the resolution by the Honourable Member for La Verendrye does not constitute acceptance either by you or this Assembly of the resolution. It is only at that stage when the resolution is introduced that any honourable member, be he the House Leader or anyone else, has an opportunity of raising a point of order. I did so at my first opportunity and we have not accepted the resolution as proposed by the Honourable Member from La Verendrye. And may I, Mr. Speaker, expand the suggestion as made that the resolution deals with exemptions of certain people or certain industry; the agricultural industry is a small business. In all due respect to the point raised, Mr. Speaker, on the point of order by my honourable friend, I again say that that is a matter that can be raised at consideration in Committee of the Whole House of Bill No. 5, and not by a separate resolution. In all due respect, Sir, if you do not agree with me now I suggest that the subject matter of this resolution should be taken into consideration by yourself as to its admissibility.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, the implication that I gather from the remarks of the House Leader that somehow the bill that is, or the resolution that is now presented by the Member for La Verendrye bears some relationship to Bill No. 5, and Bill No. 5 deals with the Succession Duty Act. Of course, Mr. Speaker, as the House Leader recognizes, it is not incumbent upon members, private members of this Chamber or members in the Opposition in particular, to propose amendments to a bill that involves the balance of Ways and Means and any amendment that would disburbs the balance of Ways and Means would be clearly out of order if brought up during the consideration of Bill No. 5. My understanding is, Sir, that you have tentatively agreed to the acceptance of this resolution and that it was only on the objection -- now one would have thought, Sir . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please. Order, please. I want to indicate one point only, that I was on the verge of accepting it when the point of order was raised. I had not accepted it yet. The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: Well, Sir, it's been perhaps a misunderstanding on my part then, but I was under the impression that when resolutions were placed on the Order Paper that you and your staff took some pains to examine the resolutions as they appeared as to their eligibility for acceptance in this Chamber, so that you'd be prepared to give a decision as to their eligibility when the time arrived for the resolution to be debated. Now I'm not going to quarrel about that particular point. If a decision has not been made as to whether or not this resolution is acceptable I'd simply point out to you, Sir, that contrary to the suggestion made by my friend the Leader of the government, the House Leader, that this matter can be raised as effectively during consideration of Bill No. 5. Let me point out to you, Sir, that Bill No. 5 has been on the Order Paper for some considerable length of time and has not been called and in all probability the intention of the government is to call during the extended hours of sitting, in other words under pressure, under a restricted form of closure. The debate on this measure can take place

(MR. JORGENSEN cont'd) on Private Members' Hour when members feel free to use their own time to debate a measure which they feel are important to them. Sir, I see no relationship to the subject matter of this particular resolution than that which is contained in Bill No. 5 as proposed by the House Leader, and particularly since my honourable friend knows full well that it is not possible for my honourable friend from La Verendrye to move any amendments to Bill No. 5 that would disturb the balance of Ways and Means. He knows that full well and so therefore he's precluded from making the suggestion that is contained in this resolution.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, if I may on the point of order and in reply to the Honourable Member for Morris. I'm sure that he hasn't given full consideration to the points raised by myself as House Leader on this resolution. I do agree with him, and really it's not a point of order, that there may be some concern by honourable members of this House that we have not gone into consideration of Bill No. 5 in Committee of the Whole. And it may be that members are disappointed because it hasn't been called, and I accept that. I accept the responsibility as the House Leader who is charged with the responsibility of the conduct of government business in this House, and will accept the same. But when my honourable friend on the point of order, Mr. Speaker, suggests that it is not within the competence of the proposer of Resolution No. 12 to introduce an amendment to Bill No. 5, it is within the competence not only of the Member for La Verendrye, but also within the competence of the Honourable the Member for Morris, or the Attorney-General, or anyone else as members of this Assembly, Sir, to vote against the provisions of Bill 5, notwithstanding whether or not they propose an amendment. Because each and every section of Bill No. 5, The Succession Duties Act (Manitoba), will be before this Assembly for consideration of each and every section, and it is within the competence without the formal introduction of an amendment, if this is the concern of my friend from Morris, to vote against that particular section. And, Sir, I am not speaking today at this time to use up the time allocated to private members. My whole interest in raising the point of order is to assure the orderly conduct of procedures in this Assembly and I suggest, Sir, that is my responsibility. Again I request that you take this into consideration if you're not prepared to rule on the point of order that I raise.

MR. SPEAKER: I thank the honourable members for their contributions. The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I just have one more point. I understood you to say, Your Honour, that once the words "consider the advisability of" were included the resolution was acceptable. That's right.

MR. SPEAKER: I'll explain to the Honourable Member for Assiniboia. I said that I had considered ruling this resolution out of order but that I am reconsidering it now that the words "consider the advisability of" have been included and at that juncture the Honourable Minister of Labour interrupted on the point of order. So therefore I had not put the motion to the House, and I want that understood clearly, that the motion is not before the House. I am taking the resolution under advisement. We'll go on to the next item which is No. 13. The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. PATRICK: Could we have this matter stand, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: No. 14, The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I would be closing the debate if I was to be speaking. I have introduced the . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Matthews in that case.

MR. JOHANNSON: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I'd simply like to determine whether or not I have the right to continue speaking. I was speaking on this resolution when debate ended the last time the resolution was under consideration and I would like this procedural matter straightened out.

MR. SPEAKER: The member has had 12 minutes. He's entitled to another approximately ten minutes to give him a chance to get his thoughts collected.

MR. JOHANNSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's been a long time since this resolution was under consideration. The previous time the resolution was under consideration I did point out that this government is willing to consider the subject matter of this resolution. It is not willing to accept the resolution as it's worded. I pointed out the fact that in the last NDP convention a resolution very similar to that of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia was passed by the convention. I might also point out that that resolution originated from my constituency, so perhaps the honourable member and I both do have the same concerns, at least in this area for the renovation and repair of housing that is deteriorating.

The member spent a considerable time in the debate, the Honourable Member for Assiniboia, knocking our public housing program and advocating programs to promote home ownership. And I would like to talk briefly on this. I might point out - I pointed out briefly that the Provincial Government already does have several programs that do involve home ownership. The Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation has been building homes for resale; it has been renovating housing for resale; it has been building remote housing, 200 in the last year for sale to low income people; it took part in the financing of a condominium, the first high rise condominium in the City of Winnipeg, and it also has been promoting . . . equity, the development of . . . equity co-ops which are a form of home ownership. However there are limitations to the application of home ownership. For example some people feel that the proposed amendments to the National Housing Act will make public housing programs redundant. Well this is inaccurate. The amendments to The National Housing Act will perhaps, will perhaps remove the necessity of providing public housing for ten percent of the people who are presently being accommodated by public housing, and there's a very simple reason for this. The fact is that people under incomes of 5,000 really can't afford home ownership, and I'd like to, Mr. Speaker, just give a couple of examples to illustrate this. I observed in the Winnipeg Tribune several weeks ago an ad put in the newspaper by Kensington Homes. They were offering home ownership to people in the income range of four to five hundred dollars a month, and what they were proposing was a \$735.00 down payment, \$118.00 PIT, which would in effect give their restrictions regarding the percentage of income that would be permitted on the PIT would - it would mean that the example would fit somewhere close to \$500.00 a month, if the person would have an income of something close to \$500.00 a month. Now that sounds good but when you look at it in a little detail it really doesn't turn out to be that good a deal. Home ownership involves an awful lot of extra expenses, and I'm particularly aware of it because I just bought a home, and there are an awful lot of extra expenses over rental. Taking this example, the initial downpayment is \$735.00; the fees to the lawyer would be roughly \$160.00, and that's a conservative estimate, very conservative. Fridge, stove, and perhaps a dryer, would cost perhaps 350, and again that's conservative because a good fridge will cost you over \$300.00. Landscaping - in the Kensington example the landscaping isn't completed, the person taking possession has to do it himself. This will take at least a hundred. So we're talking about \$1,345 minimum as an initial outlay of cash by this person, and a person who is making four to five hundred dollars a month is going to have difficulty in making such an initial outlay of cash when he takes possession of his house. There are also monthly - additional monthly expenses for heat, for water, insurance, maintenance and land, and again using a conservative estimate, a very conservative estimate, this would cost at least an additional \$30.00, so what we're talking about is a monthly outlay for a person who is going to acquire such a home of \$118.00 PIT, plus \$30.00 for additional expenses, which means that that person has to pay 148 a month. Now a person who is making less than 500 is paying far more than 27 percent of his income then on housing.

Just let me give you the contrast. For public housing a family with two children would pay \$106.00 a month at the same income level, 106. In other words \$42.00 less. With four

(MR. JOHANNSON cont'd.) children that same family would pay for public housing \$102.00 a month, and for that in that public housing you would get a dryer, which he wouldn't get in a private home, he would get playgrounds and other amenities, which he doesn't get in a private home. And he's paying over \$40.00 a month less - and my figures again are conservative. I believe like the Member for Inkster that one should use figures conservatively. Now also the average person moves every five years, and this figure I think is fairly accurate. And over this five-year period when the person has possession of the home in the example I gave you, he might acquire, if he's lucky, he might acquire an equity of \$500.00. When he sells that home at the end of five years the sales commission would be about \$735.00. The legal fee at least \$130.00. So it costs him about \$865.00 to sell that home. And if he's lucky he's going to break even. So actually how has that person benefitted from home ownership? He's acquired no equity; he has had the privilege of living in housing that has fewer amenities than the public housing, which he could have been eligible for, and he has paid for the privilege of home ownership, he has paid over \$40.00 a month extra, over \$40.00 a month. For a person on an income of four to five hundred dollars a month that's a great deal of money. That money could have been spent for clothing on the children, for food on the children.

One other example. A Mr. Bergman of the Winnipeg Housebuilders attacked our Public Housing Program not long ago and also pushed the same idea as the Member for Assiniboia, the idea of home ownership. He has a development in St. Norbert, which the Minister mentioned today, Park LaSalle, and I think the units are selling for something like 14 to 15 thousand dollars a unit. Guaranteed Homes offered this site to the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation several years ago. They offered it to the Housing Corporation for public housing. The Housing Corporation turned it down as an unsuitable site so Guaranteed Homes proceeded to build on the site under the innovative Housing Program of the Federal Government and they built what we consider to be poor quality housing, and what customers obviously consider to be poor quality housing, because they're not buying it. This is one of the federal programs to promote home ownership. This site, particular site, is flush with railway tracks, so the site is noisy; it's outside of the Perimeter Highway, and it's very far out, creating transportation problems for people who have low income.

One final point, Mr. Speaker, the Member for Assiniboia and the Member for Rhineland have been great advocates of home ownership and of Provincial Government homeowner assistance programs. In the Financial Post of April 8th of this year, an article by Charles Davies highlights the fact that housing prices are moving again and that there have been sharp increases in home, in privately owned homes, that are now for sale, and the sharpest increases have been in Toronto, in Vancouver of all places - I'm sure that this would shock the Honourable Member for Rhineland - but in Vancouver they've been rising sharply, in Ottawa and Montreal. And the main reason for this has been land prices, land prices have been escalating sharply and pushing up the housing costs. But another factor, another important factor has been these provincial government home ownership assistance programs and let me quote, "Further price gains are expected as the result of generally higher demand and the effects of the provincial government's Homeowner Assistance Plan." In other words, this is pushing up demand it's providing some additional cash to prospective homeowners, at least in the acquisition of the homes, the result is that the developers are pushing up their housing prices. So who gains? Tell me. Does the person on low income gain? Who gets the cream? Not the prospective homeowner but the developer. So I would say in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, that this proposal for home ownership has very limited application to people on low incomes,

Pardon me, do I have time to propose an amendment?

MR. SPEAKER: Well it would have to be within the next ten seconds. The Honourable Member for . . .

MR. JOHANNSON: I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. George, that following the word "because" in the second line of the first "whereas" the words "they are under the impression that" be inserted and that there be inserted following the second "whereas", the following: "And whereas this government has already begun to remedy this problem through its highly successful Pensioner Home Repair Program", and that in the third paragraph every word following "Therefore Be It Resolved" be deleted, and be replaced with the following: "That this government continue to consider the advisability of a comprehensive policy to promote the maintenance and rehabilitation of housing in Manitoba, and that as a part of this comprehensive policy it continue to study the desirability of implementing exemptions on assessment for the

(MR. JOHANNSON cont'd.) encouragement of improvements to and rehabilitation of homes for periods extending from three to five years."

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion on the amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, I don't know why it is that honourable gentlemen opposite when they move an amendment to a resolution that they don't include along with the amendment a complete wording of the resolution as amended so it'll make some sense. Now Sir, I am going to give you an example of how ridiculous the amendment is. In the first amendment that is proposed by the Member for St. Matthews goes on to suggest that the - following the word "because" in the second line of the first "Whereas" the words: "they are under the impression that" be inserted. Now Sir, if that were to be taken literally this is the way the resolution would read: "Whereas many real property owners have been reluctant to improve or repair their homes because they are under the impression that" - the sentence ends there. -- (Interjection)-- The amendment does not say so. No, when you're going to move an amendment it should say, should be inserted between such a word and another word, so that it makes sense. Sir, not only does the resolution not make any sense as it is presently worded, and I don't think that Your Honour should accept it until that resolution is presented to this Chamber as reworded. The complete amendment as reworded so that we can read the resolution as amended. There's no way that it can be done the way this resolution is written up and I suggest, Sir, that before this can be accepted by this House that the honourable member at least be courteous enough to the Chamber to provide us with a copy of the resolution as amended, so we can know whether or not it is in order. There's no way you can tell whether or not the thing is in order in the present structure of the amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I think that the Honourable Member from Morris is exercising himself unduly in speaking to that point of order that he raises. I think the amendment is quite clear, it indicates the change that is desired, the position in the preamble where the words are to be inserted and it is free from any vagueness, and the essential component of an amendment should indicate how the resolution is to be amended. It does that, there's no ambiguity, there's no uncertainty, there's no vagueness. Now perhaps, perhaps the Honourable Member from Morris has a good point in saying that perhaps it would be advisable that where amendments are moved to a resolution, or to a bill, then maybe you should cite the whole thing as amended, as it would appear amended. But in this House we move amendments from time to time to the bills - in Committee we do the same thing. We don't recite the whole bill, or the whole section, as amended. The motion is to delete certain words and to insert certain words, and the full, or amended version, is not a necessary component of that resolution. What is necessary is that there be a clear intent as to what the amendment is, and that is successfully embodied in this amendment. So the concern that the honourable member makes is ill-founded and the resolution, the amendment is certainly in order, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order, in my opinion, I would feel that the amendment completely destroyed the resolution --(Interjection)-- Well then, then it's out of order if it destroys the resolution. It completely takes out the resolved part of the resolution, it mixes it up with the Senior Citizens Repair Program which has nothing to do with this resolution at all, and it destroys the operative part completely. So in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, I feel that the amendment is completely out of order, it's a completely separate item. --(Interjection)-- It is.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Before we get into any further procedural involvement, I should like to indicate that I did confer in regard to admissibility of the amendment with the Clerk. I also took it under serious consideration before I made the decision. I would agree to the arguments presented by both sides on the point of order that there is some merit to the courtesy being extended so that we do not have to cudgel our brains when we are trying to assess whether an amendment is correct or not. It is a little difficult when it's done in the abstract, and I would suggest that the courtesy could be extended by all members when they are making amendments that they indicate what the amendment will be. In this case the problem was that the honourable member had run out of time and he did it very hurriedly. But as I said, I have admitted the amendment, it is correct, and the floor is open to debate. The amendment is allowed. The floor is open to debate. The Honourable Member for Assiniboia,

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few things at this time. I would like to point out to the Honourable Member for St. Matthews, I have at no time talked against public housing. I stated we need public housing. However, I caution the government to what extent that they're going to move in the public housing field. I also advise the government that there are many people whose desire it is to own their own homes. At the present time some of the other provinces are doing it. The Ontario Housing Corporation is doing it in Ontario; it's making it feasible for people to own houses instead of the government owning all the houses. So it appears to me at least the Member for St. Matthews is quite consistent, he believes that it should be the State that owns all the homes and not the people. But I would like to advise the member that he should realize, that he should realize when there was a complete housing research and housing investigation done in this country and 90 percent of the people were not satisfied by living in low rental housing. They were not satisfied with accommodation in the low rental housing, and they stated it was still their desire and ambition to be able to own a home of their own. So I'm sure that he must agree that many people would like to own their home; but in my opinion - and listening to the Member for St. Matthews he feels it should be the opposite way, it should be the government and not the people that own homes - so I would like to disagree with him completely on that point. I also pointed out, Mr. Speaker, to the member that the cost study in the United States . . .

MR. SPEAKER: . . . matter of privilege.

MR. JOHANNSON: I think the honourable member is misconstruing my remarks. I have never stated or implied that I thought that all people should live in publicly owned housing, or that even a large percentage should. I've never implied or stated anything of that sort.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. That is not a matter of privilege, that's a matter of opinion and debate. The Honourable Member for Assiniboia,

MR. PATRICK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I also pointed out to the House and to the member that a cost study in the United States disclosed that the amount expended on 28,000 public housing units would have been sufficient to enable 42,000 families to compete in the private market with income supplement and with money left over for renovating that property. They're finding in the United States right now, and they're having serious problem - the housing authorities in that country - of the large housing problems that they have because the income is not rising as fast as the repair bills and to keep the repairs of the low rental housing. The cost factor is rising so fast and the housing authority cannot increase the rentals because the incomes are not rising as fast. So I hope that the honourable member would understand this.

The second point I would like to tell him - the criteria should not be how many numbers or how many houses we can build in this Province. I don't think that should be the criteria at all. The criteria should be, Mr. Speaker, the location, the type of housing, the accessibility of services, the compatibility with the district and so on. We should also give consideration perhaps to renovating some of the older houses and making them suitable for our people on low income. This should be the serious consideration, not the number of homes that we can build. I have not stated that I was strictly against public housing because there are people that will never be able to own their own homes; doesn't matter if it's in a row type or because of the income they're making, unless the governments do proceed into some form of guaranteed income which will change the whole picture, but at the present time there are people that will not be able to do this. But surely, Mr. Speaker, there are many people today, and I've stated here before that there - I know of people myself that are making the type of salary that the members get here and they're living in Burrows-Keewatin. There's been signs up there "For Rent"; something must be wrong, something must be wrong. Surely there's enough people in this city that need accommodation that should have a preference to get in there instead of one or someone that's making a salary of ten or fifteen thousand dollars. So that was my point.

I am very disappointed in the amendment of the honourable member because really he destroys the complete concept, and in my opinion he is completely against any incentive for people to be able to renovate and renew their houses; to improve the interior or exteriors, to improve the roofs or plumbing. He feels that this is not necessary because there already is a repair program for our senior citizens, which is a completely different thing. And I compliment the program for repairing the senior citizens' homes; but I've had an opportunity to talk to quite a few people who were not, who should have qualified but were not accepted. And I'm speaking of at least three cases that came to my attention where a widow 80 years of age, she was not able, she had no money in the bank and application was not accepted. So I'm sure there's many

(MR. PATRICK cont'd.) people that would have liked to avail themselves to that program were not able to or were not accepted last year. And surely to say or to enact legislation to state that one should improve your home, improve your property to the extent of putting a new roof or new windows or a new furnace, that your assessment will not increase. I think it's almost ridiculous to see the Member for St. Matthews not accept this proposal. In my opinion what the government is doing is strictly patting itself on the back and saying, look we don't need any of that we already have a program for the senior citizens which is part of the federal money, so he says, we don't need. My proposal had nothing to do with the senior citizens. I said there are - besides the senior citizens there are many many people that live in the central part of Winnipeg which live in the older houses. These homes need repairs, they have poor insulation, they need insulation, they need new wiring because the wiring is gone, they need new roofs, they need new windows. --(Interjection)-- You provide for all the people in the City of Winnipeg? Like fun you do. You do not. You didn't even provide for the senior citizens. You did not provide for the senior citizens, and I can document it and bring you the proof where the letter has gone out that you're not accepted, and the widow was 80 years of age, and has no money. So the Minister for Labour should be ashamed . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. PATRICK: . . . to say that he looks after everybody in Central Winnipeg, the people that can improve their properties - that's what this resolution asks. But again the Member for St. Matthews, he may have his opinion, and I may disagree with his opinion, but I will respect it, but I still say that his proposal completely destroys the contents of the resolution and in my opinion the attitude of the government is that they're against any incentive that the people would have in low incomes or senior citizens to improve their properties. They say if you improve your property, penalize them, increase the assessment, increase your tax, we'll tax you higher. This is the policy of the government. And I think that's the policy of the Member for St. Matthews and surely of anyone in the House I think that he's probably has more people in his area than anyone else that this type of program would be most attractive to, and should have been attractive to.

Again I don't discredit the program that was implemented by the government for the senior citizens. I said it was a good program. It did not cover too many people. There's many people that requested it, were not even accepted, or qualified for it. It strictly was for the senior citizens. I'm talking about everybody. So I was very --(Interjection)-- I'm talking for people on low incomes living in Central Winnipeg, living on 25 foot lots on homes that are worth about ten to fifteen thousand dollars.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, you know at least three times to four times a day we get the House Leader get up in his place and lecture everyone in this House on decorum of this House, and I've said this before, and I'm going to say it again, if there's any one member in this House that breaks more rules, that has no respect for the rules, it's the House Leader, the Minister of Labour. I mean nobody, nobody makes as many speeches from his seat as he does. He continually talks. I guess he likes to be heard even if it's not worthwhile listening to.

But, Mr. Speaker, I'm disappointed with the Member for St. Matthews. I'm sure that people in his constituency would have liked a program like that. I know that I've had many comments, in fact I've had many letters that stated to me, and said to me, it's long overdue, it should have been implemented a long time ago.

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

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is the first time I'm getting up in this debate regarding the home improvements that I hear a member from - who originally proposed a resolution and who really gets up and spiels off, and really doesn't know what he's talking about. He doesn't know policies that are currently in effect in the City of Winnipeg, and in the province about home improvements, if he is talking about home improvements in the light of repairs. I'm just wondering if the member is aware that only where major renovations and additions are taking place to homes the Assessment Branch then adds that to the assessment but where, for instance, items wear out and are replaced and the assessor calls that normal maintenance. I could give a list to the honourable member, and then just relate to him a list that is used in the City on items that are taken into consideration in home repairs that aren't added to assessment, and I'm surprised that I as a rural member where of course the Assessment Branch would not differentiate any changes in the city from the city to the rural but, for instance, people should

(MR. URUSKI cont'd.) not be deterred from painting their house in the inside and outside, that wouldn't be considered for increased assessment. If they had to repair the roof, or renew the roof, that wouldn't be considered an increase in the assessment. If they have to put stucco on their house, or repair the siding on the house, that wouldn't be considered an increase in the assessment. If they had to replace the wooden storm windows and doors with metal windows, or change the type of windows, that wouldn't be considered an increase in the assessment. That would be considered of normal maintenance. --(Interjection)-- This comes from the assessors. If the replacement of the outside steps, and using similar material if the steps have gone down, if they have to be repaired, that wouldn't increase the assessment of the homes. If they would have to repair eavestroughs and downspouts, that wouldn't be considered an increase. Repair and replacement of heating equipment with equipment of the same type, that wouldn't be considered an increase. Repair or renewal of basement steps, and structural beams and posts, that would be considered under general maintenance, and repairing of mortar joints and interior plaster, alteration or renewal of electrical installation. The honourable member mentioned that the electricity and plumbing has really gone to pot in most homes. I think the honourable member must have, you know, if he thought that these would be considered for increased assessment if those repairs are not done. Repair or replacement of plumbing fixtures, repair and maintenance of garages, sheds, and other outbuildings - repairs - external fire escapes constructed for that exclusive purpose. All these items that I have mentioned of maintenance, repair or replacement, which materially enhance the value of the property, or that recapture the loss in value, would not result in increased assessment.

Now the honourable member went on in his original resolution - he got up now and he stated that we are concerned about low income people, and repairs to the property that they wished to do, the people in lower incomes, but he didn't state that in his original resolution, that he would consider the improvements and repairs, or improvements, do not exceed \$2,500, he would - as I understood the resolution he would have given it to everyone. But let him remember, let him remember one thing, that those people, or many of those people on low incomes, they are not - they are living in homes that are in drastic need of repair that \$2,500, a \$2,500 repair bill would probably be just a drop in the bucket to the major renovations that would have to take place to these homes, and the one that would really benefit from any renovations, or additions, to homes are the people in the middle or upper income bracket where they would want to add some portion to their house where they could do it for \$2,500.00. So who would really benefit? Would it be people on incomes of \$4,000 or less, or would it be people on incomes of \$8,000, or more, who would benefit from these types of improvements?

I read in the paper that the Conservative candidate in Wolseley criticized this government in its miniscule passing on of the \$2.00 cost of living allowance. He said that that should be increased in his recent statement, I read in the Free Press that he said that he considered it very minimal. The irony of such comments of people that state that they are really concerned about the poor people of our society, when in fact in the early 1960's that Conservative Government, or the members who were part of that government who are sitting now on the other side, did not pass over the cost of living allowance that was passed on by the Federal Government. But this government did, this one and not only this one but . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I think the honourable member is straying from the resolution. Would he get back to it?

MR. URUSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was really - this money that the Federal Government passed on and the Provincial Government subsequently did, could have been used for home repairs or additions to the homes and this is why I was really making these type of comments, Sir.

There were also comments made that you know the Provincial Government is really not moving in any concrete way in that area in and around Grace Hospital regarding there were complaints about the homes that were situated around the hospital. The Provincial Government has made an announcement that it will either tear down those homes that are beyond the state of repair, and renovate those homes that can be renovated and put into livable condition, and there would be the park areas and the --(Interjection)-- The honourable member is continually interjecting. The members on the opposite side they realize that . . .

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

MR. URUSKI: The members don't like members on this side getting up and repeating government policy, and stating what the government has done for the old age pensioners, for

(MR. URUSKI cont'd.) . . . all people of the province insofar as the Medicare shift that took place in 69, they don't like that mentioned. They don't like the program of the Home Repair Grants for senior citizens up to \$1,000 that they could have used. They don't like the property tax credit that in effect would give the homeowner a benefit up to a maximum of \$190.00 in this year, depending on the net income that he is making. They don't like this government for passing on the cost of living allowance to the old age pensioners when the people from the other side previously just left it - they just decreased the allowance to the old age pensioners and the people on a . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The hour of adjournment having arrived does the Honourable Minister of Labour wish to designate next week's program?

MR. PAULLEY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I believe that that is an obligation on the House Leader. It would be our intention to carry on with consideration of the Estimates. This afternoon the Estimates for the Department of Municipal Affairs were - the four and one-half hours allocated expired, and it would be our intention, and I have discussed this with the Honourable the House Leader of the Official Opposition, to either call the Department of Northern Affairs or the Department of Urban Affairs for consideration on Monday. I believe that my friend agreed with me that there is a certain flexibility as to which one we will call first. So that would be our intention.

And then the general order of business for next week, Mr. Speaker, would be continuation of the Estimates of the departments still remaining. It's my understanding, Sir, that there still is around about 25 hours more or less for the consideration before we reach the 90 hours. I do hope that we may be able to process some of the government bills in between times in order to give some of the committees some work. Tuesday morning the Committee on Statutory Regulations and Rules has been called. I asked the Clerk of the Assembly today to give notice to members of the Public Utilities Committee that it will be called for further consideration of the matters referred to that committee on Thursday morning at 10:00 o'clock. I announce that now, Mr. Speaker, in order that the members of the Assembly who are members of the Public Utilities Committee may be aware that that will happen on Thursday. I will be pleased to discuss with the House Leader of the Opposition early next week any changes in the procedures for next week.

MR. SPEAKER: The House is accordingly adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:30 Monday afternoon.