

TIME: 10:00 a.m.

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker

MR. SPEAKER, Honourable Peter Fox (Kildonan): Before we proceed I should like to direct the attention of the Honourable Members to the gallery where we have 25 students, Grades 6 to 9 standing, of the Split Lake School. These students are under the direction of Miss Kathy Roth. This school is located in the Constituency of the Honourable Member for Churchill.

We also have 17 students, Grades 5 to 8 standing of Pelican Rapids School under the direction of Mr. Bridgeman. This school is located in the Constituency of the Honourable Member for Swan River.

And we have 19 students, Grades 7 and 8 standing of the Easterville School under the direction of Mr. Feinberg. This school is located in the Constituency of the Honourable Member for The Pas, the Minister of Northern Affairs.

On behalf of all the honourable members we welcome you here this morning.

Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions; Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees; Ministerial Statements and Tabling of Reports.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

HONOURABLE SIDNEY GREEN (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I understand that the Law Amendments Committee finished representations last night so I am proposing that tonight the Law Amendments Committee deal with all of those bills that are presently before us, clause by clause, and as many of them as amendments are ready for. Tomorrow night we are meeting in the Committee of Statutory Regulations with regard to all the marital bills. My impression is that Wednesday night will not be sufficient for that and therefore I am suggesting that Thursday, starting at Thursday morning, that those representations continue going on Thursday for as long as is needed, which means that the House won't convene on Thursday morning. Perhaps it should convene on Thursday at 2:30 p.m. to adjourn immediately if Committee is still not finished and to await the completion of Committee to come back into the House. Now that would mean that we would be meeting with the Statutory Regulations on Wednesday evening, on Thursday morning and possibly Thursday afternoon. If that program is agreeable or if there are any other suggestions I'd be pleased to take them at the present time.

I take from the silence, Mr. Speaker, that that will be agreeable. We meet on Wednesday and Thursday morning and convene in the House on Thursday afternoon if we can proceed; if we can't, that we would go back into Committee.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. STERLING R. LYON (Souris-Killarney): Mr. Speaker, further to the House Leader's comments, I would raise the query with the Minister whether or not the schedule which he has outlined would leave sufficient opportunity for notification to be made abroad to those people who may wish to make representations on Bills 60 and 61 which are extremely vital bills.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, it was announced yesterday, which means that two days' notice are given. The Clerk usually has communications which he informs. This is two days which is generally considered to be satisfactory notice and besides it is another day because Thursday morning, those who may not have heard about it by Wednesday night will hear about it by Thursday morning. I would think that that is as much notice as is usually necessary to alert people who are interested in speaking on a bill.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition on a procedure.

MR. LYON: Yes, on the same point, Mr. Speaker. The Farm Land Protection Act in Law Amendments Committee, when is it expected that representations will be made on that bill?

MR. GREEN: I don't think it has gone to Committee yet. There are certain bills that have not gone to Committee which also will involve representation. But that one hasn't been passed yet.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, we're not in the question period yet. Notices of Motion; Introduction of Bills; Questions.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health.

HONOURABLE LAURENT L. DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, I would like to make a correction in an article of the Tribune of yesterday. The heading states, "Medicare Plus Fees Coming." This is, to say the least, very misleading. At no time did I ever state that nor what is in the first few paragraphs especially the first paragraph. What I did say when I was asked if the department was looking at it, I expressed that that was not government policy or party policy

and when I was pressed, I said, "Of course, everything is being reviewed, something might happen that would force the revision of that." But I think it is very clear that I expressed certain personal . . . I made a statement right in the House on Saturday but I made it quite clear that this was not government policy and as I said, this article is, to say the least, very misleading.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the First Minister or the Minister of Labour or the Minister of Industry and Commerce. The Federal NDP leader has released a federal document which would indicate a rise in the jobless rate in Canada over the next two years and it indicates as well a rise in the jobless rate in Manitoba. I wonder if the First Minister is in a position to confirm those forecasts and indicate whether any supporting evidence or information was given to the federal group who made this study.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HONOURABLE EDWARD SCHREYER, Premier (Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, that document referred to has been clearly identified as being in the nature of a forecast and is to be understood to be such.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, to the First Minister. I wonder if he can indicate whether any members of his government or officials furnished information to the Federal Government in connection with the preparation of that forecast and if that information has been forwarded, what information it contained so that we are in a position to judge the probabilities of the jobless forecast.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, there is communication from time to time between federal departments and agencies and provincial but specifically in this context there is no way of knowing whether the Federal Government's Department of Immigration and Manpower has sought or availed itself of information from any of the provincial departments. The only way to ascertain that would be to ask the Federal Department directly. Perhaps we can do so. In the meantime, I regard that document that was made public yesterday or leaked or whatever, as being merely a forecast and which could very well be wrong.

MR. SPIVAK: Yes, I wonder if the First Minister can indicate whether his government has made any forecasts of the jobless rate in the next two years.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, we have done some forecasting. It is about as accurate and useful as the TED Report.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, I wonder then if the First Minister is in a position to present to the House the information that has been compiled for its forecasts, to at least indicate what has been assembled by his government as the probabilities of what will take place with respect to the increase in jobless rate in Manitoba in the next two years.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, we can take the TED Report projections and provide the actual figures to juxtapose to the forecasts or targets. Furthermore, we could make projections with respect to 1978-79-80, as long as we are clearly understood that they were in the nature of forecasts and worth about as much.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOUGLAS WATT: Mr. Speaker, I address a question to the Minister of Mines and Environmental Resources. I wonder if the Minister could indicate to the House how much land the government intends to acquire in the Plum Lake area in terms of quarter sections.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I will take the question as notice. I am not sure whether that doesn't also fall under the Department of Renewable Resources but I will take the question as notice.

MR. WATT: A supplementary question. I wonder if the Minister could also give us some indication of what will happen to this land. Is it going to be rented back or leased back to the farmers that it is being bought from or will it simply go into wildlife?

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, some of it would be no doubt involved in the program that is being undertaken at Plum Lake but I will take the question as notice so that the honourable member will have more accurate information.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. BOB BANMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I direct my question to the First Minister and would ask him if he could inform the House whether Dr. John Loxley, the head of the Resource and Economic Development Section of the Planning Secretariat of Cabinet has submitted his resignation?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, Mr. Loxley will be undertaking a post at the University of Manitoba as of July 1st. He will still be dealing with certain government appointments, notably the Chairmanship of the Communities Economic Development Fund.

MR. BANMAN: I wonder if the House Leader could also then tell us whether he will be retaining his chairmanship of Channel Area Loggers.

MR. GREEN: It is possible, Mr. Speaker, but I am not sure of that one, that one not being under my

jurisdiction. I know that I have spoken to him with regard to the Communities Economic Development Fund and he is going to continue as chairman of that one.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. R. (Bud) SHERMAN: My question, Sir, is to the Honourable, the Minister of Labour. I'd like to ask him whether the bills dealing with labour legislation including Bill 65 which isn't there yet, but when it gets there will be dealt with at Committee stage in Industrial Relations Committee or Law Amendments Committee?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister for Labour.

HONOURABLE RUSSELL PAULLEY (Transcona): Mr. Speaker, my answer to my honourable friend is that a way back when we first came into the House, we had established the Industrial Relations Committee for the purpose of hearing representations on labour matters. It is my hope that Bill 65 is passed quickly so that the Industrial Relations Committee can hear representations.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

RETURN TO ORDER NO. 34

HONOURABLE SAUL A. MILLER (Seven Oaks): Mr. Speaker, I want to table an Order for House No. requested by the Member for Gladstone.

ORAL QUESTIONS — CONT'D

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Attorney-General or to the House Leader. It is with reference to the committee that will be dealing with family law, The Marital Property Act and The Family Maintenance Act. The government has prepared now, I understand from the Attorney-General, substantial amendments. I wonder if it is possible for the government to release those amendments to us so that we can at least have them in our possession when the representations are made so that in effect we are in a position to know what the policy is at this point with respect to some of the issues that may very well be raised and repeated over and over again during those hearings.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HONOURABLE HOWARD PAWLEY (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, I have already verbally indicated to some, I hope they have an opportunity to review the other amendments which are basically technical and legal today. As soon as I have had an opportunity to review them, I would certainly be anxious to release them prior to our meeting in Committee. I have no objection to that. I have not had an opportunity myself yet to review the proposed amendments, technical and legal, which I gather were finally completed yesterday by staff.

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

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make a change on the Statutory Regulations and Orders Committee, taking the name of the Member for Portage off and putting the name of the Member for Fort Rouge on. (Agreed)

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. JAMES R. FERGUSON: I'd like to make some changes also in Statutory Regulations and Orders, Mr. Speaker, and substitute the name of the Honourable Member for Rhineland for the Member for Swan River; the Member for Sturgeon Creek for Brandon West; the Member for Birtle-Russell for Lakeside. (Agreed)

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

MR. THOMAS BARROW: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make a change on the Law Amendments Committee if I may. The Member for St. Johns will replace the Member for Flin Flon. Pardon me, the Member for Flin Flon will replace the Member for St. Johns. (Agreed)

ORDERS OF THE DAY

ADJOURNED DEBATES ON SECOND READING

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, can we proceed to adjourned debates on second reading?

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

MR. GREEN: Bill No. 6.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 6, proposed by the Honourable Attorney-General. The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. FERGUSON: Stand, Mr. Speaker.

BILL (NO. 10 — AN ACT TO AMEND THE JURY ACT.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 10, proposed by the Attorney-General. The Honourable Member for St. Vital.

MR. SPEAKER: Away. The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. PAWLEY: I believe the Honourable Member for St. Vital adjourned this so that I could finalize debate.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General shall be closing debate on Bill No. 10. Is there any other speaker?

MR. PAWLEY: Is there anybody that would like to speak on this bill before I close debate?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. PAWLEY: Three areas that were raised by the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell, I'd like to briefly deal with. One is pertaining to costs. A submission by the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell that the costs that were being allowed in connection with the amendment to The County Court Act was, in effect, taking the legislation, the Small Claims Court, out of the poor man's domain into the same sort of process as you would have with other courts.

Reviewing this legislation, I note that the legislation, in respect to costs, pertains to verifiable costs by way of disbursements — costs that actually have been paid out of pocket. They are not general costs that would relate to a solicitor's costs in the normal type of court action. In fact, at the present time, disbursements are allowed in the present legislation and there is no limit insofar as the amount of disbursement that may be paid out insofar as the small claims action is concerned. The proposed amendment places a lid on the amount of costs that may be allowed in any particular matter involving the Small Claims Court.

Secondly, the honourable member made reference to the limit of \$1,000.00. The \$1,000 figure, though it is contrary to the recommendation that was received, the majority recommendation anyway of what was received by the Committee which was dealing with the Small Claims Court, it was our view that there was no good reason. We're not amending the legislation to provide for the \$1,000 limit insofar as jurisdiction is concerned rather than the existing \$500 or the \$800 that had been recommended by the Committee. The Alberta legislation provides for \$1,000 limit. Secondly, it is a good round figure that is easy to deal with and thirdly, the option always exists for those that do not wish to deal with their claim in this court to proceed through the County Court rather than deal with this court. So I don't feel that there is any prejudice insofar as anyone is concerned by lifting the limit to the \$1,000.00. I think in view of the fact that this is a court where there is minimal cost because of the necessity for any legal processes, that any movement which raises the limit to as reasonable a figure as is possible, is a progressive one. I had opportunity to speak to Chief County Court Philp, the department in this connection, and he concurs with the lifting of the limit to \$1,000 from the present \$500 — in fact was sympathetic to our going beyond the \$800 limit as had been proposed in the report.

Thirdly, the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell asked if I would have any objection to releasing the copy of the report which had been submitted by the Committee dealing with the Small Claims Court. I know of no reason why I should object to the release of that report and I will make it available today, Mr. Speaker, for honourable members to peruse if they so wish with the amendments.

I would just like to emphasize that most of the amendments in the report are not being dealt with simply because of the lateness of the hour, the lack of opportunity that we have had to review all of the recommendations. I would hope that next year we would be able to proceed with other amendments to the Small Claims legislation. It is an important court; it deals with large numbers of people off the street. Although it involves small sums of money, generally to those that are involved in that Small Claims Court, those small sums of money are very important insofar as their daily relationship is concerned with the world of commerce.

With those few remarks, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest the bill proceed to Committee for clause-by-clause review.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

BILL (NO. 32) — AN ACT TO AMEND THE HOSPITALS ACT

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 32 proposed by the Minister of Health. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. ARNOLD BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This bill will make the hospital year-end coincide with the government year-end. I have checked this with various hospital administrators and they already seem to have received notice of this change and see no difficulty with this legislation. So, with those few words, we will be prepared to let this go to Committee.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

BILL NO. 40 — MAIN SUPPLY

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 40, proposed by the Honourable Minister of Finance. The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, this Supply Bill provides members of the House with a final opportunity to summarize the activities of the government, to comment on the provisions that are contained in the bill which in effect, contains all of the Spending Estimates proposed for this year.

One unique feature about the present Estimates that were presented before this House was that every Minister who spoke on his Estimates remarked and took a great deal of pride in saying that they had cut expenditures to the bone. Indeed, the modest increases would indicate that indeed had happened at least on the surface. However, perhaps a more careful examination of the Estimates that have been provided for us would indicate that it was done more for purposes of attempting to demonstrate that this government finally has recognized the dangers that are inherent in the kind of excessive spending that has been taking place over the period of years. In those days when revenues were coming in because of a buoyant economy, revenues that were in excess of their anticipated spending, one would have thought that it would have been an excellent opportunity to relieve the province of some of its debts; it would have been an excellent opportunity to reduce taxation or perhaps a combination of both. Instead, the government matched the increased revenues with increased expenditures not contained in the Estimates that were provided the year before.

It would appear as though the government was mindlessly spending money in the hope that that expenditures of the money that was obtained from the taxpayers could consolidate their position in this province as the government forever and a day. But something has gone awry. And the honourable gentlemen opposite are now faced with the serious problem of attempting to maintain an economy that will bring in the revenues that are necessary for the basic government expenditures that they have committed themselves to. And in addition to that, Sir, they find that with falling revenues it is not even possible to carry on the absolutely essential things that a government must do, such as the building of roads, schools, hospitals, drainage and those things that are, essentially, a government responsibility. They would have to drop a lot of plans that I think they would have liked to embark on simply because the money is now not available.

They have awakened from that dream that was brought about by inflation and have now had to put their feet on the cold floor of reality and they find, as indicated by the Minister of Health just the other day in a more exuberant mood, he had been instructed to stretch out the debate somewhat, for what reason I don't know, but he became very expansive and started to talk about the need to curb medicare costs, something that I mentioned a year or so ago and was immediately accused of suggesting that we were going to drop the medicare altogether. That theme was picked up by the Minister of Education and interpreted as meaning that we would be dropping the medicare program. — (Interjection)— No, I said the Minister of Education and unless the Minister has changed portfolios very recently, it does not apply to him.

Well, the Minister of Health now suggests that the costs are getting out of hand and something will have to be done. He was very quick to retract the impression that was created in the news report that he had suggested user's fees. I checked the Hansard and I found it very difficult to place that interpretation on his remarks although he certainly did comment on the high costs that were being incurred and the difficulties of controlling them. That's something I've been saying for years. That unless we came to grips with the escalating cost which now, I think, would amount to something like \$450 — that is both the Provincial and Federal contribution to that program — would amount to something like \$450 per person and they rise at the rate of about \$50 per year per person. That is a cost that I think the government, any government, should be concerned about.

But just in passing, I might also mention one other thing that was contained in that particular article was the comment by the Minister when he spoke to the reporter that he had simply tossed out that suggestion in order to elicit a response from the Opposition. Then the final paragraph of the article says, "But the PC MLAs failed to respond." I don't know whether the reporter was unaware of the fact that the Minister was closing debate on that particular measure and there was no opportunity to respond. However, that's a minor thing and it does not concern me one way or the other.

The government is faced and the succeeding government will be faced with the very serious problem that has been created by over-enthusiastic spending and the mistaken belief that the economy was going to continue to grow and expand as it had for a number of years during the seventies. But every country in the western world and indeed, countries outside the western world are now beginning to realize that that free spending attitude, that idealistic dream that the government could play Santa Claus and could provide every need that people ask for, and a good many that they never even ask for, that dream now has been shattered, as some economists have been warning us would happen over a number of years. I am now pleased to note that almost daily one can pick up a magazine or a newspaper and find an article written by Johnny-come-lately economists who now are deploring the situation that we find ourselves in. It is a pity that many more of them weren't warning us about that earlier.

There were relatively few well known economists who predicted what would happen. Among them was one that has been recently appointed as an economic advisor to the new government in

Israel, / Milton Friedman, a Nobel Prize winner, whose economic theories have been expounded over the years. He has been one of the few economists that has been consistent in his views on the difficulties that the Western World was facing. Very pitiful little attention was paid to him until President Ford took him on staff to become his economic advisor. I am happy to see that the new Prime Minister of Israel has recognized the problems that that country faces. I was rather interested in an interview that Barbara Frum was having with Milton Friedman. She asked him the question about what did he think was wrong with Israel, and what needed to be straightened out. Mr. Friedman gave her the kind of answer that pleased me. He said, "Well, . . . just Barbara, you know, you have the same problem in Canada too much government."

It is interesting also that in Britain they have come to the belated recognition that the policies the Labour Government in Great Britain have been pursuing for the past number of years have landed that country into what can only be considered a crisis situation. It is not a dangerous situation; it is a crisis in Great Britain to the extent that former Prime Minister Harold Macmillan has suggested that they treat it as a war-time measure. Indeed, he has suggested that Britain faces an even worse situation than they faced at the outbreak of the Second World War and that a coalition government should be formed in order to deal with that particular problem. Even the Labour Government of Great Britain now has recognized the problem that they are faced with, even to the extent that in order to survive — which gives you some idea of the kind of principles that that government operates on; it also gives you some idea of the kind of principles that the Liberal Party in Great Britain are following — they are prepared to support a government that has created such havoc and destruction on the economy of that country.

An interesting headline that appeared in the papers on the 22nd March suggests that Labour may drop socialist policies to survive a vote. It wasn't very long before that they suggested that they were going to drop their socialist policies in order for the economy to recover. Well, to me it is a pretty strong admission on the part of the Labour Government in Great Britain that it was the socialist policies of that government that created the problem in the first place. Indeed, if the finger can be placed on any single feature of any government policy in any country in the Western World as to the cause of the difficulties that we face, it is a tendency, and perhaps it was a very natural tendency, to assume that they could go on forever spending, providing all of the goodies and all of the desires and wishes of their people without having to some day come to a final reckoning. I find it difficult to be too critical of the attitude in those days, because inherent in man's nature is a desire to see that his fellow man does not suffer. Many of the programs that were initiated were initiated at the, if not the request, at least with the willing consent of a large majority of Canadians; programs that were intended to remove and relieve distress; programs that were intended to remove poverty and to provide opportunities for people. And even today, I don't think you're going to find that there are too many people in Canada who would argue against programs that are intended to create a better life for Canadians in this country. But more and more of them are beginning to recognize that the weakness than they were intended to solve. We are now faced with the necessity of attempting to pick up the pieces without destroying the ideal that society really does want to provide for those who are less fortunate, society really does want to provide opportunities for its people.

The House may be interested in comments made by two well known Soviet dissidents who have commented on the situation in Russia. Andre Andrei Sackharov Sakaroff being quoted in the book, "The Russians" by Hedrick Smith, had this to say — (Interjection) — Well, Andrei Sackharov is a Russian dissident, I don't know what his policies are. He is simply opposed to some of the things that he sees in his own country, and one of the few people in Russia that have had the courage to express their opinions. He says, "I am skeptical of socialism in general." That does not suggest that he is a socialist. Sackharov declared in July 1973 to Olle Stenholm, the Swedish radio correspondent in an interview that caused Stenholm's expulsion and led to the press campaign against Sackharov: "I don't find that socialism has brought anything new in the theoretical plane or a better social order. We have the same kinds of problems as the capitalistic world — criminality and alienation. The difference is that our society is an extreme case with maximum lack of freedom, maximum ideological The habit of introducing legislation . . . every time that some little problem developed in one part of the country or other immediately there was a bill in this House intending to solve that particular problem.

I suggest, Sir, that what has been overlooked as a substitute for that kind of centralized control is the opportunity to allow people themselves to control their own destiny. Much has been said about the free market and how it is not working and how it must be replaced. We hear that expression of opinion from honourable gentlemen opposite time after time. Well, Sir, I suggest that it isn't the free market that needs replacing, it is those people that are tampering with it, and my honourable friends opposite, instead of implementing or trying to believe that by passing more and more legislation that they are controlling the economy and they are making a contribution to people's lives, are making a mistake. What is required is a return to the free market and a strengthening of consumer

Tuesday, May 31, 1977

organizations, and that implies the provision of information to the consumers so that they will not be misled by advertising that tends to get them into difficulty. That it does seem to me that if the money that is currently being wasted in attempting to impose a centralized form of bureaucracy on the economy were spent in assisting consumer organizations to help people make judgements and decisions respecting purchases, it would be money that would not be wasted, it would be money that would be well spent. It would not interfere with the right of the individual and the freedom of the individual. I get a little bit amused at honourable gentlemen opposite from time to time, particularly the Member for Thompson who loves to stand up in his place and talk about how much freedom this country has when in fact the very opposite is occurring. . It's an unusual ability to be able to see freedom in greater and greater control.

Now, in an article that was written a short while ago by Walter Stewart, he goes on to point out, it was in MacLean's Magazine of January 24, he goes on to point out the very same thing. We even have some newspaper men now and that really is an achievement when newspaper men begin to recognize that there is something wrong with the economy. "Everywhere," he says, "the rumble of gripes is growing to a roar. It is obvious that the welfare state has gone fearfully awry. Canada in many respects a welfare state, has a clear cause for concern over Europe's travails. We've imported many of the same institutions, techniques and attitudes and we have the same need to solve the essential dilemma." Of course, we are importing those things. I remember the Minister of Health on one occasion — presently the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs — making an elaborate trip to Sweden to study their system. That's the last place in the world that we want to go to study anything. Unless you want a lesson in despair.

"How to curb the excesses of the welfare state without destroying social services. How to manage the bureaucracy without abandoning the old, the poor, the handicapped and the sick, whom the bureaucrats were put in place to serve." Then he goes on to make some other comments, but then he goes on to say this, "After decades of trial, welfare systems nearly everywhere are increasingly proving to be costly, inflexible and inefficient. That's a sad defeat for the lofty ideals that gave birth to the systems in the first place," — which is pretty much a repetition of what I was saying earlier. We were told in the brave beginning that welfarism would break the back of poverty, provide decent living standards, adequate health, proper education and a robust economy. It would shift the burden from the downtrodden workers to the idle rich. Opportunities would be equalized and families trapped for generations in the poverty cycle of a society dependent on individual charity would become independent, productive human beings. That, Sir, we know has not happened. The disparity between those who have and those who have not is greater than it ever was, and it's continuing to grow.

The comments of the Minister of Mines and Resources when he closed the debate on his Estimates, seemed to me it was a kind of wide ranging debate to take place on Mines and Resources but he delved into the question of the philosophy of, "from each according to his ability and to each according to his needs". If there ever was a pernicious dogma, that is it. And it sounds good. You take from those who have lots and you give to those who have need. But there are a few catches that destroy the ideal and the first one is, who determines the need? The individual, the government, or are you going to have a vote amongst everyone in the province or in society to determine. . . who is going to give and who is going to receive? Because if that happens, if that happens, Sir, that a third party is going to be making that decision, then those that have the ability are going to soon lose that ability. They are going to lose the initiative. They are going to lose the incentive to work for somebody else. That is just not man's nature. Socialism is a doctrine that is based on a misconception of human nature. Man essentially, although they are prepared and even willing to help people who need help, the good samaritan attitude is still inherent in mankind, but basically, mankind is selfish and competitive and instead of attempting to destroy those two basic inherent qualities of mankind, we should be using them for the betterment of mankind. And you use —(Interjection)— it, explain my honourable friend says — by sheer competition. Instead of having an army of bureaucrats regulating and controlling, performing no useful function other than drawing from the public purse; just let the competition provide the levelling out and prevent the abuses .

It has always been a mystery to me, Sir, that government will do everything to prevent abuses in the economy — and we all know abuses are there — except expose those who are abusing to competition. Far better you appoint another board or another commission or pass another law; and all that does is provide an opportunity for those who are already abusing the law, to hide behind it.

Eugenio Pacelli, for my honourable friend, the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, may recognize him more by his official title of Pope Pius XII, had this to say in 1944. He said: "Private property is a natural fruit of labour; a product of intense activity of man acquired through his energetic determination to ensure and develop with his own strength, his own existence and that of his family, and to create for himself and his own, an existence of just freedom not only economic but also political, cultural and religious."

I could not improve on that observation because, Sir, it is as true today as it was then, as it has

Tuesday, May 31, 1977

been since the beginning of mankind. You deprive the individual of the right to own that which he has earned on the pretext of distributing it to somebody else, the man is no longer a free man, he is nothing more than a slave. And men or society can be counted upon to help those in need if they can be convinced that the cause is a just one, and that the need is there. But when that is abused, as it is being abused today, to provide things that the average person feels the individual can do for himself, then there is a reluctance on the part of the individual to part with that which they feel they have rightfully earned. And if my honourable friends opposite, and I predict that they are, are to lose the next election whenever that is called, they are going to be dismayed as indeed they are already dismayed, to find that the amount of money that they have distributed — the tactic of taking from the rich and giving to the poor on the pretext of protecting one from the other — is not being accepted, because there is a great deal more in the minds of people of this country than just money. I'm not suggesting that it is the people that are giving that are complaining. It's the people that are on the receiving end that are complaining, and they are complaining because, Sir, they see in these programs the loss of the thing that they consider to be a heck of a lot more important than just a few dollars from the government, and that is freedom.

Rather interesting, just the other night in Law Amendments, Sir, when Mr. Prince was before that Committee, and started talking about that thing, that very thing he was complaining about in the amendments to the City of Winnipeg Act. And, what was the Minister of Mines reaction? He said: "Is it not a fact that under this government you have received more money from the NDP than any other government." That is the only thing that is important. They think that life evolves around the gifts that can come from the government, and there is a great deal more to living than just the dollars.

I've heard expressions of opinion from some of my socialist friends, not necessarily on the other side of the House, but certainly friends of theirs, who are dismayed to learn that a lot of people intend to vote against them because they feel that the heavy hand of government is coming down on them and making it more and more difficult for them to survive — that they are losing their freedom. That, Sir, is what I'm attempting to say in this debate; that notwithstanding all of the good intentions, notwithstanding all of the noble ideals, my honourable friends are making a mistake in suggesting that the only thing that is important to the people of this country is the money that government can dole out to them periodically in the forms of grants, and what have you. It won't wash. — (Interjection)—

Well, my honourable friend says, "We should leave them all alone." What I am suggesting is there can be those transfers without the heavy hand of government depressing people in this country. — (Interjection)— My honourable friend, of course, is uttering and spouting the usual nonsense that we hear from the honourable gentlemen opposite. When we suggest on this side of the House, that there is something wrong with the economy, and the unemployment figures bear it out, when when we suggest that the thing that is basically wrong with the economy is too much government control, and not enough freedom of the individual, not enough opportunities for the individual, then they suggest that that means that those that have are going to have more.

I suggest to my honourable friends, that you expose those same people to competition and they will have a heck of a lot less and will work a lot harder for it, but at the same time they will continue to contribute, they will even contribute more, because the incentive is greater.

You know, the attitude of this government was never better demonstrated than the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs a few years ago when in the course of some remarks that I was making to the House — and I note now that he wants to ask another question, I hope it's a little more intelligent than the one he asked me then — when he said, "How then would you control wages, and how would you control profits?" My answer today is the same as it was then, what right have we got to control profits, what right have we got to control wages except.. — (Interjection)— That's right, and I opposed the Anti-Inflation Board right from the very beginning before it was even brought into. . . — (Interjection)— Yes, because I knew what it would do. My statement is on the record just in case anybody wants to look it up. I knew what it would do, because any time you start imposing controls on people, you are destroying the very substance of their lives. — (Interjection)— Well, I'm glad my honourable friend mentioned that, because they are in favour of creating all kinds of freedom insofar as it applies to booze, pornography, and all of those things, but economic controls, no. You can have all kinds of freedom. . . You can start out drinking when you're a year old, you can start looking at pornography, and do all of those things, but economic freedom, no. Economic freedom must be curtailed. That is the creed of my honourable friends opposite, and it's the very thing that is destroying the life of this country. Sir, belatedly, judging from the remarks of the Minister of Health and Social Development, the government now is beginning to recognize what it should have recognized eight years ago.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

HONOURABLE RENE TOUPIN, (Springfield): I'd like to pose a question, Mr. Speaker, and I hope that it is considered to be more intelligent than the previous one I asked of the MLA from MORRIS. To follow up on his suggestion that socialistic governments are not as capable pertaining to the balance

in the economy, why is it, as an example the Maritimes have much higher unemployment than we have here in Manitoba and/or Saskatchewan?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSON: I'm afraid I'm going to have to disillusion the Minister of Consumer Affairs because that is a more stupid question than the one he asked before. The fact is that we are living in an economy that is run federally by a socialist government.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I don't intend to have an extended speech on this subject. The honourable member referred to the fact that I said that all that we want to do is get votes by doling out money with regard to St. Boniface. The facts of the matter were that a gentleman came and indicated that the French fact in the Province of Manitoba was being eroded. I asked the gentleman was it not the case that the French fact in the City of Winnipeg had received more support financially from the three levels of government since the creation of Unicity than it had received before? And I will concede without a doubt to my honourable friend that financial support is not necessarily the only way of preserving a particular situation. But with regard to the French fact in the City of St. Boniface, the consistent problem has been a lack of opportunity to develop it, whether it be in the school system by financing the language of instruction in school as French, which was done by this province, which doesn't need additional financial support, it means a different practice in education. It means what the Leader of the Opposition said, that financial support will not be withheld from schools which give the language of instruction in French, whether it be to the Festival du Voyageur which was never before considered a total Manitoba festival because it took place in the French language and therefore financial support was removed, that the discrimination of the French fact in recognition of things which a provincial government would give to, was removed after unicity.

I want the honourable member to know that when I was on Metro Council in 1963, an application was made by the Cercle Moliere, which is the French theatre, for funding as a theatre. The representative from that area was named Ostrander; he represented St. Boniface in Metro Council and he said, "We will not give money to La this is the representative from St. Boniface, "because it is an ethnic theatre and we do not give money to the Ukrainian theatre, we do not give money to the Jewish theatre, we do not give money to any of the ethnic theatres. We only give money to theatres which are totally embracing of Manitoba." And I responded that the ethnic Cercle Moliere La is not an ethnic theatre; it is a theatre conducted in one of the official languages of Canada. And the representative from St. Boniface said, "I thought that was settled in 1759." That was his position.

Now, all that I said to Mr. Prince and I think, Mr. Speaker, that my honourable friend does an injustice when he suggested my particular form of attack is that the way of getting votes is to give money because I don't think that he will find many programs that I have initiated when I was a member of the government that involved the doling out of funds and I probably am considered one of the most miserly of Manitoba Ministers. There is one area in which I have increased expenditures and that is in mineral exploration but the amount that we are spending we are receiving from the companies, so there is no net distribution and nowhere have I gone to the citizens on the question of getting votes by giving money. There are people of all political parties who think that is a way of getting votes and the New Democrats are no exception — and I am trying to say this with as little criticism as possible — that there is money needed in some areas. But as a design for winning public support, other than as a necessity which has to be spent, I do not regard the doling out of funds as being a particular way of getting electoral support. So I tell my honourable friend, he doesn't have to accept it, that certainly he has misjudged my position with regard to that particular question and I really didn't get up to talk about that, it's the last few moments of my honourable friend's speech that has got me to my feet.

That suggestion that we believe in freedom when it doesn't involve economic matters — and he thought that this was some type of a negative feature of our program — but that when it comes to economic questions, we believe in control. Well, Mr. Speaker, I think much the same position as my honourable friend that much of what the New Democratic Party is trying to do with regard to economic control is to remove many of the economic controls which have resulted in some people taking tremendous advantage and getting tremendous profit at the expense of the rest of the community. And the word "profit" in this sense, it is done not as a result of their efforts but as a result of economic aids by the state to their particular position which my honourable friend knows about. That certain people are given exclusive franchises with regard to the cutting of timber, that that is a control against other people; that certain people are giving exclusive franchises with regard to the selling in this country of certain products effectively by lifting up huge tariff barriers preventing the inflow of other products; that certain people are giving exclusive franchises to form very very state-supported trade unions such as the lawyers, such as the doctors, such as all of the professional people who profit enormously by the result of this state assistance and economic control on the other people in our society. Many of these things that we talk about, Mr. Speaker, such as free trade

unionism, is merely the removing of a restriction which society has placed on trade unions through restrictive legislation which applies to nobody else in the community and which everybody else is permitted to do and is congratulated for on the basis that they have shown their great acumen in creating business.

The sugar companies of this country and the world created a cartel which has permitted them to set the price of sugar for years. They were prosecuted for several years in the Province of Manitoba and I believe that the essence of the judge's finding was that it was not against the public interest that this great combination be set up, a combination of companies which sees to it that the price of sugar is not sold and none of it gets to the market unless it is sold at prices which they can administer.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have tried to undo some of those economic controls but the feature of my honourable friend's position which is most amusing is that he says and he agrees that with regard to moral questions, with regard to questions of the mind, with regard to questions of individual action, with regard to questions of what a person can read, what he can hear, what he can see, to the question of when he should be permitted to drink and if he says, Mr. Speaker, that in an economic control, the result of the controls is to create more problems than it eliminates, I am not asking him to accept but I am telling you that my belief in controls, on individual morals and individual human freedoms and actions which have nothing to do with the economy but have to do with taste, which have to do with social mores, which have to do with religion, that controls on such matters create more problems than they solve. And I intend, Mr. Speaker, to address myself to that particular question when we deal with the liquor bill.

The honourable member says that I don't care if people drink at one year old. Mr. Speaker, I want my honourable friend to know that I had my first drink at the age of seven; that's seven days, not seven years. And I want my honourable friend to know how I know that. Because since that time, Mr. Speaker, I have had — of course, I couldn't remember what happened to me when I was seven days old but I know what happened to me when I was seven days old — and I have had the occasion of attending numerous ceremonies of what happens to a child of my background when he is seven days old. And they take them, Mr. Speaker, and they perform an operation. And while the operation is being performed, the child squeals; it cries and one thinks it is with pain; I don't know whether it is with pain or not, but it definitely cries. After the operation is finished, the person performing it who is not a doctor generally — not a doctor, no, he is a man who is trained to perform a — circumcision but he is not a doctor he is doing it as a matter of religious permission, not as a matter of medical permission. But he takes a dab of gauze cloth and he puts it into a glass of whiskey and he puts it to the lips of the child who has been circumcised and screams immediately stop and the child starts to smile. I've seen it happen on numerous occasions, Mr. Speaker, on numerous occasions. So I had my first drink at the age of seven. And since then as far as I can recollect, the matter of alcohol in my family was one in which it was a normal feature of growing up, it was not drunk in excess and it was dealt with in moderation. So what honourable members are obviously seeking is not an age limit, they are seeking moderation and there are much better ways of achieving moderation, Mr. Speaker, than through controls. I'll be able to deal with that when we get to the bill in question.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Member for Sturgeon Creek that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I just want to continue down the list. 48 is next?

MR. BROWN: Stand, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Bill No. 59, An Act to amend The Human Rights Act. (Stand)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Bill No. 65, An Act to amend The Employment Standards Act (2). (Stand)

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege. I have just been informed it was the eighth day not the seventh day.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Bill No. 67, the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs, The Credit Unions and Caisses Populaires Act. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. BROWN: Stand, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Bill No. 72, the proposed motion of the Honourable Attorney-General, An Act to amend Various Acts Relating to Marital Property. The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell. (Stand)

BILL (NO. 78) — THE STATUTE LAW AMENDMENT (TAXATION) ACT (1977)

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Bill No. 78, the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Finance, The Statute Law Amendment (Taxation) Act (1977). The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, we have only a few comments to make with respect to this bill and in relation to Part II of the bill which purports to deal with the exemptions for thermal insulation materials. This is the manifestation of the undertaking that was given in the Throne Speech to exempt private residential users from sales tax for insulation used on private residential homes. I made the comment, Mr. Speaker, at the time of the response to the Budget Speech that the measure was only a half-hearted measure if we could believe the words, as I am sure we could, the words of the Honourable the Minister of Finance when he said that the proposal was being advanced as an energy conservation matter and the proposition is very simple. The proposition is that if you are advancing or if you are encouraging the use of insulation to energy, then the use of insulation in whatever kind of premises, whether they be residential, apartment, commercial, factory or whatever, all works towards the saving of energy. *Ergo* if you are going to multiply the advantage that is to be obtained from the greater utilization of insulation, you remove the sales tax from insulation wherever it is used.

There seems to be an element of blindness, perhaps even perversity, on the part of our NDP colleagues opposite in that they would restrict this after having said that they want to save energy, they would then restrict the benefit of the removal of the tax to residential homes. We favour the removal of the tax on residential homes. We favour the removal of the tax wherever insulation is used because it is good for energy-saving. So we make this plea to the Ministry opposite that they reconsider the matter, that they set aside their prejudices about so-called commercial operations and that they indeed accept and embrace the total proposition that insulation should be used, a greater amount should be used for energy saving. That being the case, the sales tax should be removed from all insulation in Manitoba.

We think it is a very simple proposition, we think it is an extremely defensible proposition, we think it is totally in keeping with the principle that they have advanced, namely, that the measure is for energy conservation and we can't see for the life of us why they would not extend this tax relief right across the board at a time when the First Minister, of all people, keeps trumpeting about the need for energy conservation. The amounts of tax dollars involved, as explained by the Minister of Finance himself, are minor and we just can't see what the hold-up is and it leads one to believe that it's another example of the NDP having this kind of tunnel vision about insulation that is being used by commercial operations as being not worthy of tax exemption, whereas if it is used by an individual on a residential home it is, and still trying to maintain that they support the principle of energy conservation. So I suggest, Mr. Speaker, on all grounds, on the grounds of equity, on the grounds of fairness, on the grounds of reasonableness, on the grounds of energy-saving, that this measure should be amended by the Minister when it reaches Committee stage, to make it meaningful right across the board for all the people who utilize insulation in Manitoba for whatever purpose.

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

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK: I couldn't help but react to the comments made by the Leader of the Opposition who in his great desire to cater to his own bias in favour of industrial enterprise is now entering into the field on behalf of those people who he feels need to be not protected, not defended, but actually given all sorts of incentives. He spoke about the NDP attitude. I have to say that the Progressive Conservative attitude under the leadership of the present Leader of the Opposition is clearly one which is prepared to spend all kinds of money in a give-away program as incentives to enterprise within Manitoba. There seems to be no hesitation on his part to rise to support this money give-away program which he is endorsing and which I find surprising in view of the . . . of course, he didn't hear the Member for Morris speak about spending by governments, and therefore he didn't have the benefit of the caution suggested by the Member for Morris in handling the affairs of government and in the spending program because the Leader of the Opposition clearly wants to give more and more incentives to more and more enterprise. That is clearly of importance to him.

Now, he used the occasion to speak about insulation, as being a person who is deeply concerned about the conservation of energy. He has not told us the extent to which he thinks a five percent reduction in cost will stimulate people to invest the 95 percent of the cost in order to save energy. In my opinion, and I said this after he spoke during the Budget Debate, it is not a great deal of incentive to be told you only have to spend 95 percent and, therefore, you will be encouraged to conserve energy by insulation. Well, I see a distinction between the effort made in a symbolic way to tell people that it is in their interests to invest money in their homes in order to save on their costs of the increasing costs of energy and that this is bolstered by the program which was announced — which I think is much more meaningful — to provide loans for those very same people who don't have the cash to lay out for that program.

This compares in no way with the enterprise of a commercial and industrial nature, which firstly charges off its taxes the costs of any improvements that it makes to the buildings. It becomes a matter which, for them, the 5 percent is laughable compared with the amount that they can deduct from their tax burden by doing this work and I think that the Leader of the Opposition was just going through a form of charade, a sham, a sort of a game he is playing in an attempt to win the affection of those people whom he thinks he is trying to persuade about his efforts to save energy. That's not it at all. If

Tuesday, May 31, 1977

he really felt that this program was important and worthwhile, then why is he not proposing that rather than give up the taxes, that a bonus be paid to those people who would insulate if indeed — (Interjection)— Now, you see, Mr. Speaker, how foolish it is for the Leader of the Opposition who was part of the government that imposed this five percent tax, that put this additional cost on various of the consumers in the province, now to say remove it and remove it not only from the residents — (Interjection)— You see, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition makes most of his best speeches while sitting on his dignity and who is able only to make his contribution in that way. He is prepared to blame everybody for anything that happens as long as it is what he thinks his political advantage and therefore he is still trying to make speeches whilst sitting on his seat.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I am sorry in a way that he cannot speak further on this bill. No doubt he would have real pearls of wisdom to offer but the fact is, Mr. Speaker, that the energy costs . . . I must tell him, I guess he doesn't know it, — I'm telling him directly — that the increase in costs of energy is not unique to Manitoba. I wonder if I have to repeat that for him to know it because he seems to think that there is something happening in Manitoba that made the energy costs so high whereas he ought well to know that the relative cost of hydro-electric power in Manitoba is better than it was when he was part of a government in this province. I think that that is a fact that he likes to ignore and that is a fact that he does not speak about. All he does is speak of, as a fact, a fictitious figure of \$600 million which is a nice round sum and which he is prepared to use to fool the electorate because that is really what he embarked to do something about a year ago when he decided that he was going to swing the electorate by spreading stories no matter whether or not they have a proper foundation in fact.

I have to tell him that because we were talking here about a five percent tax, the fact that the government decided to remove it from residential homeowners, I said then that I was not impressed that it would make that big a difference or that big of an incentive, but as far as the Leader of the Opposition is concerned, the main incentive that he sees that attracts him is the one that he would like to pass on to industrial and commercial buildings. Well, if it is that valuable — and he made a big deal about it when he spoke on previous occasions how important it is to remove that five percent tax — then it is perfectly consistent to say to those people whom he is trying to persuade to insulate their home, to pay them . . . oh, one percent, maybe two percent, something additional to really give them an incentive. He calls that socialism. How peculiar it is in the mind of the Leader of the Opposition that forgiving a tax is good Conservative policy but giving an incentive is not . . . is socialism. Yet he is the one who stands up here and keeps pleading for incentives to industry. He keeps pleading for incentives and he calls them tax reductions. Mr. Speaker, there is only in the mind of the Leader of the Opposition that kind of a difference because when you have a tax and then you say we will make a special reduction to induce industry to become more active, that is a transference back to a taxpayer in a different way, in a different rearrangement of revenues which are in the hands of the province. And indeed, many of the revenues are those designed and structured by the government of which he was a part. Now he is saying, Oh no, an incentive in a tax reduction is something different than an incentive in a grant. Well, Mr. Speaker, to him, it is different. To me, it is still a transference of money from one taxpayer to another. And when we used to hear from members opposite, and the Leader of the Opposition hasn't been here long enough to fall into that kind of a trap, when they would say, All you are doing is taking from the taxpayer and giving back to the taxpayer, somehow they believed that that when we have a Property Tax Credit Plan which is a tax reduction, Oh, they say, that's not a tax reduction because you are just taking away from the taxpayer and giving it back to them. And when we say that is a rearrangement, a re-apportionment, they don't understand it, but now he is saying he does want an incentive to industry which means what, Mr. Speaker? It means a reduction to some at the expense of others and that, to me, is a payment out of tax moneys and is an incentive. Just like DREE is an incentive given for development, it is use of tax moneys, it is not a tax reduction in the minds of anybody who understands taxation but, in effect, it is a transference. That's what the Leader of the Opposition wants. I really marvel that he gets all excited about a five percent reduction, about a removal of sales tax and doesn't say, ten percent will mean more than five percent; if the tax were ten percent as it is in Newfoundland or eight percent as it is in Ontario and he would give that up, that would be all right in his mind. But the minute I suggest that if he is really sincere in wanting to create an incentive to induce people to insulate their homes to save energy, he should be prepared and consistent to say, In addition to a removal of the tax in certain cases' give them a little more. Maybe that would be more meaningful; maybe that will accomplish the purpose. I am not sure what his purpose is; I really suspect that he is not so concerned about conservation of energy as he is concerned with a desire to attract the voters' attention, which is a perfectly legitimate operation but I want him to try to be consistent when he does that. There is nothing whatsoever wrong with presenting a program to the electors but at least be consistent. I don't wonder that the Leader of the Opposition sits in his seat and wrings his hands. There is enough already on his hands to make him want to wash them frequently.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. LYON: Would the honourable member permit a question? Does he believe in the principle of

energy conservation?

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, if the honourable member had listened to speeches that I have made in the past and including what I said today, he would understand that I believe in energy conservation but I believe also in a planned method whereby one can achieve a purpose without just throwing money away as if it were — what's the expression — made of something that the Leader of the Opposition is prepared to give away in order to favour those to whom he owes some kind of allegiance.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, if my honourable friend then was answering yes, which is hard to deduce, why should the concept not be extended to all people who use insulation?

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member wasn't listening to me and if he was, he would have understood. But he has that problem. I pointed out earlier that when — (Interjection) — Mr. Speaker, the biggest problem I have in this House is that my ears are acute enough to hear the grumbling and mumbling of the Leader of the Opposition when he is seated at his seat. The person who used to be House leader has given up all efforts to try to conform to the rules of the House. Mr. Speaker, the biggest problem I have is reacting . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. CHERNIACK: . . . to him when he speaks from his seat, and I have to admit that. I have no problem in trying to explain that I see a vast difference between a commercial operation where costs such as improvements, renovations, in specifically insulation of buildings, is a deduction from income tax — I should spell it out for him — corporate income tax is reduced by the expenditures made in a commercial enterprise and therefore there is an incentive there at all times to attempt to order your business in such a way that you maximize your profits and you reduce taxation. That's a perfectly legitimate operation. It is not necessary to recognize that as an incentive to them because they are able to do that, whereas what this bill is designed to do is to appeal to people who, out of their own pockets and out of their own earnings, would be stimulated into insulating their homes and in the long run saving their costs of energy.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Before I recognize the Honourable Member for Morris, I would like to indicate that we have a guest in the loge to my right, the Honourable Mr. Dan Lang, Minister of Education, Recreation, Manpower and Housing of Yukon. On behalf of the honourable members of the Assembly, we welcome you.

The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, nothing could have demonstrated the point that I was attempting to make about a half an hour ago, more than the utterances of the former Minister of Finance, the Member for St. Johns. What I had attempted to say in the during the course of my remarks — now he has given me an opportunity to emphasize them — is that there is an inherent characteristic on the part of honourable gentlemen opposite that they believe that they must have their finger on everything, that they must control everything. And what the Member for St. Johns is suggesting, that rather than just simply removing a tax, that that step — as the Leader of the Opposition pointed out — will have the effect of encouraging people to insulate in order to conserve energy. It's a theme that is returned to time and time again on the part of the First Minister, that by encouraging people to insulate, we will remove the tax.

My honourable friend from St. Johns says, no, there is a better way of doing it and that is by paying them a bonus. He is not satisfied unless somehow or other the government can get their hands on the money and then syphon it off for their own purposes and give what is left back to the same taxpayers. This is the very thing that we've been saying about honourable gentlemen opposite time after time. — (Interjection) — There's a very appropriate story dealing with that very thing, which I won't tell here, but it does illustrate the very point that I'm attempting to make. There is nothing that this government will want to happen unless somehow or other it passes through their hands. All we're suggesting is that it's not going to create any burden on anybody, the removal of the tax on the insulation will provide an incentive for people to insulate and thereby conserve energy. It's to me a very simple proposition, but it cannot be accepted by honourable gentlemen opposite because of the — and here again is that demonstrated attitude toward — you know, they are so wrapped up in their hatred of anybody that has a business of any kind, that the prejudice shows through no matter what bill is being debated . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. JORGENSEN: . . . what discussion has taken place, that envy, that jealousy on the part of honourable gentlemen opposite against anybody that is successful. Sir, the only people that they hate more and I know that they don't like people that are in the slums, they like to get them out of there — but the only people that they hate more than those that are in the slums are those that have

managed to pull themselves out of the slums. That's a characteristic attitude and the very attitude that I was attempting to demonstrate a few moments ago as to what's going to defeat this government. Because everybody is sensing it, everybody is feeling it, everybody recognizes the attitude on the part of a government that doesn't believe in equality, that doesn't believe in equality of opportunity, that is. They believe that they are the great providers of equality.

You know, when the concept of equality was first thought of, it was in terms of freedom and equality before the law. Freedom of opportunity. Somehow or other that has been interpreted as meaning freedom of equality of economic life, and that was really not the original intention of that. I have no objections to any government making an effort to attempt to better the conditions, the lives of people who are less fortunate — providing opportunities. But that does not mean, Sir, that you have to destroy those who have the ability to do something for themselves, which is what the Member for St. Johns is implying. Now, he suggests that because the Conservative Government in the Roblin years imposed the five percent sales tax, that it's got to remain in perpetuity. Now those things, Sir, are so constant that they cannot be removed if circumstances and requirements demand it. And I don't know what is so sacred about hanging on to that five percent sales tax on insulation material. My honourable friends cannot remove from their sight, their dogmatic attitude against business long enough to recognize that there is a greater field to serve, that there is a greater need. And, as I say, the First Minister talks about it constantly, the need to conserve energy, provided with an opportunity, a suggestion that was made by the Leader of the Opposition. But one can now see that is really not the intention of honourable gentlemen opposite. Their intention is to continue to act as the people who are going to take and the people who are going to give and they're going to determine who they take from and who they give to. It's a simple proposition. Take from the rich and give to the poor on the pretext of protecting one from the other, and the Member for St. Johns has demonstrated that philosophy once again.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Would you permit me to make a correction. I stated that the Ontario sales tax is 8 percent. I was wrong, it's 7 percent.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a couple of questions of the Minister before he closes the debate. I know that in the bill it states that it applies to single dwelling units. This does concern me, Mr. Speaker, because I feel that there are quite a few small apartments, duplexes and so on that perhaps the owners would like to insulate; and some of them are in the condition that need to be insulated because the cost of heat will either close those places up, which are still pretty good units. Or is it strictly applicable to just single dwelling units. Perhaps the Minister can explain this when he closes debate.

I was somewhat concerned when the Member for St. Johns was speaking. During his speech I wondered if anybody was going to get up and ask him if he's going to support the bill, because he said it was insignificant and almost irrelevant and didn't have much meaning and he said he pointed that out before. Well if that's the case, I just wonder why the Minister of Finance is bringing in the bill if it's so insignificant and so irrelevant because, in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, I think it's very significant, I think it's very relevant at this time. Not only could it be one of the measures that we can use and perhaps expand in conservation of energy, but as well, I think that the people will take advantage to insulate their homes. Even if it's a small saving of \$25 a home as a result of the tax itself, it's still a considerable saving to many people.

My concern is to insulate a dwelling unit. I hope it will apply to some of the owners in say, duplexes or small townhouses or apartments because really I think it would make it much more worthwhile than if it was strictly applied to a small single unit. I'm sure the Minister knows that perhaps the newer units are better insulated. However, the units that were built 30 or 40 years ago need insulation because the type of insulation they used then was either shavings that have dropped to the bottom. So I think that the people will take advantage and start insulating. In fact, under the \$1,000 loan program, I've had many calls — I raised it before the Orders of the Day two days ago — from people, as to when they can apply, because some of them are taking their holidays during the summer-time and want to avail themselves of the program; they have called the Minister's office of Industry and Commerce and couldn't get any information. So I say the quicker the Minister of Finance can put that program in operation, the better.

But I was really concerned when the Member for St. Johns said it was so irrelevant and insignificant, and I wondered if he was going to support the bill. Because if it is that irrelevant, what's the necessity of the bill in the House in the first place. So what I'm saying, what the Member for St. Johns should have been saying, that we should be doing much more to expand this program so that the people do take advantage in the way of savings; and secondly, to really expand the conservation program of energy, which I think would be much more sensible, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Speaker, I just want to say a few words on this Bill 78. After listening to the

Tuesday, May 31, 1977

Member for St. Johns, I would like to reinforce the comments that were made by my leader this morning; I think they were very important. It has been mentioned so many times in recent months about one important source of energy in this province, and that's Hydro. And my leader has pointed out to this government and to the people of the province of Manitoba, how this government has mismanaged the development of Manitoba Hydro.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to relate this energy with this particular bill, when we're talking about providing some kind of tax reduction, when they are probably building new buildings, new homes, and how it relates to our hydro energy development. I can think back a number of years probably when this government first took over, how Manitoba Hydro used to be proud of advertising the use of hydro electricity for the purpose of heating homes. And I can think of many people who were contemplating building a new home, who thought well, this is a good idea, we'll change from a source of energy which wasn't produced in Manitoba and we'll build homes and heat them by electricity. Today, Mr. Speaker, that is completely changed in the years that this government has been in operation, and this is the very point I want to reinforce — what my leader has been saying — that the incentive to heat your home by electricity has been lost. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that many people have told me that when they converted from say, gas or oil to electricity, they wish now they had never done it because it has not been any advantage to them.

Mr. Speaker, I am rather surprised, and I want to reinforce the comments that have been made, by not extending this right across-the-board, to duplexes or any place where insulation is required in the building and heating of plants, whether they are for business or for private dwellings. I know the Minister of Labour, when he brings in legislation and talks about increasing the overtime from 1 ½ to 1 ¾, somebody's got to pay that, Mr. Speaker' whoever may be involved. —(Interjection)— Well, the Minister of Labour says: if they may use it. There are many cases where they are going to be using it, and I suggest that if the Minister of Labour is really in concert with the rest of his colleagues, that they will be discussing some of these things to try to establish a mutual agreement. The Minister of Labour can impose this on management who is responsible for employing people in this province, and here is one example where they could probably help, even if it is in a small way; to assist small businesses, medium size businesses — and it's a fact, Mr. Speaker, right across this province. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that those who the NDP claim to get their support from, the working people, are as concerned about this measure which could be a saving to their employer. I think they'd be as interested as the employer himself, to be able to reduce his costs.

One other thing I wanted to mention, Mr. Speaker, and that is in Part 3 of Bill 78, relating to such things as our metric system which is not law in Ottawa today. I believe, and I stand to be corrected, Mr. Speaker, Bill C23 I think is the bill that is before the House in Ottawa. Like this government, I don't know whether they are going to follow the same pattern, but the Federal Government got themselves into an awful lot of difficulty by going ahead and carrying out the instructions insofar as the metric system is concerned, to make changes across this country before the law has ever been passed and, Mr. Speaker, I'm wondering if the Minister is going to pass this section before it becomes law in the House of Commons. As far as I'm concerned, and I speak for many people, Mr. Speaker, this whole metric system and the way the Federal Government has been pushing it on the people of this country at a time of inflation, when we could probably have waited a few more years and given the people an opportunity. I remember in this session where the Member for Arthur had posed a question to the First Minister about the metric system as it applies to the measurement of land to farmers in this province, and the First Minister replied to my colleague from Arthur that he should have been asking this question two years ago. It's only in the past 6, 7, 8 months, Mr. Speaker, that the Federal Government have been sending out people to explain the whole metric system to people. It was not talked about two years ago. I am wondering in this particular section of this bill, Mr. Speaker, whether this government isn't acting in haste as well. Now, maybe they don't intend to make it law until such time as the law has been passed in Ottawa. These are a few comments, Mr. Speaker, that I want to make in regard to this bill.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance shall be closing debate?

MR. MILLER: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to respond to the Member for Rock Lake on the last item he mentioned and that was with regard to that part of the bill which deals with the use of metric measurements with regard to the Tobacco Act.

The industry is converting to the Metric System — the entire industry, and they have a timetable commencing July 1st, 1977, and the conversion is to be completed by December 31st, 1978. It will be a gradual conversion. And all that's being done here is to make it possible to use both, either the metric or the existing for taxation purposes, that's all it amounts to. It's a method by which the tax department can accept a packaging which is either in the metric or in the other, and it's a gradual one. You know, the same product will now be manufactured in the ounces denomination and the metric

Tuesday, May 31, 1977

way concurrently, as they change, as they move from one to the other it will discontinue the ounce denomination and will move to the metric. And our tax system of course has to reflect that, because our tax deals in ounces and therefore, once they package in metric then the tax has to reflect that particular change.

So I want to tell the honourable member, this is at the request of the industry, it's happening across the country. Cigars, cigarettes and tobacco is not packaged in Manitoba. They all come from pretty well three or four sources, and they are moving in that direction, and apparently they expect July 1st, 1977, some of the products are going to be packaged for the first time in metric and should be completed within a year. I hope that responds to the question.

The Member for Assiniboia asked what homes would be covered, what facility, the residences, and I think it was indicated in a release that was issued by the department that basically it's for residential establishments, which is true, on the other hand it is expected that it will cover duplexes — he asked about that. But I think the most interesting aspect of the debate, frankly, was the discussions that transpired between the Leader of the Opposition and then the Member for Morris who on two occasions spoke today. They have made this a philosophic debate.

Mr. Speaker, when this bill was introduced I did not try to delude the people of Manitoba into thinking this is other than a manner, a way, an attempt, to focus some attention on the need for energy conservation, and it has nothing to do with the fact that hydro rates have gone up — they have gone up and I don't doubt that they will continue, as will gas even more, as oil even more because as it runs out it will become a precious commodity, and that day will come. So it's an energy conservation by the average person.

People in business who are concerned about their overhead — and they're always concerned if they're good businessmen — they don't have to be enticed or attracted by that 5 percent discount they're going to save on insulation. They know darn well what the bottom line is at the end of the year, and if they can reduce their overhead by X percent, that's where the profit is. Members opposite know that insulation or any other materials that are used, can be offset against taxable income by that corporation and that \$5.00 on the hundred, if that firm is in the 50 percent tax bracket, he can use only \$2.50. So that's not the big attraction at all. A business will do what it has to do in order to keep its overhead down because it pays it to do it. If they're going to save heat, they'll do it because it pays them to do it, and they can not only do it at a lower cost than the average person, because they can write-off that tax that they're paying.

Mr. Speaker, the members opposite seem to take the position that somehow this government just has to do things in such a way as to sort of appear to be the benefactor to everyone. Mr. Speaker, what they're trying to pose as is the benefactor of business, and I say to them they're complaining about government getting into people's hair and being involved too much in people's lives — you know, if they listened to themselves, they're getting very deeply involved in the lives of business and I'm not sure that business is that desirous of that sort of involvement. Maybe let business be, they can stand on their own feet. He says he'd use taxes. Does he not know that here in Manitoba, personal income tax was reduced by 2 percent across the board. He knows it — the only place in Canada a reduction. He also knows that he's kidding no one and he's kidding no one except himself, or maybe trying to mislead, that if you deduct, if you drop the corporate tax by 1 percent — sounds like something important I suppose. What does it mean in dollars to the business? Peanuts, absolutely peanuts. Will it create more jobs? No, of course not. At the end of the year a firm with \$100,000 profit — that's not bad — a 1 percent saving in corporate tax. . . why they're going to make a \$1,000 more. And they're going to rush out and create jobs because they made a \$1,000 more profit? Nonsense. What creates jobs is consumer demand, the purchasing of products. A manufacturer will produce providing he can sell, and here in Canada we know that the entire economy is working at only 80 percent capacity. . . because there is no consumer demand. They cannot sell their products. And Mr. Speaker, these people are kidding themselves and trying to kid the public into a nonsensical stance, the idea being if you give away concessions, that somehow that's going to create customers. Nonsense. It doesn't create customers, because if I can't afford to buy, then I will not buy; therefore, they will not sell and vice versa. If you want to increase consumption in this country, then by God get these people off unemployment rolls. They will spend money and they won't spend it on frills, they'll spend it on basic essentials. —(Interjection)—

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I think we are perhaps wandering a little from this bill, and I am sorry. I shouldn't have done it, but sometimes they get to me. You know, when this bill was introduced I indicated at the time, that this was part of a thrust to make people more conscious of insulation and the need for energy conservation, that I didn't think the 5 percent in itself is going to induce or entice people, that a program whereby they could get insulation installed in their house at a price they can afford or at payments they can spread over a number of years, that is far more important. But basically it was in the hope of showing the Federal Government that Manitoba stands ready to participate in a federal program' because we have been urging and asking that the program which is

on a limited basis in the Maritimes should be expanded, and this is our way of saying to the Federal Government, it's a good program, we agree with you, expand it, Manitoba stands ready and will do whatever is needed, and as an indication of our good intent, we are removing the 5 percent on insulation. Hopefully, this will show the Federal Government that we are sincere in our desires to work with the Federal Government to join hands with the Federal Government so both levels of government can address themselves to this problem, and that both levels of government will join hands to complement the programs of each other. That's basically what this program is all about.

Now, the Member for Morris said that the Member for St. Johns suggested a bonus rather than elimination of sales tax. The fact is the Member for St. Johns never said that, he didn't even imply that and the suggestion by the Member for Morris is that the government just wants to get their hands on money so they can pass it through their hands. Well, Mr. Speaker, the whole concept of taxation in their minds obviously, taxation is a penalty. To hear them talk you get the feeling that every tax is somehow a penalty against people. Taxation is a means of society getting the funds in order to deliver programs that society wants and needs. That's all it is, it's a mechanism, not a penalty that one can remove and therefore there is less penalty or less penalization. If it's recognized that the programs are needed, and the governments therefore have to have the funds in order to run those programs, then the only way to do it is through taxation. There are various forms of it, some more progressive than others, some that are considered proportional, some even quite regressive like a flat tax on Medicare which is a very regressive kind of taxation. But taxation is revenue to a government and whenever a government amends, alters, drops a tax, on anything, then it is going to have that much less revenue to perform the functions for which it is elected to do. —(Interjection)—

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, if the Leader of the Opposition thinks that he can walk around Manitoba and talk Saunders Aircraft month after month after month, he's kidding himself because people are having it up to here with Saunders Aircraft. It's done, it's behind, it's finished. It served a purpose, it kept a town alive. Gimli, Manitoba is alive today because of the actions of this government. He can keep pedaling this junk if he wants to, that's his business.

I'm sorry, I never tell members anywhere, either on this side or that side of the House, what they should say or what they shouldn't say, I leave it up to them and their own common sense, and by and large that's a decision they have to make. But, you know, one of the things as I say about tax, remove the tax. They are always wanting to remove tax. Of course they then turn around and say, how about providing more services. Their critic from the Department of Health and Social Development says, Why don't you do this, why don't you do that. Other critics demand other things, but remove the tax. . . always remove the tax, it's a very simple proposition But you know in the case of the sales tax or any tax for that matter, what assurance has anybody got that the public will see one nickel of that saving.

You know, Mr. Speaker, the sales tax was removed on construction material the Federal Government a couple of years ago, and I can tell you in discussion with federal people, that if they had to do it again, it's questionable, because had if the sales tax been maintained, the funds that the Federal Government would have received would have made it possible for them to launch housing programs far beyond what they did. They lost a great deal of revenue. And to this day they cannot say with any kind of assurance, that that was passed on to the consumer, not at all.

Mr. . Speaker, I was in business too, and I can tell you when I could charge a buck instead of 98¢, I charged a buck. That was legitimate and I'm not critical of any businessman that does it. That's what it's all about. So don't let them tell me that if suddenly 5 percent is reduced on a product, that that full saving will be passed on. I'm not saying it will all be absorbed, but nobody knows, nobody knows. . . absolutely not. And they're going to say, Oh, competition will do it. Mr. Speaker, we know, surely we know that this is the 1970s and not the 1900s. There is competition, yes. THERE IS COMPETITION AT THAT LEVEL OF BUSINESS WHICH IS IN THE HIERARCHICAL SENSE PRETTY LOW' ONE RETAILER AGAINST ANOTHER WHERE THEY CUT THEIR THROATS, BUT THE BASIC PRICE THE COMMODITY 9(Interjection) — by John Manzo, let me tell you there is no competition there in the insulation field ' or in steel, or in aluminum, or in copper, or in or textiles. That's not where the competition takes place. Those are vertically integrated administered prices, that's where it is; yes, the retailers, they're the ones that knock themselves out, there's no question. The little guy he's fighting the guy around the corner, and they knock themselves out. But the major supplier of the basic commodities, uh uh, you don't have any competition there. I recall a few years ago, when I was operating my business, and on the first of a particular month I'd get an announcement — increase in the price of steel. Within 24 hours, I would get a beautiful brochure, a booklet, 30-40-pages thick; from the so-called opposition, the opponents, the other company selling the same steel product. Within 24 hours, they couldn't have produced that in 24 hours if they had had the Queen's Printer producing it and this is a much nicer document. I don't know how they knew on about one another's prices but there was no difference in prices. What there was a difference is that one salesman was a nicer guy than the other salesman. That's about the size of it. One gave out longer cigars than the next

one.

So, Mr. Speaker, let us not delude ourselves into thinking that somehow, by removing this five percent sales tax on insulation, we are doing any more than being consistent in trying to focus attention on the energy question, that we are indicating to the Federal Government that, yes, Manitoba stands ready, willing and able to participate in a program for Manitoba whether it be part of a national program, but certainly we want to tie into a program to make people more aware of it and because we are trying to get into an area where loans will be made available over a long term so that the savings and the payments will correlate that this is the reason for it. If we hadn't gone into that, I doubt very much whether there would have been this particular amendment brought in this year.

So Mr. Speaker, with those few comments with which I will now be closing the debates, I want to say that I found the comments of the members opposite interesting. But frankly, I know they haven't convinced me and I am not quite sure what they were trying to prove except maybe to build up a straw man so they could destroy it and maybe by repeating it constantly, they even started believing it themselves.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 79 proposed by the Honourable Attorney-General. The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell. —(Interjection)— The second one is 77. The Honourable Attorney-General is not here.

BILL (NO. 77) — AN ACT TO AMEND THE PENSIONS BENEFIT ACT

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I was going to ask that a correction in spelling be made. On the Order Paper the name "Paulley" is spelled incorrectly.

MR. SPEAKER: Very well. The Honourable Minister of Labour, then.

MR. PAULLEY presented Bill No. 77 - An Act to amend the Pensions Benefit Act, for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, in introducing this bill to amend The Pensions Benefit Act, there are certain amendments, most of them at least, essentially technical and are intended to clarify certain provisions in the Act. There is one change, for example, Mr. Speaker, which is intended to clarify the status of an employee with regard to the vesting requirements. In particular, to clarify the status of an employee who has worked in Manitoba and moves to another province or of an employee who has worked in another province and moves to Manitoba. The amendments spell out more clearly what such an employee's vesting rights are.

Other amendments are intended to clarify the situation with respect of integrated pension plans. That is, pensions plans that are a combination of private plans and public plans such as the Canada Pension Plan. It is made clear that once it been determined what the amount of the total pension 'that the employer must pay, that the amount paid by the employer cannot be reduced because of any increase that the person on pension may be entitled to because of a change under the Canada Pension Plan or a change under the Old Age Security Plan. The person on pension would, as a result, receive the full benefit of any increase under a public plan.

Other amendments restrict the amount that an employer may offset because a person is entitled to benefits under a public plan. Many pension plans, for example, Sir, provide for a reduction in the pension that the employer must pay when a person becomes entitled to benefit under a public plan such as the Canada Pension Plan. However, in cases where an employee has worked for more than one employer, and is entitled to benefits under more than one pension plan, there is some uncertainty as to how much each employer can offset with respect of the employee. The amendments in the Act, Sir, clarify this by setting out a formula restricting the amount that each employer can offset. This amount is dependent upon the years of service the employee had with each of his employers.

One of the sections in the Act generally provides that contributions made to a pension plan are deemed to be in held in trust by the employer for payment into the pension. A new provision is being added to make it clear that the Minister may, on behalf of the government, enforce that trust. In other words, further protection of pension funds.

Another new provision stipulates that where an employer fails to pay into the pension plan the amount that he is required to, the trustee or administrator of the plan must notify the Superintendent of Pensions of this failure. The intent, of course, Sir, is to make the Superintendent and Pension Commission aware of such failures as soon as possible so that appropriate action may be taken to protect the plan and protect those concerned. I indicated earlier that these proposed changes are essentially technical and are intended mainly to clarify the intent of certain provisions contained within the Act.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

Tuesday, May 31, 1977

MR. GEORGE HENDERSON: I move, seconded by the Member for Gladstone, that debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

SECOND READING - PUBLIC BILL

BILL (NO. 73) — AN ACT TO AMEND AN ACT TO INCORPORATE THE SINKING FUND TRUSTEES OF THE WINNIPEG SCHOOL DIVISION NO. 1

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if you would call the introduction for second reading of public Bill No. 73 standing in the name of the Honourable . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. WILLIAM JENKINS presented Bill No. 73 - An Act to Amend an Act to Incorporate the Sinking Fund Trustees of the Winnipeg School Division No. 1, for second reading.

MOTION presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member.

MR. JENKINS: Thank you' Mr. Speaker. I will just give a brief explanation of the bill. The bill is here as a result of a motion passed by The the Winnipeg School Division No. 1 on April 5th of this year, requesting changes to The Sinking Fund Trustees Act of the The Winnipeg School Division. Basically if it was adopted by this Legislative Assembly it would make the investment powers of the Sinking Fund Trustees subject to the provisions of The Pension Benefits Act and the regulations and clarify the possibility of any conflict between current legislation that is coming in here in Manitoba and The Pensions Benefits Act.

The overall effect of this amendment would be to increase the investment powers of the trustees. The Pension Benefits Act allows investments on the same basis as the Canadian and British Insurance Companies Act, which is somewhat more liberal than the current Sinking Fund legislation.

The second thing that it would do, it would provide for an expansion of investment powers to the Sinking Fund Trustees and permit the Trustees to invest in corporate bonds and debentures that are secured by the authority of the . . . of Canada.

If there are any further explanations needed the Solicitor of the Board and the Secretary-Treasurer have assured me that when the bill goes to Private Members' Committee, that they would be pleased to be in attendance and answer any questions that honourable members may have.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

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

MOTION presented and carried.

ADJOURNED DEBATE ON SECOND READING

PRIVATE BILL

BILL (NO. 71) - AN ACT TO AMEND AN ACT TO INCORPORATE THE SOCIETY OF INDUSTRIAL ACCOUNTANTS OF MANITOBA

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, would you call Bill No. 71, standing in the name of the Member for La Verendrye.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye, Bill No. 71.

MR. BANMAN: Thank you, Mr. speaker Speaker. We have had a look at Bill 71 and understand that there are no basic objections from this side of the House. We will pass the bill on to Committee. We understand that one of the basic proposals of the bill is to change the name of the society to the Society of Management Accountants of Manitoba, and with those few words, Mr. Speaker, we pass the bill on to Committee.

QUESTION put, MOTION carried.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I didn't originally intend to go into third readings. I think the hour being very close to adjournment, we may call for the adjournment?

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

MR. BARROW: Mr. Speaker, before adjournment, I would like to make another change on the Law Amendments Committee. The Member for Radisson will replace the Minister of Finance. (Agreed)

MR. SPEAKER: The hour of adjournment having arrived, the House is now adjourned and stands adjourned until 2:30 this afternoon.