

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA  
2:30 o'clock, Wednesday, August 19th, 1964.

Opening Prayer by Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions

Reading and Receiving Petitions

Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees

Notices of Motion

Introduction of Bills.

The Honourable the Member for Carillon.

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): Madam Speaker, in the absence of the Member for Carillon, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Gladstone, that leave be given to introduce a Bill No. 16, an Act respecting the Town of Steinbach.

MADAM SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. MORRIS A. GRAY (Inkster): Madam Speaker, the other day I directed a question to the Minister of Labour about the exodus from Thompson. In this morning's paper on the front page there is quite a write-up about so many people leaving, leaving their furniture, not paying for it, finance companies had to take it over and the impression given to me at least is this is becoming a ghost town. The responsible Minister of this situation -- I don't hold him responsible for it -- but I say there is no one else I could ask but the Minister of Labour which he is responsible of the situation whether anything could be done to stop the migration from an industrial city with beautiful buildings, cities, businesses, to get . . . . even if it is not a fact but the impression is given as such.

HON. OBIE BAIZLEY (Minister of Labour) (Osborne): Madam Speaker, I wish to thank the honourable member for giving me notice of this question. However, I am afraid there is not too much I can add to the statement that I made on Monday afternoon. At that time I showed that the Department had done everything possible to help the parties arrive at a satisfactory settlement and I'm told that many of the people who have left the community temporarily will return to the community when a settlement has been reached, and as I said on that occasion we have no authority to impose a settlement on the parties and we do not believe it would be advisable to do so if we did have such authority. Now, Madam Speaker, under these circumstances it's obvious that people cannot be prevented from leaving the community. Certainly we're most anxious to be as helpful as we can. If there's any indication that we can help as conciliators or mediators why as I said on Monday we're only too ready to serve them.

HON. MAITLAND B. STEINKOPF, Q. C. (Provincial Secretary) (River Heights): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I'd like to reply to a question asked of me yesterday by the Honourable Member for Rhineland about the status of the issue of Hansard for this Session. I am able now to inform him that the subscribers who subscribe on a yearly basis will receive the issues of Hansard for this Session without any extra fee.

MR. J. M. FROESE (Rhineland): Madam Speaker, I wish to thank the Honourable Minister for the information. At the same time I'd like to direct a question to the First Minister. What is the total cost of the Michener Commission that has just brought in its report this spring?

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier) (Wolseley): I didn't hear the first part of the question.

MR. FROESE: My question was, Madam Speaker, what the total cost was of the Michener Commission that brought in its report this spring.

MR. ROBLIN: My honourable friend will recognize that this would probably be best entered under an Order for Return.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the second reading of Bill No. 4. The Honourable the Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Madam Speaker, I adjourned the debate on this particular bill to check the amendments or recheck the amendments that were made in committee and having done so I have a few minor points that I want to raise but I'll do this in committee so I will have nothing further to say on it at this time.

Madam Speaker put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the second reading of Bill No. 5. The Honourable the Member for St. John's.

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q. C. (St. John's): Madam Speaker, I was not present yesterday when the two other honourable gentlemen spoke on this bill and having just received Hansard I would like an opportunity to read what they said. I ask that this matter be allowed to stand over unless someone else wishes to speak.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed? The adjourned debate on the second reading of Bill No. 3 and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable the Member for Lakeside. The Honourable the Member for Selkirk.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q. C. (Selkirk): Madam Speaker, yesterday afternoon the Attorney-General spoke on this debate and on page 46 of Hansard he is reported to have said: "I would want to remind the members as well, Madam Speaker, that the matter of referring these items to the Court -- some reference was made to action in that regard that was taken on another occasion earlier this year -- brought some considerable criticism from those who are now suggesting that this should be done and indeed called forth from the Honourable Member from Selkirk a motion expressing the regret, as he phrased it, of the House, on the highly improper action of the Attorney-General in flagrantly disregarding as he said the independence of the judiciary when the Attorney-General requested an opinion from the Court." Now, Madam, I wish to correct the error in that statement. I did not make any reference to a judicial enquiry. What I said was that the action of the Attorney-General of this province in writing personal letters to the Chief Justice of the Court of Queen's Bench and the Chief Justice of Manitoba was highly improper, particularly when one considered that the matters in respect of which he was seeking an opinion were before this House and were then being debated in this House. My objection was that the Honourable the Attorney-General was dragging two judges of our Courts into a political discussion and the Attorney-General is quite wrong when he says that I objected to any judicial enquiry. As a matter of fact I think the only safeguard we have in this province and when we consider this bill that is being brought in here today, is our judiciary; it's the only way that we can protect the average citizen.

Now if the Attorney-General is of the opinion that his letters to the Chief Justice of the Court of Queen's Bench and the Chief Justice of Manitoba constituted a judicial enquiry, well all I have to say, Madam, is that the Attorney-General and I did not study jurisprudence in the same jurisdiction and that the Attorney-General is still living in the age of the star chamber.

So much, Madam, for the Attorney-General. I would like to deal with the bill that is before this House and I would like to assure all members before dealing with it that there's nothing personal in my approach. I'm exceedingly sorry that it has been necessary to bring this bill into this House. I'm exceedingly sorry that the Honourable Minister whose name is mentioned is involved. I have the greatest personal regard for him and I hope that after what I have said today that my feelings towards him and his feelings towards me will not change in the slightest. But, Madam, in my opinion this is a matter which transcends personalities. This is a matter which every member of this House must approach in an objective way because as the Honourable Member for Lakeside said yesterday this is something which strikes at the roots of democracy.

There has been a great deal said in this House about a technical breach of the law. Now as a lawyer I would like these people who have used that expression to define it. To me there cannot be a technical breach of the law. You either break the law or you don't. There's no grey. Now I think what these people are confusing is the fact that the law may have been broken without intent; or the law may have been broken without any motive of personal gain and I don't think anyone in this House has suggested for a moment that there was any element of personal gain involved in this transaction, nor do I think that there was any intent. I think perhaps it was done quite innocently; but the fact of the matter is, Madam, that ignorance of the law, the mere fact that the honourable member who was then a nominee for election in this House was not aware of the contents of The Legislative Assembly Act did not in my opinion change the offence because ignorance of the law is absolutely no excuse. It is not an excuse for the ordinary citizen and it certainly is not an excuse for a member of this Legislature. I feel, Madam, that The Legislative Assembly Act is enacted to protect the citizens of this province against the members of this Legislature and anyone who is nominated for election thereto. It lays down certain rules to govern the conduct of these people and these rules are laid down for public protection and I

(Mr. Hillhouse cont'd) . . . think that it ill behooves us as members of this Legislature when any member is guilty of a breach of the rules laid down in that Act, for us to forgive that breach by simply passing an act exonerating him from any penalty which he is subject under the provisions of that Act.

If an ordinary citizen goes through a red light and had no intention of doing it, it was just a momentary lapse, that ordinary citizen cannot escape punishment for his act and I don't think that any member of this Legislature who unknowingly or unwittingly or unintentionally does something which is a breach of The Legislative Assembly Act I don't think that he should be excused simply because he didn't think. As I said this Act is passed for the protection of the public and it lays down certain rules of conduct which must be observed by people who are nominated for election to this House and people who become members of this House and I think it is basic and elementary and I believe that every member of this House should observe these rules to the fullest possible extent and that when a member of this House is guilty of a breach of these rules whether there was any motive or whether there was any intent behind that breach, I do not think that this Legislature should excuse that breach by passing an Act such as the one that is before this House.

I feel, too, Madam, that the remarks passed by the Honourable First Minister regarding the action which is now pending in the Court of Queen's Bench wherein the Honourable First Minister said that had he known that this action was pending at the time the bill was drafted, there would have been a clause in the bill making it apply to actions then pending in the court, but advising us that such a clause would be put in, I think that the Honourable First Minister would be very foolish to do such a thing. And I think that the best way to resolve this matter is to let the action which is now pending in our courts go to its logical conclusion so that we can get an authoritative decision from a court of competent jurisdiction as to whether or no the person named in that action has been guilty of a breach of the rules of this Legislature.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party) (Radisson): Madam Speaker, I wonder if the honourable member would permit a question? Does he not think that this Assembly is a competent body to make decisions?

MR. HILLHOUSE: In answer to that question I say that this Assembly is not a fact finding body. We must ascertain the facts in this case before we can pass judgment on them. We have two statements of fact now as to what happened in this particular transaction. We have the preamble to the bill which was given to us last session and we have the preamble to the bill which was given us now; and quite frankly Madam, to me there is quite a variation between the facts contained in one bill and the facts contained in another bill.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I wonder if the honourable member would permit another question. --(Interjection - Sure.) Is it not within the competence of this Legislature to call before a committee of this Legislature any witnesses, indeed summons any witnesses dealing with any matter which is the concern of this Legislature or the public activities of the Province of Manitoba?

MR. HILLHOUSE: Madam, such a matter would be controlled by the majority in this House. If a special committee of this Legislature were set up to consider this matter the government members would have a majority on it and what assurance have we got that we'd get at the facts. The honourable member tried to get at the facts -- (Interjection) -- No -- (Interjection).

MR. GRAY: Madam Speaker, if no one else wishes to speak I want to adjourn the debate.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Selkirk has the floor.

MR. GRAY: Are you, you're not through yet are you? -- (Interjections) -- No, really . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. HILLHOUSE: I listened Madam, yesterday, with a great deal of interest to the remarks of the Honourable Member for Lakeside. The Honourable Member for Lakeside is the Dean of this House, and I think that he is entitled to be listened to. He is a man who has devoted the greatest part of his life to the public service of this province. He is a man who is noted for his honesty and integrity, and when a man of his stature and ability and honesty and integrity makes the statements that he made in this House yesterday I think that they're worthy of taking into consideration, and I do hope that this House will not enact this bill but will refer this matter to a proper enquiry, or, withdraw the bill and let the present action which is

(Mr. Hillhouse cont'd) . . . . pending in the court go to its final conclusion.

MR. GRAY: Madam Speaker, if no one else wishes to speak I wish to adjourn the debate, seconded by the Honourable Member for Radisson.

Madam Speaker put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the second reading of Bill No. 11. The Honourable the Member for St. Boniface.

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Madam Speaker, when introducing this bill for second reading the Minister stated that it would be rather difficult to confine oneself to the principle of the bill as they were several. I agree with this statement and for that reason I and the members of our party will not oppose second reading of this bill. But Madam Speaker, this does not mean that we agree with everything in the bill. Far from it. In fact, some points we reject completely. This government as it usually does when things get tough, when things get rough, name a commission to look into Metro. Then at that time it was very urgent, this had to be done right now, we must look into the affairs of Metro. Mind you Madam Speaker, this was done in 1962, barely 18 months after the Metro was born. Of course it was many more months after the end of the session before the commission was named and before it got down to business. Of course we on this side of the House anticipated at the time that the Premier was to call an election before any report was brought in. The great leader of men who is leaving the House now would be in a position to say, "Oh, Metro will not be an issue at this election, because there is a commission looking into it." There was no rush after this, after the election there was no rush. Very little was brought in during the last two sessions, but all of a sudden we have a very important session, a rush session, and we're talking about Metro. Oh, yes, we on this side of the House were expecting a change in the Metro Act. The first regular term of the commissioners is over, and the commission has recommended that this term should be extended to four years instead of two years. This of course Madam Speaker made sense. We of the Liberal Party would be anxious to support such an amendment; at least we would be accomplishing something at this session -- we would be saving some money for the taxpayer.

I might say Madam Speaker that we also feel that all the elected members of the representative of the municipalities also should have a four-year term. The elected representative of Metro and the different municipalities are certainly as intelligent and as capable and as honest as the members of this House, and if we insist on the rather security of a four-year term for ourselves, well the least we could do is extend the same courtesy, the same right to these people. But of course this wasn't even mentioned in this bill. This government in this bill decides that the people of Greater Winnipeg must now pay 20 percent of the capital cost in the land acquisition of hospitals in the area. Madam Speaker, we certainly agree that the hospitals cannot raise the 20 percent. In fact, I warned the Minister of Health and his colleague the previous Minister of Health many times in the past that this couldn't keep on. They weren't too anxious to even discuss this last year at the last session. It was only after repeatedly asking the same question and insisting on an answer that the Minister said that this 20 percent was no problem and gave as an example the proposed Salvation Army Hospital in St. James. Madam Speaker, I think that it might be advisable if at this time I would read the words of the Honourable the Minister during last year's session, and I quote from Hansard, page 1289 of March 19, 1964, the Minister of Health speaking, "The 20 percent equity: I referred to that at the time too, and you may be interested to note that the General Hospital here in Winnipeg were able to raise the 20 percent on both 174 beds and the service wing; the Grace Hospital raised its 20 percent through the City of St. James; the Brandon General 20 percent was raised on a new hospital through the City of Brandon and through voluntary giving, and the hospital is now negotiating for 20 percent for the new nurses' residence; Dauphin General the 20 percent was raised in the Town of Dauphin and the Rural Municipality of Dauphin; with St. Boniface there is no indication that the 20 percent cannot be raised; with Misericordia there is no indication to the Commission that 20 could not be raised; Winnipegosis Hospital the 20 percent is being raised; Eriksdale the 20 percent is being raised; and the City Municipal Hospitals and all rural municipal hospitals have been able to raise the 20 percent; and in the north country with the hospitals in Flin Flon and The Pas there is no indication that 20 percent could not be raised.

Again, the matter of the 20 percent equity was discussed at the Advisory Committee on Hospital Costs, the one which I attended in January. In some provinces it varies quite

(Mr. Desjardins cont'd) . . . . considerably, and the methods of assessing costs per bed was discussed with some newer ideas being submitted to the Committee at that time by two of the provinces — one of them was the Province of Saskatchewan and I believe the other was the Province of Quebec -- who had different approaches to this particular problem. Here in Manitoba the 20 percent so far is one of the, not the most generous, but one of the most generous in the Dominion and with the exception of two of the hospitals here in Winnipeg, the Victoria and the Children's Hospital, we have had no indication apart from those two that the 20 percent could not be raised."

Madam Speaker, I then asked the Minister if the government intended to look into this matter to vary this question of the 20 percent, and he answered me at the time that the government had no intention of doing such a thing that it was certainly satisfied and that there would be no change of policy in 1964. All of a sudden we have a special session. The government does not tell us who will pay the 20 percent of hospital construction outside of the Greater Winnipeg area, no new policy is announced, but the protectors of the people sitting across from us, those who believe in robbing Peter to pay Paul, the great humanitarians who once again are trying to bribe the people of Manitoba with their own money, well this time they have a terrific setup. The municipalities have the responsibility of collecting taxes and the home owner will receive a nice cheque signed by Mr. Duff Roblin. Oh what villains these municipal people are, but the Premier, always the perfect Boy Scout, ready to help -- oh, how sweet. Well Madam Speaker, why should the people of Greater Winnipeg area pay for the cost of hospitals that are serving the people of Manitoba? I ask the government to answer this question. To keep pace with the development of Metro Winnipeg there are about \$35 million worth of hospital building waiting in the books. Who will pay for this? Well the people of the Metropolitan area will pay for this, for the first 20 percent to start with -- \$7 million. Will the government send the bill to the people? Will the Manitoba Hospital Commission send the bill to the people? Oh no, Heaven forbid. Metro has been a good whipping boy in the past. Metro will send a bill to the people.

Madam Speaker, I suppose that in the area outside of Greater Winnipeg the area municipalities will also have to raise this 20 percent. Brandon will have to pay for their hospital and Portage will pay for the hospital that is situated within its boundaries. Why should these people be penalized? Why should the people of Metro be penalized? Madam Speaker, hospitalization is a service extended to all citizens of Manitoba and all citizens of Manitoba should pay their share. The people of Greater Winnipeg are already doing enough. Valuable land is given tax free for the erection of hospitals and although all services are maintained free, but there is a limit. When this bill comes into committee we will definitely oppose this clause.

And then there is another clause that we will oppose. Two members of Metro government would be appointed as members of the governing board of the hospitals to which the grants were made. The Minister stated that at the present -- that's the Minister of Municipal Affairs, when introducing this bill -- that the municipalities appoint two members to this board. Well Madam this is certainly not true -- certainly not true in all cases anyway and we have been fighting for this autonomy, for the protection of these hospitals. It hasn't been so easy Madam with the dictatorial ways of the commission in the past but we're still trying to protect these hospitals, and now Metro will be asked to stick its nose in the affairs of the hospital just because they are collecting money to use for construction of hospitals approved -- mind you approved -- by the Manitoba Hospital Commission. In other words they will have no say or if they do they would never dare to refuse the 20 percent grant which has been recommended by the Commission, the Minister of Health and the government. This bill does not suggest that it was a suggestion that the Metro Council should be represented on the Advisory Board of this hospital. Oh no. But it insists that these men be appointed to the governing board of these hospitals -- not advisory board -- governing board of these hospitals. I thought that we had enough now with the Commission and so on who dictates everything now; we'll have two more people telling this board what to do. What will this arrogant government think of next? Who will they invade next? Who will they insult next Madam Speaker?

No, Madam Speaker, the Liberal Party of Manitoba will not condone such insolence. Before I leave the subject of hospitals, there are some questions I would like to ask the Minister of Health and I do hope that he will take part in this debate. Can he tell me what deal,

(Mr. Desjardins cont'd) . . . . what arrangements have been made with the Victoria Hospital? And I ask this question -- maybe I should explain or, better still, read a quotation from the Free Press of July 29th, 1964. "Hospital to rebuild in south Winnipeg. New Victoria going up. Bypassing 20 percent cost clause. Plans for a new Victoria General Hospital to be built in south Winnipeg at a cost of from 5 1/2 million to 7 1/2 million were announced Wednesday at the hospital's annual meeting by A. Allyn Rossen, Board Chairman. He said agreement on the plans to re-locate in south Winnipeg had been reached after considerable discussion with the government, considerable discussion with the government and the Manitoba Hospital Commission. In an interview Mr. Rossen disclosed that the hospital would not be required to put up a 20 percent local contribution toward the cost of the new hospital. This is a major departure from the standard construction financing principle in the province. However, it is understood the hospital board is prepared to hand over the existing hospital building to the province. Twenty percent. It has been learned from other sources that the 20 percent local requirement will no longer be demanded of hospitals. These sources say that the province has definitely decided to do away with the requirement in view of the Michener Report recommendations. In future the money will either be put up by the province or raised by a Metro district hospital board as recommended by the Commission. The sources for this information claim that Mr. Roblin himself made the statement -- Mr. Roblin himself made the statement. The new 300-bed hospital will be on a 20 acre site now under negotiation and will be so designed that it can later be increased to 400 beds. It will also include a large nursing education building. Go ahead given them. Mr. Rossen said in the interview his board had instructions from the Commission to go ahead and buy the land. He said the board had three different sites in mind but they were already in the process of negotiating the purchase of one of the sites. He said the final cost of the new building would depend on the size of the nursing education section."

Is this the procedure that this government wants to follow, are they going to tell us here in the House that no new policy for 1964, will evade our questions, and then make a different deal with somebody else? When will this government stop ignoring this Legislature? Was a different offer made to the Grace Hospital in St. James? Was an offer made to the St. Boniface Hospital, or any special deals that we should know about? In other words, Madam Speaker, what is going on?

There are other points in this bill that we will question in committee and I do not intend to elaborate on them too long at this time. Apparently one of the points that should have been brought in and has been ignored has been the question of zoning. Oh we've talked about zoning -- the Metro zoning for -- not the application, but more the chance of making representation. That isn't included in there. But this question of zoning, the application and so on, is so muddled up because there is so much red tape. At the present one must go through Metro, to different municipalities, the Department of Health of a municipality, to the fire chief and so on and so forth, and most of the time these people cannot give them the right direction because they're all mixed up themselves. Well I certainly hope that this government and the Metro government as well as all the different municipalities, will have present at the committee experts who can answer these questions and we can thrash this out once and for all.

This bill also stated that the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council shall, by Order-in-Council, alter the boundaries of one or more of the Metropolitan divisions. Well Madam Speaker, I think it would be more proper if a committee composed of members of this House, of the Metro Council and the municipalities involved could at least make recommendations to the Lieutenant-Governor. I also question the advisability of having the government decide what streets would constitute the Metropolitan street system. I mean what guarantee that anything will be done and how long will we wait for the Minister's answer? I think that we should have a little more confidence in the people of Metro and although the government will contribute to the maintenance and the building of these streets, the government would be less tempted to play politics if Metro could make their own decisions in things that concern them. I am at a loss to understand why this government will make decisions for Metro in matters affecting them as we must feel that they are not too responsible -- responsible enough to make their own decisions -- but then on the other hand we are trying to impose these same people that we have no faith in -- we are trying to impose them against their wish on the different

(Mr. Desjardins cont'd) . . . . hospitals, as I said previously.

Madam Speaker, we will allow this bill to go through at this time but we can promise you some very interesting discussions at committee.

MR. E. R. SCHREYER (Brokenhead): Madam Speaker, as I see it there are about five or six distinct parts to this bill and I have no intention of dealing with the principles of the various sections, except for the first, because the first section of this bill -- or actually first part of this bill, has to do with the rearrangement of the Metropolitan outer boundary. Several municipalities of a rural or semi-rural composition are being left out of Metropolitan jurisdiction by the provision of this bill, and this is welcome news to the people living in these municipalities such as West St. Paul, East St. Paul, Springfield, and also it is welcomed by the officials of the municipal councils of these areas and by myself as a member of this Legislature. It was, Madam Speaker, rather amusing and rather confusing to see the effect that The Metropolitan Winnipeg Act had on these areas in question, because for the first two or three years there was a good deal of confusion as to just in what regard did the Metropolitan Corporation have jurisdiction and taxing power over these different municipal areas. It was also very much unfair, Madam Speaker, because the effect of the Act as it was, was to tax people living in rural areas that obtained absolutely no Metropolitan services of any substance and so, even though it did take three years to rectify the situation, at last the correction has been made. Members should just consider what a mistake we made here when we passed the Act in its original form in this particular respect. I believe that the Act provides that where a municipality is even partly in the Metropolitan area that whole municipality is subject to Metropolitan assessment. The result was that we had a municipality that was almost exclusively and completely rural having Metropolitan assessors assessing as far out as 35-40 miles from Winnipeg and this was really quite silly and quite ridiculous. This is now being corrected as are the other things being corrected by the provisions of this bill now before us. So in conclusion I would like to say that I certainly feel that the people there who have continued making representations to the government and to the Cumming Commission, I am glad for them that their efforts have not been in vain. I am also, in a selfish sense, happy because the position which I took in 1961 has now been vindicated and admitted by members opposite.

HON. CHARLES H. WITNEY (Minister of Health) (Flin Flon): Madam Speaker, I think I should enter the debate on this second reading of this bill, particularly as the Honourable Member for St. Boniface has passed some . . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Wasn't the last member closing the debate? --(Interjection) -- Oh. The Honourable Minister of Health.

MR. WITNEY: Madam Speaker, since the Honourable Member for St. Boniface has had some comments to make on this bill with respect to hospitals and since he has asked one or two questions, and since he has indicated that perhaps the information that I gave during the debate on the estimates was not right, I think that I should answer him at this time.

First of all I think I should make the statement to him that no special deals have been made with any hospitals in any part of this province. I think secondly I should say to him that the policy of the 20 percent equity still is in effect and will be in effect in this province and that I had a press release issued following the news release that he referred to in the newspaper to that effect, that it still would remain and I think that the honourable member should realize that if he had read both of them that there had been no deviation from the policy that the government had in effect prior to this bill coming into this House. I think I should also say to him too that the information that I gave to him last time this House met with respect to the 20 percent equity that that information was correct. And surely he should realize that all that we are doing at the present time in this amendment is allowing the people of Metropolitan Winnipeg to have the same privileges as those in the rural parts of the country. We allow them out there to raise the 20 percent equity through a levy and we are allowing that to take place here in the Metropolitan area, and if he will read that clause it says, "Toward the capital cost of hospitals to be constructed within the Metropolitan area, that any such grants shall not exceed 20 percent" -- so it can be up to 20 percent. So if there are some who still wish to give voluntary giving toward the 20 percent in the metropolitan area they can do so. I see nothing inconsistent with this viewpoint with the metropolitan people or the rural parts of the province

(Mr. Witney cont'd) . . . . and I think that the metropolitan people will welcome this opportunity. In the rural parts of the province too we allow the municipal councillors to be on the boards because the municipalities are putting up part of the money and that is all that we are doing at the present time in the metropolitan area with the amendment to this Act.

He made reference to tax-free land here in the metropolitan area. That is no different to the rural parts of the province. Tax-free land is given for the use of hospitals outside of metropolitan areas also. I think he should also be apprised of the fact that I consider after speaking with officials of the Associated Hospitals and officials throughout the country that this idea of the 20 percent equity is still desired by the majority of hospital people in this province, because if the honourable member is going to allow this bill to go past second reading he also accepts the principle of 20 percent equity. -- (Interjection) -- He accepts the principle of 20 percent equity when he allows this bill to go to committee because he is passing it on principle at the present time. -- (Interjection) -- And the 20 percent is agreed to in the rural parts of the province and for the most part the Metropolitan hospitals as I can ascertain their feelings, there are a large number of them want to retain the 20 percent equity principle. -- (Interjection) -- I don't know. The honourable former minister asks what the alternative that the honourable member has is. Perhaps we will hear that when we are before the committee stage. But I simply rise at the present time, Madam Speaker, to refute the inference that special deals are being made and to assure my honourable friend that the 20 percent equity principle still remains.

MR. DESJARDINS: Madam Speaker, I wonder if the Honourable Minister would clarify a point. He said when I mentioned tax-free that it was the same thing in the country, in the rural points and the points outside the metropolitan area. Now can he see the difference that people are leaving those points to accept service in these hospitals in Greater Winnipeg and I doubt if there is anybody from Greater Winnipeg who are going to those hospitals. This is the point. -- (Interjection) -- There are a big portion of these people that are going to these hospitals now that do not belong, that do not reside here, and the fact is that the people of the Greater Winnipeg area will have to pay for this, pay for their hospitalization.

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Education) (Gimli): May I answer this question?  
-- (Interjections) --

MR. DESJARDINS: You're always out of order. -- (Interjection) --

MR. JOHNSON: I'd like to speak on this resolution if I may or -- (Interjection) --

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable the Minister of Education. -- (Interjection) --

MR. JOHNSON: Madam Speaker, I didn't intend to get into this debate on second reading of this bill but simply to complement what my colleague the Minister of Health has said. I certainly think that I'm just sitting here year after year and every year I think very reasonable explanations of government policy with respect to capital equity and operating costs of hospitals have been enunciated over the years, and certainly at public accounts and at other times I think the facts have been discussed, and on one occasion we had a very full rehearsal on the whole matter of hospital costs that I think was very gratifying to all members of the House. However, the honourable member -- what I'm objecting to at this time, Madam Speaker, in speaking to this bill and what made me rise, was every year the Honourable Member from St. Boniface stands up with his great voice -- and for that I commend him -- and infers that this administration and the members on this side of the House are arrogant and dictatorial, exerting unusual powers -- "dictatorial attitude of commission, arrogance of the ministers," and what have you. Well, Madam Speaker, I don't think this can be justified in any way. The facts are before us. The Honourable Member from St. Boniface should know, if he doesn't know, and this is what I object to, he goes all around the periphery picking up tidbits and stands up in this House and pontificates on the whole matter as the authority -- and I understand he is the authority on hospital matters for the Liberal Party in this province. However he forgets 70 percent -- I'm just speaking to this equity -- when we came into office and the Hospital Plan came into being there was no policy on capital costs. Those decisions had not been made when the universal plan came in and there had to be a change. This government was commended by the very people he knows for the generosity and the policy of 20 percent because it went as far, if not further, than most provinces in Canada. It went on the principle that the province didn't want to take over all the hospitals, which they'd certainly have to do



(Mr. Johnson cont'd) . . . . if they gave 100 percent of capital, but that they wanted to go as far as they could possibly go in keeping the voluntary component in the hospital field and it was generally agreed that 20 percent was a good figure. I have never met in this province an authority in the hospital field who was willing to see them go 100 percent over to government control. The day that happens there is no need for local boards, etcetera. My honourable friend should know that. The government would have to exert control. This partnership has worked well. It can continue to work well and the Minister and this government at this time in this bill is making it possible as the Minister has said for the Metropolitan community of Greater Winnipeg to plan an integrated hospital system which they need to avoid duplication, to plan in unison. We can't have five heart centres; we can't have 20 maternity centres; we have to pool our resources in a province of a million people and what we create we create under some general regional council with elected representatives of the people responsible for raising part of this money. They certainly should be asked to participate on the boards of these hospitals in making some of these decisions. I'm as certain of this as I breathe Manitoba air. But, I also feel that no one can pontificate in these matters and make these sweeping kinds of statements we've heard here today. This is a matter that must be worked on all the time.

The honourable member should know that over 70 percent of hospital costs are spent in operating Manitoba's major Metropolitan hospitals where all the major surgery and major work is done. But my honourable friend needn't tell me as a rural practitioner that we didn't have Winnipeg folks use our rural hospitals. I would like to show him some records that might open his eyes.

MR. DESJARDINS: I'd like to see them.

MR. JOHNSON: Yes, Sir.

MR. DESJARDINS: I'd like to see them. I'd like to see those records.

MR. JOHNSON: By Golly. I was a country physician . . . .

MR. DESJARDINS: I'd like to see them. Get those records out.

MR. JOHNSON: I was out in Gimli in the 1953 polio epidemic. My honourable friend -- (Interjection) -- you've been talking about that. He's inferring is he that we're something lesser in rural Maniba in the medical field and in the care field -- (interjection) -- Some of the best medicine I've seen in this country comes out of Dauphin and rural Manitoba. Let's put a voice up for rural Manitoba. We're not putting it all here but what we do put here we're going to plan in an integrated way and that's the purpose of this bill -- (interjection) -- My honourable friend -- I can yell just as loud as my honourable friend when the chips are down.

MR. DESJARDINS: Probably louder.

MR. JOHNSON: And I resent it, this arrogance that he showed today and this super-knowledge. We haven't got any arrogance on this side, not at all.

MR. DESJARDINS: I have no arrogance.

MR. JOHNSON: I just get my back up when I hear the kind of nonsense I heard come from that side today. Let's get into committee and let's let the Honourable Member from St. Boniface give us the solution, Madam Speaker, that's defied the best people in the hospital field from coast to coast. Thank you.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Madam Speaker, I wonder if the Minister who has just spoke would permit a question. Will the electors of Metro have a vote in any of these projects where they'll have to contribute the 20 percent?

MR. JOHNSON: I believe it's under the usual Metro financing arrangement which can be explained in detail by my colleague the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. LEMUEL HARRIS (Logan): I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. John's that the debate be adjourned.

Madam Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the second reading of Bill No. 2. The Honourable the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): Madam Speaker, I would ask the indulgence to let this matter stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed? The adjourned debate on the second reading of Bill No. 9.

(Madam Speaker cont'd) . . . The Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

MR. SCHREYER: Madam Speaker, we support the principle involved in this Bill No. 9 but we do so with some reservations and with some caution mainly because we are not clear of some of the implications of some of the clauses in the bill. It seems to me, Madam Speaker, that the Minister should attempt to explain to us at some point either here in this Chamber or in committee the implications with respect to the following: First of all, how is this going to affect the provincial-municipal cost-sharing as regards drainage work. As I look through the estimates of the previous years and look through the — oh some booklet here which indicates government grants -- I find that up until the present time the province has paid 60 percent and 66 percent of drainage maintenance district work, both construction and maintenance, and then 50 percent and 33 percent for construction and maintenance in that order, of local drainage works, and now the effect of this legislation is to make the province solely responsible for the drainage-maintenance type of work and to leave the municipalities completely responsible, financially responsible for local drainage.

Now what's this going to do to the over-all cost sharing in respect to drainage? It seems to me that we are entitled to ask how this will be affected. Secondly, there is provision in the bill to the effect that the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, shall have the final authority to designate any drain, etc. a provincial waterway, and this raises the problem or the matter of appealability. I think it would be good, in fact necessary, that provision be made in this bill to indicate clearly that there is some source of appeal. It's just simply good policy to allow for appeal to some higher body or to some quasi judicial body such as a municipal board. And lastly, it was disturbing to me to see in the bill some reference to the effect that the province assumes no responsibility and I assume that includes financial responsibility for bridges, etc., over provincial waterways, and of course I may have misinterpreted that particular clause but by that I understand that whereas up to now the province has granted, has shared in the construction of bridges and so on, according to this particular clause it could mean that this policy is being drastically changed, and I would like some clarification from the Minister on this third point. And so with these three questions in effect Madam Speaker, I say again that apart from these we support the essence of the bill.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. ALBERT VIELFAURE (La Verendrye): Madam Speaker, I wish to say that I am in favour of this bill because as far as I can understand it it is a piece of legislation that has been greatly needed in most parts of my constituency for quite some time. However, the way I understand it again its effectiveness will be limited by the basis upon which the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council will decide what waterways are to be selected as Provincial Waterways. In my own constituency there is all of the Municipality of La Broquerie and about half of the Municipality of Ste. Anne which have been experiencing some very serious flooding in 1944, '59, and '63 that I can remember now, and the problem there has been discussed and it has been found that it would be a matter of sharing with the department but even on the existing sharing basis of 50-50 or 40-60 it would be practically impossible for these municipalities to take over such a project. However, I do not see in this bill any basis to determine whether such a project would be taken on as a provincial waterway and I would like the Minister to give us some explanation as to what the requirements will be for such waterways to be taken over as provincial waterways.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I just want to make one or two brief comments in respect of this bill or rather the lack of the content of the bill. You may recall, Madam Speaker, the other day while dealing with another bill I brought up the question of a peculiar situation which exists in the City of Transcona in respect of purchasers of property on leasehold land in which they did not have the right of the homeowner to vote until such time as they qualified for residency qualifications under the Municipal or School Board Acts. Yesterday the Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs when replying to me on this point said that I was speaking on the wrong act, I should have raised my question on the Municipal Act — and this is The Municipal Act.

HON. ROBERT G. SMELLIE, Q. C. (Birtle-Russell): Madam Speaker, I think my honourable friend is still talking on the wrong act. My understanding is that we're still discussing the Agriculture and Conservation Act.

MR. PAULLEY: Oh! Well then Madam Speaker, I must confess that I'm in error twice in a row. I will await then for the Municipal Act when I can speak on this question once again to my honourable friend. I ask the forgiveness of the House for interfering at this time.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. JOHN P. TANCHAK (Emerson): Madam Speaker, if nobody else wishes to speak I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. George that the debate be adjourned.

Madam Speaker put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the second reading of Bill No. 12. The Honourable the Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Madam Speaker, in the absence of the member for Portage la Prairie may we have this matter stand. However, if anyone else wishes to speak we have no objections.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, possibly seeing as I did get up a couple of seconds ago in error I might just make a brief contribution, if it indeed is a contribution to Bill No. 12, an Act to Amend the Municipal Act.

As I said Madam Speaker, I raised the question the other day on the wrong bill and I attempted that a few moments ago again, dealing with the situation that a number of citizens of the City of Transcona find themselves in as the result of entering into an agreement with a developer to purchase homes but not the land upon which the homes are situated. Now Madam Speaker, the basic reason for this is because, as I understand it under the National Housing Act, a person who desires to purchase a home -- and by home in this instance I mean all inclusive including the land -- must put down a certain percentage of the total cost as a down payment in order to buy the home. One of the developers in the Greater Winnipeg area has found a way where it seems that the purchaser is able to at least give effect to purchasing a home at a lesser down payment if the land as such is not transferred or becomes part of the mortgage. This is happening in Transcona and the Minister mentioned yesterday as recorded in Hansard he thought that Transcona was the only place in which this is being done. It's my understanding Madam Speaker, subject to correction, that the same thing is being done by the same developer in the Municipality of Assiniboia. Again I say, Madam Speaker, the reasons behind this is in order that a lesser down payment be required for an individual to obtain housing accommodation. My honourable friend the Minister of Municipal Affairs yesterday said that in effect it seemed as though nothing could be done to remedy this situation, and that he wasn't, if I gathered from him correctly, anticipating anything being done. Now I think Madam Speaker there's something that can be done. The leasehold arrangements as I understand them are for a period of 18, 20 years and up. The land is the lesser amount of value of the property and I think that a simple amendment to the Municipal Act could be introduced into this House in order to give effect to allowing these people to vote on matters of local concern with which they are very interested.

As I understand it Madam Speaker, about 80 people in the City of Transcona were deprived of the opportunity to vote for a new school in the City of Transcona, and I regret to say in this House, Madam Speaker, that the school by-law was defeated by the majority of the electors. Had these people who had been in the municipality for less than six months been ratepayers they would have been able to vote on the by-law because of the setup of the act at the present time. However, here was a group of people going into a new development in this community who will in effect be paying the total costs of the operation of a school and also other . . . . . of the municipality through the tax bill which they have to pay, albeit the land in effect is held in the name of the developer, they were deprived of an opportunity of saying whether a new school should be built for their children. Now I appreciate Madam Speaker, that this is a peculiar situation. Had they have been there six months as electors they would have been entitled to the vote. As purchasers of the property being there less than six months, albeit the fact that they were paying the tax, they could not vote. And I suggest Madam Speaker, in all deference to my honourable friend the Minister of Municipal Affairs that this is something that he should give a close look at. I appreciate that at the present time, as the Minister properly said, that this has just started in the City of Transcona; I believe I'm correct in giving him the information that it also prevails in Assiniboia; and this can be something that expands in the construction industry right across Manitoba and there might be a

(Mr. Paulley cont'd) . . . . . considerable number of people affected in the future.

Now my honourable friend said today that the whole system today is based on the ownership of real property which is true. He also went on to say that if we consider the recommendations of the Michener Royal Commission Report that it might be, if the section of the report wherein the Municipal Board will approve of by-laws without reference to the ratepayers, that this situation will be overcome. I appreciate my honourable friend saying this, Madam Speaker, but the fact of the matter is at the present time we have not adopted the recommendations of the Michener Commission. The fact of the matter is that at least 80 families, and I would suggest all of them having children from whom school accommodation was required, did not have an opportunity of voting for a school in this new development in the City of Transcona. I regret to say again Madam Speaker, that this by-law has been introduced twice in the City of Transcona for the building of new schools and twice has been rejected, indicative of the opposition to the ever spiraling costs of education on land, and possibly before this session is finished some minor changes will be made to overcome this. But I do say, Madam Speaker, and I'm making another appeal to the Minister, to have his legal authority, his advisors in the field of municipal affairs, to take another look at this because I feel, as an ordinary railroader, as an ordinary layman, that surely to goodness there's some way of making provision that where a person is the bonafide purchaser of a home, and if the lease is for a period of 18 or 20 years it's indicative of the fact that they want to stay there, it's indicative of the fact that they want to stay in the community in order to bring up their children and have them schooled there, that there should be some method whereby these people, on the purchase of their homes or of their leasehold estate, as I understand it is now called, will be given an opportunity of saying whether their costs will be added to without the necessity of having to wait six months before they come under the provisions of The Schools Act.

Now I hope and trust that now that I have spoken under the proper Act that the Minister will give reconsideration to his remarks of yesterday and when he is closing the debate in a day or two on this bill that he will be able to say, well I found a solution to the problems of some citizens in the City of Transcona which have been raised by the Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the Member for Hamiota and the proposed amendment thereto by the Leader of the Opposition. The Honourable the Member for Elmwood.

MR. S. PETERS (Elmwood): Madam Speaker, when I adjourned this debate I adjourned it for my leader.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker I'm not prepared to go ahead at this particular time. I might be able to make a contribution tonight; I'm not really up to it. If it is the desire of the House to meet tonight I might possibly be able to give them half a dozen sentences or two; but if there isn't going to be sufficient business for tonight then I would suggest I could speak tomorrow.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker on the point of order raised by my honourable friend I think we would meet his convenience and whether we met tonight or not I think he should feel free to hold it over if he's not up to par this evening, but it probably would be in order if he would simply move the adjournment and then we would have the record straight.

MR. PAULLEY: I think Madam just for the purposes of the record if the adjournment still stays in the name of the Honourable Member for Elmwood. Has he spoken? Then I move the debate be adjourned.

MADAM SPEAKER: Your seconder please.

MR. PAULLEY: Seconded by the Honourable Member for Elmwood.

Madam Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MADAM SPEAKER: The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker I beg the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed. The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Ethelbert Plains.

MR. M. N. HRYHORCZUK, Q. C. (Ethelbert Plains): I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lakeside, Whereas with the rapid increase in government expenditures in this province it has become impossible for members of the Executive Council to scrutinize and administer in an efficient manner the money voted by the Legislature; and whereas the appointment of an Auditor-General in other jurisdictions has proved of great benefit in controlling waste in government and has provided savings to the taxpayer; therefore be it resolved that there be appointed an officer known as the Auditor-General of Manitoba, that he be empowered to make independent spot inspections and running audits of all government departments, boards, commissions and utilities, and to report to the Legislature; and be it further resolved that the Auditor-General should be appointed by the Legislature, be responsible only to the Legislature and be removed from office only by a two-thirds majority of votes in the Legislature.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Madam Speaker, this matter has been before the House and both the members of the Opposition as well as the Government have expressed their opinions as to whether they feel that an Auditor-General is needed in the province. I'd like to say this Madam Speaker, that in moving this resolution I'm not moving it simply because I happen to be in the Opposition. I'm convinced that an officer of this nature is an officer that more than pays his way in the province and would be of considerable assistance to the government in more ways than one. Now sooner or later we are going to have this type of an officer and I would suggest, Madam Speaker, that the sooner the better.

Now in the debate last session the Honourable the First Minister led us to believe that the Comptroller-General was more or less performing the functions that an Auditor would, and I'd like to point out that he did admit though that the Comptroller-General didn't have the depth of investigation that we could expect from the Auditor and it was also clearly pointed out that what the Comptroller-General does is an internal audit, or a pre-audit of the payment of the accounts of the Province of Manitoba. Well I would suggest, Madam Speaker, that there is a big difference between the responsibilities of Comptroller-General and that of an Auditor-General, and in order to show the difference I'd like to read what our own Act, The Treasury Act provides insofar as the Comptroller-General is concerned, and under him all our accounts are kept and he makes reports to us, under Section 28, to show among other things the current state of the consolidated fund, the receipts and payments of the current fiscal year, the precise financial condition of the government. The Comptroller-General is in each year to prepare an annual statement called Public Accounts, of which we are all very well aware. By Section 34 the Comptroller-General is to check and audit all the receipts of the consolidated fund to see that they are fully accounted for and may examine at his discretion the accounts of any revenue officer and all persons employed in the collecting and management of the revenues and receipts and is responsible for the control and audit of payments from consolidated fund. The Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council or the Treasurer may at any time direct the Comptroller-General to make a special examination or audit of any institution, branch, person, commission, board or department. It will be seen therefore that in Manitoba we have the receiving and expenditure of provincial moneys under the Provincial Treasurer and we have an internal audit under the Comptroller-General. There is no external audit.

I would be impossible for this particular officer to do the work that an Auditor-General does; impossible for him to follow through and see that after payments had been made to see whether they were properly made and whether there was value for the money. If he wanted to do this it would be just impossible unless he did it on a spot check and running basis as is suggested for the Auditor-General. However, there is another point that is very important and that is that instead of being responsible to the Lieutenant-Governor as the Comptroller-General is, the Auditor-General would be responsible to the Legislature and to the Legislature only, and that is the reason for the wording of that resolution in the manner that it is worded.

We have an Auditor-General in our Federal House and I believe that one here would do the same type of work that is done there and since we have this example I would like to point out to the members of the House just what the Auditor-General's duties are, what he has uncovered in the past years -- I'm not going to go through the details of all the years, except

(Mr. Hryhorczuk cont'd) . . . . . the most recent ones, just to give the members an idea of what can be uncovered. Now insofar as the Auditor-General is concerned, he can employ such employees and officers as he needs, he has free access to all government files, documents and other records, and may require from members of the public service such information and reports and explanations as he requires. He may station in any department any of his people. His duties are to examine accounts relating to the consolidated revenue fund and to the public property and ascertain (a) that the accounts have been faithfully and properly kept (b) that all public moneys has been fully accounted for and there has been an effective check on the assessment, collection and proper allocation of the revenue (c) that the money has been expended for the purpose for which it was appropriated by Parliament (d) proper records and procedures to safeguard and control public property are maintained, to report annually to the House of Commons on the results of the examinations and calls attention to cases where he observes (a) neglect or omission to collect or receive money (b) any public money not duly accounted for (c) any appropriations that were exceeded or used in a manner not authorized, and (d) any fraud. His report is tabled if Parliament is in session, on or before the 31st day of December, or if Parliament is then not in session within 15 days after the commencement of the next ensuing session. The Auditor-General may also make special enquiry as to the financial affairs when requested by the Treasury Board or the Governor-in-Council or the Minister of Finance. Finally, whenever it appears to him that any public money has been improperly retained by any person shall forthwith report the circumstances to the Minister of Finance.

In summary, the Dominion scheme is, under the Department of Finance and under the Minister and his staff all the receiving of and paying out of money is handled, there is an internal audit under the Comptroller, finally there is an independent external audit under the Auditor-General. Now it's interesting to note how he's staffed and what type of personnel he gets into that particular office under his jurisdiction, and I have here, Madam Speaker, an advertisement which appeared in the Tribune on February the 5th, 1964, and it's headed "The Auditor-General of Canada. Attractive career opportunities for auditors. The Auditor-General is directly responsible to Parliament. The function of his office is to examine the accounts of government departments, crown corporations and other public instrumentalities. He reports on his examinations annually to the House of Commons. The work of the office is carried out in the same manner as that of independent public accountant firms." Now I'm quoting from this ad Madam Speaker! "Its overall objective is to determine that the various instrumentalities have discharged their management and financial responsibilities effectively. The audit procedure followed include the evaluation of the adequacy of internal controls, including management reports and internal auditing, review of operations in order to determine that funds and other resources have been used effectively, and the examination of financial transactions to the extent considered necessary to certify financial statements." You can see he has very very wide powers. And now what qualifications must these applicants for these positions have. According to this ad, there were openings at Edmonton, Alberta and at Winnipeg, Manitoba. And here's what it says about -- "applications are invited," as far as Manitoba are concerned, "from professional accountants, university graduates in accounting or related fields, high school graduates applicants must possess satisfactory auditing experience." So you can see that this is a free open audit not controlled by government in any manner whatsoever and the Auditor-General has the ultimate say as to whether things have been done efficiently, rightly or wrongly.

Now what has transpired in Ottawa to date, I believe that that particular officer has been in office -- not one particular gentleman -- but that office has been open in the Federal Government for at least a decade now, and what are the practical results of having him in office. As I said at the beginning I'm not going to bring out anything that's happened in the past. We've all had the opportunity to read in the newspapers what he has discovered in his audits in the Federal Government, but I am only going to take extracts from his last report which is made in this particular year. Now we have, for example in the Tribune of June 17 of this year "Huge Government Waste Unfolds in Ottawa."

Now I don't want to suggest, Madam Speaker, that I am implying in any way that huge government wastes would be found here in Manitoba, either under this government or any

(Mr. Hryhorczuk cont'd) . . . . government, but there 's always that possibility and that is the reason why this motion has been made is to forestall any such possibility. It's humanly impossible for the ministers, either these of today or any other ministers, to follow through and see what each employee of that department is doing; whether he's doing rightly or wrongly; whether our social workers are applying the proper rules towards recommending, say payments of welfare, social assistance; whether all of our staff in the public works department are doing what the minister would like to see them doing and doing it efficiently and so forth. It's humanly impossible for the ministers to do it, and hence we have the Auditor-General to just do that type of work that each minister would like to see done and like to see the efficiency in his own department which he cannot look after properly himself. You have an officer of the Crown or an officer of the Legislature, if you wish to put it that way, who will look into this and that is his one and only duty.

Now let's see what happens here and what we see in this particular piece in the newspaper. "Examples of waste and bad management in government departments have increased so much that a special appendix for them will be needed in the next report. Auditor-General Maxwell Henderson informed the Commons Public Accounts Committee Tuesday. He said that 22 examples cited in his 1962 report being examined by the committee were uncovered only in spot checks. Mr. Henderson said that 22 unproductive payments involved expenditures of \$627,000 and nine government departments. Eight of the cases occurred in the Northern Affairs Department and five in the Defence Production Department and three in Transport. He said seven cases involving expenditures of \$275,000 dealt with faulty designs or goods unsuitable for the purpose intended" -- and so on.

Now we can pick up another report and this is also from the Tribune dated February 20, 1964. "A new flock of bureaucratic blunders has been flushed into the open by the Parliament's fiscal watchdog, Auditor-General Max Henderson." Now there's no reflection cast on the ministers of these departments. It's quite evident what the Auditor-General is looking for and what he reports on and what he investigates. They include an airport which cost five times the original estimate; a force of five special policemen to keep four voters in order; doctors who earned \$400 a day doing machine gun medicals on militia recruits; and a woman who made a \$19,500 interest-free loan to her son-in-law then claimed the \$50 monthly pension because she had no income. Well that could very easily occur here in the Province of Manitoba as well as in Ottawa, immaterial of who is in the government.

They go on and on with other reports and it's surprising the huge sums of money, millions of dollars are uncovered that have been wasted. But this is -- it's not a control so much on the government spending, but here's what it said and I think it applies to any government, and I quote; "The Auditor-General's report tabled in the Commons Wednesday by Finance Minister Walter Gordon disclosed more minor than major sins but the mere fact that such a report is made annually is considered to have a salutary effect on the bureaucrats." That is, when you know that there's a possibility of an audit and a check, you're going to be pretty careful when you come to spend public funds.

Now I just want to repeat that I feel sincerely that this is an officer that we should have in the Province of Manitoba, not only in the Province of Manitoba, in every province, but we're concerned with Manitoba and I'm not alone in that opinion. I have an editorial here from the Winnipeg Tribune of February 21, 1964 and it reads in part as follows: "As the watchdog of public accounts, the Auditor-General performs a service of great value. He is completely independent of the government of the day and makes his report directly to Parliament. If in his view his investigatory work is in any way impeded, either overtly or covertly, he is completely free to say so in no uncertain terms. As usual, it contains references to a number of unauthorized expenditures in many different departments of government. The public will expect their members of Parliament to obtain satisfactory explanations for such irregularities and corrections made and discipline applied where necessary and practical" -- and so forth.

So I say to the Honourable the First Minister and the government that they could do much worse than to support this particular resolution. I'm quite sure that they'll find it beneficial; they'll find it's going to be of great assistance to the ministers; that the load the ministers now carry will be lessened and that, as a whole, there is bound to be savings in

(Mr. Hryhorczuk cont'd) . . . . the public purse; and I ask for support of this resolution.

Madam Speaker: are you ready for the question?

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the honourable member for Carillon, that the debate be adjourned.

Madam Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MADAM SPEAKER: The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Selkirk.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Madam, I crave the indulgence of the House and ask that this matter be allowed to stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed. The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Burrows.

MR. MARK G. SMERCHANSKI (Burrows): I beg the indulgence of this House to let this matter stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, that completes our Order Paper. I therefore move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce, that the House do now adjourn.

MADAM SPEAKER: Until when?

MR. ROBLIN: Well I think we should adjourn until eight o'clock tonight Madam, and see if anyone wishes to continue the debate, although as I said that it's a matter to be decided when we get there I suppose, but I think that we should sit at eight o'clock tonight.

MR. MOLGAT: . . . . wise to canvass the members to see whether we can make progress at all. I have no objection to sitting but if it's going to be just a formality then. . . .

MR. ROBLIN: Well, I'd be glad to do that. If I may have your permission, Madam, and the consent of the House, may I ask, is there any member here who has an adjournment for which he is responsible prepared to speak this evening? If so, would he please indicate. A deathly hush pervades the Assembly. A deathly hush pervades the House. Well if there is no one who is prepared to speak tonight, Madam it's obviously not. . . .

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, if I may interject just for a moment. I realize that this is a special session of the House. I have consulted with my colleagues and they seem to be of the opinion that if it's all possible to advance the business of the House, seeing it is just a special session, that we should do so. I've been told by my boys, and being a very humble leader who listens to the dictates of his members, that if it's humanly or physically possible for me, I should make my minor contribution to the Throne speech tonight, and they have ordered me to say to the First Minister in this House if there is a desire to meet tonight then as far as we're concerned we will.

MR. ROBLIN: I thank my honourable friend. Under the circumstances, I'll move the adjournment until eight o'clock tonight.

Madam Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House adjourned until 8:00 o'clock Wednesday evening.