

## THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Tuesday, April 2, 1968

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions  
 Reading and Receiving Petitions  
 Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees  
 Notices of Motion  
 Introduction of Bills  
 Orders of the Day

HON. WALTER WEIR (Premier)(Minnedosa): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could have leave of the House to just say a few words to recognize the deeply regretted death of Dr. Donald M. Stephens. Manitoba and the nation have lost one of our truly great administrators and one of our great leaders. He had a tremendous capacity of getting people to extend their vision and their thinking, to accept the bold concepts that today are changing the developing face of Manitoba. He had too, Mr. Speaker, a profound faith in young people and their capacity to meet a challenge. Because of his background in the resource field he was able to grasp the tremendous potential offered. At every opportunity he worked and inspired others to work, to transform these great resources into usable form, the harnessing of our rivers for water power, and particularly the great new northern Hydro development which is giving a new look to our northland. The encouragement he gave to new techniques in long distance hydro transmission, his abiding interest as a member of Atomic Energy of Canada in this new field of power development, his work as a member of the Canadian section of the International Joint Commission, all were part of his great desire to see resources used for the benefit of all, for people were his major concern. He could help them through resource development. His vast encouragement to the young was heartening indeed, and at his death he was President of the Community Welfare Planning Council.

Of the honours that have been conferred upon Dr. Stephens, the Vanier Medal, which he received recently for distinguished service as a public servant, points up better than anything I can say as to the worth, respect and esteem that we have held for this dedicated man. His works will be his lasting remembrance. The Standing Committee on Public Utilities and Natural Resources, which Dr. Stephens was to address, assembled this morning and out of respect immediately adjourned, having expressed deep sympathy in the passing of Dr. Stephens. I am sure that all members of the Legislative Assembly and the people of Manitoba would want to join me in expressing condolences to the family of Dr. Stephens with the thought that his services to the province were such that he will be greatly missed.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, I would want to associate my group with the words expressed by the Premier and the sentiments contained therein. Certainly in Don Stephens the Province of Manitoba loses a great civil servant, a man whose name will probably be recorded as the architect of our hydro-electric development in this province. He was associated with this in his years, first of all here as Deputy Minister in the Department of Mines and Natural Resources, and then when he went directly over to the Hydro-Electric Commission. Not only do we lose, though, a great public servant, we also for most of us lose a good personal friend because through the years those who have been here for some little time had frequent contacts with Mr. Stephens. Just on Saturday last, most of the members of the House were privileged to spend the better part of the day with Mr. Stephens. The Premier and the Member for Rhineland and myself were fortunate in being in his company all day as we toured that latest development with which he is so closely associated.

The First Minister spoke about Mr. Stephens' faith in young people in particular. This was nowhere more evident than on Saturday when he introduced to us his team of people at Kettle Rapids, and how surprising it was to find there in what is one of the biggest developments, not just in Canada but in the world, a crew of very young people. This is probably the greatest tribute, in fact, to Don Stephens, that he had the foresight, the ability to get around him that type of man, and this is the way in which he will be remembered. And I'm sure that I can speak for all of the members of, not only in my own group, but of the House that we deeply regret the loss of this fine man and this fine friend.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the N. D. P.) (Radisson): Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate my group with the expressions of condolence in the passing of a great

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.) . . . . Manitoban and a great Canadian. It doesn't seem conceivable that a man who was so energetic just a day or two ago has now gone to meet his Maker. And I don't think that it will be without regret throughout the nation and the continent that his passing is noted, for I feel that Don Stephens brought into his favoured profession, electrical energy, the type of prestige that is so required today particularly in the guidance and conduct of a public enterprise. I think that Don Stephens added the prestige to the development of our natural resource in hydro energy that sometimes is questioned in some quarters, and I think that Manitoba owes to this distinguished gentleman deep appreciation and deep thanks. And, as has already been said, not only did Don Stephens acquaint himself with the development of our natural resources, he was also an active participant in the development of the community, both young and old, through his connections with the community welfare groups and other groups. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, a man to remember was Don Stephens, and my group joins with the other members of this Assembly in an expression of appreciation for a job well done, and we extend to those who were intimately connected with him and his family, our deepest sympathy and we temper that sympathy with the knowledge that we are sure that they, too, will receive solace in knowing that Don Stephens did an outstanding job for the community, for Manitoba.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to associate myself with what has already been said by the previous speakers. I have learned to know him, to love him, and to appreciate Don Stephens. Just last Saturday we had the privilege of being with him all day and we just enjoyed the day as a result. He was a man very energetic and very able, in my opinion. He could transmit and impart to others what he stood for and what he believed in, and I feel we in Manitoba have taken a great loss in his passing. I, too, would like to extend my sympathies to the family and the bereaved.

MR. DOUGLAS CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, I find it very difficult to say a word about Don Stephens. I certainly agree with everything that has been said. He has made a great contribution and it's a distinct loss to the Province of Manitoba and to the country that he has been taken away in his absolute prime as far as his chosen work and efforts have been concerned.

Don came to the Province of Manitoba, or rather came to the service of the Province of Manitoba, as a fairly recent graduate in Engineering. Don was older than the average in graduating from the University because he had to work his way through and those were the difficult years in which to find remunerative employment. As a matter of fact, he graduated right into the very toughest of the years because he graduated, I believe, in 1930 or immediately thereafter. So he joined the department in a pretty junior position and he worked his way through by sheer force of ability and initiative and dedication to where he became the Deputy Minister. Then, when Hydro was formed, he was the natural and unanimous choice to take over that position. The work that he's done there is well-known and, as has been already mentioned, one of the greatest tributes to his all-around capacity was the fact that he leaves behind him a team that for depth and ability can be surpassed in no part of the province or country and equalled in very few. I, too, would like to join in paying tribute to the splendid work that Don has done here, and would also associate myself with the expressions of condolence to his family.

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN, Q.C. (Provincial Secretary) (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, as the member of the ministry presently most closely associated with the work of our late colleague, Don Stephens, I would like to associate myself with the gracious words that have been spoken by the First Minister and the other honourable members. I am certain that I speak for all who have had the privilege of voting the position in government to which the utility, the Hydro, was most closely associated insofar as their administration was concerned, when I acknowledge his great friendship and his frankness and his great and obvious desire to be helpful at all times. And so I'm sure that all who have held this position would want to acknowledge the passing of one who was a wise counsellor and guide and a very loyal colleague.

MR. R. O. LISSAMAN (Brandon): Mr. Speaker, as having served on the board of Hydro with Don Stephens, I feel that I would like to add a word or two of condolence to the family at his tragic passing. And it is a tragic passing, I believe, to this province and to Manitoba Hydro and he will be missed in the organization for the many little kindnesses. On any trips that we've been on, inspecting work, I have never ceased to marvel at the warmth of the man

(MR. LISSAMAN cont'd.) . . . . who would stop and talk to the probably least important workers on the job and a word or two of talk about the job and an encouraging comment. The last few years on the board certainly have added greatly, or did add greatly to responsibilities on Don Stephens' shoulders, and he was most unsparing of himself. In fact, I have the feeling that the last couple of years, had he taken it just a bit easier this might not have happened so untimely. And so, Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my words of sympathy and condolence to the family at the passing of this great Canadian.

MR. SPEAKER: I'd like to introduce our guests for the day. We have 17 students of Grade 9 standing, from Ste. Anne's Collegiate. These students are under the direction of Mr. Legal. We also have on my right 15 students of Grade 11 standing, from the Landmark Collegiate. These students are under the direction of Mr. Siemens. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for LaVerendrye. We also have on my left 30 members from the Notre Dame de Lourdes 4H Club. These students are under the direction of Mr. Deroche. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable the Minister of Urban Development and Municipal Affairs. On behalf of all the honourable members of the Legislative Assembly I welcome you all here today.

HON. CHARLES H. WITNEY (Minister of Health) (Flin Flon): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I wish to lay on the table of the House the Annual Report of the Manitoba Hospital Commission for 1967, the Statistical Supplement to the Annual Report of the Commission, and the Annual Report of the Alcoholism Foundation of Manitoba.

MR. BEN HANUSCHAK (Burrows): Mr. Speaker, in the light of the 25 percent tax increase in Winnipeg, I wish to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Kildonan, that the House do now adjourn to consider a matter of urgent public importance, namely, the effect of the record mill rate increase on the taxpayers of the City of Winnipeg, being one-quarter of the population of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: I should like to thank the honourable member for meeting the rules and having a copy of his resolution in my hands now before the opening of the House, giving me the opportunity to examine it. I'd like to say to him that I've considered the motion of the Honourable Member for Burrows. The first principle involved dealing with a matter of urgent public importance is whether the subject involved the administrative responsibility of the government, and I would refer the honourable member to Beauchesne citation 100 in this regard. I believe the subject raised in the resolution is not the responsibility of the government but rather that of the City of Winnipeg authorities. I must therefore rule the motion out of order.

HON. J. B. CARROLL (Minister of Welfare) (The Pas): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to take this opportunity to reply to a series of three questions that were raised by the Member for Selkirk on Friday last. The first question dealt with comments that were made by the Executive Director of the Children's Aid Society of Winnipeg, and reads as follows: "Under what authority does the Society allege that such refusal is illegal?" This was the refusal to place children for adoption in homes of parents who had no specified religion. I believe it generally has been accepted by the various Children's Aid Societies and by the Department of Welfare and their legal advisors, that there is a legal impediment within the statute that does prevent the placing of children in homes of parents who have no religious affiliation, and this, of course was the subject of certain discussions that have taken place with the various Children's Aid Societies and which was the cause of a resolution put forward two years ago by the Children's Aid Society of Western Manitoba, suggesting that certain amendments take place.

The second question was: "What faiths are recognized by your department as adoptable faiths?" And the answer is: all faiths are acceptable.

The third question states: "Does the government share the opinion and views of the Children's Aid Society of Winnipeg as expressed by the Director?" With respect to this question, I can only say that the Children's Aid Society have not expressed an opinion with respect to this particular impediment. In fact, their Society have advised me that they were unable to arrive at a consensus of opinion within their Board, and so presumably the Executive Director was stating a personal opinion when he suggested that certain amendments should be made, and presumably the President of the Children's Aid Society did the same thing in a statement that he made that was reported in the Winnipeg Free Press on the 30th of March, in which he commented in similar vein to the comments made by the Executive Director a day

(MR. CARROLL cont'd.) . . . . or two earlier.

MR. T.P. HILLHOUSE, Q.C. (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Honourable Minister would allow a question. Could he tell me what specific section in the Child Welfare Act prohibits the adoption of children by people who do not profess any religious faith?

MR. CARROLL: The section that is causing the concern is Section 131, 1 (a) and it's the phrase at the end of that section that appears to be causing the concern among the legal people who have been advising the various societies that are involved in adoptions as well as our own department.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Would you mind reading that section?

MR. CARROLL: The phrase that was specifically referred to reads, "regardless of their religion". It is presumed that a person must have some religious affiliation and it presumes that a person has some religious faith, and if a person has no religious faith they feel that this is not contemplated by the Act and, in fact, is preventing the placement of some children or may prevent the placement of children in homes of no specified religious affiliation. It was for this reason that three of the Societies have recommended a change in the Act. We were rather hopeful that the largest society in the province, the Children's Aid Society of Winnipeg, might have allowed us to have the benefit of their views on this subject. Apparently there are some very strong views within that Society and they have been unable to come forward with a recommendation. As a result, we are left at the present time contemplating what changes, if any, should be made to withdraw any impediment that may be read into this particular section of the Act.

MR. HILLHOUSE: . . . a supplemental question. Isn't it a fact that the Executive Director of the Children's Aid Society of Winnipeg stated that the reason why they believe that a person had to have a religious faith was due to the form of application that they were using?

MR. CARROLL: That may well be. I can't comment on that. It was the sections of the statute that were first raised by the Children's Aid Society of Western Manitoba which have been referred to the various agencies for their comment. I realize that the form is another matter again which could be changed very simply by Order-in-Council, but this does not remove the other impediment which is the subject matter of consideration by the Societies today.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, on a supplementary question. Could the Minister advise whether there have been cases where parents have not been able to adopt a child because they haven't been able to indicate a religious denomination?

MR. CARROLL: We have not been made aware of any although we have asked the Children's Aid Society of Winnipeg to clarify the comments that were made by their Executive Director. There's one case came forward where there did seem to be some difficulty and this was apparently worked out to the satisfaction of all concerned, but we know of no specific case at this moment, although we have asked for further details from them. We had asked them earlier, if there were cases of this kind that were causing problems, to bring those cases forward as special cases for consideration. None of these have come forward as far as we can find out.

MR. SAUL MILLER (Seven Oaks): Mr. Speaker, a supplemental question. As I understand it, the Minister does say that this Act, or the interpretation of the Act, is in fact an impediment to the adoption that's taking place in Manitoba today. In view of that and since the Agencies really operate under the Act, is it not his opinion that this Act should be cleared up and corrected so that this impediment, which he agrees exists, should be eliminated.

MR. CARROLL: Mr. Chairman, that's precisely why we sought the opinions of the various boards to see what difficulties they saw in changing the statute. We must recognize that the religious sections of the Child Welfare Act have, in the past, caused very real and sincere concern among certain religious groups in the province of Manitoba, and we want to make sure that whatever changes are made, are made with the benefit of the advice of all of those interested people who have been expressing these concerns in the past.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, another supplemental question. If there is some difficulty in the form, would the Minister consider that the Act be not pre-judged by immediately amending the form? Because if it's the form that asks you to specify a religion, then surely the form can be changed by regulation immediately, and then if there still is an impediment - which I as a lawyer would doubt, but I'm not going to argue that question - at least it wouldn't be in the form.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. CARROLL: Perhaps I should answer that question. Yes, we will give consideration to the amendment to the form, although we do see a larger problem involved as well.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Education. Have the provincial Finance Board made any special reports to the Department or the Government under the Act? And a second question: when does the fiscal year end, of that provincial Finance Board?

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Education) (Gimli): Mr. Speaker, I believe their fiscal year is the end of the calendar year and they are required to table a report, as I understand it under the Act, by the end of April. They will be tabling an Annual Report to this Legislature.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. No special reports have been asked for - is that right?

MR. JOHNSON: No special reports, no.

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question of the Honourable the Minister of Education. That is - it's not a new question - it's this question of the round trip of over 75 miles per day that apparently some students are required to make. The Minister was going to check into that and give me an answer. Have you an answer?

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, in speaking to the Director of Transportation, he advises me that to his knowledge there are a few cases in Manitoba where students do travel more than 75 miles - that's round trip - to school. He said an attempt is made by all the divisions to keep travelling time within an hour, and he said in certain sparsely settled areas of the province students must travel longer distances. Of course, he makes the point that the distances that students travel in an hour depends of course on the number of pick-ups, and in certain cases this can be kept under an hour even with this longer distance. In speaking to him, he told me that travel time one way is the unit of measurement rather than distance, because of pick-ups. You can understand that a straight run can go 30 miles in 30 minutes, or 40 minutes, and he can't say there are not any elementary students going this distance. He thinks there may be a couple but he couldn't pinpoint any locales for me where elementary students are going this distance - I believe the honourable members's question was concerning elementary students - and he couldn't pinpoint any, but he said if there are they must be very few in number.

MR. DESJARDINS: A subsequent question. Is there a maximum speed for these buses? I don't think any of them will cover 30 miles in 30 minutes with all these pick-ups. I hope that the Minister is still looking into this because that doesn't seem too reasonable.

I'd like to ask a question of the Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Again, it's a question that I asked last week. Has the government made up their mind? And will it insist that the Chairman of the Boundaries Commission be a full-time chairman from now on?

HON. THELMA FORBES (Minister of Urban Development and Municipal Affairs) (Cypress): Mr. Speaker, no I have not an answer for the honourable member as yet. And while I'm on my feet, I would like to reply to a question given to me by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition yesterday when he asked how the cost-sharing of the study on Churchill was being carried out. The CMHC pays 75% of the cost, the province 12 1/2%, and the local government districts 12 1/2%.

I might tell the House that the draft copy of the report on Churchill was presented by the consultants to the liaison committee on which are representatives of Central Mortgage & Housing, the province, and the local government districts. It was presented to them for their information and comment, and concerning the desirability of extending the scope of the report. The liaison committee concurred with the recommendations of the consultants concerning the scope of the report, and the consultants were asked to have a number of copies of the final report prepared. Now yesterday I tried to find out if this report was ready for distribution. I find that it has been sent to the printers and as soon as it comes back it will be tabled and made available. At that time the report will be, as I said, released jointly by CMHC and myself, and also at that time, a number of the copies will be sent to the local government district at Churchill, so that the residents of Churchill will have ready access to this report.

MR. SAUL M. CHERNIACK, Q. C. (St. John's): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Welfare? Since the Director of Adoptions is in his department and must

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd.) . . . . approve of applications for adoption, is there a policy of the government on the question of adoption by parents who do not declare a religion?

MR. CARROLL: I think I would have to say that we are bound by the provisions of the Act. There has only been one case that I am aware of that has come to our attention where there was no stated religion and the adoption was completed.

MR. CHERNIACK: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Does that mean that the government interprets that the Act does not bar an adoption by prospective parents who do not declare a religion?

MR. CARROLL: I think we are prepared to say that there appears to be some doubt as to whether it does or does not. In this particular case the application was approved; it has not been challenged, and there's where the matter rests. This is why we have asked for consideration of this whole problem, because of the concern that has been expressed by a great many people with respect to the present statute as it exists at the present time, and knowing the concern of some of the Societies at least - at least one of the Societies - for any change in that statute, I think we want to look at it very, very carefully. We hope to get the advice yet of the Children's Aid Society of Winnipeg with respect to where we should go from here.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I would like to direct a question to my honourable friend the Minister of Municipal Affairs. When the Chairman of the Boundaries Commission was employed by the government a year or two ago, was it understood at the time that he was employed, that he would devote 100 percent of his time to the job that he was to be engaged in?

MRS. FORBES: No, Mr. Speaker, he was hired as a part-time chairman.

MR. DESJARDINS: But Mr. Speaker, I don't think that's quite correct. The First Minister last year said that he was hired as a full-time member. This was changed after, but he was hired as a full-time member, according to the words of the First Minister.

MR. HILLHOUSE: I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Urban Development and Municipal Affairs. When may I expect to receive a reply to my Order for Return respecting condominium legislation? I think I put it in here about three weeks ago.

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q.C. (Attorney-General): Mr. Speaker, I think that is in my department. I'll check and see how they are coming on.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to address a question to the Minister of Health. In view of this little slip that came out now, the doctors' warning that starting March 31st - in other words a few days ago- they will charge more because their contract doesn't cover the bills. Is it the intention of the government, or the Minister, to release the schedule of fees as approved by the government? Because you'll have doctors' fees approved by the government?

MR. WITNEY: Mr. Speaker, the government has not approved any schedule of doctors' fees.

A MEMBER: It never has.

MR. DESJARDINS: Didn't the Minister say last year that the government would approve; they were negotiating with the doctors, that board that was formed, and that they had to approve the schedule of fees?

MR. WITNEY: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for St. Boniface is referring to negotiations between the doctors and the MMS.

HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Minister of Agriculture and Conservation) (Rockwood-Iberville): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might take this opportunity to answer a question by the Honourable Member from Assiniboia with respect to the Inner Perimeter road development. The government has not approved any location of the Inner Perimeter Highway in the Assiniboia or St. James and Charleswood area. There are several possible locations that are being considered and the government has, in a few instances, authorized purchase of property in various locations to safeguard the interests of these various locations where it was absolutely necessary.

MR. DESJARDINS: I'd like to inform you, Mr. Speaker, as well as all the members and the members of the press, heads of departments, that that famous Pea Soup Night evening will be held again this year, sponsored by Associate St. Jean Baptiste of St. Boniface, and it will be held on Wednesday, April 17th, at the St. Boniface College Gymnasium starting at 8:30 p.m. I am told that this year the City of St. Boniface, as it's celebrating the 150th anniversary of the founding of St. Boniface, they promise to have something special - even

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd.) . . . . better than other years.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a further question to the Honourable Minister of Highways. To my question, the answer that the government did approve and not authorize Metropolitan Corporation to expropriate properties in a certain location, if the government did approve to expropriate property from certain locations, it that not approving the location of the inner perimeter? Because I'm sure the Metropolitan Corporation is not expropriating properties in three or four locations, they're expropriating in one location wherever the perimeter was approved; and, to me, I would conclude that he is saying the government has okayed the location. Is this not correct?

MR. ENNS: To the best of the information to me at this time, is that a specific location in the areas the Member refers to has not been approved by the Government of Manitoba.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, if I may direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Highways in connection with the inner and outer perimeter roads. My question to my honourable friend would be: can the people of the eastern part of Greater Winnipeg be assured that the outer perimeter will be completed before there's any extensive expenditures on an inner perimeter?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I want to assure the Honourable Member from Transcona that the interests of the Department of Highways has not waned insofar as the development of the outer perimeter. I would take this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to point out to the Honourable Member, as I'm sure he's aware and appreciates, that the work done by the department within his immediate area, that is - and I refer specifically to the full development of Highway 59 at 100 % our cost - that there is a very major input of provincial moneys in highway development in that particular area of the province, and it is for this reason primarily where the priorities have been placed. We intend in due course to complete the remaining work to be done on the perimeter.

MR. PAULLEY: A supplementary question, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate the plug of the Honourable the Minister of Highways for work already done. I'm referring to work that has not been done. There is only one portion of the outer perimeter, to my knowledge, that has not been completed, namely from Highway 15 to Highway 59 north. My question is directed in respect of that, not Highway 59 south or north, but the connecting link between 15 and 59. Can my honourable friend indicate that - again, my question - before moneys are expended for a second or inner perimeter, that the outer perimeter, as envisioned years ago, will be completed.

MR. ENNS: Well, not knowing exactly, Mr. Speaker, to where precisely the jurisdiction of this department has in terms of ultimately determining the priorities that another jurisdiction, namely the Metro Corporation, has in this area, I would only reiterate that our interest in the outer perimeter is still the same as before. I'd like to point out in the particular area he refers to, that we do have some specific problems of meeting grade and rail crossings that are major concerns to us in that part of the highway.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs and Urban Development. Has Metro Corporation the right to deny a building permit when the applicant complies with all the zoning regulations?

MRS. FORBES: Well, not knowing the reference, I'd rather take your question under consideration and I will be glad to speak to you about the particular case.

MR. GORDON W. BEARD (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, I know it's rather unusual for me to ask a question of the Ministers but some information has come to me and I would like to ask if at this time - and I probably would have to direct it either to the Minister of Municipal Affairs or the Minister of Education - but it has just been brought to my attention that it has been announced in Ottawa that they will be moving the Eskimo Vocational School from Churchill to Frobisher Bay, which will take in all of the Central Arctic training centre. This means, Mr. Speaker, that they will have approximately, as I understand, 600 students available -- moved out of the Churchill area as of 1971, and in respect to the navy base withdrawn, I ask if the Ministers know or have heard any information on this, particularly in respect to the study that was being made.

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, in reply to the honourable member; after the last year as Minister of Education here in dealing with Ottawa in the so-called area of Federal-Provincial co-operativism, I wouldn't say this is anything -- it doesn't shock me too much in view of this. However, I must say that I would hope that this is not the case and will make inquiries

(MR. JOHNSON cont'd.): . . . . through the official sources as soon as possible.

MRS. FORBES: Mr. Speaker, I, too, would like to say that I have heard rumours of this but we have no official notice of it, and I really do think that when such a move is taken that there should be some co-operation between the federal people and ourselves.

MR. SPEAKER: I'm sure the House has seen my impartiality toward northern matters in that last question. May we proceed? The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask a subsequent question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs in answer to her question of mine of yesterday, regarding the study at Churchill. My concern has been if the Local Government District did pay part of the costs that they should of course have copies and she's cleared this today. Could she tell me approximately when she expects that these will be mailed out, because the very question that has been brought up by -- or the statement that's been made by the Member for Churchill, indicates the urgency of having this report out. Now can she give us an approximate date?

MRS. FORBES: In asking of the consultants, they tell me they had to retype the draft report in order to send it to the printers, and the printers tell me that in about 10 days' time they could have it.

#### ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Virden, the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell in amendment thereto, and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains in amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for Springfield.

MR. FRED T. KLYM (Springfield): Mr. Speaker, I beg the indulgence of this House to have this resolution stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed? The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for LaVerendrye. The Honourable Member for St. Matthews.

MR. ROBERT STEEN (St. Matthews): Mr. Speaker, I, too, would ask the indulgence of the House to allow this matter to stand. However, I have no objection if any other member would like to speak at this time.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, perhaps on a point of order, it would be in order to remind everyone again that we're under the new rules now, and that the effect of standing orders - this applies on all sides of the House equally without fear or favouritism - the effect of standing a resolution has a certain effect with respect to the position of that resolution on the Order Paper. That may have perhaps escaped honourable members' minds and I merely wanted to mention it so they would all be aware of the new rules.

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia. The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I ask the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Honourable Member have leave? Agreed? The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for St. James, and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks in amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, there have been a number of members who have spoken on the resolution of the Honourable Member for St. James, and when one examines his proposal clearly one is confronted with the question of what exactly does he mean, because at first glance it would seem to be somewhat platitudinous. The only word that seems to be of importance in the resolution is where he asks that municipal councils be encouraged to give leadership and direction regarding recreation. So the question then arises as to what exactly does he mean by encouragement. He makes no mention, or seems to give no indication, that this would mean financial encouragement and he did not appear to indicate that there would be any new permissive legislation allowing for example, community clubs and school boards to get together. So one might conclude, perhaps incorrectly, that he was really in effect applauding the results of some of the municipal areas in providing recreation and recreational facilities, and if so, that in itself is worth doing but it would hardly seem necessary to bring in a resolution for that matter. So it would seem to me that the Member for Seven Oaks turned this general proposal into a practical proposal by asking for enabling legislation to "permit school boards and municipalities to initiate and enter into



(MR. DOERN cont'd.) . . . . joint construction and development projects for recreation."

He also included a second Resolved section which, in effect, I think did the same as the Member for St. James, namely applauded the fine work done by councils, school boards and community clubs, because it seems that there's a rather silly practice of renting facilities from each other, and if one looks at this in a broad context it doesn't seem to make very much sense.

But I must say that I was most surprised by the comments of the Member for Roblin. If I understand him correctly, he expresses a rather interesting and amazing attitude. First, he seemed to indicate that some of the area which he represents has a very sparse population which apparently is inadequate to support population centres or towns of any size, therefore schools of any size, and therefore recreation facilities of any size. Well, that may be true, but the question then is, assuming that is true, assuming that his area cannot benefit from this particular resolution, why then should he oppose the resolution? It would seem to me that MLAs should go beyond supporting only those resolutions which benefit or affect their constituency. Otherwise, should urban members vote on purple gas in its favour? Or for example, should rural members therefore support day care centres if it doesn't benefit them directly? Or should rural members oppose urban transportation systems? Well, I think obviously not, and this reminds me, going back into history, of the - what was it - the speech of Edmund Burke to the electors of Bristol when I think he pointed out that one should go beyond - the great Conservative philosopher - one should go beyond one's own constituency and look to the general advantage. Otherwise we all simply vote in favour of what benefits our areas and oppose that which does not.

This reminds me of a fight in my general local area, in the area of East Kildonan, when the East Kildonan Council debated whether or not they would contribute to the Centennial Arts Centre, and one of the aldermen was quoted as saying: "Let's not say that we're against the Centennial Centre, let's just not donate any money to it." Other people argued that since the Centennial Centre wasn't being built in East Kildonan or parts in that end of town, that therefore no money should be given toward it. Well, I think that was a rather parochial attitude, and finally reason prevailed and the City of East Kildonan gave a grant which, in the end, I think turned out to be the largest grant of any area in the Metro area outside the City of Winnipeg. They were once second but by process of elimination wound up with the heaviest donation, I think to their credit.

The question is then, does this amendment make sense and does it apply beyond the Metro area if that is the question? I think it does. I happen to have some familiarity with rural Manitoba. I know, for example, unless there have been new changes in Stonewall, which is near the Metro Winnipeg area, that the main recreation facility there is the school, and I don't think there are any other facilities in the area where people can engage in recreational facilities. Similarly in Emerson. The key facility again is the school. We were up at Gillam the other day, and there again you have the key facility being the school, although they are more fortunate and in addition are getting a recreational center. So that, if you look at a map of the province, I think you will find that the educational facilities are the only recreation facilities in many areas. And this I think is also true in the dense urban areas. If you look around, for example the Metro area, there are some of the older sections of the city which do not have land areas and do not have recreation facilities, and the school is the only possible facility that could be used for recreation. The amendment really asks that, in school design and in the administration of the school facilities, that these things be taken into account, that possibly more lockers are provided or that more showers are provided and so on.

This resolution also makes sense to people who are concerned about whether or not our expensive educational plants are being used, people who feel, for example, that the university is only being used part of the year, feel that the plant is not being sufficiently utilized. Well, if you took the secondary educational system or the primary system and geared that into the general community, you would get evening use and adult use, and one could have badminton clubs, as we do in some of the schools, physical fitness courses and so on.

Swimming pools are in some instances still not tied into the general community. For example, quoting from an article of October 27, 1967, a Mr. King speaking at an in-service training institute for public health inspectors, he's quoted as follows. He says: "We've been pushing for years for pools in schools. We got close with the Pan-Am pool. It's only 100 yards from Grant Park High School but too many people still think of pools as frills." And

(MR. DOERN cont'd.) . . . . then it goes on to point out that most Winnipeg schools provide swimming classes at public pools. It also points out that the same Mr. King wondered how many adults make use of gymnasium facilities after they leave school, etc. Well, I notice today there was an announcement that the R. B. Russell School, the junior vocational school on Dufferin Avenue, may have a swimming pool built adjacent to it, and to me this makes a great deal of sense. Similarly, in my own community we have at the center or the core of Elmwood, you have Elmwood High School and David Thompson Junior High School, and then there's a community club right opposite, right across the street, and I remember speaking to the principal of this school who requested that this was something that was very much needed in the area was a swimming pool, and that it could be built almost adjacent to the school or right across the street. This makes a great deal of sense. Where is a better place to build recreation facilities than beside a school? Because the children can to a large extent use the facilities in the day time, and then why not reverse the procedure and allow the adults to use the school facilities or any other facilities in the evening?

Now the Minister of Education, I'm most interested to hear what he has to say. He may object to this. Apparently last year he went on record as not being favourably impressed with this kind of idea. I know it's not because he's against physical education, because he was quite an athlete himself at one time, and still is; but I think that his fear probably is that this might over-burden the educational budget. I think maybe he's afraid that if you start adding on and building and keeping certain recreation facilities open to adults and evening classes etc., this may over-burden education and the result is that this may cause some sort of a backlash. Well I think this resolution takes care of that because it simply permits the joint use, and I think therefore sharing the joint cost of these facilities. It doesn't mean that these facilities shall be built and paid for under the education budget. I think it simply means that one could have a working agreement between the municipalities, the community clubs and the school boards to provide and share resources in the area. And this, Mr. Speaker, to me makes a great deal of sense and I urge all members to support this amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for . . . The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. EDWARD I. DOW (Turtle Mountain): Thank you, Mr. Speaker, speaking on this proposed resolution, I am concerned of the fact that there is some suggestion made that municipal people are not pulling their weight in regards to developing recreational facilities throughout the province. I suppose we can be parochial sometimes in our thinking and maybe assess the results in the area in which we live, and possibly the mover of this resolution may have some grounds to suggest that his particular area and council is not providing the recreational facilities that are required within the area, but I would like to take a broader look on this than the fact that in my experience in municipal affairs that the municipalities have been the leaders in developing recreational facilities throughout the province to the extent of the monies that were available that they could do so.

There are many communities that you can go to today where they have a decided outright complex of total recreational facilities from swimming pools to curling rinks to skating rinks to ball diamonds to track and field and what have you, and this has been a joint effort between the various municipalities. The municipal law does give certain consideration to municipalities to work with one another to develop these types of things. And I think the amendment to this resolution is excellent in the fact that they are giving some recognition to the municipal councils in doing what they have done in the past, and possibly legislation could be expanded a little bit more to implement it and make it a better deal. I might suggest that there is some problems in regard to schools being part of the recreational system, that if the school has a physical director which they don't all have and which the Minister might some day get into being, the facilities they have in the schools is pretty well taken up by the school children themselves, and so to get the adults into recreation facilities there has to be something more than that. I agree with the previous speaker that it's best to have them built close by so that joint facilities can be made, but I really believe, Mr. Speaker, that if you take a good look at the province as a whole you will find that the municipalities have given good leadership in developing recreation to the money that has been available.

I was somewhat concerned by the Honourable Member from Roblin in regards to his remarks, as has been said, because this is not true, generally speaking, that municipal councils do not give leadership to recreation facilities. I can recount many places where they do have permanent physical directors, they do have groups of organizations taking

(MR. DOW cont'd.) . . . . advantage of the grants that have been given by the department in regards to promoting this. This is all worked through the municipalities involved. And so I would say, Mr. Speaker, that I think this amendment to the resolution is good and I'm prepared to support it.

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

MR. DOUGLAS M. STANES (St. James): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Churchill, that debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Inkster. The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Elmwood, that

Whereas this House recognizes the effectiveness and desirability of integrating and co-ordinating municipal services for the Greater Winnipeg area, and such services should be administered by one municipal government;

There be it resolved that this House endorses in principle the implementation of such measures as would be necessary to establish one municipal government responsible for the administration of municipal services in Greater Winnipeg.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the resolution is so simple and so easy to understand that it is possible that the question should be put immediately and voted on unanimously by the members of this House. But, having regard to past experience with this question, I would suggest that I have no right to be so optimistic as to expect that that would happen, and therefore, Mr. Speaker, I guess that I have to begin in adding to the seemingly endless debate that has already been held outside this Chamber on this particular issue and which is now being discussed in this Chamber itself.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin my remarks by indicating that the wording of the resolution is not intended to create any difficulty in the minds of any members, nor is it in any way intended to say something which it doesn't say. Mr. Speaker, I think that this is the shortest resolution on the Order Paper, and having regard to some of the resolutions that I, myself, have drawn, and in looking in it, I think that probably this is one of the plainest resolutions and that there is no difficulty, as I said before, in either understanding its meaning or appreciating what it says. In short, Mr. Speaker, it says what it means and it means what it says. There is no equivocation about it. There is some history to it and perhaps that has accounted for perhaps some of the difficulties which some members have had as to understanding why the resolution is worded in exactly these words.

Mr. Speaker, I don't intend to take credit for suggesting that Greater Winnipeg should be one city and run by one municipal government. I think probably the person who has pushed this idea the hardest and with the greatest consistency is the Mayor of the City of Winnipeg, and I don't think that there is any doubt about that. However, from time to time different people have advanced the idea and it has been advanced from time to time by different political parties, although never as an official position of a political party, and I want to say immediately that the resolution that I'm advancing is not the official position of the New Democratic Party; it's a resolution which I advance as an individual, one which I have reason to believe will be supported by an overwhelming number of New Democrats, both in this House and without, and which I have reason to believe should be supported by a great majority of the members of this House. I pose this resolution not in any political context; I pose it as being a matter of straight common sense.

But I indicated that it did have a history. In July of 1965, Mr. Speaker, I was a member of the Metropolitan Corporation of Greater Winnipeg, and at that time I moved a resolution in words almost identical to the resolution which is now before you. It was different to the extent that I used the word "Council" rather than "House" but the basis of the resolution was almost identical. And at that time, Mr. Speaker, I stayed away from catch words or catch phrases which could involve some political partisanship of one kind or another, and therefore, Mr. Speaker, I didn't use for instance the word "amalgamation" because amalgamation appeared to be a Winnipeg idea. To me it doesn't matter whose idea it was but amalgamation appeared to be a Winnipeg idea and I wanted to demonstrate that what we had

(MR. GREEN cont'd.) . . . . to say was not a Winnipeg idea, it was an idea that could suit any of the municipalities in the area.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I said that the Council - and I now say the House - recognizes the effectiveness and desirability of integrating and co-ordinating municipal services for the Greater Winnipeg area - I don't think there's anything equivocal about that; we recognize that they should be integrated in the Greater Winnipeg area - and that such services should be administered by one municipal government. Now how that could be equivocal I don't understand. One municipal government for all municipal services. "Therefore be it resolved that the House endorse in principle the implementation of such measures as would be necessary to establish one municipal government to be responsible for the administration of municipal services in Greater Winnipeg." Mr. Speaker, I don't see how that is in any way equivocal. It suggests that there be one municipal government for municipal services in Greater Winnipeg. And once, Mr. Speaker, we understand that the House wants to go in this direction, then I say that the government should bring forth legislation each step of which should take us there. They can bring in one bill and immediately amalgamate all services if that's the way it can be done. If it can be done quickly, let it be done quickly. If it requires the implementation step by step towards that end, let it be done that way. But let us all recognize - and this is what this resolution says - that we are looking for one government; not two, not four, not six, not eight - one municipal government. That's what the resolution says. That's what it intends to say; that's what it said in July of 1965; and that's what it still says. And the only reason that it has been formulated in this manner is that's the way it was formulated when I introduced it on Metro Council in July of 1965.

Mr. Speaker, one important change. In July of 1965, during the course of debating this resolution, several of the councillors - as a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, none of them really opposed it but several of the councillors said, "It's a good idea but your timing is bad," and I have heard that so often, when somebody hasn't got a good reason for opposing something, they blame the timing or some other innocuous suggestion - these councillors said that the timing was bad. During the course of the debate, I asked permission to insert the word, because of these councillors, to insert the word "eventual" implementation, the eventual desirability of integrating services. Mr. Speaker, despite this attempt to therefore enlist people who said that the timing was bad and the idea was good, the councillors didn't apparently think that even that change was satisfactory and they still voted against the resolution, so without making any compromise in this House because I don't think it is going to do any good, I don't want to use the word "eventual". I want to say that we establish the principle now, and that we then proceed to move towards one municipal government for municipal services in Greater Winnipeg, and that should be the direction in which this House moves the government, and I hope that the resolution is so framed as would commend itself to the government itself.

Well Mr. Speaker, I want to indicate that the Winnipeg Tribune had no difficulty in understanding what this resolution said in 1965. The reporter who covered it had the headline "Five to Four Vote Against Uniting", so that reporter apparently knew that we were talking about uniting. And then, "Metro Council Thursday rejected a motion calling for its endorsement of the amalgamation of municipal governments in Greater Winnipeg," so the newspapers had no difficulty about understanding what was meant, and the Free Press covered the story, Mr. Speaker, in much the same way.

I think, Mr. Speaker, I have probably spent more time than is necessary in explaining what I said, and I still think it is a simple resolution, unequivocal, easy to understand. Perhaps it may be too easy to understand, so that somebody is looking for something in it that isn't there. I suggest to you that there is no reason to look beyond the words of the resolution itself. One municipal government for municipal services in Greater Winnipeg, to be implemented by this government.

Mr. Speaker, now I think it is much more important to deal with the reasons for putting this resolution on the Order Paper than to explain the resolution, and as I say, I have probably gone on too long in explaining it. Mr. Speaker, if we look at the situation of Greater Winnipeg now, we look at a map which is a jigsaw puzzle of thirteen municipalities, containing thirteen municipal governments plus a super government, the Metropolitan Government, administered by over one hundred politicians, one hundred municipal politicians, each elected to the valous area councils and to the municipal government itself, it's surprising to me that

(MR. GREEN cont'd.) . . . . under these circumstances anybody would say, "What benefit would you have by amalgamation?" Because let's assume, Mr. Speaker, we could start from the beginning. In other words, we have the most expert town planners available; we have a social, economic and geographic area which is one unit, geographically economically and socially. Would any person in his right mind draw the plan of municipal government in Metro Winnipeg the way he finds it today? I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that if someone did that, there would certainly be reason to question as to whether he is in his right mind, because nobody would do it.

Therefore, the real question to be asked is not whether or not amalgamation does us any good, the real question to be asked is whether the existing system is of any value whatsoever, and I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that it's of no value. It is exactly the antithesis of any form of reasonable municipal planning, and that's the real reason, Mr. Speaker, and I say that that's the overriding reason, for talking about one municipal government for this geographic area.

I want to deal very briefly, Mr. Speaker, because I think that there is a great misunderstanding and could be in the future a great misunderstanding, about this question from the point of view of cost. I am not putting this resolution because I say that eventually the taxpayer in the City of Winnipeg is going to save some taxes, the taxpayer in Greater Winnipeg is going to save taxes, I think that he will. I believe that he will and I believe that he will in one or other of two ways. There are two ways of saving money, Mr. Speaker. We can buy the same car for less money or we can buy a better car for the same money, and I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that one of these two things would happen and I don't know which, I wouldn't want anybody in this House to give the citizens of Greater Winnipeg the idea that if there was an amalgamated city two years from now or five years from now or six years from now, the mill rate would go down and their taxation would go down. It likely won't. But I say, and I say this as a matter of prediction and I say this as a matter of common sense, that they will get better value for their money. And that's the issue - not whether taxes will rise or taxes will go down, but will they get better value for their money?

I want to make it plain, Mr. Speaker, that this motion cannot be dealt with from the point of view of taxes alone, because if you do it on that basis, then you are going to prepare the people for something that possibly would not happen. I have put this motion, not because I think primarily that it will reduce taxes - although I repeat I think we will get better value - I put this motion because I think that it will remove existing problems and that primarily -- it won't remove all the problems but it will remove some of the most pressing problems on the municipalities at the present time, and that eventually, and its greatest advantage, is that it will improve the democratic process in Metropolitan Winnipeg.

Now, what are some of the most important problems, Mr. Speaker? and I wish to indicate that I can't deal with all of them. Some of my colleagues will be dealing with some of them very fully. But what are some of the most pressing problems which this structure creates and which I suggest cannot be removed except by the elimination of the existing structure? And I want to make another point plain before I continue. I'm not suggesting who this municipal government should be. I'm not suggesting that it should be Metro. I'm not suggesting that it should be an annexation by the other municipalities by the City of Winnipeg. My inclination is that there should be a complete sweep and a new government introduced with the Legislature considering how the municipal officers would be elected. My point is not to prefer one form of government to the other, but to prefer one government - a democratic government, of course.

One of the major problems, Mr. Speaker, deals with the question of planning, because we now have a situation where the Metropolitan Corporation of Winnipeg is responsible for planning in the Greater Winnipeg area. This in effect, Mr. Speaker, gives that corporation tremendous economic control over what happens in a particular area. It, in effect, says that a certain area is going to be a dormitory area, is going to consist of largely residential homes, and probably its planning authority is right in saying this. It also says that a certain area is going to be set aside for industry and that industry will locate in a certain municipality. Now this, Mr. Speaker - and I was on Council and I remember feeling this - this puts the metropolitan councillors in the awful responsibility - and it is an awful responsibility - of suggesting that a particular area is going to have a low revenue - producing tax base in perpetuity, as a result of the planning authority, while at the same time not having within it the

(MR. GREEN cont'd.) . . . . power to -- it's going to give it a certain character planning - wise without giving it the power to collect money to take care of the people in its area.

For instance, and I'll put it more clearly: St. Vital and West Kildonan, both dormitory municipalities, lovely municipalities - they should stay that way. Any planning authority would say that they should stay that way. But they're condemned to not get any industrial revenue because there is no industry within their municipality and therefore, although Metro could describe the character of a municipality, it couldn't alleviate the tax burden that it created by affirming that character, and Mr. Speaker, I'm saying that whatever planning authority you have - and it should be one - should have both powers. It should have the power to describe the character of the area and it should also see to it that all of the revenues in the area are distributed so that one area will not have the disadvantage of not being able to share in the industrial revenue of the entire province. And this is why, Mr. Speaker, an area like West Kildonan although it doesn't pursue -- or an area like St. Vital, although it doesn't pursue the idea of one municipal government, it does pursue the idea of shared municipal industrial revenues, because that it agrees with. It goes that far towards establishing one municipal government but stops there, and I'll attempt to describe the reason as to why I think it stops there.

So we have, Mr. Speaker, a government which is able to control what an area will have but which is unable to do anything for it tax-wise. We have a situation where two of the essential protective services in our society, that is, fire and police, are in no way related to the Greater Winnipeg area as a whole, so we have the situation where the technical people, Mr. Speaker, all say that Winnipeg should have one police force, Greater Winnipeg should have one police force, and I suggest to you that the findings of the Huband Committee -- and by the way, when I was on Metro Council, it should be of interest to at least the Leader of the Opposition that a person by the name of Charlie Huband seconded this motion. We have the situation where the police chief said that there should be one municipal, one Greater Winnipeg police force. We had the position at one time where the fire chief said that all of the fire departments in Greater Winnipeg should be connected with a sound system, which connects each with the other. This was turned down by the City of Winnipeg - not by the Fire chiefs; by the City of Winnipeg politicians.

Mr. Speaker, it almost is trite to say, nevertheless it has to be said, that crime in Greater Winnipeg does not know any boundaries. It does not know that when you get to McAdam Avenue you leave North Winnipeg and enter West Kildonan. Nor does fire in Greater Winnipeg know any boundaries. It does not know, for instance, that when you cross Highway 59 at Nairn that you leave Winnipeg and enter the City of Transcona - at least I think that's what you enter. And I say that these municipal services should know no boundaries, and indeed many of the people who are against one municipal government concede that you should have a Greater Winnipeg Fire Department and a Greater Winnipeg Police Department, just as you now have a Greater Winnipeg Transit Company and just as you now have a Greater Winnipeg Interceptor Sewer System, although the interceptors are Metro and the feeder sewers are municipal, and I don't know that a great number of people understand just where the municipal jurisdiction ends and the Metro jurisdiction begins, and that's one of the serious problems.

Mr. Speaker, another area, which I'm happy the First Minister is here, because he was seriously involved in this area. It is the area of Greater Winnipeg streets. Although many of the outlying municipal councils are against one municipal city, what they do agree to is that more and more of their streets should be paid for by the Greater Winnipeg area generally. In other words, although you have West Kildonan, let us say, not agreeing to one municipal government, it likes to throw Salter Street in, Salter Street north, into the Metropolitan street system for the purpose of getting it paid for by the rest of the area. Although St. James is one of the strongest opponents to a metropolitan system - the mayor of St. James in any event - there was no objection to having Ness Avenue right into his development area, made a part of the Metropolitan streets system. And the First Minister will recall that there was a big argument about streets with regard to Metro, and all of the outlying areas came to the Minister of Highways as he then was, and they said to him, " We think that this is a major urban thoroughfare and therefore it should be part of the Metropolitan street system," and they threw streets into the system. The City of Winnipeg, on the other hand, for some obscure reason which has never been made sensible to me, because they were angry with the Metropolitan authority they said we should take streets out of the system, and the First Minister, being a

(MR. GREEN cont'd.)..... very astute politician, said that "I'll satisfy you both. The outlying areas will put the streets in so the City of Winnipeg will take the streets out," with the result, Mr. Speaker, that the City of Winnipeg not only had to pay for the streets of the outlying areas which satisfied them, but they didn't get the outlying areas for it to pay for the streets within their own area. Mr. Speaker, maybe the First Minister thinks that that was a very clever solution to the problem, but I suggest to you it wasn't a clever solution because it made the twenty representatives of citizens in Greater Winnipeg, it made them - as he knows that - have their citizens assume a burden which they shouldn't have and made it easier for the people in the outside area.

The solution, Mr. Speaker, reminds me of the story of the Russian and American diplomats who grew to be great friends in the United Nations, and they were in Washington one day and they noticed a picketer standing in front of the White House, and the picketer not only had signs but he was shouting, "Down with Johnson. Down with Rusk. Down with the United States State Department." And the American said to his Russian friend, he said, "Now look; isn't it a wonderful thing that in our country you can stand in front of the White House and say this type of thing?" And the Russian said, "Well, that's nothing unusual." He said "If you came to Russia you could stand in front of the Kremlin and you could say "Down with Johnson. Down with Rusk. Down with the United States State Department." It's a clever "out" but, Mr. Speaker, it won't wash. It doesn't do justice to the situation in Greater Winnipeg and it still doesn't do justice to the situation in Greater Winnipeg.

Metro has now established a route sign system which tells you that Route 90 runs in a certain direction, and I'm not even going to argue about the merits or demerits of the idea. What I will argue is that it's scandalous, and especially to a visitor, to be told that Route 90 running north, let us say, on Salter Street, stops at Mountain and it's no longer Route 90 because you're out of Metro Winnipeg, and that's the way those road maps are made up and I suppose that's the way they have to be made up because that's the way the street system in Greater Winnipeg has developed under this government, and because of this kind of perhaps astuteness that the First Minister thinks that he dealt with on that Metropolitan roads question. True, he did satisfy the urban constituencies and he satisfied the constituencies surrounding Greater Winnipeg and apparently he satisfied the politicians of the City of Winnipeg, although I really don't know why.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as I've indicated, all of the arguments for a Greater Winnipeg come from those politicians who seem to oppose it the most, because on specific issues they are all for it. I've indicated that on the issue of roads, the surrounding areas want them in the system. I've indicated that on the system of industrial spread of the tax base, your dormitory areas want that part of the Metro system. They don't want amalgamation but they want that part of the Metro system, which is in fact a recognition that all of the revenues that are received by Greater Winnipeg as a whole should belong to Greater Winnipeg - and I agree with that, Mr. Speaker. And I think that the citizens of Winnipeg agree with that, even though that may affect them in some way adversely; and I think that the common citizens agree with this. The common citizens are not trying to achieve the tax advantages that are sometimes sought by the local politician who happens to be in that basis. For years the citizens of Greater Winnipeg were solely responsible for the maintenance of the two big parks of Winnipeg, Assiniboine Park and Kildonan Park, and then these became part of the Metro system because they were used by all of Metro Winnipeg. Mr. Speaker, I don't think you will find any citizens complaining that they have lost their unfair advantage as a result of being part of the Metropolitan parks system.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to deal now with the history, to some extent, of urban growth and why I think municipal politicians are so contrary to one municipal government. The very nature in which they are formed, the very nature in which they have progressed, indicate that they must be against the amalgamated area because many people started to live outside the fringe of a great urban area in order to have the tax advantage of the fringe municipality while enjoying the living advantage of the urban area itself, and therefore, when that tax advantage is sought to be removed by the creation of one municipal government, I don't think that there's any doubt that they're going to oppose it, and in my years on Metro Council -- Mr. Speaker, I have every respect for what the municipal politicians are doing, but they do have that posture; they are in the position of continually trying to get an edge, taxation-wise, as against the people in other municipalities or against people in the area itself. I can well recall, and I've indicated certain

(MR. GREEN cont'd.).... examples of it with regard to the streets system. I can well recall that when we were talking about the Pan-American Games, Winnipeg decided to go it alone and tried to get contributions from the other areas, and when Metropolitan Government indicated that it might favour some participation, many of the municipalities screamed: "Stay out of it." They were willing to let this go on as it did go on, provided that they were willing to bargain. I remember Mayor Guay in particular, saying, "Well, we may participate but I'd like to know where you're going to put the Cadillac. If the Cadillac is in my garage then I'm willing to pay for it." So they were bargaining for the placing of facilities as against their contribution. Now surely, Mr. Speaker, that's the kind of thing that should be decided by the elected representatives of the people.

Mr. Speaker, I can recall, and I think that it would be well here to indicate, that the existence of the 13 municipalities and the kind of procedure that they have to go through at budget time, should more than anything else indicate that they do not have real substantial issues to discuss at the local level, and that's why you'll find, Mr. Speaker - and I blame nobody - that the lower municipality blames Metro, Metro blames the Provincial Government, the Provincial Government blames the Federal Government, and the Federal Government blames them all; that this is the attitude that is taken on these particular councils, because let's look at a typical budget.

The budget of the City of Winnipeg is -- roughly \$61 million came out as being the budget yesterday. Of that, Mr. Speaker, there are these items in which the municipal councils have almost no say whatsoever: \$22 million of that is on schools. All they can do is get the school board budget and pass it; \$6.1 million, Mr. Speaker, and another 2.6 million, are the Metro levy. They have nothing to say about that levy. They pass it. \$10.3 million is police and fire, almost all of which is made up in salaries, and they have very little to say about what happens there. It's determined either by collective bargaining or, if not concluded by an agreement, it goes to arbitration, so the municipal council can't decide that either. Another \$3.8 million, Mr. Speaker, are debt charges; debt charges. They can't say that this year they aren't going to pay those charges. They've got to pass them, which, Mr. Speaker, is a total of \$45 million on those items alone - and I suggest to you that many of these other items are uncontrollable - which is 75% of the budget is a completely non-controllable expense over which the local politician has nothing to say, and this was demonstrated to me so graphically that I shall never forget it.

All of the engineers came to Metro and said that we should have a standard by-law, Mr. Speaker, would you believe, as to the width of a tube, as to the width of pipes that would connect the hose in the area. And they all agreed that something like a half-inch or a three-quarters of an inch was the right size. Then Metro had a meeting with these municipalities and tried to get them agree to have this pipe made at three-quarters of an inch, and there were all kinds of objections - not to the three-quarters of an inch, but at the idea that one Metro authority was going to say that it should be three-quarters of an inch, and I remember the Mayor of one municipality, Mr. Speaker, saying - and I use, as close as I can recall, his words: "It's not so much the question of having this by-law but if you take away that power to say how thick that pipe is, then we may as well not be here; then you may as well get rid of the municipal politician." Well, Mr. Speaker, I said to him, "If you're in politics to decide only the question as to the thickness of a pipe, then I'd suggest to you that you should leave," and he did leave, Mr. Speaker - not of his own choice, but he left. And I suggest to you that that's what it is starting to amount to, and that's why there is all kinds of extraneous debate as between the various levels of government.

Now Mr. Speaker, I want to try to convince this body that I do not have a disrespect for these politicians. I think that they are doing the best that they can, and I go further: I say that if you replaced them all, all 115 or 120 municipal politicians, you replaced them all and selected what you think were the best men for the job and put them into those various jobs, within a month, within two months, you'd have the same arguments as you now have as between the municipal authorities and the Metro government, and the Metro government and the Provincial Government. It's not the people that are responsible, it's the beast itself, and it is a beast - it's the nature of the beast. Mr. Speaker, two years ago or three years ago, I said and I repeat that the administration of municipal government in Greater Winnipeg today is like an octopus with a nervous breakdown. That is the situation. It's not the people; it's the nature of the beast. And that beast has to be changed, and I hope that it can be converted into, not



(MR. GREEN cont'd.)..... a beast, but a useful instrument for democratic process in Greater Winnipeg.

Mr. Speaker, I think that some of the difficulty that we have been concerned with insofar as municipal government is concerned, is what we are concerned with and will be concerned with for time immemorial with any type of government. It has concerned personalities. It has concerned the victory of one position over another position. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that by the implementation of the resolution, the passing of this resolution that I put forward, it will not be a victory for a particular individual, a particular party, or a particular chamber, or a particular government; it will be a victory for the processes of democracy itself, because this is my conclusion, Mr. Speaker, that that is the real reason for changing the nature of the municipal governments in Greater Winnipeg, that the present system is not conducive to democracy.

The people in the area do not know, cannot easily identify their responsible government authority. If they go to Metro they are told by some people that the responsibility is at the local level. If they go to the local area they are told that the responsibility is the Metro area. They don't know, and it can never be clearly defined as to which of their governments is responsible. So I say, Mr. Speaker, let us make the democratic process operative. Let us say that in Greater Winnipeg, when we are talking about municipal services, you can identify the politicians, and if you don't like what he's doing, if he is increasing taxes, you can identify who has increased taxes. You don't have to be told, as you now are, by the City of Winnipeg, that the reason that our taxes are so high is because of the uncontrollable Metro levy, and you don't have to be told by Metro the opposite, that "when we took over these functions the City of Winnipeg should have got out of it," because that is what they are now told.

MR. SPEAKER: May I remind the honourable gentleman he has four minutes.

MR. GREEN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I suggest to you that the municipal taxpayer doesn't know whether he is coming or going, that he is so confused by the present municipal system, and that the real victory, if we enact and pass this resolution, would be a victory for the democratic process for which we are all concerned. It would then be possible for that metropolitan voter to know who is the source of his tax increase, and that, Mr. Speaker - and as I have indicated earlier, I don't base this argument on tax saving; I base it on economy but not tax saving and there is a difference - that the real measure of its effectiveness insofar as tax saving is concerned, is that the person who spends those taxes will be in a position where he has to be responsible without any fuzzy lines as to whether he in fact spent them or not.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that this is the main proposition that I advance here. I advance the proposition for all the reasons that I have put, and I am sure that other members of this House will put other equally valid reasons, and perhaps will put them in a better form, as to why there should be one municipal government, but the main reason, the overriding consideration, is that it will make for effective democracy insofar as municipal government is concerned in Greater Winnipeg. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Continued on next page.

April 2, 1968

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

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, I wish to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Kildonan, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition. The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): Mr. Speaker, may we have the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand, please?

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Honourable Member have leave? The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Emerson. The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Speaker, I assure you that I will not take up a great length of time of the House on this particular resolution. The honourable member that has just taken his seat said at the beginning of his remarks, and repeated it on several occasions, that his resolution was clear-cut, there should be no misunderstanding about it, and I say the same thing for the one that is before the House now. When the Honourable Member for Lakeside spoke on this resolution the other day, it developed into a kind of a racial battle and I do not intend to touch on that particular subject at all. The resolution just simply asks that an education committee be established of members of the House.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in looking over Votes and Proceedings No. 13, it appears to me that we have committees on Privileges and Elections, Public Accounts, Public Utilities and Natural Resources, Agriculture and Conservation, Municipal Affairs, Law Amendments, Private Bills, Standing Orders Printing and Library, Industrial Relations, Statutory Orders and Regulations. Now, in consideration of the fact that the estimates that are before us call for the spending of \$377 million, of which nearly 40 percent is for education - nearly 40 percent is for education - it only seems reasonable to me that we should have a Standing Committee on Education. An editorial in the Free Press the other evening, dealing with education costs, pointed out that the spending of \$135,931,000 meant \$136.00 for every man, woman and child in the Province of Manitoba. And these are huge sums of money that we're dealing with here, huge sums of money; and I can't see anything at all wrong with at least setting up a committee made up of members of this House to deal with the situation. What would it cost us to do this? My guess is it would be little or nothing. It doesn't cost us anything to set up committees on Agriculture, Public Accounts. It doesn't cost us anything. And I think it would be most helpful if we could call on members of our society to come and speak to us. Surely nobody in this province has all of the answers that are being asked of education today. When you sit at the St. Regis Hotel and observe all of the various weekly newspapers that they have down there and just glance over the front page of any one of them, they're all filled with expressing concern over the high costs of education. And it's only natural, I suppose, that that would happen at this time of the year because all of the schools are preparing their budgets and presenting them to the local council - my honourable friend the Member for St. John's just touched on that - and just everyone in the Province of Manitoba is concerned about our rising costs of education.

The Manitoba Chambers of Commerce, that present their statement of policy and resolutions to the government annually and then mail out copies of same to all members of the House, have this to say in respect to education on Page 3, Resolution No. 4: "The Manitoba Chambers of Commerce believes that (a) its member Chambers and businessmen should be urged to work with the Provincial Government and local authorities to further the cause of better education. Businessmen should acquire a better understanding of the problems of teachers and educational administrators. Its member Chambers should direct attention to attracting more men and women of adequate qualifications to the teaching profession. The educational authorities should continue to make a constant study of the curricula to ensure that they provide the kind of education which will produce good Canadian citizens equipped to make their contribution to Canada and to the world."

Now if we would establish this Committee on Education we could have the senior executive members of the Chamber of Commerce come to us and let them elaborate on what they propose in their resolutions. They would be glad to come. They have said so in their resolutions that are before us. The Farm Bureau people would be glad to come before that committee. They have said so in their briefs and resolutions. The Farmers' Union likewise, and all of the other people that are anxious and eager to speak with the various Ministers throughout

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd.) . . . . the year.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I am just eagerly waiting to see what the government has to say when they either amend or turn down the resolution that is before us. I believe the Honourable Member for Emerson made the statement - either in private conversation with the Minister of Education or in debate a year ago - that the Minister at that time said he favoured the setting up of an Education Committee. Perhaps the reason that it hasn't been set up long ago is that it isn't done in other provinces. I don't even know myself whether it is done in other provinces, but that does not stop this government from establishing a committee as referred to in the resolution.

Surely the new Premier, who has said on so many occasions in the last six months that he intends to hold the line, would favour the setting up of this committee because it doesn't cost any money. We're in, apparently, an austerity program - that's what my honourable friend the First Minister intends to carry out in his regime, the first year anyway - and surely he would like to have the views of a lot of the Conservative (with a big "C") friends come to this committee and say, "Listen, my dear friend. Here we have solutions to help my honourable friend out, ways and means and measures of having a better quality of education at less cost." Isn't that what we're interested in? My honourable friend has said so on many occasions. And so, Mr. Speaker, I will look with eager interest to comments that are made on this particular resolution by members of the government, and in particular the First Minister.

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

MR. MOLGAT: Yeas and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

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

YEAS: Messrs. Barkman, Campbell, Cherniack, Dawson, Desjardins, Dow, Doern, Fox, Froese, Green, Guttormson, Hanuschak, Hillhouse, Johnston, Kawchuk, Miller, Molgat, Patrick, Paulley, Petursson, Shoemaker, Tanchak, Uskiw and Vielfaure.

NAYS: Messrs. Baizley, Beard, Bjornson, Carroll, Cowan, Craik, Einarson, Enns, Evans, Hamilton, Jeannotte, Johnson, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McGregor, McKellar, McKenzie, McLean, Masniuk, Shewman, Spivak, Stanes, Steen, Watt, Weir, Witney, and Mesdames Forbes and Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 24; Nays, 29.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the resolution lost.

The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for St. John's in amendment thereto. The Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I sincerely trust and hope that there'll be as much enthusiasm when I take my seat as apparently there is when I start, because in looking at the resolution that we have before us, I must confess, Mr. Speaker, that one of the reasons -- and I would suggest to the members opposite that they don't all leave as they apparently intend to do because I am going to try and use my persuasive powers, if indeed I have any persuasive powers, to elicit from the members of government some contribution to the debate on Medicare.

We did hear the other day from the First Minister briefly when he referred to the mathematical escalation of costs that he had arrived at in respect of Medicare, but we haven't heard at all from any of the members opposite as to why the change in the philosophy of the Party, if indeed one can call it that - and I'm referring of course to the Conservative Party - from a year ago. It seems to me that as one reads the newspapers that the only talking that the Conservatives in this government are prepared to do is through the media of the press and not in this House where they have to stand up and be counted. We have not had an opportunity of hearing from them and we certainly want to hear from them before these resolutions are passed, and I particularly would like the Honourable the Minister of Welfare to stay because I have some remarks I would like him to hear in a few moments.

You know, Mr. Speaker, I made reference some time back to a certain convention that took place in our province last November, and I want to draw to the attention of the Conservative representatives in this House a few of the remarks respecting Medicare that were made at that particular time by the aspirants for the office of the Leader of the Conservative Party. At that time, in their appeals to the citizens of Manitoba they were very much concerned with the people of Manitoba respecting Medicare, but it seems to me that as the convention day arrived

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.) . . . . and as it went, there seemed to be a change in approach and a change in attitude that is not understandable, at least to myself and many of my colleagues, and I am sure that hasn't been understood by the people of Manitoba. And if the government or the members of the government have enough gumption to explain their change of attitude in this House, then I welcome it.

I can recall the debates of a year ago when the government gave to the Honourable the Minister of Health the prime responsibility for conducting through its various stages the Medical Insurances Bill - and he did - and if you recall, Mr. Speaker, at that particular time, or period, the Honourable the Minister of Health found it necessary to chastise some of the members of his caucus for the approach that they were taking in respect of Medicare. I recall a speech from the Honourable the Member from Roblin, one from the Honourable Member from Souris-Lansdowne, and others, in respect of Medicare. I can also see right now, or picture, every single member opposite, when the vote was taken, stood up and was counted. But what is the sad sorry state of affairs today? Gone is the vigor; gone is the active participation in the debate. With the sole exception of the First Minister the other day in a few passing sentences, not one word opposite.

What did my honourable friend the Minister of Education have to say in his bid for the Leadership of the Conservative Party? -- (Interjection) -- I'll tell you what George said. George says, "Most of all our riches are in people, all kinds of people from differing national backgrounds and cultural backgrounds, speaking many languages, and they know what this means. We owe a tremendous debt to these people from so many lands who have shared their abilities, their hopes and their faith in our destiny." And just prior to this my honourable friend the Minister of Education had said: "The real issue is that we must continue to invest enough in the education training and the physical well-being of our people on a sound basis." In a few moments, Mr. Speaker, I want to inform the House of what the Government of Manitoba means today of the physical well-being of our people on a sound basis.

And what did the Honourable the Attorney-General in his flight for the heights of leadership have to say at that convention? "I ask a commitment to a richer and fuller life for all Manitobans from all of us." That's what he wanted, a fuller life for all Manitobans. He went on to say he was condemning the previous administration. Condemning them for what? "For the neglect of the needy and stagnating health services and economies." Another point that he made: "The foundation of the great Conservative Party I hope to lead," he said, "is to provide for Manitoba services for the needy and the neglected." Not one word from my honourable friend the Attorney-General in this House this Session of any concern for the needy and the neglected.

What about the gentleman who occupies the Throne today as the Premier of this House? What did he say? And he was speaking of Medicare. He said, "Let me say in regard to Medicare, that in a country with such a high standard of living, no one should go without proper medical treatment because of an inability to pay."

MR. WEIR: Finish.

MR. PAULLEY: The whole speech?

MR. WEIR: The part on Medicare.

MR. PAULLEY: Sure, don't mind at all. -- (Interjection) -- Well I don't mind. However, I am not in agreement - or I am in agreement with those who are presently urging the Federal Government not to proceed with its legislation in the form that it is now in. Fine sentiment, but my honourable friend had voted for what he was not in agreement with less than six months previously, and by what right had he, on assuming the office of Premier of our province, to reject the firm decision of this House six months previous. How concerned is this government? We hear on all sides - outside of the House of course - the concern of the Conservative Party in Manitoba for the poor, those who are not able to provide for themselves medical insurance. Even our press seem to indicate, and maybe they are leading the decisions of this government and the silence of its members in the field of an approach to Medicare.

On Wednesday, August 23, 1967, the Winnipeg Tribune was supporting the contention of the Premier at that time, Dufferin Roblin - and I regret that he is not here - but they were supporting his about-face from May of 1967 in respect of Medicare by saying, "Roblin is urging that universal welfare schemes should be revised and that financial help from public funds be given to those who need it." A noble expression - a noble expression. If the government of Manitoba had enough courage or intestinal fortitude to adopt that proposition there may be less

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.) . . . . criticism directed toward them.

And then the Free Press on February 5th in an editorial says "the Manitoba Government has at least the courage of its convictions. It has decided not to be stampeded by Ottawa in entering into Medicare next July," and then went on to talk of the concept of need again. But this government and this Legislature was committed by a vote of 44 to 2 in favour of proceeding, and not one word have we heard from the Minister of Health, the former Minister of Health, or any of the rest of the front benchers, with the sole exception insofar as the dollar base is concerned from anybody opposite. Have you lost your concern for people?

MR. ENNS: No, no.

MR. PAULLEY: My honourable friend the Minister of Agriculture says "Oh, no." Then stand up and be counted now the way you were a year ago. Where has your intestinal fortitude gone in the meantime? Playing around with horned cattle legislation instead of looking after the welfare of the people of Manitoba. My honourable friends opposite are joined apparently with the heads of the Manitoba Medical Service. "Subsidize the needy," said Dr. Norman Corne on February 7th of this year. Noble sentiment - a noble sentiment. Now we read in today's paper a speculative article, "Flexibility the Government Aim in Medicare Changes."

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask - I'd like to ask the members of the Conservative Party, are they aware of the policy of their government today in respect of the provision of Medicare to the needy? I want to know if the Minister of Agriculture knows what the policy of his government is, and were I a betting man, I'd bet two cents to two bucks that he doesn't know, because if he did know, I'm sure that he should hang his head in shame instead of nod it sidewise.

Does my honourable friend the First Minister of this House know that the Department of Welfare are insisting on one who is applying for a Medicare card to turn in a prepaid funeral plan in order to qualify for a Medicare Card? -- (Interjection) -- Of course it's right. I wonder if my honourable friend the First Minister knows of that? My honourable friend the Minister of Education, Mr. Speaker, a few years ago when he was the Minister of Health and Welfare, on a couple of occasions nearly jumped over his desk to come over and chastise me or punch me in the nose - I don't know which it was - and he hit his fist on the table and he said, "By the Lord Harry, we don't do things like that."

I used to accuse him and his government of having one of the meanest means tests of any government in Canada, and they have got it. Let me recite - let me recite - let me recite the proposition that I have now and have been conducting for some couple of years with the Department of Welfare to try and get a Medicare Card, Mr. Speaker, for an old age pensioner who has a prepaid funeral plan of \$710.00. This little old lady and her husband were on social welfare allowances a couple of years ago. They had no assets; they were on social welfare - social allowances. The husband died and it appeared that the family itself might have to look after his funeral plans and everything else, but unbeknown to them the former employer of this couple had taken out an insurance policy of \$2,000 on the life of the husband.

As I said, they were on social allowance. It was reported that they had received this asset. They spent, first of all, for the burial of the husband approximately \$700.00. In addition to that, at that particular time there were a few outstanding debts that they had accumulated which were paid off. The lady bought a few articles of clothing. They had \$300 in the bank, as allowed under the regulations, and then representatives of the department could not locate an item of \$302 so they considered that they could not qualify for a Medicare Card, principally because of the fact that this woman had used part of the assets to arrange for a prepaid funeral plan. That was September of a year ago.

I have pursued this case with the Department of Welfare. I saw the woman in question early this year. Her cash assets are now \$155.00. That's all she has, Mr. Speaker, \$155 - or a month ago she had. She is paying, incidentally, \$18.00 per quarter for Medicare - MMS - but she has \$155 in cash. I again appealed to the department for consideration of a Medicare Card for this lady. I received the reply about three days ago, and what do you think the reply is? The reply, Mr. Speaker, to that woman is to the effect "Get rid of your prepaid funeral plan of \$700; dispose of the extra assets that you can accumulate of the difference between what the regulations will call for and we'll consider a Medicare Card for you, or in the alternative, you have the right to appeal to the Appeal Board of the Department of Welfare."

Humanity, Mr. Speaker? Is this what my honourable friend the First Minister is talking about when he is talking about provision for the needy? How mean and how miserable are the tests here in Manitoba to qualify for a Medicare Card.

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.)

Last night I saw a very interesting ad in one of the papers from Kerrs Funeral Chapel listing the cost of funerals, running all the way from \$349 up to \$926. The allowances of my honourable friend in this department of humanity says that the most that you can have for a pre-paid funeral plan is \$300.00. No mention of one in this ad. They are saying to this woman: We the great benefactors of society, the Conservative Government of Manitoba, are prepared to give you a Medicare Card if you get rid of the tangible assets you have of a \$700 funeral plan. A person who came from abroad with her husband years and years ago, and one of those who were referred to by one of the speakers opposite as he endeavoured to obtain the leadership in this House.

Is this, Mr. Speaker, the type of Medicare that the government has in mind? Is this what the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture suggests is an acceptable plan today? Where stand you? Where stands the Honourable Minister of Education today, that honourable gentleman as I recall so vividly back in 1958 on the introduction of the Social Allowances plan for Manitoba stood up in this House, Mr. Speaker, and he says, "We've broken through the barrier; people in Manitoba can hold their heads on high and in dignity." Is there any dignity today in asking a woman to trade in a funeral plan? Where is dignity? Where is honour? We need a Medicare plan in Manitoba.

The purport of the resolution that we have before us, that if my honourable friends are prepared to reject \$17 million of federal moneys as a contribution toward a Medicare plan, if they are prepared to reject that, then I say in Heaven's name, in the name of humanity, start a plan of your own so that people do not have to dispose of an asset in the form of a prepaid funeral plan in order to qualify for a Medicare Card. Have you no dignity? And yet, Mr. Speaker, through all of this, everyone on that side of the House has been mute. We have not heard one word from the Honourable Minister of Health. Where now does he stand in respect of Medicare and the treatment of the people of Manitoba?

Mr. Speaker, I could go on and on reciting cases of citizens of our province who cannot obtain Medicare Cards. Today we had tabled before us the report of the Manitoba Hospital Commission indicating to us that there are 53,000 old age pensioners and those on fixed and low incomes who are qualified to receive exemptions for hospital premiums, and the last report we got from the Welfare Department was more than half of them do not qualify for a Medicare Card. What a situation! How do you justify this? I ask you, Mr. Minister of Health - and I know you're concerned in many respects for the people healthwise, in Manitoba - how can you justify the actions and the attitudes of the Department of Welfare in respect of Medicare? I ask the former Minister of Health and Welfare, the present Minister of Education, will you not agree with me now that your government has one of the meanest means tests to be found, in the light of the information that I'm giving to you and can document? Will you not now agree that what you used to call a needs test has been supplanted now by the Department of Welfare by a mean means test? Don't you think that under the philosophy that you introduced into this House in 1958, that a person in this particular category should be entitled to a Medicare Card? I'm sure that inwardly you agree with me - at least I hope you do. I hope you haven't changed over the last few years from having the high ideals that you expressed at that time, and I do hope, Mr. Speaker, that my honourable friend the Minister of Education may for at least five or 10 minutes get out from underneath the thumb of the Premier in respect of Medicare and make a contribution to the debate. I hope that the Minister of Health can get out from under the thumb of the First Minister and perk up what you so ably presented to us a year ago and make a contribution to a debate on Medicare.

And finally, I sincerely trust and hope that my friend the Minister of Welfare, who is charged with the responsibility of looking after people in need, can and will stand up in this House and apologize for the inhuman treatment accorded to the person that I'm referring to, and I would be glad to disclose my file on a personal and private basis to any member of this House in order that they know too that this government is only giving lip-service to the possible treatment of need. And I say to my honourable friend the First Minister, yes, it's well to smile, but I want to say to my honourable friend, and I appreciate that possibly the First Minister, Mr. Speaker, hasn't got away from snowplows and tractors and road patrols yet, to know really what is going on in Manitoba in respect of looking after the needs of people.

The Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, as I illustrated just the other day, has just given us a new brochure dealing with the action and attitude of government,

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.) . . . . and the opening paragraph on the new publication was "People Count". I say, Mr. Speaker, people do count, and I call upon this government to start helping people, to start aiding where aid is needed, and to stop hiding behind a wall of silence as they have done in the debates that have taken place thus far in Medicare. If you haven't got enough gumption to stand up in this House and defend your actions, then for Heaven's sake have enough gumption to get out so that a government that does rely and does recognize people can take over in the best interests of all Manitobans.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question on the amendment to the motion?

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, unless the Minister of Health would like to adjourn the debate, I'll move, seconded by the Member for Gladstone, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Gladstone. The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. PETER FOX (Kildonan): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the honourable member, may we have this matter stand?

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Hamiota. The Honourable the Provincial Treasurer.

MR. DOUGLAS M. STANES (St. James): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Honourable Minister, I wonder if this matter could stand.

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Elmwood. The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Wellington, that

Whereas one-half of the provinces have lowered the voting age to 18 or 19; and  
Whereas our young people are better educated and informed than their predecessors; and  
Whereas our educational system can provide the basic essentials of civics and government in preparation for the franchise;

Therefore be it Resolved that the Province of Manitoba lower the voting age to 18.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: Before I call the question . . .

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, may I have the opportunity, if you are going to make a ruling, to make a comment on the same before your ruling is presented to the House, in which case it may not be debatable.

MR. SPEAKER: You have no idea what I am going to say.

MR. PAULLEY: Yes, I have. Yes, I have. I anticipate. I would like to point to your attention, Mr. Speaker, if I may, in anticipation of possibly what you may be going to say.

MR. SPEAKER: That's our problem. That's the problem - the anticipation. I'm at a loss to know how to deal with a given situation. However, if the honourable gentleman has a word or two to say, he may take the floor.

MR. PAULLEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The reason I'm standing, Mr. Speaker, before you make a ruling on this, is in view of the ruling that was made the other day in respect of a Bill introduced by my colleague from St. John's, and that was based on a sentence contained within the Throne Speech dealing with matters pertaining to the Election Act. We didn't question your ruling and of course I can't now.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable gentleman will agree with me that the principles we follow that when a ruling has been made there will be no discussion on that ruling, and the few remarks that he has made is suggesting to me that he is possibly going to discuss that ruling. Very well.

MR. PAULLEY: No, Mr. Speaker, I'm not. I merely want to draw to your . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I'm anticipating too.

MR. PAULLEY: Very good. May I suggest, in all due respect to each of us, we're pretty good anticipators.

In the Throne Speech, Mr. Speaker, is this sentence: "Certain amendments to The Elections Act have already received the attention of the Legislative Assembly and will now be brought before you for further consideration." May I in all due respect suggest that the proposition of the lowering of the voting age to 18 was not considered by the Assembly in certain amendments that were before the House. That's my purpose in rising at this time, Mr. Speaker.

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.)

The matter of content of this resolution was never brought to this Assembly in regards to the amendments referred to in the Speech from the Throne, and it's for that reason, Mr. Speaker, I'm suggesting that that be checked if your ruling indeed - and this is anticipatory I know - was going to be the rejection of the resolution for the lowering of the voting age based on the reference in the Throne Speech.

MR. SPEAKER: May I ask the honourable gentleman if the material he's discussing was part of last year's Session - or the last Session?

MR. PAULLEY: Not to my knowledge, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Well, I thank the honourable gentleman for his opinion, and I would say to the Honourable Member for Elmwood, in having dealt with a matter under The Election Act yesterday, which is familiar to all the members, I have considered the contents of this resolution carefully. The Honourable Member for Elmwood is no doubt aware of the statement contained in the Throne Speech to which the Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party has spoken of in regard to The Election Act, and I would suggest the contents of his resolution might very well be part of the debate of the said Act when it comes for discussion. In order to be consistent - I repeat that - in order to be consistent with what has gone before at this Session, I feel that I must rule that the proposed resolution, in its present form, is out of order on the grounds of anticipation and contrary to our Rule 31.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret that I have to challenge your ruling.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the Members.

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

YEAS: Messrs. Baizley, Beard, Bjornson, Carroll, Cowan, Craik, Einarson, Enns, Evans, Hamilton, Jeannotte, Johnson, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McGregor, McKellar, McKenzie, McLean, Masniuk, Shewman, Spivak, Stanes, Steen, Watt, Weir, Witney and Mesdames Forbes and Morrison.

NAYS: Messrs. Barkman, Cherniack, Dawson, Desjardins, Dow, Doern, Fox, Froese, Green, Guttormson, Hanuschak, Hillhouse, Johnston, Kawchuk, Molgat, Miller, Patrick, Paulley, Petursson, Shoemaker, Tanchak, Uskiw, Vielfaure.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 29; Nays, 23.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the ruling of the Chair sustained.

The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Elmwood. The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: I beg leave to have this matter stand.

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Kildonan. The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. FOX: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave of the House to have this matter stand.

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Brokenhead. The Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

MR. SAMUEL USKIW (Brokenhead): May I have leave to have this matter stand?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brokenhead. The Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

MR. USKIW: May I have leave to have this matter stand?

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Inkster. The Honourable the Provincial Treasurer.

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Provincial Treasurer) (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, I ask the indulgence of the House to allow this matter to stand.

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains. The Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains.

MR. MICHAEL KAWCHUK (Ethelbert Plains): I beg the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson. The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. JOHN P. TANCHAK (Emerson): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Portage,

Whereas the business of farming is highly dependent on the vagaries of weather; and  
Whereas the weather plays an important role in the successful operation of a farm; and  
Whereas orderly planning of daily farm operations is essential to a farmer;



(MR. TANCHAK cont'd.)

Therefore be it Resolved that the Government of Manitoba consider the advisability of co-operating with the Government of Canada and the news media in providing detailed local and regional, daily and long range weather information primarily for the benefit of Agriculture.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. TANCHAK: Mr. Speaker, I think I'll break the monotony of standing and start at least on this resolution. It is my privilege again to introduce this resolution in the House. As most of the members will remember, two years ago I introduced a similar resolution. It was defeated by the government members. Several members spoke on that resolution. I think there were at least three that I remember who spoke opposing it: the Member from Brandon, Souris-Lansdowne and Springfield.

The Honourable Member from Brandon seemed to oppose it because it would cost money and he was against that, and he said that there are other medias that are at the present time forecasting weather. He mentions one of them as air travel agencies and he thought that was sufficient.

The Honourable Member from Springfield talked about being displeased about wet weather which had nothing to do with the resolution. He really did not give any valid reason why the resolution should not be accepted.

The Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne, it seemed to me, was more concerned about the welfare of his Party than the proposition before us. He was afraid that if the government was to approve of it and weather wasn't favourable or mistakes were made, his government would get the blame for it. I don't think that was too relevant anyway.

There were three members on this side of the House who spoke in favour, and in my opinion they were more objective in that. It seems to me that at that time the members of the government seemed to reflect their approach of this government, the approach that this government takes to requests from different organizations, different parties, and especially agricultural organizations. The attitude taken by this government is simply to ignore different resolutions, ignore the requests made by the agricultural representatives, hoping that sooner or later these people will get tired of making those requests and forget about it. In my opinion, this isn't a remedy for that.

I can cite certain examples where this government simply ignored the request of the farmers. For several years now the farmers have asked the government to see to it that the farm trucks over ten years old should have a fixed licence say of \$10.00. Most of the organizations asked for it but the government kept ignoring it until now we don't hear so much about it anymore, and maybe the government hopes that most of these requests will be forgotten after a certain time.

Most of the farmers have objections to daylight saving time the way it operates now. This government ignored most of these representations. The farmers, although they did not forget about it, they've got something that they have to live with it. I am not personally complaining about it right now. Maybe I can forget about it too or get used to it anyway.

Now we've heard the farmers for several years ask for changes in hail insurance or the crop insurance, and there is a resolution on the Order Paper now asking that the different fields should get individual insurance. That has been asked for several years but the government simply chose to ignore it hoping that maybe they'll forget about it.

We all agree in this House that farming is still the basic industry of our provincial economy. There is so many different industries that derive their origin from agricultural products. We all agree to that and we all know that this industry of farming is very highly dependent on the vagaries of weather. I am not going to go into it, explaining why, because most of the members by this time should know pretty well just why the farmers have to depend so much on weather.

The active part of this resolution simply asks that the government co-operate with -- the Provincial Government co-operate with the Government of Ottawa and also with the news media in providing detailed local and regional daily and long-range weather information primarily for the benefit of agriculture.

Maybe the resolution two years ago didn't have the full desired effect, but now I can say that it did have some effect, maybe not on the government but on other people, because now, as we all know, the CBC is broadcasting the five-day outlook. I see the Minister of Agriculture agreeing with me on that. They do broadcast the five-day outlook. But where - where

(MR. TANCHAK cont'd.) . . . . . does the CBC get this information? Is it our provincial information that is worked out? No. We know that the Americans in North Dakota have had this regional weather forecasting for some years and that's where the information is beamed from. That's where the CBC gets their information in there. They know that Alberta to the west has been giving this information to the farmers of Alberta for several years. Saskatchewan likewise is doing it. I do not think that the information, although it helps, but it's not as full as the farmers would like it to be. The farmers would like to have more regional information. This information that comes . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I hesitate to interrupt the honourable gentleman. He probably has a good deal more to say and has considerable time. Possibly this could be left open. It is now 5:30 and I am leaving the Chair to return again at 8:00.