

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

8:00 o'clock, Monday, March 10, 1969

MR. SPEAKER: I have a short announcement to make. During recess, as is the custom, the Chamber was tidied up and some papers were disturbed. If there is any honourable member who is missing his Hansard or any other piece of paper, would he communicate with the Deputy Sergeant-at-Arms and I hope it will be returned.

The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the Member for Rock Lake and the proposed motion of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition in amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. PETURSSON: Mr. Speaker, at the conclusion of the afternoon session I was speaking about the introduction of diesel-operated buses by the Metro Bus System in place of the trolley buses that they now use, and I was pointing out that while there were many large centres in the United States, or several large centers in the States that are eliminating their diesels in place of trolleys as an aid to decreasing the amount of air pollution, Metro is taking the exact opposite step. It's eliminating the trolleys, adding to its diesel-operated buses, and therefore increasing air pollution in Winnipeg, and this at a time when the Manitoba Hydro is in the process of constructing a power plant on the Nelson River to produce power which it plans to export to the northern states in the United States to find a market for its product which the trolley buses in Winnipeg, if they were increased in number instead of the diesels, could easily take up and help to use up some of the surplus power that the Manitoba Hydro seems to feel that it may have.

I referred to the \$7 million garage that was built to house the new diesel buses that are proposed, whereas no garage was needed for the trolley buses because they were self-heating and had no need of a heated garage. I was getting to the point of saying it surprises me to see that this should be done at the very time when power beyond imagination is being developed in the north, where dams are being built, where lakes are to be flooded; it is proposed to flood lakes, it is proposed to dispossess Indians and Metis who are making a living in what is known as the Southern Indian Lake area; fishing will be depleted, if not completely destroyed, or if the fishing is not destroyed it will be impossible to get at it because of the number of trees, the forest along the lake edges that will be uprooted and floating around on the lake making it impossible, impractical to lay nets in the lakes to catch the fish. Great areas of forest it is being proposed will be submerged in water because it is regarded as uneconomic to attempt to salvage this timber before the flooding takes place, and it is impractical and uneconomic to salvage the logs even after they have been uprooted and are floating around on the lake. One authority on such a development has said that there are enough trees, there is enough timber surrounding the lake to eventually, if the water is raised to a 35 foot level, or by 35 feet, when it is uprooted and floating on the lake, to completely cover the surface of the lake so that it would be impossible to get down into the water through the floating timber for any purpose almost. All of which means that an unbelievable large territory in the north, extending even down to Lake Winnipeg, is to be disturbed in one way or another, flooded, diverted, having water levels raised, having forests uprooted, ruining the trapping industry and so on and so on, and all to produce several millions of kilowatts of electrical power, making it impossible to use this particular lake, the Southern Indian Lake, for tourist purposes or other purposes, and the land surrounding it.

And then, as I say, at the same time Metro Winnipeg is doing away with its electrically-operated transportation and in place of it substituting, or proposing to substitute a noisy, smelly, air-polluting form of transport that in other large centres in the United States is being phased out. This is hardly what would be called or could be called "Going to Beat '70". Now I let that go at that. Others will pick up this particular problem from here on in, particularly after the proposed bill that has already had first reading is presented to the House on flooding the South Indian Lake.

But now, Mr. Speaker, I wish very briefly to turn mainly to one other matter and that is the language question, which is uppermost in the minds of many and not least here in Manitoba. I mentioned the number of different religious groups that might be or actually are represented in this House. We have just as many national or racial groups represented in this House, and in Manitoba we have a great many more which are not, as a racial group, represented here. The largest number of any one racial group or ethnic group, while we say the English, we mean the English-speaking people in Manitoba. Second in line in actual numbers is the

(MR. PETURSSON Cont'd.) . . . Ukrainian group; third is the German in numbers - and this is according to the -- the statistics. How is it I get a mental block? I forget what the -- when they are taking the census. It's the Census Report. And fourth in line are the French; and then a very small minority, but by no means an unimportant minority, is the Icelandic group.

SOME MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. PETURSSON: We have a few people in the House who know what Icelanders are, and I wish to dwell for awhile on the subject of this Icelandic group. One of the first things that it was my privilege to mention when I came into this House was the fact that there were five men here of Icelandic stock sitting in this House. I'm glad to know, to see and be aware of that they are still sitting in this House. Unfortunately they are in the wrong pews, as it were, but nevertheless, they say blood is thicker than water and so it is the Icelandic fact that draws me to them regardless of where they stand politically, and I hope draws them to me. If my power of attraction is greater than theirs then we may eventually be able to fill some of these empty chairs that are around here.

Now I mention the Icelandic group because, in discussing the language problem and the problem of race, the question of rights is often brought forward - the right of a group to this, that or another privilege; and yet the Icelandic community, which makes fewer demands than any other I know of as a community, had originally, when it came here, certain rights bestowed upon it. The immigrants from Iceland came to Manitoba in 1875. At that time Manitoba as a province was a very small province and extended from the International Border north to what is known now as Boundary Creek, just north of Winnipeg Beach, and when the immigrants from Iceland came, the Federal Government saw fit to give them, actually, the territory lying north of Boundary Creek from Boundary Creek north to Hecla Island or the shore line opposite to Hecla Island, a distance of 36 miles and 10 miles inland from the Lake, and there this Icelandic group was supposed to establish a self-governing community responsible only to the Federal Government, and this they did. The province was south of where this settlement was, and the Icelanders came in there, 1875, in barges that had been hauled down the Red River from Winnipeg by a tugboat that abandoned them on what is now Willow Point, just south of Gimli, and from there they made their way along the lake shore to the site of Gimli, and at the beginning of the winter season - they landed there on the 21st of October - at the beginning of the winter season, with nothing there except what could be produced by their own ingenuity, they cut down trees, they built a few log cabins, salvaged equipment from the barges that they had come down on, and they spent their first winter there.

They drew up a constitution; they built schools; they built churches and they began to publish a newspaper, and this was all done within the first two or three years that they were established in that place, and now, of course, we know what Gimli has developed into and is growing into. These people came here in poverty but with the willingness to work; and many, or I should say most, if not all, proved themselves. They became good citizens of this country. And just a note in passing. From among these people the Historic Sites and Monuments Board has seen fit to raise monuments or memorials to two men, one who was born there, another one who became part of a community in Marterville, Alberta. He was a poet. The one who was born in what was called New Iceland, Vilhjalmur Stefansson, is to be memorialized with a monument, a picture of which was shown in one of the newspapers, the Free Press I believe it was, just this past week. He was Manitoba-born, became a world-renowned explorer and lecturer, author, writer, authority on arctic conditions, and this has been achieved in a comparatively short period.

As a racial group, the Icelandic people are proud of their heritage. They are proud of being Canadians and they feel that they are accepted as they accept people of other racial backgrounds, as equals. And people weren't always accepted as equals in Manitoba, in Winnipeg. I have heard stories about in the boom days in Winnipeg, when signs were set up outside of a building project where it called for men, on the sign were printed the words "Men Wanted" and below that legend were the other words in brackets, "No Englishmen Need Apply". And so there has been discrimination, but as far as I am aware now, any discrimination that may exist is really more in the minds of individuals than it is in fact. I have never felt that I was a victim of discrimination and there is no reason in the world why anybody else should feel that he is the victim of discrimination. But as the time goes on and people become assimilated from these various groups, they go through an experience which deserves sympathy and understanding. All racial groups have gone and are going through this

(MR. PETURSSON Cont'd.) . . . experience of feeling that something is slipping away from them, something to which they had had a strong attachment, whether it's their culture, their traditions or their language, that this is somehow slipping away, and they have tried to compensate for it in whatever way they could. Many feel that their language is the barometer of their retention of their identity. It doesn't have to be so. But to all groups that feel this way I have a very deep sympathy; I have an understanding of how they feel. My grandparents went through the same emotional sense of loss and of deprivation. They were barely able to use the English language; they preferred not to if they could avoid it. My parents, of course, they grew up in this country and they went to school and they learned to speak English. But every racial group goes through this experience, the feeling that it is losing something, and this is the experience that the French community is going through at the present time. They feel that something that is dear to them is slipping out of their grasp and they are making not only requests, they are making demands that there be legislation to halt this erosion, you might call it.

Now, the Honourable Leader of the Official Opposition is, in a sense, an illustration of what I mean. He felt compelled to establish his identity by addressing us a few days ago with a few words in French to prove that he is truly bilingual. But bilingualism does not mean simply or solely English and French; it can mean English and Ukrainian; it can mean English and Hebrew; it can mean English and German; it can mean English and Japanese. I say that because one of our members learned conversational Japanese during the war. And there can be English and Dutch; and there can be English and Icelandic. And all of these people are bilingual.

Now, sometimes we get the impression that the bilingual English and French are wishing to impose the French on us as well as to retain it themselves, and I feel that I can understand their feelings about these things. They feel that their language will be more secure if they can establish it in one way or another by law, or by writing it into the constitution making it compulsory. I don't know how true this would be, but the courts would probably have to be resorted to to determine whether it is constitutional and, as the Honourable the First Minister said, before the fact rather than after the fact.

The one thing we must recognize is that all of these people, regardless of their language or linguistic background, helped to build this country no less than any other, these minority racial groups as well as the major racial groups, and they hold places of honour and worth. They could be equally recognized by any other racial group with understanding and consideration, and it is that approach that I would want to make to this whole question. It has been said facetiously that the Icelanders may want to pull out and re-establish themselves in that community which was theirs to begin with where they were self-governing and self-determining. . .

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

MR. PETURSSON: Thank you. I'm just winding up, Mr. Speaker. They had their own schools, they had their own churches, they had their own printing press and newspaper. It has been said that if the Icelandic community would wish to really isolate itself they could all move out to Hecla Island and they could wave their own flag and they could shout "Vive la Hecla libre" and live there in peace and contentment.

A MEMBER: Would they do it in French?

MR. PETURSSON: They wouldn't do it in French. "Vive la Hecla libre" - this is not Icelandic. But the Icelanders I know wouldn't be content. Their ancestors were Vikings who ranged the broad seas and they had many adventures. They exerted an influence on France by setting up what is now known as Normandy, the British Isles in Britain. Northumberland is settled by Danes. The Icelanders, when they had become an independent nation, used to ravage the coasts of Northern Ireland and steal all the best-looking girls and take them back with them to Iceland, and that accounts for the stalwart qualities that exist in the Icelandic people because they had a little bit of mixture of French blood.

But I think, Mr. Speaker, that I would just simply conclude by saying that it is unfortunate to boil this linguistic question up into proportions which it does not justify. We are all Canadians, with our rights as Canadians to live here freely as Canadians and to become or be as good citizens as it is possible for us to be. Thank you very much.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. WARNER JORGENSON (Morris): Mr. Speaker, my first words in this Chamber,

(MR. JORGENSEN Cont'd.) . . . Sir, must be of congratulation to you for the easy informality in which you preside over the deliberations in this Chamber. A Speaker of any Chamber such as this of freely-elected representatives carries a heavy responsibility in ensuring that debate can proceed without unnecessary restrictions and at the same time in a manner that will conclude the business that we are assigned to perform, and I know that the qualities that are necessary in a Speaker are very much the qualities that are necessary in response from a government. It must be responsive to the moods of the Chamber as well as a government must be responsive to the moods of a country, and I am happy to say, Sir, that in the brief period that I had an opportunity to be in this Chamber, that I feel that your presiding over here will enable us to complete the work assigned to us.

Permit me to observe as well, Sir, that I notice a striking similarity to the way in which business is conducted in this Chamber as in the House of Commons. Most of the members there don't know the difference between a point of order and a point of privilege either. But I thought I detected a rather unique innovation on Friday when I was sitting in the gallery. One of the members - I believe it was the young member from Elmwood - arose in his place "on a point of speculation", and I am sure you are aware, Sir, of the remarkable opportunities that are available under that kind of a point. I was wondering just how you were going to deal with it and I'm glad to see that it was allowed to pass without comment made because I'm going to remember that particular technique in the future. I would have thought, however, that the news media would have had patent rights to that particular phenomena and I'm sure that they will be claiming them once they realize that somebody's trying to usurp that authority in this Chamber.

May I say also to the members of this Chamber, my gratitude for the way in which they have welcomed us here. Members from all sides of the House have given us their best wishes and it is, I suppose, one of the unique characteristics of a place such as this, where you can enjoy the personal relationships and the good fellowship of members on all sides of the House while at the same time differing vigorously on matters of public policy, and I look forward to the relationships and the friendships that I know we will make in this Chamber. I might also add that I am looking forward to some of the debates that I know will be taking place.

I cannot let this opportunity go by, Sir, without making some comments on the reasons that I am here in the first place, the passing of Harry Shewman, a man that I know enjoyed the good fellowship and the friendship of all members of this Chamber on all sides of the House, a man who I had the privilege of knowing for a number of years and receiving the benefit of his great wisdom. I know there will be a more formal occasion when more will be said on this and I will reserve any further remarks I might have to say to that occasion.

I should also like to express my congratulations to the mover and seconder of the Address in Reply. Both of these gentlemen acquitted themselves in a manner that does credit to their constituencies. They spoke knowledgeably of their particular areas and of the problems of this province. And I do want to congratulate one other, the Minister of Agriculture, for his being given the portfolio that he now holds, and I know that in the dedication that he is capable of and the leadership that he is capable of providing, the Department of Agriculture is in good hands.

Much has been said during the course of this debate, Sir, on the problems of regional development, and I share with I believe all members of the House the difficulties in ensuring that all areas of this province develop equally so that there is equal opportunity for all. Perhaps some of us differ in the manner in which we feel that regional development can be effected. I don't believe, for example, that you can bring in industry into any particular area by simply grabbing it by the scruff of the neck and bringing it in. I think you have to provide a climate for development. I believe that the government are to be congratulated for the manner in which they approached this particular problem. What are the ingredients of regional development? I think primarily we must provide those things that will enable industry to prosper. There must be a trained work force and education. Schools are important, and the manner in which this government has forwarded education in this particular province does credit to them. There must be communication, roads, electric power and water, not only water for industrial use and human consumption, but water for recreation as well, and I think even the most critical people in this province will have to admit that much has been achieved over the past ten years.

There remains, of course, a great deal more to be done -- we're all aware of that. In

(MR. JORGENSON Cont'd.) . . . my own particular constituency of Morris we have water problems two ways. There are periods of the year when there's too much of it, but a good deal of the time there's not enough, and I feel that if we are to adequately provide for regional development of industries throughout this province that each area of this province must be assured of an adequate water supply. I think that the recommendations of the International Joint Commission are proceeding with the development of the Pembina River project, which will bring great benefits to the areas, not only in the Pembina Valley but in the Red River Valley as well. For years I have been attempting to get water development on the Rosa River and I hope that there won't be too many years go by before we'll see the realization on that particular project, providing water for all the towns along the Red River. I'm sure that the members representing the southeastern part of the province will have worked hard and diligently to encourage that particular development of water supply.

So much for the need to provide water. A more immediate problem at the present time is the need to get rid of it. The flood forecasts that we have heard in the past few weeks from the Water Control Board seem to indicate that floods of the levels of 1966 can now be anticipated, assuming of course that all the factors are there, and of course the most important one is the weather itself. If an early break-up occurs, I think the prospects of a flood are diminished considerably and we would sincerely hope that this would be the case. I think that the people of the City of Winnipeg can rest reasonably assured that no matter what happens there is afforded for this city a considerable amount of protection at the present time.

The protection is not available for those towns up stream and further to the south, and I would hope that over a period of years some consideration might be given to the possibility of ensuring that the water that is being brought into the Red River drainage basin will find its way quickly and swiftly to the floodway so that the possibility of flood along the Red River can be diminished, and I am confident that if the proper projects are undertaken, the incidence of floods can be lowered by about two feet in any given location. I know that this is not possible overnight; it's not possible even in a period of ten years, but I would hope that serious consideration will be given to that kind of development along the Red River, because I am confident that with the amount of water that is being brought into the Red River Valley by improved drainage not only in this province but from across the line, the needs for that kind of provision being made will be greater and greater as the years go by, and I would hope that studies can be made and measures taken to ensure that protection will be afforded to people who live along the Valley.

Much has been said in the course of this debate as well, about the present grain situation, particularly as it applies to the properties of damp grain that will be left on the farms as a result of the inability to move it. I know that members are very seriously concerned about this problem and I was fortunate in being able to attend a meeting this morning of municipal councillors and Reeves who will be affected in the Red River Valley. Plans have been laid to take care of the situation that might occur if the weather is not favorable. I need hardly mention to this Chamber that we in the areas, the rural areas of this province, representing the rural areas, face a serious problem with the grain situation, and I need not mention either that wheat is the key to the agriculture problem and it doesn't seem to be any use just transferring the problem from one commodity to another. The recent reports that have been made seem to indicate that the solution to the wheat problem is by reducing wheat acreages by ten to eleven million acres. Of course that's not going to afford any immediate relief to farmers today. The key, I believe, is in moving wheat into the export markets of the world, and at the present time the world trade in wheat amounts to something like 1,700,000,000 bushels to two billion bushels. Now that compares to about a billion bushels about ten years ago. One can see that the increase in the volume of wheat being moved into international markets has doubled itself in the past ten years, and the reports of the International Wheat Agreement - or I should say the International Wheat Council - is that that volume again will increase to three billion bushels by 1980.

Now at the present time, of that total volume, Australia, Argentina and France, by virtue of their location and proximity to markets, will probably sell something like 725 to 730 million bushels. The United States have committed themselves to selling about 750 million bushels, and in one way or another they usually manage to export that amount. That leaves a total export market for Canada of something like 225 million bushels in those years when the export figure is down around 1,700,000,000, somewhat more when it reaches about two

(MR. JORGENSON Cont'd.) . . . billion bushels, but it affords no immediate prospect of relief to Canada's wheat growers in spite of the fact the prospects for 1980, as I said earlier, are about three billion bushels.

What we're hearing today is what we pretty well heard in 1956; the answer to the problem is by reducing wheat acreages. But I think that there are other measures that can be taken, Sir, that will assist Canada in moving ever increasing quantities of grain in export markets. I can't understand for the life of me, Sir, why it is that our storage facilities for grain have to be located in Canada in the crowded Port of Vancouver or the Lakehead, where part of the year they're ice-locked. Why is it not possible, Sir, for Canada, or those who handle Canadian grain, to build terminals in places such as England, Amsterdam, or even the Far East, where they can be utilized when a market develops in those areas. It will enable us to move grain into those areas at times when it's not so critical, and when you consider the difficulties that we've encountered in the past year, first of all the strike at the Lakehead which held up deliveries for some considerable time and then the tie-up in Vancouver, one can only wonder why we don't have storage facilities in these places in order to enable us to take advantage of markets when they occur.

Much has been said in the past year or so about the inability of the Wheat Board to move wheat. I, for one, would like to come to the defence of the Wheat Board as I believe that the Board have done everything humanly possible, albeit they have made mistakes as anyone attempting to do anything has done. In the first place, the Wheat Board has never been responsible for selling wheat in export markets. The Wheat Board acts primarily as an agent on behalf of the farmer to ensure that he gets the best possible price for his product, and outside of those instances where you have the communistic countries of the world preferring to deal with government agencies - and these are the only occasions when the Board actually negotiates sales - the bulk of the selling is done by private traders, and it's a rather interesting thing to note that four major grain companies do the most of the selling. One of them is located in Brazil, one in France and two of them in the United States. Now we have a number of grain agencies in Canada - I think of the prairie wheat pools, the United Grain Growers, the National Grain Company, Federal-Searle, Pattersons, James Richardson - all of these people are involved in the grain trade but not one of them sells a bushel of Canadian wheat. Why have they not been active? Why have they not banded together and formed a grain selling agency to sell Canadian wheat? They seem to be content to build storage facilities in which to store grain and they don't seem to have any motivation to move it. It might be interesting to point out in passing that the executives of the companies that I have mentioned are also the executives of the new Canada Grain Council. It seems to me that a group of people who are not active in selling wheat and not active in pursuing the selling of wheat are hardly the people to be advising the government on how to do it.

Now I think that Canada has missed another opportunity in the moving of coarse grains into the world markets. At the same time that the market for wheat has expanded by about a billion bushels, the market for coarse grains has almost tripled from 650 million to 1,740,000,000 bushels, and it isn't going to be too many years before we'll be selling far more coarse grains than we have been selling wheat. The explanation for that of course, Sir, is the fact that as the countries living standards increase the consumption of protein foods, high protein foods goes up. In most of these countries, in Western Europe in particular, there is an ever increasing demand for coarse grains and we have been unable to capture that market because our barley is not competitive with American corn. Unfortunately, the barley that we grow in this country is nothing more than a by-product of the malting trade and we haven't developed the kind of high-yielding feed barley that will enable us to compete with the feed grains that are being produced in other countries. Now it can be argued that we could lower the price of barley and perhaps, Sir, there is some validity to that, but to lower the price of barley without correspondingly increasing the yield would not afford much of an incentive for farmers to produce that barley. I think that there is a great opportunity for research to be done in the development of the kind of feed barley that will be competitive in the world markets. I think that if we can take the lead in scientific development of feed grains, we can capture the bulk of that market.

Now, Sir, the last few years have seen a considerable change in the attitudes of people, and I'm sure that we all sense it, towards government and their relationships towards government. I suppose it's indicative of the demands of our times. It seems to me that people want

(MR. JORGENSON Cont'd.)... to become more active and to participate a great deal more in the development of their own communities. My own home town of Morris, I think, is a pretty fair example of how people band together to improve their own lot with encouragement and with assistance from their governments. I'm sure that I need not mention to this Chamber, because I'm sure that Mr. Shewman has mentioned it on many occasions, one of the great attractions in this province today, the Morris Stampede, is an example of how people can help themselves to develop their communities, and I'm sure that each member here could give examples of their own particular areas where people have banded together to help themselves to a better life in this country. I share with the Premier the optimism that he expressed here on Friday, the optimism that this province has a great future, and I know that with the co-operation of all members of this Chamber and the people throughout this province, that optimism will be realized. Thank you very much.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Carillon.

MR. LEONARD A. BARKMAN (Carillon): Mr. Speaker, I would like to add a few comments to those that have already spoken. I would first of all like to add to the many compliments and congratulations that you have already received. I'm sure these individuals that have spoken must be serious, and I'm sure those that haven't are serious in wishing you the very best. I hope it doesn't sound too degrading to your high position when I say that I am one of those that do not begrudge your position, and I am sure that you wonder at times on what side all of us really are.

Also to the mover, the Member for Rock Lake, I thought his speech was very sincere; it came from the heart and I believe he meant what he said. I also wish to congratulate the seconder, and I admire the way he mentioned his beautiful constituency. I'm sure that this is the way he thinks of it, and most of us do I guess of our own constituencies. It was nice to hear him be the seconder. I thought for a while that he was possibly spreading it a little bit thick there for a while, but then when he mentioned that this happened to be Honey Week, I was the first one to forgive him on that point.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to also congratulate our new Minister of Agriculture, not just because I think that he's also a friend of mine but I also believe that he's taking his work serious and his efforts are going to be seen very shortly I'm sure. I would like to possibly congratulate some of the many ministers but I don't think that I really know the titles of quite a few of them so I hope I will be forgiven if I bypass them at this time.

I do wish, though, to join the others in welcoming the new members that took their seats today. I have a special respect for the member that just spoke, the Member for Morris. I must admit that I didn't do anything drastic to try and get him elected, but I have my respects for him as a friend over the years because he happened to be my member in the constituency of Provencher for quite a few years.

Mr. Speaker, approximately a year ago - and I possibly better look at the clock although I won't need that much time today I don't think - approximately a year ago when I started to speak on the Reply to the Throne Speech the sub-amendment vote came up, of course which was quite in order, and that was the end of what I had to say that evening. Possibly for most of you here it was fortunate at least the boredom was taken away right there and then. However, I feel today, and possibly more so than I did a year ago, that I was on the right path when I suggested that perhaps the time had come, at that time, that we should be comparing provincial-municipal relations on the same basis as we compare -- or on the same basis we are possibly discussing our provincial-federal relations. I think we could even go further and say that possibly one of these days we should ask for a "Municipal Speech" from the Throne".

However, the events that have taken place, especially the events that have taken place the last three months - and I am not particularly referring to the elections now - but these events have convinced me that we are on the right track, and that we are on the right track once we're going to take this situation more seriously. I do not want to in any way suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the present First Minister - and I'm sorry that he's not in his seat but I'm sure he has a good reason for being in Ottawa today - I do not want to suggest that the present First Minister has taken the attitude that he would rather discuss federal-provincial fiscal matters than such matters as the language bill and others. I am sincere that we should never forget that all the money in the world for that matter is going to mean very little if we don't first learn to live together. I do not want to open the subject at this time, I think it has been discussed enough in the House, but I do wish to leave my feelings on this matter and I do so

(MR. BARKMAN Cont'd.)... because I think these things are important to us as Manitobans and certainly to all of us as Canadians.

I was happy the other day when the First Minister mentioned a few of the municipal problems that municipalities today are faced with. I think this government, other governments, and many governments before this government, have been aware, possibly never to an extent as they are today, and I was glad when the First Minister mentioned last Friday, I believe it was, some of the problems that the municipalities are faced with. I also think - and I certainly agree when it was mentioned in the Speech from the Throne - that more consideration should be given to provincial-municipal problems. I appreciate that the First Minister mentioned this because it has not been mentioned very often in this House in the six or seven sessions that I have had the honour of sitting in here. I think this marks some kind of a mark that at least this is becoming more important, and I am very much aware that over the last few months my Leader has advocated and has told people - and I know he believes this - that for some time now that there has to be, there must be, and there should be some tax reforms on the municipal basis, and naturally this leads directly to a direct taxpayer's basis.

I think it is fair to say, Mr. Speaker, that a lot of the municipalities have reached a point where some of the individuals, whether they be Reeves, mayors or councillors, have reached the point where they are ready to resign, willing to quit their responsibilities, because they do not feel that there is a way out. I am not one of those that I think that this is really the solution. I believe that just because things are as they are, we still have to try and get them settled and I'm sure there's really no use in us running away from the problems. And this, I believe, is where our provincial-municipal relations have to be strengthened, not just relations of goodwill. We've had, I believe, a lot of goodwill. I can think back for quite a few years now and there's been a lot of goodwill, but I think we're past that stage of just getting to the point of saying that "we want to and we're concerned". I don't think relations have been bad at all in that respect, but I think we have to get down and be directly concerned or get direct involvement. We have to get involved directly with this problem, an involvement that is going to put our municipalities in a position that each and every one - and I don't just have to talk of Manitoba, although I believe that, leave alone the citizens of Manitoba, we know they're involved; we know that the federal government is involved to some extent; we know that the provincial government is involved and to a large extent; but of course it always comes back to that same place, it has to go back on the municipal level. And I wish to say today, Mr. Speaker, that this is one avenue, one train of thought that we just can't escape, to get back to that grassroots level, back to that base if we wish to or not. As long as we have to get back there, I think somewhere we have to start solving our problems from there up, and I believe that if we're not going to deal with this directly then this government or any other government, any municipal government just won't exist, and there is no use going on from there, and I'm sure again that this is not the intention of any of these governments, including all municipal governments.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when I read and heard in the Speech from the Throne that it was the intention of this government to set up a committee, I felt that this really is not enough. I believe -- and I do not wish to enter the phase of discussing committee work, I happen to be on the Municipal Committee. Unfortunately, we only met twice but I, possibly not like the others, felt that the members that attended those two meetings, they were well attended and they were well worked with. There was real discussion and the meetings were held in a very fine manner. Unfortunately though, I do blame this government that we didn't have enough of them, because if we are concerned about completing our Municipal Act, and most lawyers in here will tell us more than I can, but with all the amendments in the book as it is today, I am sure that there isn't one of us that wouldn't like to see the new Municipal Act completed at least this year, and I hope that regardless how we fail, it's time that we must go ahead as soon as we can and I'm sure that the rest of the committee members agree on that.

Now coming back as far as this problem, the municipal problem is concerned, I think we've reached a stage where a committee is not good enough. I think that we can not make enough progress at this time to try and form a committee when the situation is as grim as it is, and as the First Minister mentioned the other day, I think we're in the eleventh hour and I think it is high time that we started thinking of possibly something else than another committee. Normally a committee may be all right, that is not up to me to judge, but I think in the situation of finding help with municipalities, I think the time has come where we have to

(MR. BARKMAN Cont'd.) . . . go past the thought of forming another committee.

I think it was also mentioned in the Speech from the Throne that there should be an investigation and a study. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, we agree with this, this is not the point at all that we're arguing with, only the crisis has reached the stage where we have to either put up a crash program or look at this thing from a different angle. I thought the first move on behalf of the First Minister last Friday was in the right direction when he announced that there would be a five percent increase in the Foundation Grant. I for one was hopeful, and I am sure that most school boards and most municipalities were hopeful, that it would be at least ten or fifteen percent, and certainly five percent is better than nothing, but I don't think it's enough at this stage. Certainly I was elated about the increase from \$3.00 to \$8.00, or an increase of \$5.00 per capita grant - this is wonderful - but I think if anybody does a little bit of figuring they'll find out that the \$5.00, while it'll give the municipalities a different type of elbow room and while it will give a municipality the type of break that it has needed for some time because any kind of encouragement was always seemed to be picked up -- any slack that might have occurred was always picked up by the education bill, it's in the right direction, but it does not, in my figuring, represent the same amount as five percent would have if they had gone to ten or fifteen percent, or the ten for that matter. I think the government short-changed the taxpayer by at least \$3 million. I don't say that that figure's accurate, but I believe it's very close to the right amount. I think also that the First Minister, or possibly the Treasurer - maybe I should say the Finance Minister at this stage - are very much aware of this and surely they can say that they are not in a position to give any money away, but I think they would have to agree that the feeling, generally speaking, was that there would be at least a ten percent increase and not a five, or perhaps in this case an eight percent increase if you take the per capita grant into consideration. So, Mr. Speaker, in other words, let us not say that we're tired of committees, but I think the time has just come where the case is too urgent to try and work with a committee at this time.

Coming back now, Mr. Speaker, I for one have no objection when this government continually blames a lot of their problems on Ottawa. I have no objection to this. If they feel that they should be asking for more and they in their minds feel that it is right that they should, I absolutely have no objection and I hope they get more. I sometimes wonder though, I wonder how many of us, and I'm not sure that I know the exact percentage but I believe it's very close, that our provincial government's budget possibly picked up by the tune of about 60 percent by the federal government. In other words, if our total amount, our budget may be \$385 million, or 400 or whatever it may be, 60 percent of that is picked up by the federal government. This isn't bad and I certainly think we need every cent of it. I believe that Prince Edward Island gets 62 percent and I know we were around the 57 percent mark at one time, and I hope we are at 60 now, but I think this is fairly close. Now take your sales tax and take your liquor revenue, you can readily see where a province at least has a chance to draw some revenue from certain quarters. When this government, and rightly so, says that they have not enough avenues to draw from after the federal government has already drawn from nearly every source, then put yourself in the position of a municipality after you fellows and the others have already had their go at it. It's just becoming very very grim and possibly you look at realty taxes and a few business taxes and possibly a dog licence or something like that - it just about boils down to that.

So I believe that if we took out education, and possibly public works like it used to be called - I'm referring to highways and roads that municipalities are favoured with grants from the provincial government - I believe that there isn't too much left, possibly from eight to twelve percent, somewhere in that avenue, and I'm not certain that this is the right figure. I would be delighted to hear from the Finance Minister some time what the figures really are, and I realize that this changes very much from one municipality to another. I'm glad that the rural municipalities are getting a little more grants because of their road situation and other things that they have to be concerned with. I know that for example the Town of Steinbach used to get grants up to the tune of twenty and thirty and \$35,000. Lately we've had a tough time getting twenty to twenty-five thousand, including per capita grants. So it is a struggle and it is a serious situation, and I hope that the time has come where this government is not just going to talk about it, nor act and say it's got to get more from Ottawa - I wish they do, I've no objection to that - I only wish they'd pass some of this on to the municipalities.

(MR. BARKMAN Cont'd.)

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think from what I've said so far, we know it is high time that we have to place priorities where they belong, and I'm also trying to make this point clear, that in this case it's also high time to shelve the idea of a committee and see if we can't get something going on an immediate basis, whether it's called a crash program or whatever it is I don't really care, but I know it is serious and I know that both levels of government, the provincial and the federal governments, are concerned. It disturbs me when I heard the other day that the provincial government could at times receive more grants. For example, I'm referring now to the PFRA Act. I believe not too long ago the federal government sent approximately \$5 million to Ghana, which I'm certainly not objecting to, but I believe in my constituency at least - I just have to think of small points like St. Labre and Woodridge and Marchand and Sandilands and a few others - we can certainly use a little bit of those grants, especially if they are available in Ottawa. Again, I have no objection asking Ottawa for more money as long as we distribute this right when you receive it.

I wish at this time, Mr. Speaker, to say just a few words. One never knows, with redistribution around the corner, and one never knows just how long - the mortality rate is fairly high in this House - I thought it would be proper for me today to just mention the fact that the last 17 years I've been very honoured of walking in and out of the offices of the Municipal Department - I was sorry the other day, or last fall when I heard that the former Deputy Minister, Mr. Charlie Chappell, was switched to a different department, but I understand this, especially what the First Minister said on Friday, sometimes we have certain people that are capable of even bigger jobs, and I wish him well there - but I wish at this time to thank these civil servants for what they've done for our municipality and myself.

Mr. Speaker, I just briefly want to mention that the stakes that have been sitting around in my constituency for the last 12 years, that 205 Provincial Road, I understand, is finally going to be built, the stakes are going to be burnt, come the election or not election, and the tenders have been let. I wish to extend my gratefulness to this government that his road, while it was supposed to have been built last year, we didn't quite get there, has been tendered for now, and I wish to let this government know that we are certainly hopeful that it will be built this year and that there is a road very close by that needs just as much attention as this one that I hope will be built this year.

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to close on a note. I was happy to see the Minister of Municipal Affairs - Northern Affairs I guess I should call it - get up and say a few words about our Centennial Year of 1970. I happen to be a member of the Centennial Corporation Board - and I must admit that my political stripe is possibly not just as popular in that committee as some of the others, but since we don't talk politics in there and since they have treated me very royally in there, I possibly shouldn't make too long a discussion of that. Leave alone the fact that many people don't think too much of the Chairman we have, I'm one of those that think very highly of him and I think he's done a lot of work for the Corporation. But I was just wondering if some of you people that represent your constituencies feel that you wish in any way to help - I'm sure that the Minister wanted to say this the other day and, if not, he'll possibly say it later on - I think all of us should get involved to some extent. I'm not going to ask you tonight to sell licence plates, I'm not going to ask you tonight to possibly do a lot of things, but I think it's our duty - you have people in your constituency - that you should be giving names to this Corporation. They are short of people that know -- the right people in your own constituency. I may have the wrong attitude but I don't think that this is just this government's Centennial Year, I think this is everyone's Centennial Year. I believe this belongs to all of Manitoba and I think that all of us should be helping, and leave alone that there's so much work, I just have to name possibly five or ten or fifteen departments or student exchange, the lighting effect for the whole year, the International Fur Trade, the Historical Observances Committee, the Historical Publications Committee and so many others, but if you fellows would pass on some names from your own constituency, I think this would be helpful. Now, Mr. Speaker, I do wish to close with this note though. My municipal concern is great at this time. I know it's often said it is easier to tear down than to build up, but, Mr. Speaker, it is our duty on this side - and I include the whole side - as the opposition to be critical at times; and it is also the duty of the other side, and I'm sure they know this better than I do, that they have to try and solve some of these problems and also maybe accept some of this criticism. Surely if we accept this kind of an attitude, surely then there will be some solution to some of these problems.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. SAUL MILLER (Seven Oaks): Mr. Speaker, in the fifteen minutes left before the hour is called, I would like to just convey to you firstly my congratulations on continuing as the Speaker of this Chamber. I know that you will, as you have in the past, try to deal fair and equitably with all members, and I also know that in the times that you don't, that members of this side of the House will try to remind you that your purpose in here is to be impartial.

Now, Mr. Speaker, since I only have fifteen minutes I will try to limit myself to one or two items, or one or two points which I feel are important and which I feel that the Throne Speech that we heard, although a better speech than in the past in that it did attempt to at least meet the problems or admit to problems, didn't really come to grips with them nor resolve them. Again, instead of an answer we got - in the First Minister's own words - we got a band-aid. Now he justifies the use of a band-aid when perhaps major surgery is required by saying that they want to have time to explore and to study the best solution to the problem. But, Mr. Speaker, we need real political ingenuity today and real initiative to implement known solutions to the problems because the problems have been accurately defined up to now. They're not new, they're not a new problem that this First Minister just encountered; the problem has been with us in Manitoba for many years, and the very thing that the First Minister is suggesting that be done has already been done although in another form. I would remind the government that the Michener Royal Commission was established to study the very problems which the First Minister now says we have to discuss with the municipal people, and the Michener Royal Commission was established on the very eve when the municipal people themselves, the Urban Association and the Union of Manitoba Municipalities, had made an exhaustive study and had come up with recommendations, and it was on the eve of these recommendations being made public that the then Premier of this province, Duff Roblin, came forward and announced that a new commission would be established to - as he put it - to take into consideration the problems of the province, not just of the municipality, and this is what gave birth to the Royal Commission on Municipal Finance, the Michener Royal Commission. They went right through the countryside and they had hearings all over the place. They heard representations from all the municipal people and they had the best advice and expert guidance of the provincial administration and they came up with answers, they came up with answers to known problems, and so at this stage to come out and say that we have a problem, yes, but now we have to go seek a solution, is really evading the issue, trying to avoid taking measures that are clearly set out and for which solutions have been laid out by commissions in the past.

I'm particularly concerned that once again this Throne Speech ignored what I feel is the major issue in Manitoba, as it is in Canada, and that is the plight of the cities, the problems of the cities. You know the sixties have been very bad years for the cities. There has been urban blight and urban polarization and inadequate housing and the transportation problems, that is the moving of goods and people within the urban area. These have been growing constantly and somehow we haven't been able to come to grips with this problem. Mr. Speaker, it's in the urban centres that the people are concentrating; it's in the urban centres where the wealth of an industrial society is being produced. These are the facts of life in the late sixties and coming seventies, and we better understand that. We are part of an evolving Canada which is industrializing at a far greater pace than any other western country. The growth of the cities is not something that may happen, it's here. The projections are not very difficult to follow. By 1985 it's expected that one-third of Canada's population will live in six cities. It's shocking to think in these terms when we're so used to thinking of being a rural society, of being an agricultural society, but these are the facts of life and it's in the cities in which our human resources are so heavily concentrated that the challenge is the greatest, and if we don't meet that challenge, Mr. Speaker, we do so at the peril of our society.

There is one - I would like to explore that in greater detail but I see that time is running out - I would like to bring one point to the attention of the government and that is this matter of the payment of medicare fees. I'm not going to go into the problem of the fact that in our opinion medicare should not be paid on a premium basis. The Member for Brokenhead and other members have already discussed that, the fact that it's inequitable, but I'm going to ask the government to realize whether they are not creating a very real problem in the collection of these fees. The Minister of Social Services and Health and Housing and a few other things, I don't know - Corrections - I don't know his full title - (Interjection) - He doesn't either sometimes. Well, it takes time to get used to it I suppose. The government is faced with a

(MR. MILLER cont'd) real problem of having to collect premiums of \$204.00 a year from people and so doing that -- Mr. Speaker, I've just been asked -- I wonder if I could get direction from you. May I continue after the vote or do I lose my right to speak? -- (Interjection) -- I'm asking guidance, I'm asking guidance from the Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable gentleman, I take it, is speaking to the amendment which will be closed off at 9:30.

MR. MILLER: Thank you.

MR. PAULLEY: ... is if he has the opportunity and is first up on the next motion he can continue. Is that correct?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. However, I've lost a few more minutes on this guidance. Who needs friends when I've got -- (Interjection) -- Mr. Speaker, the government is trying to collect \$204.00 a year for hospital and medicare premiums. Knowing full well that they cannot possibly hope to collect such premiums on a semi-annual basis, they're going to be changing to a monthly basis and they've gone to the municipalities and they've said to them, "You will be our collecting agency. We will also licence a few dealers who take in light and power bills and so on, they too can be our collecting agencies. At the same time you, the municipality, will have to guarantee each and every premium paid in your municipality." Mr. Speaker, what we are going to witness in Manitoba, and I predict it, is the creation of a machine with hundreds of people in the municipalities running around trying to collect monthly bills from people who default on their premiums. It's all very well for the Minister to say, "Well some of these you can put under your Social Allowances Act, you can claim 40 percent from the government." Well I want to know from the Minister: does that apply to all unpaid premiums or only those that qualify under the Social Allowances Act? In other words, those that are either on welfare or just at the welfare level who might somehow qualify after investigation. But I'm quite convinced that there'll be hundreds within the municipalities, and in the larger cities, thousands of young people between the ages of 19 to 21 who are not at university and who have just entered the working force, and maybe working a few months of the year, who inevitably will default on their monthly payments, and the moment that happens the municipality is liable, the municipality will have to collect - not collect, but to pay on their behalf and then try to collect from these people. I can see an army literally of people running around on behalf of the municipalities trying to collect these unpaid premiums. Perhaps it's a way of creating employment, if this is what the government had in mind, maybe it's a method, as I say, of creating jobs but surely we can find ...

MR. SPEAKER: Order. I wonder if I might interrupt the honourable gentleman to tell him he has five minutes.

MR. MILLER: Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Having completing that five minutes, he may catch my eye later.

MR. MILLER: Well, we will hope. Thank you. So, Mr. Speaker, I urge the government to look at this matter because I know the municipalities of Manitoba are concerned. They're concerned enough so that they sent a letter to the Minister in which they feel that they haven't been given enough opportunity to evaluate this program; they haven't been consulted well enough in advance to really study the impact within the municipality; and although they were told, and they had reason to believe that under the new arrangement no municipality would be in a less favourable position than it is today, they now know, after preliminary meetings with the department, that this statement that was originally made to them was not valid and that in fact the municipalities are faced with a real problem of collection and a real problem of trying to locate people who have failed in their monthly payments. It would have been so much simpler, so much easier and so much more economical - and this is the government that claims that it's a business-oriented government - it makes common sense that instead of employing people to chase other people to pay premiums, how much simpler it would have been to go into this whole scheme through either the income tax or other form of taxation without any premium collection, without having to chase people, without having to find means to get the people to pay every month at the rate of \$17.00 a month. Mr. Speaker, \$17.00 a month, it's inevitable there are going to be people who default, not because they want to but because they are maybe temporarily out of a job, because they may not have worked for two or three weeks in the preceding weeks, and when that happens they default, and the moment they default they're going to be hounded by the municipality; they're going to be sought by the government. Mr.

(MR. MILLER cont'd) Speaker, this is inefficient; it's uneconomic; it makes for the kind of attitude where people resent government and perhaps have good reason, because if a government has to resort to hounding people then maybe it doesn't deserve the respect of people. I'm suggesting that this government, because it in itself did not want to introduce medicare but because it was almost forced into medicare, found the most onerous way of getting people to pay for it, the one that would hurt and aggravate the people most. It was almost a penalty. You wanted medicare; now we'll give it to you but we'll give it to you under the worst possible conditions. Now if this is what their aim was they certainly succeeded.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Minister, before this plan goes into effect April 1st, to really keep in mind that the pressure on the municipalities that he is now imposing through the method that has been introduced is going to not only impose a cost on them but is going to make their job of collecting difficult, and I don't think it's going to help the administration of the scheme at all. I would ask them to reconsider. And now my time is up.

MR. SPEAKER: The time has arrived now to deal with the proposed motion of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition in amendment to the motion of the Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

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

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

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

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 22; Nays, 27.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost.

MR. LEONARD A. BARKMAN (Carillon): Mr. Speaker, I was paired with the Honourable Member for Wolseley. Had I voted, I would have voted for the amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Rock Lake, seconded by the Honourable Member for Roblin, for the Address to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor in answer to his Speech at the opening of the session. Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, one of the items, or one of the matters which this government is now taking a lot of credit for and patting itself on the back, is the announced changes in the Foundation Program. They're going to increase the Foundation Program from a 65-35 ratio to a 70-30. Mr. Speaker, all that's happened really is that the government is now giving back to the people of Manitoba that which they shouldn't have taken away in the first place. We were witnesses here in 1967 to a beautiful snow job. We were told in 1967 that the Foundation Program was being brought in at \$95 million. This was the figure that the Minister at that time pulled out of a hat and he said this was going to cover the costs of a Foundation Program across Manitoba. Now it's true he conceded it's possible, particularly in Winnipeg and some of these suburban school divisions, there might have to be a special levy. Well Mr. Speaker, when I asked him where he got the \$95 million, he said: "Well, this is our estimate based on the best known figures." The fact that the year before the actual cost of the 90 million that the rate of growth had never dropped below eight percent per year, that apparently didn't count, and so we were told that \$95 million was the Foundation Program with, I say, very few having to levy special levies. Well in fact that year there wasn't a unitary division that didn't have to levy over and above the Foundation Program, and it's fortunate for the government that so many unitary divisions turned it down, turned down the unitary division vote that year. They weren't created, because had they been created, the government would have been in a worse position.

And so last year we witnessed the salvage operation, the salvage operation which they dreamt up to find an answer to the miscalculations which had developed the year before, and the salvage operation was to announce one fine day a 4.1 mill increase on the equalized assessment. In other words, they were going to raise \$3.6 million more in 1968. And now, Mr.

(MR. MILLER cont'd) Speaker, we are now told they're going to give us back out of the \$3.6 million which they raised last year, they're now going to give us back \$3.2 million. So they're not giving it all back; they're still hedging a little bit on the bet. There's about \$400,000 which I'm going to be looking for. Hopefully I'll find it. So that when this government is taking credit for all these goodies, let's not forget that the money was taken from the people in the first place and it was taken without any "by your leave" - they just announced one fine day that 4.1 mills would be added to the equalized assessment of every local taxpayer. And so today they're giving it back. Now that has been forward-looking; if that's their concept of proper administration, I leave that for them to decide. On the other hand, we now are told that there's going to be a \$5.00 per capita payment to the municipality, and there's no doubt, there's no doubt that that is probably the sweetest political snow job of any, because . . .

MR. LYON: Who's going to turn it down?

MR. MILLER: We'll take it and we'll . . .

MR. LYON: Are you going to turn it down?

MR. MILLER: We'll take it . . .

MR. LYON: You're not going to take it?

MR. MILLER: We'll take it . . . Any time I can get a dollar out of the Attorney-General, I'll take it, I can promise you that.

MR. LYON: How much are you going to refuse?

MR. MILLER: And if the Attorney-General will throw in some money of his own, I'll take that too, because he's very free apparently tonight with public money but I'd like to see some of his own. There's no question, this \$5.00 per capita, the unconditional grant which last year I asked the government to consider and which last year they didn't consider, is going to make it possible for some of the municipalities to keep the increases which they're going to have to pass on to their ratepayers this year to keep their increases down somewhat. I doubt whether it's going to relieve or prevent increases. I think that the school levies in Metropolitan Winnipeg, the Metro levies, and the municipal increases themselves, the cost of administration to the municipalities, are going to be so great that it's questionable whether the municipalities can avoid some increase, but I don't doubt that this amount of money that we're now getting will help to offset that. But the government needn't pat itself on the back. Whenever a government gives money it is because, since it's not raising any special funds this year, it isn't that we, apparently here, isn't going to be introducing new taxation, then if they have money obviously it's money they've squirreled away and if they've squirreled it away it must be money that they charged and they brought into their treasury over and above what was anticipated. In other words, they've overcharged in the past and now they're going to give some of it back. I wonder if they'd give us some of the interest that goes with it.

But, Mr. Speaker, in all seriousness, you cannot continue to hide behind temporary measures. We heard this year, during the by-elections, that transit was finally going to get a little more money than it had in the past, Metropolitan Transit System of Winnipeg. All I can say to that, it's too bad that there isn't an election every year. If there was an election every year maybe the taxpayers of Manitoba would get the sort of legislation that they're entitled to, but with the by-elections on the government felt it necessary to make this announcement. It's also too bad they didn't make the announcement during the hearings or just when the Metro Council was discussing the whole question of Metro fares, because we find ourselves in the position in the Metropolitan area where the municipalities in desperation were forced, almost all of them if memory serves me correctly, to support the case for an increase in transit fares, although they know and they're aware of the fact that an increase in transit fares was not going to be the answer to Metro Transit's problem. But they did it simply out of desperation because they were afraid of the impact on their tax structure, because when a transit system within Metropolitan Winnipeg is running up deficits of close to \$6 million a year, then the municipalities had to concern themselves with what it meant to their taxpayers. And so they were forced to adopt the attitude and pursue the policies of those who said: "Well, let's try to increase fares," and they supported it, although I can tell you many of them with great reluctance, but they really had no choice, and it's regrettable that the government didn't choose to make its announcement a few weeks earlier and perhaps they could have avoided a tax fare which in the final analysis is regressive. It's regressive in that it must hurt the Transit because it will affect - it'll again affect the number of riders; people will turn away from the Transit because they simply can't afford to ride it or to use it, and had the government acted in a somewhat less

(MR. MILLER cont'd) political fashion and announced three weeks or four weeks earlier what it announced a couple of days before the election, maybe Metro and its faulty government would not have had to take the steps it took.

So, Mr. Speaker, the government, for all its beating of the drums, is still taking from the people in the Metropolitan areas in particular, far more than it's giving back to them, either in the way of services or in the way of funds to make services available. Because, Mr. Speaker, as I started earlier, I said that the tragedy was that in the '60's the cities received the short end of it, and I know there are many rural members here who won't agree with me, but as I said, the cities is where the growth is, the cities is where the future of this province and Canada lies; that the urbanization, like it or not, is here to stay, and that we've got to have cities that are more than just concrete jungles; that cities should be for people, and we have to put men more consciously and consistently into the centre of the picture in our cities. We can't just expect them to live in this concrete jungle where the stresses of living are oddly enough greater than they are in the quiet rural areas or in the sort of areas where the Minister of Labour today has referred to the north country, where he mentioned the quiet, peaceful secluded areas where one can fish and relax.

This is not the city of the 20th century, of the late 20th century. The pressures within the city are great. We must provide for recreation in these centres; we must provide for elbow room in these centres; we must provide for cultural and social amenities; we must make it possible for the people moving in from the rural and agricultural areas, whether they be Indian, Metis or White, to fit into this society in which they're entering. We must not permit that they be jam-packed into central down town core areas, into blighted housing, so that they cannot fit into the community, so that they feel alien within the community and are creating the kind of welfare problems, are creating the problems of alienation which develop oddly enough in the city. One would think that in the city, where people live close together, there wouldn't be any feeling of alienation, but it's the opposite, it seems. The more people are packed together the more there's a tendency to feel enclosed or entrapped, the more there's a tendency to feel that they are alone, that they're not understood, and we see the emotional breakdown within the people living in the cities - and it's not unique to Winnipeg, it's general throughout North America - and I think Winnipeg has a golden opportunity, because we lagged behind other cities, because we lagged behind the United States, we have an opportunity to learn from the errors both south of us and east and west of us. We are good because we have lagged behind. Had we grown at the rate of, let's say, Vancouver or of Toronto, we would be in a sorrier mess than we are today because the growth was uncontrolled. Whatever growth there was was uncontrolled. Fortunately, we lagged behind and so the rate of progress, the rate of growth has been slower, and because of that we still have an opportunity to correct some of the imbalances within our centres, within our city centres in the urban areas generally, and unless we learn from the errors which have developed elsewhere, unless we benefit from what has happened elsewhere, then the advantage we have gained by being a little behind isn't going to do us much good.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would like to urge the government that in bringing in legislation they anticipate the changing human needs of our city, that if they're not prepared at this session to act on recommendations of the Michener Commission and other commissions which have laid the path very clearly, if they're not prepared to do that, let us not -- I hope they don't just continue to patch existing programs and call them policies. If they want to take a year off to temporize and to evaluate, then of course I can't stop them from doing so, but let them not claim that these are new policies. This is simply temporizing at a time when we need dynamic action. The housing situation in Metropolitan Winnipeg is extremely bad. Just two years ago I think it was, when the Manitoba Housing Renewal Corporation Act came into force, the Minister at that time when she introduced them, we asked her to eliminate certain impediments in the Act which we felt would retard the development of homes, and the answer we got was: "Well, we'll wait and see". Well, we've waited and we've seen, and unfortunately we've had very little housing - and I'm not talking about the Lord Selkirk development which was in the cards long before the Manitoba Housing Renewal Corporation Act was passed or the Burrows-Keewatin one - we've had very little in the way of housing. And the way it stands today - and this is not the fault of this provincial government, I admit - but the way it stands today, people with incomes of seven and eight thousand dollars are frozen out of the housing market. They cannot find accommodation; they cannot buy homes; and it seems ridiculous that at that level of income we cannot make provision for these people.

(MR. MILLER cont'd)

Where I'm critical of our government here in Manitoba is that they sat back and they've used every possible means to discourage the development of homes. Instead of encouraging municipalities to enter into the field of urban renewal and housing they've brought out impediments, ratepayer by-laws, ratepayer approval is required before any municipality outside of the City of Winnipeg could enter one of these schemes, so that instead of getting some homes after 24 months under this particular Act, we can point in Manitoba to very little success. I know that the Minister announced a hundred homes in the rural areas and something like a hundred homes in Greater Winnipeg over two years, but considering the need then really this is not even a drop in the bucket, it's just a token effort that hopefully will look good on the hustings but really doesn't make any impact at all on the housing needs.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I see it's almost 10:00 o'clock and I want to thank you for the opportunity you gave me to complete the remarks that I had to make and -- (Interjection) -- No, I am through, but if someone wishes to take over we can or -- it's up to the members of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the Minister of Government Services.

HON. THELMA FORBES (Minister of Government Services) (Cypress): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Education, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Provincial Treasurer, that the House do now adjourn.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House adjourned until 2:30 Tuesday afternoon.