

## THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

8:00 o'clock, Wednesday, July 7, 1971

OPENING PRAYER by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions; Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees; Ministerial Statements; Tabling of Reports; Notices of Motion, Introduction of Bills; Oral Questions.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture and ask him if there are regulations in effect which prevent the importation of chicken broilers into the Province of Manitoba.

HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Minister of Agriculture)(Lac du Bonnet): Not to my knowledge, Mr. Speaker, but I can take that as notice.

ORDERS OF THE DAY - GOVERNMENT RESOLUTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q.C. (Minister of Finance)(St. Johns): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Agriculture, that the resolution reported from the Committee of Supply be read a second time and concurred in.

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

MR. CLERK: Resolution 96; 97; 98; 99; . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: I wish to speak on item Resolution No. 98. I've waited quite a while for the opportunity and I hope not to take too long. I was absent from the city at the time this resolution was debated in the House in Estimates but I've had an occasion to read Hansard and the newspapers reporting on some of the debates that took place on the question of censorship in which one of my colleagues participated. I would never, I hope, stoop to getting involved in a personal name-calling match but I do feel that the right that he has to express his point of view is the same right that I have to express my point of view, and I would like to indicate my disagreement with much of the position which he took in regard to two issues: one is general censorship, the right and the duty of members of this Chamber to legislate as to standards of morality. I disagree with that. I don't want someone else to decide for me what my moral standards should be nor do I wish to determine for others what theirs should be. I feel the question of what is obscene is in the eye of the beholder. To me, it is most obscene when insults are thrown across this floor, and when I participate in them, as I sometimes do, I find that equally obscene. I find it obscene when members in this House and in other places make remarks, insinuations, cast innuendoes about civil servants who haven't had the opportunity to speak for themselves. I find it obscene that people are referred to by name who are not in the Chamber able to answer. I find that more obscene than when I personally am attacked in the House because then I do have an opportunity to answer. I find it obscene when we are presented, as we are, on TV and movies and have been for years, with murder, killing, brutality, and yet it is not for me to decide that others must not see it. It is for them to see and to judge, and therefore I don't want to set myself as the guardian of the morals of others. I do want to set standards for myself and attempt in some way to measure up to them and possibly by some example to have others measure up to them.

Another position taken by my colleague was in his description of what he called the "lazy malcontents, the undisciplined product of our permissive universities," and went on on that, and I just want to voice my feeling that the permissive society of today is not, in my opinion, worse than was the rigid society and the disciplined society which saw war as we see war today; which saw the destruction of people for no reason other than because of their colour or because of their religion or because of other classifications in a time when we presumably had a well-disciplined family life, when people starved - and people are starving today - and I don't want to associate myself with the thought that our universities are not doing a good job and that the young people of today, who have rejected so many of those accepted ideas that we, apparently, we, our generation and that before us thought were right, are right. The fact that many of them rejected is a matter that they may have every right to do, because I'm not sure that any of us alive today have been able to say that our generation has cured ills of the world

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) . . . . or has done such a good job in managing the lives of people in the community, in the general country, in the world today.

And having said that, I again recognize, as I have all along in the years that I've known my honourable colleague, that he has firm points of view, opinions which are dear and important to him, and since I too have ideas that are important to me and since we are in disagreement on this issues as an example, I felt that not having been present at the time of the Estimates, I would like to have taken the few minutes I did to express my own point of view.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. LEONARD A. BARKMAN (La Verendrye): Mr. Speaker, I was also not present at the time this item was under discussion under the Estimates and I will be very brief, but I think I would like to say a few words in regards to the matter of the reports that the Manitoba Censorship Review Board has come up with recommendations that perhaps the Censor Board should be done away with or at least cut down to a different proportion; and I must admit, while it isn't very often that I side with the Honourable Minister of Transportation, that I am siding more with his attitude than I would perhaps do in most cases, but I think this is serious if this Censor Board should be cancelled out. I understand they are recommending the complete abolition of censorship and I presume that sooner or later we'll see legislation come up that will perhaps cancel this out, although perhaps this is not the time to say that because it hasn't yet, I understand. But I think that, in my opinion, this is a matter where politics should not count too much and I gathered from what the Honourable Minister of Finance says that he feels the same and he certainly has the right to voice his opinion, as all of us in this Chamber have. But I wish to encourage that instead of this Censorship Board being cut down or perhaps getting into a position where they cannot voice their opinions on a matter of obscenity or other forms, I am sure that all of us are concerned, not just for ourselves but also for our children. And I could not resist but get up and say that I hope that the Board rather gets tougher than start thinking that because we cannot gain the points that we ought to gain, give up because of that account. That is all I wish to say at this time, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. J. R. BOYCE (Winnipeg Centre): Mr. Speaker, having been in the Chair during the debates I would just like to make a brief contribution to this debate. I could perhaps shorten it by just adding ditto marks to much that the Minister of Finance said but to expand on just one area of it, when he was saying about the violence and things of this nature which is being portrayed. It was drawn forcibly home to me because over the years I've enjoyed western movies, but we had occasion to have a girl from one of the Ojibway Bands live with us for two years and, while sitting on the chesterfield watching one of these cowboy-Indian sort of things where they always portray the Indian people as the underdog and the stupid ones and the horse thieves and the drunks, but this goes on and on and on, on television and nobody says a word about it, and this girl - I just happened to see her watching this thing that I was getting some relaxation watching, and I just saw the livid . . . in this particular girl's face and it brought home to me forcibly some of the things that many of us accept as part of our main culture. And if I was to be for censorship in any form, it would be the depicting of any race or any religious group or anything else in a derogatory manner such as we have allowed in our country over the years, that if we want to help in any way the Indian people regain their rightful image of themselves, that this is one of the areas where we should start, and advertisers that use the medium and support this type of thing on television, in the movies, I think can make a contribution by withdrawing their support of this type of a program.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. ARTHUR MOUG (Charleswood): Mr. Speaker, in regard to what has been mentioned in cultural affairs, censorship, I have a letter - it was written by the Minister of Public Works and Highways on his stationery - it was written to one Kerry Parker, Strathclair, Manitoba. It reads: "Dear Mr. Parker: Thank you for your stereotyped Tory letter. I appreciate your comments because I feel exactly as you do when the incompetent, corrupt and idiot Conservatives were ruling on matters of . . . in this province. As for blunders, well, the same taxpayers are paying for our blunders (none so far) and your education, spending, as you . . . type of thing." He goes on to say: "I paid \$5,000 in income tax last year so a snobby kid like you can get some sense pounded into your head in school." New paragraph. "When you dry up behind the ears, to cure your pea brain and become a taxpayer, please write me again." This is signed, "Joseph P. Borowski, Minister of Highways." I would like to table a copy

(MR. MOUG cont'd) . . . . of this with the Clerk, and I would have to say, Sir, when anybody talks about certain films being showed in the City of Winnipeg and throughout our province . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs.

HON. BEN HANUSCHAK (Minister of Consumer, Corporate and Internal Services)

(Burrows): I believe, Mr. Speaker, that our rule calls for the tabling of the original received by the person reading the document, and not a copy of it.

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder if I could confer with the Clerk on that.

I am led to understand, and I'd have to check it, but I believe for our purpose at the moment, the ruling is that the document which is being read from has to be tabled on request. If the honourable member wishes to table it. . . the Honourable Minister of Corporate Affairs.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, further to the point of order then. Could we have it clarified: was the honourable member reading from the copy of the letter or was he reading from the original letter? And whichever document the honourable member was reading from, that, I would respectfully suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, is the document that ought to be tabled.

MR. SPEAKER: I believe the honourable member was going to table it anyway. The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. MOUG: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have two of one million copies of the letter that I just read off. Now there is, I'm sure, a thousand copies of this in the Province of Manitoba and probably a million. I'm willing to table them both. All I want to scratch out is some notes I put on here; it'll still be legible and you'll still be able to read them. I wanted to mention, as I pass these on to the page . . .

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

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Is the honourable member amending the document he's about to table?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. MOUG: Well, apparently, Sir, the Minister that's been jumping up and down, and I'll quote the Minister of Highways because I'm up, and the man that wants to censor everything, the Minister that's been jumping up and down, as he said, the Minister of Highways said, "like a bride's nightgown," and he mentioned that while there was a church group in the Gallery, and I'll quote him when he said that, and he won't deny it. As the Minister moves around with the grin still on his face - it has been there for the last ten days - nobody asked me to table this; I volunteered the tabling of it, and it came to me as a copy of the letter, Sir, not the original. The original was wrote by the Minister of Highways. I wanted to add, now that it was brought to my attention by the Minister of Cultural Affairs, that this very document was -- or Consumer and Corporate Affairs, I should say -- this very document was in answer to a boy of 17 years old who is the class president. -- (Interjection) -- I would like to see it. I would just love to see it. I would just love to see the original letter, and how any seventeen-year old boy who is the class president of the school and seeking information from a department of the Province of Manitoba, from one of the Treasury Bench Ministers, should have this type of thing sent back to him . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable Minister of Transportation on a point of order.

HON. JOSEPH P. BOROWSKI (Minister of Public Works and Highways)(Thompson): Mr. Speaker, my point of order is that I don't know what the letter has to do with the subject matter at hand. However, if this discussion is in order, then I would like to have the opportunity to table the letter from the snotty Conservative kid who sent it to me in the first place.

MR. SPEAKER: I was trying to determine where the Honourable Member for Charleswood was heading. He indicated he was discussing Censor Board and Cultural Development. I'm still waiting to determine this. The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. MOUG: I agree with you, Sir. You're exactly right, and as I go back I'm saying that the answer to the letter, regardless of how provocative it was, whatever provoked a Minister of a Treasury Bench to answer a letter in this fashion, I can't understand. I think if this letter, the answer to the letter shouldn't be censored before it be sent out by this government or somebody in the capacity and tabled, censor this type of answer from a Minister of the Treasury Bench, certainly all the letters that come into the members of the Treasury

(MR. MOUG cont'd) . . . . Bench should be censored before they are opened by them so as not to provoke them in this fashion. It's a disgrace, Sir, I have to say to you tonight, for me to take the letter that I tabled into my constituency and say, "Here is why we don't get an inner beltway built - the Minister is too busy answering in this style, in this style." I would say it how I'd like to say it, Sir, but I would be censored.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: Well, Sir, the letter just tabled by the Member for Charleswood is an interesting commentary on the attitude of the Minister of Highways who parades about the province . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order. I would like to suggest that if the honourable member is going to precipitate a personal attack on the Honourable Minister, I don't think this comes within privy of the Tourism and Recreational and Cultural Affairs Department, and if he's going to speak to the subject I realize I've got to give him a lot of latitude, but I certainly don't want him to start off on the wrong foot. The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: No, Sir, it was not my intention to get started off on the wrong foot or to stay on the wrong foot. The item under discussion, Sir, is the Censor Board, and my remarks were going to be related to, if not the necessity, the desirability of having some sort of a Censor Board censoring the Minister's letters before they leave his office if that is the kind of a letter that he . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable Finance Minister on a point of order.

MR. CHERNIACK: I believe that there's absolutely no justification for the honourable member using the opportunity that he wishes to debate the actions of a Minister under the item Censor Board. I think we well know what the Censor Board is and, if I may, I'd hate to think that because I started a subject discussing a difference of opinion, that we are now going to start debating an individual who is really not involved in the matter relating to the Censor Board, which is the item before us.

MR. SPEAKER: I would concur with the Honourable Minister of Finance. The point is well taken. The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I find it's a little bit difficult to understand how the Minister can find justification in him taking issue with a statement made by the Minister of Highways and then deny me the right to deal with the same subject of the Censor Board, and, Sir, this is what I'm talking about, the Censor Board and the . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I would not wish to debate the subject with the honourable member but I would like to point out to him, if he's going to contain himself within the terms of reference of the Censorship Board, then I shall have to allow him the latitude of making his debate and listening to all his arguments, but I would not wish him to make it a personal or a straight inference on the Minister himself. The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: Well, Sir, then I will endeavour to comply with your ruling, Sir, and I assure you that I will refrain, or attempt to refrain, from mentioning the Minister of Highways in my remarks, but there have been statements made in this House in regard to the Censor Board and the need for increased authority of a Censor Board because of elements within the province that have been described as undesirable and have been described in many different ways in this Chamber and outside the Chamber, and again, Sir, I assure you that I won't mention any names. But my purpose in rising, Sir, was to deal with this particular subject in the light of an article that I took out of the Winnipeg Tribune yesterday, which is entitled "The Permissive Society Poll Shows Surprising Results," and I thought it might be interesting to the House to have some idea of the attitudes of the so-called permissive society, that group of people that have been so castigated on different occasions in this country and who seem to be the object of some severe criticism by people, again, Sir, people that I will refrain from mentioning, and simply to indicate that perhaps this so-called permissive society and this group of people who have been the subject of so much criticism may not be as terrible as they have been portrayed to be, and the results of the poll that was taken in Great Britain by the Harris Group, the Harris Opinion Poll Group, is very revealing, and Sir, I'll quote from sections of the article:

"A survey was carried out among 629 young people, aged between 16 and 29, throughout Great Britain between May 17th and the 24th. With all the talk about the permissive society, the results were pretty surprising. One teenager described the permissive craze as too much filth and too much nudity. Another described those who take part in it as hippies and dropouts,

(MR. JORGENSEN cont'd) . . . . 'all those dirty people.' Not all were quite so adamant in their views, but only one in ten thought that Britain should become more permissive than it is now." That, Sir, is from a group of young people. "A large majority, 77 percent, thought that marriage was still relevant in society and four to five were against legalizing pot," and that is pretty much similar to a poll that's been taken in this country. "Perhaps one of the most surprising results of the poll was how few young people connect drugs with a permissive society, although one in five admitted being offered drugs at some time. One question on marriage asked: It is said that marriage is out of date and that people should be able to pair and part as they please - do you agree? Only 18 percent of all the people asked did agree."

Again, Sir, I remind the House that this is the poll that was conducted between a group of people between the ages of 16 and 29. The article goes on to relate some of the different questions that were on this poll and the attitudes of young people. One can only conclude, Sir, that although they've been the subject and the object of much criticism in this House, that same so-called young age group have displayed in their attitudes in this Harris poll a great deal more sense, a great deal more mature judgment than a lot of people are prepared to give them credit for.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. HENRY J. ENARSON (Rock Lake): Well, Mr. Speaker, I would just like to make a few comments on this particular resolution in regards to our Censorship Board. I think, in view of the great deal of publicity that it has received in the past 12 months, shall I say, Mr. Speaker - and I don't think I have to mention any names who may have been attached to all that publicity, particularly to one or two particular shows that have been held in certain theatres in the City of Winnipeg - I think this is an important matter. But I just want to go back and say, Mr. Speaker, that from my own personal experience when I was a member of government, we had a Censor Review Board composed of three people, and on more than one occasion I, along with a number of my other colleagues, were asked to go over to where these films are shown and censored. We were asked to give assistance to the Censor Board to pass judgment as to how we felt about some of those films, and there was films, certain films selected to pass judgment on them, and I think this was a worthwhile effort and time spent. And I can say, too, Mr. Speaker, that there were certain members who are now on the government who were there with me and with my colleagues to take part in passing that judgment.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what concerns me is this. After some of the remarks that have been made by certain members of the government - and I note, Mr. Speaker, that they're very very sensitive if we make mention of any one of the Ministers or any one of the members; if it's something that is of a delicate issue and has some political overtones they don't like to be mentioned - but at the same time, I think, Mr. Speaker, I am wondering what is the thinking and what is the position of all members of the cabinet particularly, on this particular issue, in view of the fact of some very strong comments that I've heard in regard to certain types of shows that have been shown in this province, the pornography that has been attached to them. Am I given to understand, Mr. Speaker, that they are now intending to do away with the Censorship Review Board? Is it their intention to bring in legislation whereby this board is going to be done away with and there will no longer be any censorship insofar as films are concerned? This, Mr. Speaker, with all the debate that we hear and we may discuss, to me, Mr. Speaker, this is the one point that I think is very important and I think that the people of Manitoba are interested in knowing: where do we stand insofar as this government is concerned on the censorship of films in this province before they are allowed to go on the screen for the public to witness them? This is the one point, Mr. Speaker, that I wanted to bring before this House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. GEORGE HENDERSON (Pembina): Mr. Speaker, before we pass this I'd like to make some remarks, too, because when I was first elected we were given the opportunity to go down and see what type of films are clipped and what is clipped from them. At the invitation, when the Minister of Cultural Affairs was looking after that department, we were invited down, and I would think it would be terrible, myself, if we were to cut this board down. The things that were in this film that were clipped should be clipped. Now we know we have different films and adults see different pictures, but when you get these films going out where families go and there's always other groups go that are sneaking in that are under age, then I think we're only acting stupid if we don't continue with the Censor Board and see that it does

(MR. HENDERSON cont'd) . . . . its job.

MR. CLERK: 99; 100; 101.

Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$2,783,600 for Urban Affairs, Resolution 102, 103.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. MOUG: Mr. Speaker, I spoke on this on two previous occasions. I simply want to go on record as saying that I feel that the \$1,750,000 is a hidden amount of money. The amount is a grant in lieu of taxes that is accounted for in the Department of Municipal Affairs. It includes the area of the uni-city proposal. There's been a ten percent increase there, which is understandable, and certainly there is no way that we can account for bringing this one and three quarter million dollars. There was a time after this department had gone through the committee - or not committee but as we spoke on the budget - that the Minister tried to explain to me that there's a possibility that there be given progressive payments to the uni-city after it is formed at the beginning of 1972. I decline to accept this, Mr. Speaker, because we're going back to the city operating on a calendar year and the government is operating on a fiscal year March 31, 1971 to March 31, '72, and for that reason this is hidden money. If what he says is true and it is preparing for the three months, the one and three quarter million dollars can't be, surely can't go in for three months to give them progressive payments in January, February and March, and if this is the case and they intend to do that, then Municipal Affairs should have been cut back by pretty well a like amount, because if this department's going to pick it up, the other department doesn't need it, and if this amount - and I'm sure that the department has made a mistake; I would think that \$1,750,000 would come pretty close to looking after 12 months of the uni-city area. Also it's hard for me to suspect or guess just how far it would go, but I'd say that I think it's hidden money. Whereby last year just under \$3 million looked after the entire province, I can't see one and three quarter million become one quarter of the calendar year of 1972, and I would like some time for the Minister to clear that.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, it is with some regret that I must record the fact that I either lack the ability to explain or the Honourable Member for Charleswood lacks the ability to comprehend. I wish only to record the fact that I had with me at the time we were dealing with these estimates, complete and detailed explanations ready to answer all questions relative to the budgetary items, and that in fact the Opposition indicated that there were no further questions to be asked and passed the items, and out of respect to the Opposition I did not insist that I take the opportunity to deal with questions, to give answers to questions that were not asked, and I resent the fact that there is now, after there was ample opportunity to review it in the budget estimates, I resent the fact that there are now accusations being made that answers were not given. The fact is questions were not asked.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there was a question asked during Municipal Affairs, at which time I tried and I received permission, I believe, from the Chairman of the Committee to answer, and I answered it to the best of my ability. Having said what I did about obscenity about 25 minutes ago, I don't want to enter into the field of categorizing the receptiveness of the honourable member's mind to what I was trying to say, but I will tell him this concisely if I can.

The amounts set in Municipal Affairs under Grants to Municipalities are the amounts payable out of the current, the provincial fiscal year for the municipal current fiscal year, the fiscal years being different. The amounts set up as payable in the current provincial fiscal year are the amounts which are payable to municipalities for the calendar year 1971, which is the municipal fiscal year. I think that's as clear as I can put it. The amounts set up in the Urban Affairs is one quarter of the expected amount which will be payable to the municipalities in the calendar year 1972, which is - that is the municipalities of Greater Winnipeg - in the calendar year 1972 which will be its fiscal year. It is one-quarter of the amount. The Member for Charleswood can shake his head all he likes; the fact is I can't hear what's going on in his head but I can see that he just does not comprehend what I'm stating in a simple way, in simple words. That means he doesn't believe me. I have no right to demand that he believe me. I have only the right to assert the position I am taking.

I can only add one other thing, that it would be to my great pleasure, as Minister of Finance, to know that there are all sorts of items here which will not be spent so that I can

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd) . . . report at the end of the year that we have a substantial surplus on hand without having raised taxes in this current year. I think I would be complimented by all members of the Legislature if I could report that. So to even suggest that there is something hidden is again to beg the question as to why hide something you don't need. I hope that in a year from now I will be able to report that not all the monies requested have been spent. I hope I can also report that we received more monies than we actually expected to receive. That's a very fortunate situation for the province.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. MOUG: Sir, if I have the privilege to speak again, I would like to know . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. CHERNIACK: . . . at least I should suggest, as a matter of order, that he could not.

MR. SPEAKER: I indicated that as soon as he indicated it. You may ask a question. The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. MOUG: No, I would just like to ask a question of the Minister. I would like a brief explanation, and try to put it down to a high school dropout attitude so I can . . . Can you explain to me, or would you give me the answer to this, where this budget shows there's \$5,039,000 in this budget for grant in lieu of taxes in comparison to the end of the fiscal year March 31, 1971, of \$2,990,000? Now if you can explain that . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I believe the question is too comprehensive for a simple answer. I'm certain the Honourable Minister would be — Order, please. I'm certain the Honourable Minister would be glad to entertain a question in private of that length. Resolution 101 passed. 102 passed.

MR. CLERK: 103; 104; 105; 106; 107.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, I wish to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney, that while concurring in Resolution No. 107, this House regrets that the government has miserably failed to provide assistance to all students attending public schools in Manitoba under the new \$19.00 per student grant.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, in bringing forth this motion, I want to emphasize the failure of this government to treat all students in this province equally and alike. So much has been said in past years of equal opportunity, that all students should have an equal opportunity in this province to obtain an education, and here we find that they're bringing in a new grant, for the first time that a grant of this type has been paid, and that they're going to give it to only certain students attending schools, public schools, in this province. We can do nothing else but deduce from that that we not only have second class people in this province, now we have second class students as determined by the government of this province.

We find, when we look at the Estimates of Revenue for the Province of Manitoba for the ensuing year ending March 31, 1972, we find very substantial revenue. Under gasoline tax this government is going to collect \$39 million. A lot of this tax money will come from the multi-district division areas. These haven't been excluded. They will be contributing towards this \$39 million. We have, under the Motive Fuel Tax, \$6.6 million. Under the Revenue Act of 1964 - \$4,750,000. Under the Revenue Tax - \$68 million. This was a special tax that was brought in not too long ago, now referred to generally as a sales tax in Manitoba. It was specifically brought out at that time for the purpose of assisting education, yet up until now the multi-district divisions have not been getting any assistance even though they collected these many millions of dollars.

We take a look at the Automobile and Driver's Licences, 13,065,000. Again, the Winkler area alone was the fourth largest centre outside Winnipeg City in selling licences in Manitoba. This was the case up until a year or two ago - I don't know whether it still is that way but it was until a few years ago. So the people in those areas are contributing large amounts of money toward this \$13 million, yet they will be, and are being, denied a proper share of this money for educational purposes in their areas.

Then we find also that the Government of Canada is going to contribute something like 32.9 million dollars towards the provincial government. This is for Youth and Education only and, surely enough, this one should go to all students in this province. How can this

(MR. FROESE cont'd) . . . . government dare not give the students in those areas the proper share, because the Federal Government has designated it as such, and I feel that this government is acting contrary to law in not providing those students with the proper share of those revenues.

I could go on and name others, and I think I should mention one or two more. We have under the Liquor Control Commission an income of \$31 million. Then, Individual Income Tax \$121 million. Surely the people in southern Manitoba are paying income tax and I'm sure that their proportion is just as high as elsewhere in the Province. We have Corporation Tax of \$30 million, and then the National Equalization payments from Ottawa, \$49 million.

Mr. Speaker, certainly the equalization payment is based on a per capita base for the number of people in this province, and these students are counted in, so why do they not get a proper share, a proper allocation of these funds when it comes to educational purposes? And the students in these areas are just as deserving of an education as other students in this province, and I feel that this is a very large injustice that this government is perpetrating, not only continuing from past years, but is adding on to; in fact, they're going to practice further discrimination now because of the way the new person grant is being paid out in that only students attending school in multi-district — or in unitary divisions will be entitled to this particular grant. The government may have written off Manitoba through this new deal that was discussed in B. C., but the amending of the Constitution will not provide for a voice in Manitoba. I cannot do otherwise than take it that the concept of the five provinces for Canada is already being accepted by this province; otherwise they would insist on a voice for Manitoba in those conferences and any future amending of the Constitution; so if they're going to write off Manitoba in that way, this is just another indication of what is happening in Manitoba. The number of students involved certainly isn't that large so that this government can't afford to do it. I think it would only involve something probably about 10,000 students more or less, in that neighbourhood, and surely enough when we talk of \$18.00 per student this is not an amount that cannot be brought forward. We are actually robbing the children, the students in these divisions, of a share of support that should be rightfully theirs in order to get an education equal to other divisions.

Mr. Speaker, the other day mention was made of this government in their election platform having promised \$2,000 tax exemption, tax exempt on the first \$2,000 of property assessment, and they indicated that this was not true or certainly they were not aware of this. Yet, Mr. Speaker, this is a big ad that appeared and a big sized one, and it said, "You pay more than your fair share" then they go on to discuss the matter of industry resources; and then I would like to quote. It says, "There are other New Democratic policies just as reasoned, practical and necessary to improvement of life for Manitobans as the policies listed here. They constitute a meaningful program aimed at bringing to you at last, government of, by, and for the people."

Is this the government for the people that is discriminating against these students? Is that what you mean when you say government by, for the people? And this continues: "That's what democratic government should be all about. That's what the New Democratic Party is all about, and all the people of Manitoba are aware of the need for a government that legislates for people. That's why the New Democrats are heading for government." This is the ad that appeared. And then, in bold letters: "A New Democratic Government will give you tax exemption on the first \$2,000 assessment of your residential property." — (Interjection) — When? Yeah. The Member for LaVerendrye asks "when?" Certainly they don't want to hear about it at this time. They have no ears for this, yet this is one of the promises that were made and this involves many, many, many times more the amount than what would be needed to give the \$18.00 student grant to all students in Manitoba. This involves probably \$25 million — \$40 million, yet the amount that I'm speaking of is roughly a quarter of a million. Why does this government insist on renegeing in paying this \$18.00 per student grant? We know that they're bringing in, trying to bring in, a new system and they are going to stick with student grants. They'll be gradually changing over so that they can get control of costs, and I don't quarrel with this. I don't quarrel with it at all — in fact, I endorse the per student grant; but I feel that this should be paid to all students, not discriminate against a certain number of young people in this province who are as deserving as any other students in this province.

I feel that this government is discriminating against a certain group of people. Were these people in southern Manitoba, were they of Indian or Metis extraction, we wouldn't see this. We wouldn't see what we are seeing happening today, because in those areas they can be



(MR. FROESE cont'd) . . . . . school districts and they are recognized for purposes of the increased grants. They are paying them left and right up in northern Manitoba, yet when it comes to southern Manitoba they will not do so. Why? Why discriminate? Why take this action that you are doing? The government is fully aware of what they are actually perpetrating on the young people of this province in southern Manitoba. This government should be ashamed of their actions in this respect and I feel the least I could do is bring in this motion stating the regret that assistance is not provided for all students in Manitoba on an equal basis under the new \$18.00 per student grant.

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

MR. CLERK: 108 -- passed; 109 -- passed; 110.

Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$200,000 for Flood Control and Emergency Expenditures for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1972.

Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$1,797,000 for The Pas Special Area Agreement for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1972.

MR. SPEAKER: This concludes . . .

MR. J.R. FERGUSON (Gladstone): Mr. Speaker, I'm afraid that we got through a little too quickly.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. FERGUSON: I was listening quite hard too but it got through. I would like to speak on 111 if possible.

MR. SPEAKER: 111? (Leave granted.) The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. FERGUSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I would like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Pembina, that while concurring with Resolution No. 111, this House regrets that the government, through its lack of policies, has failed to take the necessary action to eliminate and/or control flood conditions in the area of Gladstone District north, and have further failed to recognize the need for compensation on flooded crops and hay lands.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. FERGUSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I must apologize again to the House for the fact that this got through, but as I come from, I think, the most flood-prone area in the Province of Manitoba, I think that this is possibly the only opportunity that I will have to speak on it, consequently I would certainly like to exercise that option.

Now, we have had spring floods for the past five or six years. This year, I think between the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources and myself and a little help from above, we were able to avoid the spring flooding. However, in my particular area there has been four weeks of continuous rainfall. This has now approached the stage where there is roughly 12 to 14 inches of rain and there is just no way that the people in my constituency can absorb the loss that is going to be incurred. The amount of crop damage now I think is approaching roughly 100,000 acres. The reeves on the councils that are directly involved have made a representation to the Minister of Agriculture. It seems kind of queer, but on the 26th, I believe it was, the Premier made a tour of the area, and on the 28th when-- I was at a meeting, rather, on the 28th of June in the town of Plumas where there were 125 farmers. At that time, I think there were ten at that meeting that had crop insurance. I would like to point out at this time that in my particular area that this is the third crop loss that many of the farmers have had, and the fact that possibly they can protect themselves with crop insurance and PFAA, why there just is no money to buy crop insurance, and this is a fact. And it seems to me that in 1969, I believe the fall of 1969, the first session we were here, the potato farmers received \$55,000. I could be wrong on this, but it seems awfully queer in this particular case and the fact that I think when this amount of money was brought in, the request was made for the compensation, that it was a crop that couldn't be covered by crop insurance, so consequently it should be paid.

Now, as I said a few moments ago, this is the third crop that the people have lost. There's 100,000 acres involved. The drainage appropriations have been cut severely, I think anywhere from 50 to 70 percent, and this seems to tie in with the program of the present government whereby the road system is also being penalized the same way, and the theory has been federally, and I don't know how much provincially, that they want to get rid of three out of four farmers, and I would suggest to the government that this might be one of the best opportunities they are going to get, because you have 100, 150 farmers in here this fall on relief, welfare, and what they are going to do with a lot of municipalities I don't know, but this is

(MR. FERGUSON cont'd) . . . . going to be a fact. I think that at a time like this, the amount of money involved, I think the request by the municipalities, if I'm not incorrect, was \$7.50 an acre. The method that the amount of acres involved to be arrived at, would be arrived at possibly by inspection by the councillors or through aerial photography, the same as the LIFT program, but I feel that some compensation has got to be forthcoming, and if it isn't, I don't know, I suppose possibly that a large percentage will bail themselves out again, but to consider again the fact that we can in our budgets go for a \$30 million hike in Health and Social Welfare, and in going through the accounts the other morning in Room 254, you see the amount of money that is spent here and there, and when you take a look at the amount of people that are involved, the amount of losses involved here, and the little bit of money requested, \$7.50 an acre, I think would prime the pump and possibly give some of these people an incentive to go back and try again.

It's not only crop loss but as of last Sunday the people were moving out of the area looking for hay to feed their cattle, and there is no way in a lot of cases that they are going to get out in their fields to put up hay at home, which is another expense. I know, I realize the fact that the government must get sick and tired of hearing requests for funds, and the facts that are presented are always the worst, of course, in anyone's particular area, but I do think that the request made by the municipalities -- I brought in a petition to the Minister, the amount of crop loss that was supposedly involved. This would only have to, of course, be very rough; it would have to be checked out. And again I think that this would be a cost-shared basis probably with the Federal Government, and I would certainly hope, and I know that the Cabinet hasn't had time to consider this, they probably haven't had time to come out with a program if they are going to come out, but the fact if it is a cost-shared basis, I think that it certainly would deserve some consideration and I would hope that they would. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I wish to briefly comment on the resolution before us, because the people in my area have in past years had the same experience and they feel with these people who have lost their crops through flooding and so on. This year we are in a much more fortunate position although we have had considerable rain but not flooding such as is being experienced up in northwestern Manitoba. I feel that the Province of Manitoba and the government should have a standing policy in connection with flooding and flood relief. I don't think it should be a matter of yearly deciding whether flood costs will be paid or if these people will be compensated in any way; I think it should be a matter of course so that we know, when people are suffering in this way, that some kind of compensation will be paid. Whether this could be worked in with the crop insurance program, even though fields had not been seeded, is probably something that the crop insurance corporation should study. I feel that it would be worthwhile to have this considered and find out what kind of a premium would be required. I think the premium could probably be very small; also to negotiate with the Federal Government in this matter so that when losses were incurred it was understood that they would be contributing a certain share. I think a program of this type should be worked out so that the people, when suffering loss of this kind, would know ahead of time, or at the time that they were facing this situation, that there was some relief in sight. Certainly, I would endorse such a motion.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Resolution 111—passed; Resolution 112—passed. That concludes . . . The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management, that the House resolve itself into a Committee of Ways and Means for raising of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried, and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Ways and Means with the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre in the Chair.

#### COMMITTEE OF WAYS AND MEANS

MR. CHAIRMAN: The matter before the Committee is: Resolved that towards making good certain sums of money granted to Her Majesty for the public service of the province for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1972, the sum of \$507,008,300 be granted out of the Consolidated Fund.

The Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, a few brief words. Honourable members may laugh, I don't mind, because I think the total amount of the estimates this year are the highest -- well, I don't think, I know that they are the highest on record. We are increasing them something like \$69 million and the people of this province will have to fork up that amount of money to pay the cost of government. How long can this go on in Manitoba?

In addition to that, we find that this government is going to borrow millions of dollars. In fact, the authorization they were seeking was something like \$300 million, last year \$295 million, so we can't continue indefinitely in this way. We will have to make ends meet, and I think we should, rather than expend more money each year, that we should cut down wherever possible, and I don't think that that's the case; I don't think we have cut down wherever possible. I am sure that, as far as the Department of Health and Welfare, cuts could be made and I feel that is one of the department that should have much closer scrutiny in years to come than what it received this year. We have not done justice to the examination of the estimates of that particular department.

So, Mr. Chairman, even though you passed the total amount of estimates, I feel that the revenue has to be brought up to pay the costs, but I do hope that the government will exercise more care and try and bring in smaller budgets instead of the increased ones.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Passed? The Member for Riel.

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Chairman, just before we leave this. We have had lots of give and take on the estimates, but one of the most curious things I found about going through the estimates and the budget is the question mark, and having sat through a couple of budgets, making up the budgets and fighting and chiselling to try and make them balance, one can't help but be left with the rather depressing thought that the Minister of Finance has a major job on his hands, one that is probably greater than it has ever been before. The shift, or windfall, I guess you might say it, from the Federal Government this year of \$19 million, plus some shift from capital into current added to it, probably brings an effective deficit of maybe \$30 million and well it's nineteen plus your seven from the university which brings it to twenty-six, plus there's a little bit in Highways, I think, probably some others - there are some typewriters shown as capital - but, if I had to make a guess, I would say \$30 million, which is effectively two points on the sales tax if you look at it in real terms, and one can't help but be left with the rather sobering thought that since it is a one-year-only windfall that was received this year, that then we do have an effective deficit of, say, \$20 million, \$30 million, or somewhere of that order, is how the government can possibly meet its requirements for another year unless there is something very different happens between now and next year. These are the concerns that override the specific concerns in the estimates and I think were worthwhile pointing out at this time, and I think that, although it may not have any great value to the government in the way of advice, there certainly should be sobering concerns on both sides of the House about the deficit that is likely to occur once the once-only benefits have run out.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Chairman, I take very seriously what was said by both members, and the Member for Riel is quite right - we are in a sobering time. We are in a time when our economy is not too good, and of course I'm not going to launch into a big speech blaming the Federal Government for what I think is really a situation to which it did contribute, I just agree that times are serious and that the needs are great, and we are facing difficult situations and difficult decisions. I indicated during the budget time we are not talking in terms of balanced budgets. The fact is that we have really a deficit in that we have substantial capital works program ahead of us; borrowing is required; a number of the governments, the bigger governments in this country, and indeed the government of the United States of America, are spending more than they are taking in, and that in itself is not a terrible thing because in the general economic balance and mix there is justification for that kind of budget approach, but I accept what the Honourable Member for Riel said - and what the Honourable Member for Rhineland said - as being serious indication that we have difficult decisions to make ahead of us, and we are seriously and definitely conscious of the problems that we face.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Passed. Committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

IN SESSION

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Member for Flin Flon, that the report of the Committee be received.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister for Consumer, Corporate and Internal Services, that the resolution reported from the Committee of Ways and Means be read a second time and concurred in.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. CLERK: Resolved that towards making good certain sums of money granted to Her Majesty for the public service of the Province for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March 1972, the sum of \$507,008,300 be granted out of the Consolidated Fund.

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

GOVERNMENT BILLS

MR. CHERNIACK introduced Bill No. 89, an Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the public service of the Province for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1972.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK presented Bill No. 89, an Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the public service of the province for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March 1972, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: I think it requires leave to have second reading, and I think we would like to peruse the bill before we do that.

MR. CHERNIACK: I appreciate the honourable member drawing it to my attention. By leave, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: By leave? (Agreed) Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for La Verendrye, that debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

HON. SIDNEY GREEN, Q.C. (Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, it is my intention now to proceed with the adjourned debates on second reading, so perhaps members who have bills standing in their names can be prepared for that. I am just going to go in order as long as I see a member in his seat, which means -- yes, Mr. Speaker, . . . call Bill 36. I'm calling Bill 36 first and then the other bills on the Order Paper.

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Finance and the amendment thereto by the Honourable Member for Morris. The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. GABRIEL GIRARD (Emerson): Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to discuss the matter of Bill 36 at length because I realize that much of it has been said already. However, I think that it would be important for me to again place my position on the record with regard to this bill and hope that it is not prolonged too much and that it goes into committee.

Last night I waited very eagerly for the Speech from the First Minister because I fully expected that the speech from the First Minister would contain all the ammunition, all the arguments for Bill 36, and I thought to myself that there was a possibility that members in this Chamber who might not yet have decided which way they're going to vote would be convinced by that particular speech. But I'm sorry to say, Mr. Speaker, with all respect to those who might have been involved in the speech writing, that that I thought was one of the weakest defences that the First Minister presented on that particular speech.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I detect a bit of an inference there. I am certain the honourable member has no intention of doing that. Possibly his words are running ahead of

(MR. SPEAKER cont'd.) . . . . his thoughts, I'm certain he wouldn't want to indicate that to the House. The Honourable Member for Emerson. -- (Interjection) -- Well, the inference was that someone else was writing his speech for the First Minister. I wish he would retract that.

MR. GIRARD: If it is your wish, Mr. Speaker, I retract . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. It's not my wish; it's one of the rules of the Assembly that there must be no inference.

MR. GIRARD: I do not wish to infer that the First Minister had his speech written for him. However, Mr. Speaker, I wish to indicate very clearly that the speech, in my view, was one of the weakest defence of any bill presented in this House by a government member. I might have misinterpreted some of his suggestions but it seemed to me that the hardest point he wanted to drive, the most convincing argument in favor of the bill that he had last night, was the fact that we already spent a million dollars studying what we should do with the reorganization of Winnipeg, and after having spent a million dollars we had to do something and therefore we presented Bill 36, and I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that's hardly a good enough reason to come up with a bill that is as drastic, as sweeping as that of unifying the cities that now exist in Metro Winnipeg.

I listened equally with eager attention to the Member from Sturgeon Creek, my desk partner, and I found that his speech was clear enough. His experience tells me that he knows what he's talking about, and I'm convinced from his speech, Mr. Speaker, that the bill will not work as well as the Minister of Urban Affairs or the Premier has indicated it might work. I suggest that it is seemingly true that the people of Winnipeg are almost left off the page when it comes to representation. I think it's going to be a cumbersome thing and I don't think it will meet with the kind of efficiency in representation that the government is looking for.

As a rural member I have said, and I say again, I find it difficult to even think of supporting this bill - not that it does too much for the City of Winnipeg. I would like to see things done for the City of Winnipeg; in fact I think it does too little for the City of Winnipeg and it does even less for the rural people. And I again want to say that I cannot understand why members on the other side who represent rural constituencies can get up and really vote for this. I am at a loss to understand how they will **explain** to their constituents how they can defend a bill which will place the representation in government matters in the hands of, granted, more than the majority of more than half of the people of Manitoba, but yet unify, and I'm suggesting that the tail will be wagging the dog and it will be a city government rather than a provincial administration that we're going to have eventually.

I waited eagerly as well for the speech from the Member from St. Boniface - and I regret that he is not here tonight - and he spoke quite eloquently, I thought. However, I find that it is very difficult for me to follow his course and his trend of thought and his defence of his position. I thought maybe for awhile that it was the kind of stand that the member had taken for a long time so I went back in some of the Hansards, and I thought maybe that he was much of the same view during the Metro debate. And I find it ironical that I'm of the same opinion as the Member of St. Boniface, but that opinion which he held during the debate on the formation of the Metro government -- and I'd like to read just the last paragraph of one of his speeches which points out pretty well my position and is diametrically opposed to the position that he is taking now. This is the speech of March 18th, 1960, on 1749 of the Hansard, and he ends his quite lengthy speech by saying, "I would like to go on record as saying, Mr. Chairman, that I oppose this bill in principle. I'm afraid, I'm afraid that it will lead to total amalgamation, which in this case would be detrimental to my constituency. I would also like to go on record as saying that when, but only when this bill is passed, I will do everything in my power to help make it a success. I accept this democratic way of doing things. I know that I will no doubt make mistakes, many mistakes probably, but I'll continue to do what I think is right knowing full well that if I make too many of these mistakes my constituents will soon replace me. But one thing, Mr. Chairman, that I want to make clear is that I will never be intimidated by members of this House, my constituents or anyone else."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I too would like to say that I will not be intimidated, but I would like to say also that I hope I can be consistent in my views. I would suggest, as I have suggested before, that Bill 36 is a permanent measure whether we like it or not. When we remove the existing boundaries of civic government as we are planning to do in Bill 36, we are doing something that is going to be permanent. I don't know of situations where we went from a multi-city

(MR. GIRARD cont'd.) . . . . kind of situation to a uni-city and back to the multi-city situation. I am suggesting that what we're doing now is something that is permanent, and we'd better have a good look at it because of its permanency.

I would like to suggest also that we have on this side been accused on occasion of having been reactionary because we don't do something for so long and suddenly we're badgered a bit and then we make some decision that is rather rash. And we call this, somehow we call this reactionary. And I am suggesting maybe that the reactionary group in this House might not all be on this side. If we look at what we've done with Medicare, we've gone from this kind of premium to no kind of premium and we call that a non-reactionary action, but I suggest maybe it is reactionary. We've gone from a situation where we had difficulties with our insurance problems, with our insurance industry, and so we went from a situation where I think it could have been modified, it could have been helped. However, we didn't go to the compromise situation; we eradicated. And I'm suggesting we're doing much the same thing with our uni-city bill. We're not attempting to make Metro representative of the municipal councils that exist, and I'm suggesting to you that that is really the solution I'd like to see. I realize there are problems. I realize that the Metro system is too far divorced from the affairs of the other municipalities. The solution to the problem is not eradication; rather, I suggest the solution is remedying the situation that is. But that's not what we're doing in Bill 36.

I want to reiterate, Mr. Speaker, that it's not because it does too much for the city that I'm opposing this bill, but rather I feel that it does too little good and too much harm to too many Manitobans.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Attorney-General,

HON. A.H. MACKLING, Q.C. (Attorney-General) (St. James): Mr. Speaker, I rise to take part in this debate in respect to the motion which would have the effect of postponing indefinitely a decision of the whole question of urban reorganization.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to refer to some of the remarks of the Honourable Member from Sturgeon Creek but prior to doing so, or prior to considering the few brief remarks of even the Honourable Member from Emerson, I would like with your indulgence, Mr. Speaker, to ask honourable members of the House to reflect with me for a few moments on the whole question of the social and economic relationship that exists between the several cities and municipalities that make up Greater Winnipeg. I think, Mr. Speaker, that we have to look at not only the studies that have been made, the Michener study, the Goldenberg study and so on. I think we have to reflect on the historical makeup and the working of Greater Winnipeg.

Mr. Speaker, I as a boy was born in the City of St. James and I know something of its history and I know something of the history of Greater Winnipeg. As a lad, when I was at school and we took swimming lessons, there was no swimming pool in the City of St. James for elementary school swimming classes. We went downtown, the City of Winnipeg, and we either found accommodation at Sargent Park, owned by the City of Winnipeg, or Sherbrook pool, owned by the City of Winnipeg, or perhaps the YMCA, largely subsidized by the City of Winnipeg. When as a lad in school, at this time of the year, you know, most of the kids have had their outing; they've gone on their picnic. Year in and year out the children from St. James went across the City of Winnipeg, the City Park bridge - that's the Assiniboine Park bridge - to a park owned and operated by the City of Winnipeg. We had no substantial park anything like that in the City of St. James - the Municipality of St. James as it then was - and there was a zoo and a substantial park maintained and operated by the citizens of Winnipeg and there wasn't any cost barrier for us in St. James to use that park or its facilities. And year in and year out the citizens of our area used that park and used it extensively.

When, as a young man, I had an opportunity to play golf, for the citizens who couldn't afford to belong to a golf club the opportunity for participating in a game of public golf was obtainable only, only at golf courses operated by the City of Winnipeg and maintained by City of Winnipeg taxpayers. The fact is that the people in St. James - our family typified families in St. James - found their bases of employment in the City of Winnipeg, in other parts of Greater Winnipeg. My father worked at the Weston shops, C.P.R. shops. The C.P.R. as an industry had been wooed and obtained as an industry for Greater Winnipeg by entering into a very long-term agreement, much to the detriment of the citizens of the City of Winnipeg. But the fact that that industry was there and had been obtained meant the livelihood for many many thousand of breadwinners of families throughout Greater Winnipeg, and many many of those workers lived in the municipality of St. James and many still live in the City of St. James-Assiniboia.

(MR. MACKLING cont'd.)

Mr. Speaker, the historical inter-relationships, social and economic relationships, are well-known to most people in this province, the relationships of people who lived in one part of Greater Winnipeg and found their place of employment in another. They, over the course of years, developed homes in various parts of Winnipeg, and did so because of the environmental advantages that they found there. The fact remains though, Mr. Speaker, that the Greater Winnipeg area has always been one social economic base. There wasn't a barrier. The essential services that secured a way of life and a reasonable environment in one part of Greater Winnipeg was maintained through an inter-relationship and a sharing of costing between the various areas.

Mr. Speaker, I reflect on the years that I spent as an alderman on the Council of the City of St. James, and the City of St. James-Assiniboia latterly, and some of my colleagues on that council found their place of employment outside of the City of St. James-Assiniboia. They owed their salary and their income to industry, even to corporations, municipal corporations in one instance, outside of the City of St. James-Assiniboia. In no way, Mr. Speaker, can anyone take a hang-dog approach to what happens in the entire area of Greater Winnipeg. The period of splendid isolation which many councils I think felt that they would prefer to have, ceased many many years ago.

Mr. Speaker, as cities grow, the new areas, the development areas, get the benefits of the established industry, the established social-economic mix that is there, that has been obtained through the years, the historical growth of the main part of the city. It is the new areas that produce the greatest cost factors. As the city grows and it sprawls further and further away from its center, the cost of the infrastructure gets greater. And so it was that back in the '50's there had to be a very expensive interchange developed right at the top of my old street, Madison Street, in the City of St. James as it then was, and that facility was needed not because there had been tremendous growth in the City of Winnipeg proper, but there had been extensive growth to the west of the City of Winnipeg in the City of St. James and the Rural Municipality of Assiniboia. And there was terrific traffic volume going west on Portage Avenue and action had to be taken to relieve the problems there, and at tremendous expense the interchange was built at that location - by the Metro Corporation - and that, Mr. Speaker, is typical of what happens as urban growth moves further and further away from the core.

The more expensive facilities are requires to maintain a reasonable standard of transportation and facility of movement within the urban mass. And, Mr. Speaker, the people in the older portion of the city who paid to Metro, were paying for the interchanges and the developments that were necessary to facilitate movement throughout the urban area. The Honourable Member from Sturgeon Creek shakes his head, but these are economic facts, historical facts. It is only reasonable, Mr. Speaker, that there should be an equality of treatment in the sharing of costs of services that are shared by all, and no one can doubt the sincerity of the desire through the development of the Metropolitan Corporation to try and find a vehicle for a more equitable sharing of the costs of basic services to the urban area. Despite the sincerity and the concern, history has shown the failure of that two-tier system to bring a proper equation of relationships between services to people and the tax that the people have to pay for them.

I would like, Mr. Speaker, to ask honourable members of this House to look for a moment with me beyond the City of Greater Winnipeg and look at the cities of North America, and look at the amazing degradation of cities who have been allowed to grow indiscriminately, the system whereby the core was allowed to become blighted and rotten, where the planning, such as it was, provided a mechanism not for a health inter-relationship, but an isolationism, a burrowing, a Balkanization within one urban mass, and the resultant necessity for ever more expensive traffic techniques to provide for the quickest movement out of the decaying core of the heart of the city and the resultant ghetto atmosphere of very substantial segments of the older cities of North America. And this, Mr. Speaker, is what certainly can and is likely happening in the City of Winnipeg. Surely we can learn from the mistakes that we see occurring in other areas of Canada and other parts of North America.

Statisticians, Mr. Speaker, tell us that within a relatively short time an overwhelming percentage of the population of Canada will be concentrated in an ever fewer number of large cities. These are facts which we are required to face, and face realistically. To say that a system won't work, it can't work, there are no new things, is to fly in the face of any attempt

(MR. MACKLING cont'd.) . . . . to rationally meet the challenge that lies before us. Mr. Speaker, the challenge is one to which I hope that even the members of the opposition will want to meet realistically.

Mr. Speaker, there has been some reference made during the course of the debate on this bill and the six-months' hoist motion, to the question of the amalgamation of the City of St. James and the Rural Municipality of Assiniboia, and I would like to say a few words about that. There have been suggestions that there were some very ulterior motives about that coming about, or questionable motives and so on, and I would like to put my views on the record in respect to a number of factors about that amalgamation. First of all, I would like to say something about the merger of the Town of Brooklands with the City of St. James. At the time of that merger there was an approach made to the then provincial government to assure that, given an agreement to merge with the Village of Brooklands or the Town of Brooklands - I think, pardon me, it is the Village of Brooklands - with the City of St. James, that the Province of Manitoba would participate in providing a vehicle through Federal Government participation in urban renewal, and as part of that concern there was the concern that we would obtain, included in the renewal scheme, a development for the provision of storm sewer drainage to the entire area of the then Village of Brooklands, and history is well-known of what happened to the Federal Government's participation in urban renewal. They decided, Mr. Speaker, that the result of the schemes that they had seen was not in keeping with their estimate as to their desire, and arbitrarily urban renewal schemes were brought to a halt. And thus the City of St. James, that had spent considerable time and effort in engineering studies in respect to both the urban renewal selective reconstructing of sections of the former Village of Brooklands, was aborted.

Yet we still have a very substantial problem in that area in respect to storm sewer drainage. It was hoped that in view of the fact that the City of Winnipeg had substantial property contiguous to the Village of Brooklands that we would be able to share, through agreement, with the development of the necessary drainage system, a drainage system that will likely cost in excess of \$4 million. Now I hope at least, Mr. Speaker, that with a new regional government, a vehicle will be there and available to provide for the provision of an essential service, not only for the area, the northeastern area of the City of St. James-Assiniboia, but also as to other portions of Greater Winnipeg that can be serviced and developed through the provision of adequate storm drainage services. Otherwise the City of St. James taxpayers would have to go it alone.

Mr. Speaker, in respect to the amalgamation of the City of St. James and the Rural Municipality of Assiniboia, I happened one evening to catch a brief word on a newscast of the travels and efforts of the Leader of the Liberal Party of Manitoba, and I happened to hear a bit of his dialogue with someone, and his words were to the effect that we knew the entire cost of the amalgamation of St. James and the Rural Municipality of Assiniboia right down to the last cent. Now, Mr. Speaker -- and the Honourable the Member from Sturgeon Creek shakes his head -- (Interjection) -- He sure was wrong. Well, I'll just deal with that.

Mr. Speaker, we did know what the assets were of the City of St. James, and the liabilities. We did know what the assets and liabilities were of the R.M. of Assiniboia. But as to the integration of the two corporate bodies and what the future cost would be, no one had any reasonable forecast. It was absolutely impossible to develop forecasting because the two school boards were not in the position to give us that. We couldn't forecast what the new amalgamated budget would be, nor did we even try. It would have been completely hopeless. But the rationale for the amalgamation was a common sense one and I still uphold it. There was absolutely nothing improper. There was no ulterior motive. It was common knowledge that restructuring of the Greater Winnipeg area was being considered. There were talks of mergers here and amalgamations there, certain municipalities merging and forming a larger unit, and we were concerned that if this was going to come to pass, if reconstruction of Greater Winnipeg was necessary and if it made good sense economically and socially to do this, then we ought to endeavour to minimize the duplication of services that would otherwise exist with our neighbouring municipality. As it was, Mr. Speaker, we provided for that municipality's fire fighting services by agreement. We shared in the arrangement for garbage disposal, a unique system. The City of St. James put up the money and bought the land in the Rural Municipality of Assiniboia, and we shared under a joint arrangement the utilization of those facilities.



(MR. MACKLING cont'd.) . . . .

Those are only two of the ways in which we had already developed an understanding and a working arrangement. The Rural Municipality of Assiniboia was faced with providing its own fire fighting services and building substantial facilities to handle them. Everything pointed to an overlapping, a wasting of resources, if there were going to be mergers and amalgamations in any event. So the steps were taken, not on the basis that there was going to be any great savings of dollars, in tax dollars. We couldn't be certain of that. But one thing we could be certain of is that there would be less wastage of human initiative, less duplication of services and hopefully a higher standard of service to all of the people in the combined area and that has resulted.

Mr. Speaker, one of the aspects of the amalgamation that we were unaware of was the magnitude of the solicitors' bill. The Leader of the Liberal Party was one of the counsel who sat in and we were all given to understand that costs there weren't any problem but that was the most uncertain factor of the cost of amalgamation because when Mr. Asper tendered his bill later on not only were the Aldermen of the City of St. James shocked but also the councillors of the former Rural Municipality of Assiniboia were shocked that even a bill had been presented. I'll tell you that that was one of the most uncertain factors of the cost of amalgamation in that area. And when Mr. Asper, the Leader of the Liberal Party, goes around in the Province of Manitoba and says we knew down to the last cent what the costs of amalgamation were going to be, he knew what his bill was going to be but the councillors of the Rural Municipality of Assiniboia and the aldermen of the City of St. James certainly were totally unaware of what his was going to be and the magnitude of it. And that was a shock.

Mr. Speaker, no one on this side, no one I think in the opposition side would fault any alderman or councillor of a municipality or city for fighting as an alderman or as a councillor for the best fiscal arrangement, the best social arrangement that he can obtain for the people who elect him and sometimes local aldermen and councillors, school trustees, are accused of being parochial because they see things from the point of view of their electors. They're not to be faulted for that and I have never faulted them for that because I was, admittedly, as anxious and as earnest for the best advantages to my electors when I was an alderman of the City of St. James as anyone else. And I have been accused of now doing some sort of a non-sensical flip flop on attitudes. Well you know, Mr. Speaker, there is a responsibility involved, there is a responsibility particularly involved on those who are elected on the basis of government responsibility. What is that responsibility? The responsibility of an alderman or a councillor or a trustee is to do his utmost to obtain for the people who elect him to get for those people all the advantages that he can. But, in respect to the obligations of a member of the Legislative Assembly he has an obligation, Mr. Speaker, I submit not to look only at his constituents but he is to look at the affairs of the province as a whole and he is faced with a responsibility for participating in the decision-making to the problems that affect his constituents, yes, but affect his constituents as citizens of the Province of Manitoba. And we have a concern as a government not only for the need for a proper organization of government in Greater Winnipeg but a need to fulfill the development of regional centres throughout Manitoba. We have a commitment to development of regional growth that is being frankly and honestly met.

Mr. Speaker, to suggest that we, because of our participation, because of our concern to meet a problem of re-organization in Metropolitan Winnipeg are going to ignore the problem of the rest of Manitoba, is to ignore the decisive programs that we have enunciated since we have been elected to office. We have made commitments to the building of new buildings in various centres in Manitoba; we have been concerned about the location of the industry in various rural centres in Manitoba. Some of that work has borne good fruit. To suggest that what will be created will be a Frankenstein that will face a provincial administration is a completely negative approach - and that's the easy approach, that's the easy approach that provincial administrations have used in this province indefinitely.

The argument constantly was if you put all the power into one central, unified technique of government in an area like Greater Winnipeg then you won't be able to deal with this government, they will dominate and frustrate every endeavour of a provincial administration to provide a measure of reasonable equality of services in a way of life, the equality of life in the rest of the province - and that's a completely negative and irresponsible attitude. Leave them divided; let them fight it out amongst themselves; don't let them get unified and work

(MR. MACKLING cont'd.) . . . . together and plan and coordinate effectively; leave them divided and divided we'll be able to control them - and that has been the technique, that was the fear, a negative fear, complex on the part of the previous administration and the administration before that, and that was wrong and we are out to redress the wrongs that have existed for so many years in this province.

Mr. Speaker, there is a positive challenge facing government in the 1970's, a challenge of meeting the problems of the cities that just can't be answered by a divide and conquer philosophy. There are former members of the provincial administration, the chairman of the Boundaries Commission who uses words like "they are creating a Frankenstein". That's the approach, scare the people - scare them - say that this new government will dominate and frustrate reasonable equality of services. That's a negative, crassly, improper technique - frighten the people.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, we can respond to challenge in a positive way. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that those who are concerned about what they have in the short run would rue the day that they sat in an attempt to isolate themselves from the problems of the greater area, if they did that, because you can't cordon off areas of blight and areas of decay. That social malaise will spread like a cancer and there is an obligation on the greater area to provide a virile, adequate environment for all people in the one social and economic area.

Mr. Speaker, much has been said of the destruction of various cities and municipalities. My own city of St. James-Assiniboia - and I'm proud of the planning that took place in that area, they did a wonderful job. Former members of this Legislative Assembly participated in it, the development of systems and techniques which provided for excellent planning and development, but when you reflect on the cost, historical cost that went into the Greater Winnipeg area, you'd be amazed to find how much the taxpayers of the City of Winnipeg proper really maintained the basis of the social and economic structure of the entire area.

I had some statistics prepared, Mr. Speaker, and I would like to relate a few of those to you. You know for years the City of Winnipeg Police Department trained all urban policemen without fee, year in, year out. They provided an exchange of information, communications, a central registry, a morality division, a detective division, a traffic division, a juvenile branch, the services of many of which were used extensively by other urban governments. You'd be surprised, Mr. Speaker, to find - and my research bears this out - that prior to 1938, and I hope that many of you around here were around then, that 6.7 percent of the police budget of the City of Winnipeg was used to provide services to outside municipalities, and that came to a total of \$1,067,000, Mr. Speaker. From 1938 to the present day, 4.5 percent of the police budget, the budget of the City of Winnipeg, was spent to provide outside services, a total of \$3,400,000. Those are significant amounts of tax dollars that were paid by City of Winnipeg citizens for support services enjoyed by the citizens of the surrounding area. This is fact, not fiction. That's the combined area.

The Winnipeg Fire Department, from 1924 to the present day, \$205,813, or approximately one percent of their budget was used to provide outside services. Prior to 1938 fire control services were provided free of charge, and let me assure honourable members that the City of Winnipeg has been around since 1884 and no record was kept of the cost of fire services provided to outside areas from 1884 to 1938. I know for example that in the area that I live, that we counted heavily, I as a lad, for the services of the City of Winnipeg fire protection.

What about library services? We didn't always have a library in the City of St. James. When I was in school they had a very tiny library in our high school. Where did we go when we wanted research of any kind? We had to go to the William Street library. There was the repository of the bulk of the books that could be obtained for further research and we were directed by our school. You'd be surprised at the total budget, Mr. Speaker, of the City of Winnipeg library system since 1886 - approximately \$14 million. The total cost of library services provided to non-residents equals approximately 10 percent of the total budget, or \$1,382,832. And I'm proud to say that as a lad I exercised those facilities myself at no cost to the taxpayers of the City of St. James. Prior to 1932, the use of the libraries to non-residents was provided free of charge. During the year 1932 a membership charge of \$1.00 per year was initiated for non-residents, and this fee was later increased to \$5.00. However, Mr. Easton, the city librarian, maintains that the revenue from non-resident membership fees did not even begin to offset the cost of services provided to those people.

Winnipeg Municipal Hospitals. We didn't have a Grace Hospital in the City of St. James

(MR. MACKLING cont'd.) . . . . when I was a lad. The cost of the municipals hospitals for the City of Winnipeg from 1913 to 1959, prior to the Manitoba hospitalization scheme, was \$14 million. The aggregate net cost of hospital services provided to suburban municipalities for the same period was \$939,720, or approximately seven percent of the total cost.

Let me give you some indication - and my honourable colleague the Minister of Mines, and Environmental Management touched on that the other day - of the cost of a facility that was turned over to the residents of Metropolitan Winnipeg as a whole by the City of Winnipeg without any compensation. The Parks and Recreation Department - the only compensation that was paid to the City of Winnipeg was for tools and equipment in the amount of \$42,000.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member has five minutes.

MR. MACKLING: Thank you. A summary of the total value and the operational costs of the parks to April 30, 1961 is as follows: The Assiniboine Park and the extension which was opened in 1904 - the total value of land and buildings, \$1,292,265; the Assiniboine Zoo opened in 1908 - total expenditure, \$925,752; the Assiniboine Conservatory, \$946,191. The total value of the park, zoo and conservatory, and all of the expenditures made to maintain those facilities - \$5,828,142; no compensation paid to the citizens of Winnipeg for those facilities.

Kildonan Park, opened in 1909 - total value of the land and buildings, \$202,680; total expenditures in maintenance, \$1,239,700-odd; a total of \$1,442,000. And I could go on - St. Vital Park, Churchill Park, Assiniboine Park and so on. Golf courses, I've mentioned already. The aggregate cost of assets turned over to Metro by the City of Winnipeg, \$7,520,000 - no compensation, no claim.

Mr. Speaker, one has to look at the question before us with a fair, rational approach, not the approach of the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek who keeps saying it won't work, you can't make it work. He keeps saying you are giving us amalgamation. It's not amalgamation. I, Mr. Speaker, fought amalgamation and I fight amalgamation today. What is provided here is a unique and challenging concept, a concept that will provide a vehicle for the development of a new technique of urban government. The honourable member obviously hasn't read the Act. Of the total number of the councillors, well over half of them will not be elected in wards represented by people presently in the City of Winnipeg.

So what is the fear of domination? The unification of services comes not by direction of this government, not by the direction of the Honourable Member from Sturgeon Creek but by the direction of the democratically elected councillors to 50 wards, over 50 percent of which are elected outside of the City of Winnipeg. And that is the democratic institution that will be given the responsibility of deciding the stage, and stage at which any unification takes place. And let me, Mr. Speaker, underline that not only is that fact but there has to be, if he's read the Act, notice, ninety day notice before any unification can take place, and there is ample time for the articulation and the development of democratic opposition, understanding, dialogue, debate, opposition and defeat of any unification proposals if they are not in agreement, if they don't find agreement with over 50 percent of the elected councillors of the new city.

Now this is a democratic institution. If the honourable members are afraid of democratic institutions, let them say so, because that is essentially what has been provided in a vehicle which we consider, Mr. Speaker, to provide an answer to a challenging problem that faces us today, a problem that must be met in a positive way and not in a negative, completely irresponsible fashion. And I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that the kind of dialogue, the kind of opposition that we have heard from members opposite has been absolutely negative. They have refused to even read the bill and appreciate the novel, unique concepts that are involved in the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek on a point of order.

MR. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Minister is saying that I didn't read the bill. He's assuming that I didn't read the bill and I wish he would withdraw that.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. The Honourable Attorney-General has thirty seconds.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, my assumption was based on the observation and analysis of the argument that has been articulated. It would be impossible for me to believe that the kind of arguments that have been advanced on the other side were made by people who had read the bill and understood its provisions.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. MOUG: I just want to make one or two observations, Sir, seeing as the Honourable

(MR. MOUG cont'd.) . . . . Minister that just spoke had quite some experience on St. James council and he was there at the time that amalgamation took place with the town of Brooklands as well as the R.M. of Assiniboia.

I want to mention first, before going into the depths of what he was speaking about, make reference to that which has taken place from the time the government put their figures together to what is happening today in the year of 1971. The City of Winnipeg has a mill rate of 73.15, an increase of 6 1/2 over last year; West Kildonan dropped 4 1/2 mills to 60.8; Tuxedo increased 2 mills to 46 mills; Transcona dropped 5.3 mills to 64; St. Vital went up 3 mills to 65; St. James-Assiniboia - and this is very interesting - they went up 2.3 mills to 55.6. At one time, not too many years ago, five years ago, before amalgamation those two municipalities sat at something like 40 and 41 mills. This was after the unitary school division came into effect and dropped all mill rates substantially.

Now with an increase that the government brought this year of another 5 percent, we are still riding St. James-Assiniboia 55.6; St. Boniface is up 2.4 mills to 69.2; Old Kildonan is down 1.2 to 62.6; North Kildonan is up 5 1/2 mills - and there's a reason for this, Sir, they have a capital type project in that mill rate, and with the sanction of the board, municipal board and department, which is quite substantial and it has increased them by 5.5. Other than that I think that they would have had a slight decrease as well. Fort Garry had a decrease of .6 mills and stand at 67; East Kildonan had an increase of 1 mill to 71.4; Charleswood had a decrease of .8 and they stand at 47.8.

Now the reason I bring this up, Sir, is because the government in their White Paper suggested that there would be two municipalities - or four municipalities I should say, that would have an increase when uni-city took place or was brought together. Now we have ten according to these figures. If you use the same figures we're going to have ten municipalities that are going to have an increase and two will show a slight decrease. Going through the figures that I mentioned before - and I don't want to go through them entirely again - assessment comparisons with the two that will show a slight decrease versus the ten that will show an increase, they're less than half, to show that there's no way to bring the City of Winnipeg that has the large assessment they have, there's just no possible way to bring them down with the ten that are going to increase. You may drop them a few mills but certainly not appreciably.

To go over to the area of St. James that I wanted to mention, one other interesting point I wanted to bring up is that permanent employees in St. James-Assiniboia is one employee for 216 people. If you're going to Tuxedo you have a slighter different ratio, one person to every 80 people. The City of Winnipeg has one to every 62. Now it's interesting to note that a municipality like Charleswood can manage with one person for every 343. This is allowing for volunteer firemen, R.C.M.P., the whole ball of wax. I know that question is coming from you immediately, but I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that this is how extravagant large administration comes. Bureaucracy sets in, all the friends get jobs - and we know that, we've experienced it in this House, the out-migration from Saskatchewan that come into this province - and there was one clean cut thing about it, never did the Province of Saskatchewan come to us and blame us for brain draining their province. They never accused us of brain draining their province because we didn't; we certainly did not.

Now I want to get over, Sir, to the amalgamation of certain areas. We go to St. James-Assiniboia and I have the mill rates here before and after amalgamation, and I refer to 1968 and 1970. I won't break them down into general municipal, school and Metro as I have them here, I'll give them to you directly as total municipal - and this was on farm and residential and certainly wasn't on commercial or industrial. I refer to farm and residential only. In 1968, Assiniboia was 40.5 mills; St. James was 41.8. That was in 1968. In the transitional period of '69, I haven't got that figure with me, I didn't think it was a fair one to bring, but in 1970 the mill rate for St. James-Assiniboia, an amalgamated municipality, was 63.3. This took place in two years, an increase of 12.8 for the Assiniboia residents and 11.45 for St. James, in two years from 1968 to 1970. Charleswood's increase was 5.69; St. Vital's increase was 4.9; and West Kildonan was 4.93.

The per capita municipal expenditures in 1968 - I'll give you them in totals - St. James-Assiniboia was \$158.24 in 1968; St. James was \$206.42 in 1968. In 1970 the per capita expenditure was \$249.80. That's a \$91.56 increase for Assiniboia in just two years. Charleswood's increase for two years was \$47.37, just about half. West Kildonan's was \$23.15, pretty well 25 percent of what the increase was in St. James-Assiniboia.

(MR. MOUG cont'd.)

St. James-Assiniboia's total operating costs have increased \$5,201,888 in just two years. For St. Boniface and St. Vital combined - I use those two, Mr. Speaker, because they are like areas as far as one being a bedroom-type municipality and one being an industrial and commercial type municipality which was the likes of St. James and Assiniboia previous to their amalgamation - St. Vital and St. Boniface combined increased only \$2,961,000; it's just about 60 percent of what St. James-Assiniboia increased in 1970.

The municipal expenditures for St. James-Assiniboia increased \$2,400,000 in just two years, where St. Boniface and St. Vital combined increased \$1,300,000 - \$110,000 less than that of St. James-Assiniboia. West Kildonan's general municipal expenditures increased only \$235,000 in comparison to James-Assiniboia's 2.4 million. In the same two-year period Charleswood's increased \$314,300 in that same period. I think that that indicates to the Attorney-General, Mr. Speaker, what happened.

Now if this increase follows the same pattern for the new uni-city - I don't want to say amalgamation, it upsets the Minister responsible for Urban Affairs - if this pattern follows, then comes the subsidization as they promised in their White Paper and the province is going to make good to them. If they went to the Urban Affairs president, he would tell them that there was a resolution brought in by the City of Portage la Prairie expressing their concern over the one-city concept in light of the existing tax imbalance between Greater Winnipeg and the rest of Manitoba. He goes on to say: "And Whereas the assessment factor, industrial growth and income of Greater Winnipeg is higher than the rest of Manitoba; and Whereas school and municipal tax loads are heavier in many areas outside of Greater Winnipeg for fewer services; Whereas provincial funds are extracted from the province as a whole and any equalization formula must also be subsidized by the taxpayers outside Greater Winnipeg; Therefore Be It Resolved that the Manitoba Urban Association strenuously oppose any subsidy from provincial funds being applied by way of tax equalization towards the proposed amalgamation of Greater Winnipeg."

Now that is one good reason that before they look into this amalgamation, or pushing together of the several communities, I think they should give consideration to the balance of the province. Not only the City of Winnipeg was involved - this was unanimously passed at the convention - it was every other centre in the Province of Manitoba that has an urban build-up.

The Attorney-General made reference to the interchange that was constructed at the perimeter and No. 1. He said the cost went to Metro. I think that's a fair assumption but it's wrong. All those projects are a 50-50 share basis with the province. I would like to know who is going to cover the cost of an interchange, and there's going to be more put together right in the new uni-city area. The province is going to come in 50-50 with it again and it's only right that they do.

He mentions that previous administrations liked it the way it was because it was divided and easier to control. Well, I hope he realizes what he said tonight and can stand up two years from now and say that it's better to have it amalgamated and together and unified, because they're going to control this Legislature then, I'll tell you, and in every respect.

When I quoted some time ago to the press that there was going to be a 40 percent increase in Charleswood to increase our mill rate from 47 to 67, it was read into Hansard by the Minister without Portfolio that I was touting a 20 mill increase. I'm not touting it, as far as I'm concerned I know it's right and I'll dig the Hansard out two years from now and I'll put it in front of his nose to let him see that I knew exactly what was coming up.

As far as dividing and controlling a city, I don't think it's to anybody's advantage except the people that live in it. They have a way to get around and get to somebody to see what their problems are and see they get them ironed out. I think I'm on record as suggesting previously that the Mayor of Winnipeg has great influence over the government on amalgamation because that's all he spoke about for the 15 years he's been in power, and I see in tonight's paper, a headline, with his suggestion that the mayor should be elected at large, he should be elected by the people and not by the 50-man council that they were going to have in the new uni-city. And I can understand that because I think any 50 sensible people that get together would have a problem justifying themselves in supporting our present mayor for the super-mayor of the new area. I think that before this bill is back in the House for third reading we are going to see an amendment to it and that amendment will read down the lines of the mayor being elected at large rather than by the 50-man council.

(MR. MOUG cont'd.) . . . . .

The Attorney-General also mentioned when he crossed to the river to go to Assiniboine Park, he mentioned when times he'd go down to the City of Winnipeg to borrow a book, he was hovering around 1932 area and I'd have to say, Mr. Speaker, that if he can come back to me with the figures and let me know what percentage of the park was paid by the Provincial Government, I think he could go in there and feel justified in going in and not think he was bumming off the City of Winnipeg.

I think that it's the same with every street you drive on in the city. All the work that Metro does in this area now, there is people from The Pas paying for it, there is people from Thompson paying for it. When they drive across the streets in the City of Winnipeg they don't have to feel that they're trespassing in any way, because in all these areas that everybody harps about and says there's no way Charleswood can live, no way West Kildonan can live without the City of Winnipeg, it's wrong. I have to say that if you closed down the City of Winnipeg tomorrow it's going to have a very very bad effect on the City of Brandon, it's going to have a bad effect on the City of Portage la Prairie, an extremely bad effect on the Town of Selkirk, because a good percentage of those people commute to Winnipeg daily to work and earn their living here.

As far as making use of areas in the City of Winnipeg, if the people of several urban areas and rural municipalities and suburban municipalities quit coming in, Eaton's is going to have trouble to survive and so is the Hudson's Bay. The City of Winnipeg mulches up money with their size today at such a great rate that I am told that there's \$700,000 in tax money comes in from the Richardson Building annually, and still with that, plus selling the Auditorium, plus selling whatever assets they have in land to the tune of \$800,000 this year, you still have the same increase of six point something mills. They've run out of auditoriums - I know they have no more of those to sell. I don't know how they stand for land. This could be another problem because you can only sell land for so long and you're going to be out of it. And land that the Member for Gladstone has to sell won't do any good here.

But if you want to say that Charleswood and West Kildonan and other areas live off the City of Winnipeg and without them couldn't survive and they should all amalgamate, I say that Brandon, Portage, Selkirk should be amalgamated with Winnipeg because they couldn't survive without them; Elie couldn't survive without them. It would have an effect on Morden and Carman. It has such an effect, it would have such an effect on Regina that they would change their time zone to coincide with Winnipeg to fit the warehouses and to fit the offices. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Would the honourable member permit a question? Earlier at the beginning of his address he referred to certain mill rates for each municipality, mill rate increases, but I didn't hear whether he gave the authority on which it was based, and if he did I would like to hear again what it was. And I also wonder if he could spare me a copy of that, earlier than waiting for Hansard, like tonight or tomorrow morning if possible.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Member for Charleswood.

MR. MOUG: Yes, I can copy this, Mr. Speaker. The authority that I have on this is simply what you can get from the municipalities from year to year. We have it on the record in our municipal offices. We get it every year as it comes out. Our treasurer compiles the several mill rates. I'm simply taking the mill rate that I have on Page 1 here and put it against Page 2 which was going from 1970-1971 mill rates.

MR. CHERNIACK: Thank you.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Member for Point Douglas.

MR. DONALD MALINOWSKI (Point Douglas): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, no long speeches should be necessary at this stage in dealing with this bill before us. The Honourable Minister, the Minister of Finance, has in my view done a very effective, educational job. Every citizen has been given every opportunity to become familiar with the proposals for the unification of our civic administration for Greater Winnipeg.

The people who have prepared the draft of this legislation have done a thorough job. The draft of the Act runs to 499 pages and, in going over it, I can't see that anything has been overlooked. There are ample provisions for the exercise of the democratic rights of every citizen. There are ample provisions to enable citizens to make their influence felt, both in their immediate communities where they live, as well as in the larger area concerning Greater

(MR. MALINOWSKI cont'd.) . . . . Winnipeg as a whole. All details of the new concept of one-city government have been worked out with a great wisdom and thoroughness.

Mr. Speaker, I believe most of the opposition to this measure is prompted by fear of change, by a reluctance to depart from the old and familiar. Opponents of the one-city government concept have made all sorts of wild charges. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry has even made the unfounded and ridiculous charge that under the new set-up it will be easier for the New Democratic Party to elect a city government. I wish that were so. But I am sure the honourable member must be aware that for years on end Liberal and Conservatives under the label of Civil Election Committee have dominated the Winnipeg City Council.

Some honourable members have also made the charge that the proposal we are discussing will increase taxes by \$100.00 for every taxpayer. I don't believe this, Mr. Speaker, but I want to emphasize the point that our aim is not to get the cheapest kind of administration for Greater Winnipeg, but the best.

Winnipeg has grown into the last half century from a city of less than a quarter of a million to a half a million people. Furthermore, a city of half a million people in 1971 is a vastly different city from one of half a million people 50 years ago. Its needs are infinitely greater and its problems are more numerous and more complex. I have been rather disappointed by the narrow outlook of some honourable members. They seem to think all is well with the world so long as their own little area in which they live is well looked after.

Naturally all of us have reason to be most keenly interested in the immediate districts we happen to live in. We are concerned that the streets we live on are well paved, well lit. We like to be sure our own neighbourhoods are well protected by the police and that other city services are well maintained. But surely, Mr. Speaker, the interests and concern of responsible and intelligent citizens should not end at the doorstep of their own communities.

Greater Winnipeg is our city. It is the capital city of our province. The people living in the suburbs of St. James or East Kildonan are just as proud of our Centennial Hall or Legislative Building and other fine features of central Winnipeg as are the people who live in centre Winnipeg. Likewise, no one is particularly happy to see the downtown or any other area deteriorate into a slum, even if our own homes are located far from these areas.

I represent one of the oldest districts of Winnipeg which is also one of the most neglected. Point Douglas at present needs and deserves more attention than other more favored areas. Allowing this area to suffer is not only affecting the people in Point Douglas but it is not doing the people in River Heights any good either — not in the long run.

Much has been heard lately about the deterioration of the life in New York City. That city seems to be disintegrating into utter chaos. There has been a breakdown of law and order resulting in enormous increase in crime. Many New Yorkers don't dare to go out at night. Garbage collection is in a sorry state, pollution is worse than anywhere else. There is chaos in public transportation — I am not talking about our Minister. There are the horrors of the slum ghettos, and the administration of welfare is in a mess. These problems give concern, not only to the people living in the areas most affected, but possibly even more to those wealthy New Yorkers living in the better neighbourhoods. Many Americans are, in fact, becoming greatly concerned about the deterioration of life in their big cities even if they don't live there.

I might also mention, Mr. Speaker, that concern about conditions in New York City have become international. According to a recent report in Time magazine, many delegates at the United Nations are seriously suggesting the headquarters of the United Nations be moved from New York to a place where greater order prevails. Neither in New York, or St. James, or East Kildonan, or Tuxedo, can people live as if they were a little island to themselves. What affects one affects all.

Take, as another example, the city of Windsor and the city of Detroit right across the river. In Detroit, a city of one and a half million people, conditions have deteriorated to the point where it has become one of the most lawless, crime-ridden cities. Drug addiction has reached most alarming proportions. Across the river from Detroit is the Canadian city of Windsor. This city has, up till now, remained relatively free of the woes afflicting Detroit. As a result, many citizens of Detroit spend their evenings in Windsor to be free from acts of violence and the troubles and tensions of their own city.

But lately the people of Windsor are beginning to be seriously disturbed about the increase in drug addiction and the increase in crime in their own city. They are now very much concerned about the deterioration of a civic order in Detroit because it is beginning to affect their

(MR. MALINOWSKI cont'd.) . . . . own city. The people in Windsor can't do much about conditions in their neighbouring city of Detroit, but the people of Tuxedo or River Heights or St. James can do much to restore to health the centre core of Winnipeg.

I may have wandered a bit to make the point that responsible citizens cannot afford to take too narrow or too parochial attitudes to modern civil problems. We should not try to live as separatists in St. Vital, separatists in St. James, separatists in East Kildonan. Living as we do in an organized society, it is much better to live in unity and brotherhood where the concerns of one are the concerns of all. As I see it, Mr. Speaker, this is the spirit behind Bill 36.

As I mentioned on a previous occasion, Point Douglas, the area I represent, is the oldest and most historic parts of Winnipeg. It is also an area suffering considerably from past neglect. I believe Point Douglas will definitely benefit from the bill before us. Under the new concept of the one city government - under the philosophy I have outlined - I believe Point Douglas is an area that should be given top priority in future redevelopment plans. I am saying this, not only out of a sense of duty because I represent this area in this House, I would still speak up for Point Douglas at this stage even if I represented River Heights or any other constituency. (Even Ste. Rose.)

I believe all honourable members who have freed themselves from a narrow parochial outlook will agree that areas in the most need for development are the ones that should be first considered. I believe if the Point Douglas area is fully developed into a beautiful part of Winnipeg it will not only benefit the people of Point Douglas, but indirectly the people in the rest of Greater Winnipeg will benefit.

Mr. Speaker, under the old order our cities have over the years developed according to a standard pattern - slum districts at one extreme and beautiful mansions at the other. There was never any justification for that and there is none now. It is well within our power to make every part of Greater Winnipeg more liveable and beautiful - a city all of us will be able to be proud of. I regard Bill 36 as the first step in that direction.

Mr. Speaker, I share the enthusiasm of the Honourable the Minister of Finance when he introduced this bill. I believe the passing of this bill will be a great day for Greater Winnipeg. The passing of the bill before us will enable us to deal more effectively with the problems of Greater Winnipeg. It will enable us to make Greater Winnipeg truly great.

I plead with all honourable members opposite to shed, for once, their partisan considerations. I plead with them to free themselves from too limited and too narrow an outlook. I urge them to think big and to give this Bill 36 support.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. INEZ TRUEMAN (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member from Brandon West, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Bill No. 37. Is the Honourable Member for La Verendrye here? Apparently not. Bill No. 51, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MACKLING presented Bill No. 51, an Act to amend The Criminal Injuries Compensation Act, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, this Act provides the facility for the determination of compensation to victims of crime employing the Workmen's Compensation Board as the administrative vehicle for the hearing and determining of applications for compensation. As most honourable members will know, I have indicated a continuing concern in respect to the problem of the extensive number of boards and tribunals which of necessity are created in order to provide a technique for the handling of work that is established as a result of the particular enactment of concern. For example, we have in the Workmen's Compensation - pardon me, in the Criminal Injuries Compensation Act, a requirement for some form of tribunal to hear the various applications and to determine upon their validity and to determine the nature of the compensation that should be awarded. We have in Manitoba an existing



(MR. MACKLING cont'd.) . . . . tribunal which does this very thing in respect to the claims resultant from injuries to workmen, and it seemed logical, therefore, that an attempt should be made to utilize an existing tribunal to carry out the same functions. It would mean that we would be able to avoid the expense of having a separate administrative staff and a separate tribunal to hear what, hopefully, will be a relatively small number of claims, however important they may be to the individuals involved. So the rationale behind the amendments that are provided here, the basic one is to provide that the Workmen's Compensation Board may be used as that tribunal to hear these cases.

Now, another important principle involved is that the bill, the Criminal Injuries Compensation Act as now enacted, provides that there must be a hearing. Well, the technique of operation of the Workmen's Compensation Board does not necessitate a hearing in every case. It may be that the case does not require a formal hearing at all but the application may be processed by the staff of the compensation tribunal without the necessity of a formal hearing, and so the necessary amendments are provided to facilitate that.

In addition, it was felt that one of the basic provisions in the Workmen's Compensation Act and the administrative regulations is that a person is compensated for their actual economic loss and not for pain and suffering, the imaginative assessment of what are purely subjective things. Under existing Workmen's Compensation regulations there is compensation paid for actual disfigurement or loss of a part of the physical body but there is no compensation for pain and suffering as such, and it seems to us only logical that what ought to be compensable in respect to a workman who's injured while he's gainfully employed, surely there ought to be the same standard applied to a person who has been subjected to injury as a result of a criminal act. So there shouldn't be a double standard, that one should be able to get more if you're injured as a result of a criminal act than you would if you were gainfully employed. So the amendments will provide that the compensation that is paid is for economic loss only, that is loss of earnings, loss of what otherwise the person would have been entitled to obtain if they hadn't been injured, and loss for actual disfigurement or loss of any facilities of the human body.

Another amendment would provide a clarification that the compensation would not include a loss of property. For example, if an individual happened to have a very substantial amount of personal property on him, such as money, the compensation does not cover the property he has lost, it covers his injuries, it doesn't seek to endeavor to compensate him for whatever money or valuables he had on his person, like jewellery or anything else that might have been taken as a result of the criminal act. So as a result of a consideration of the legislation, these aspects are recommended for basic amendments.

Now there are provisions in the bill which really are what could be termed "housekeeping" in nature, which make improvement on the wording of the Act to facilitate the better administration by the Workmen's Compensation Board.

One other aspect that is important to note is a retroactive feature and, generally speaking, it is most reasonable to avoid as far as possible any retroactivity of legislation, but in this case when the retroactivity is a benefit and an attempt to provide some compensation to persons who might have suffered injury - and there have been cases brought to our attention - during the pendency of the legislation, that is after the legislation was available but really hadn't been brought into effect, we felt that it was only reasonable to provide for retroactivity to the date that Royal Assent was given to the bill. The bill wasn't actually proclaimed until sometime later and the date when it was given Royal Assent was July 16, 1970.

I know there may be other aspects of the amendments which honourable members would like some further clarification on and I'll endeavour to give them, but those, Mr. Speaker, are the basic amendments that are provided in this legislation and, as I indicated, they will make for a uniformity of treatment of claims and provide for a very economical and reasonable handling of claims, avoiding duplication in setting up another administrative facility.

And I might add that another one of the bills that is on the Order Paper provides for amendment to the Workmen's Compensation Act in order to provide authority for the Workmen's Compensation Board to do this work. Now the payment would be on a per case basis for the use of the Workmen's Compensation Board. As most honourable members will appreciate the Workmen's Compensation is paid for out of assessments against employers and employees, and the costing of the board, the administration of the board is thus largely maintained not by direct government payment. But we will make arrangements, and

(MR. MACKLING cont'd.) . . . . arrangements have been tentatively confirmed, subject to the passage of this legislation, for the board to be able to handle these cases and we will compensate the Workmen's Compensation administration and board for the time and effort that's involved in the handling of these cases.

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

MR. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge, that debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Bill No. 45, Mr. Speaker, on Page 1 of the Order Paper.

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, we've examined the bill and reviewed the explanations as given by the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs. We accept the points, as he has mentioned them, that the principal intent is to clear up some ambiguities in the present Securities Act and to make the Statutes of Manitoba as uniform as possible with those of Ontario. The amendment which would provide and clarify the issuance of debentures by hospitals in Manitoba seems to be a useful amendment and will certainly clear up some problems that they have had in recent years where their debentures are being secured by money from the Manitoba Health Services Insurance Fund rather than from taxation on properties.

The Act is quite acceptable as we now understand it. We do note that while the intent is to make the Manitoba Act as uniform as possible with Ontario, that there still are perhaps some differences and perhaps the Minister might comment on at least one of these, the reason for its retention, that is the reason for the difference remaining rather escapes me. I might mention to him now that under the lists of trades and securities exempt from registration, the Manitoba Act reads in one section that "securities of a private company issued by the private company, where they are offered to not more than that number of persons or companies who together with all persons and companies who at that time were holders of securities of the private company will not exceed ten." And this is a trade which is exempt from registration, while in Ontario the same exemption reads: "Securities of a private company issued by the private company if the securities are not offered for sale to the public." Now I'm not just sure why Manitoba wants to retain that specification that the holders of securities of the private company will not exceed ten while Ontario chooses simply to say that the securities, if they are not offered for sale to the public, are exempt from registration.

Other than this particular point, Mr. Speaker, we have no objection to the bill as it now stands and are prepared to see it move on to committee.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

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

MR. SPEAKER: The House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Bill 59, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MACKLING presented Bill 59, an Act to amend The Corrections Act, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, this is a very simple and concise Act providing an amendment to the Crown Attorney's Act to facilitate graduates at law actually participating by being able to appear in Court, in Magistrate's Court on summary conviction matters. At the present time, or up until just recently this had been the case, but the regularity of such appearances was brought into question in an action before a magistrate, and after dialogue with the Law Society, who have indicated a like concern to make amendments to the Law Society Act when they are ready with other amendments, they are agreeable that an amendment be brought to facilitate graduates at law, those who have attended law school for three years and have a law degree and are articulated.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. MACKLING: Oh, am I talking to -- I'm sorry, I'm sorry.

MR. GREEN: . . . honourable member perhaps -- I wonder which motion was read in, which bill was read into the record?

MR. SPEAKER: Bill 59, the Corrections Act.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I wonder in view of the fact that the Honourable the Attorney-General has been introducing the Crown Attorneys Act, can we not have that motion read now so that this speech can apply to that bill? Is that agreeable? Can we have the motion read on Bill No. 67? That's just an error and then he'll come back to the other one after he's finished.

MR. MACKLING: I apologize, Mr. Speaker, for having picked up the wrong slip.

MR. MACKLING presented Bill No. 67, an Act to amend The Crown Attorneys Act, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. MACKLING: Well, Mr. Speaker, as I've indicated in incorrectly addressing my remarks to the previous bill, and now putting those on record formally in connection with Bill No. 67, the amendments will provide a facility for graduates at law to be able to participate in court proceedings which up until recently they had been unable to do.

As I have indicated, the Law Society have been consulted and are in full agreement and they intend to request a like amendment to the Law Society Act in due course to provide a clarification of the law to permit those who are graduates at law and have a law degree and are articulated to participate in court proceedings even though they haven't had their formal call to the Bar. This will provide that they will be able to do that.

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

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, I think we understand the intent of the bill and the explanations of the Minister and it is quite acceptable on our side.

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

MR. GREEN: Can we now, with leave, Mr. Speaker, go back to the motion introducing Bill No. 59 and take it as having been read?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, this amendment to the Corrections Act provides a like facility for the enforcement of orders of maintenance and alimony that are made in the Superior Courts to be enforced in a like manner with a Court order obtained in the Family Court. At the present time, Family Court orders can be enforced when there is default by application to administrative officials who follow up in respect to the defaults that have occurred. They correspond and they bring the default proceedings, bringing the defaulting party before the Court, and it removes the necessity of invariably the spouse having to take these proceedings and phone and write. It has worked very effectively to increase the payment of Family Court orders, and we believe this same facility ought to be available to those who have obtained a like order but in another Court. The Courts have indicated their agreeability to these changes and I warmly recommend them to the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. TRUEMAN: Mr. Speaker, I just have really not so much a comment on the bill as a question to ask of the Minister. I would like to know whether it is possible then to file an order in a Court in another province as well, whether we have reciprocity with the other provinces, and also whether we have reciprocity with the United States in case someone who has defaulted has left the boundaries of Manitoba and gone elsewhere. I think with the answer to this question that we are prepared to see the bill proceed.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Well, Mr. Speaker, in answer to that question, there is a Reciprocal Enforcement of Maintenance Orders Act, and I believe pursuant to the provisions of that Act it is possible to have the maintenance order that is obtained in a Court in Manitoba made applicable and enforced in another province or in another state that has reciprocated by agreement, and we have reciprocating agreements with an extensive number of states in the United States of America and most of the commonwealth countries, in fact probably all of the commonwealth countries although I hesitate to be absolutely certain of that.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Bill No. 48, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Transportation. The Honourable Minister.

MR. BOROWSKI presented Bill No. 48, an Act to amend The Snowmobile Act, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, the bill is a fairly substantial bill and a generous upgrading of what we have today. Although I have said on many occasions, and I stand by my statement that we have the best Snowmobile Act in Canada, nevertheless because of the growing popularity of the sport and the tremendous increase in the purchase of the machine and unprecedented abuse by those operating the machines, we find that it is necessary to bring in some pretty substantial changes.

There are twelve changes in all, and I think the most important ones are that in conjunction and cooperation with the Minister of Mines and Resources and the Snowmobile Clubs of Manitoba and our Vehicles Branch Department, we will have an organization set up throughout the province where everyone will have an opportunity to learn how to operate the machine. One of the conditions from the time this bill becomes effective, one of the conditions will be that they must have a certificate to operate and they cannot operate without the certificate. However, if anyone has operated a machine a year or more, this would be considered as one who has completed and therefore eligible for the issuance of a certificate which will be available from the three groups that I have mentioned.

One of the other important amendments in the Act is the prohibition of children using the snowmobiles. Police have seen on many occasions, and of course have reported to us and to our Registrar, of children, very young children running around in machines that are capable of speeds up to 70 miles an hour. We are fortunate, indeed very fortunate that we haven't had more fatalities and serious accidents. Ontario has a very bad record. Last Christmas and New Year's I think they had nine people killed on snowmobiles, and based on the number of snowmobiles and the population, based on the number of cars and the population, snowmobiles in that period were 14 1/2 times more dangerous and the fatalities 14 1/2 times as high as they were in automobiles, and Ontario already has a pretty grim record for fatalities on the road. So one of the amendments is going to, I hope, stop this.

Also, where children want to operate, we are having a distinction between the horsepower. I'm not sure of the horsepower that's put into the machine or into the amendment - right now it's not going to be put in but later on in Law Amendments - where kids under 16 can operate a machine only up to a certain horsepower, and that is of course off the right-of-ways which is legal to operate with the licence. In other words, your back yard or in a farm you can operate it without the restrictions imposed on you when you are operating on a public thoroughfare.

Insurance is going to come into effect, unfortunately because of the difficulty we are having in running the program for auto insurance and motorcycle insurance, I don't think we will have it ready until 1972, and when the paper work is done then the insurance will be available for snowmobile operators. I think I indicated last year that in Manitoba they charge anywhere from 20, 21 to 45 dollars for a snowmobile while in Saskatchewan, under government insurance, it's \$8.50.

One of the other areas that's been a great deal of concern to all is the racing, the complete lack of planning and precaution taken when various races are staged. I think we all recall last January and February where a snowmobile went out of control and ran over a child, which I understand is still in hospital and will probably be a cripple and a vegetable for the rest of his life. There was absolutely no precautions taken to protect the public and under the amendment to this Act anyone sponsoring, any group sponsoring any type of racing whether there is prizes involved or not will have to get a permit from the Registrar and will have to comply with very stringent regulations to avoid the tragedy that we had this past winter.

Mr. Speaker, I was shocked to find that the Free Press has stooped again to the yellow journalism. I read an article in here the other day which was entitled "Snowmos Face Tough Sledding" and I just couldn't believe the length that this paper would go to try and embarrass me or embarrass the government. And I'd just like to read some of the things in this article. It's unsigned but it was the type of thing that I would never expect to see written in a responsible paper. The story starts by saying, "Snowmobilers whodrew the ire of Highways Minister Joe Borowski last year by driving their machines along the frozen Salle River" -- this is the La Salle River -- "past Mr. Borowski's resident near La Salle will have their activities severely curtailed in future if a bill now before the Legislature is passed." Further on they say the La Salle -- they explain -- "the La Salle River behind Mr. Borowski's residence is a snowmobile highway and the Highways Minister had several run-ins with the snowmobilers when he

(MR. BOROWSKI cont'd.) . . . . attempted to block the river by putting up a skating rink and a barricade last winter. The river is only about 50 feet wide behind the Borowski residence and the various provisions of the bill would effectively block the highway whenever anyone wishes to use the skating rink." Mr. Speaker, if that isn't yellow journalism I don't know what is. First of all it's a damn lie what's in that thing; and secondly, the items that were pointed out there were completely distorted and as for bringing in the items in the bill, we have set up a commission where the Attorney-General's Department is involved, the city police, the RCMP, the Chief Magistrate of Manitoba and I have asked them to recommend certain things; the Registrar is on it. The snowmobile clubs were encouraged to write to us to recommend, because they were concerned about what was happening in Manitoba and many of the recommendations, in fact most of the recommendations in that bill or in this amendment are not mine, they're brought in by the various organizations. Many of them were suggestions from various police forces and for this moral degenerate of a press to come in and say that I did this for my own convenience is just incredible, it's just incredible to make that kind of a statement that I would be so low that I would bring in legislation because some snowmobile happened to be bothering me. Isn't that incredible? I don't think the opposition would even make that kind of a statement. I am used to all kinds of nonsense from the Free Press but they continue to pile on abuse and invective on me and on the government under the so-called sanctuary "freedom of the press" and I wonder, Mr. Speaker, and I take this opportunity to protest that a press should set themselves up almost in the same place as a judge where nobody can say anything to them and they feel that they're sitting up on top there and they can slander anybody in this House and what recourse does any member have here? These are the most serious charges that a person could make. This makes me out to be the most selfish person surely in Manitoba if I pass legislation because I didn't like the noise.

If anybody was in my office this past winter, any day of the week, he would find delegation after delegation, phone calls, letters and I'm sure the members of the opposition have had it, "do something for God's sake because these guys are driving us nuts." You can't have a peaceful night. You go out to the lake you can't have a peaceful day. You go fishing they come whizzing past you; you go skiing; you go skating; they break into cabins. You know it's reached the crisis position where something had to be done. We brought in a bill based on these complaints and on the recommendations from very responsible people and the press had the gall, the obscene, vulgar gall to come out and make that kind of a statement. I'm sorry that they're not up there today to be able to print the stuff that's being said in here. I would like the opposition if the opposition has any strong feelings on the various points that's in this - and I'm not minimizing, it is a tough bill, it's intended to be tough, this is a Highway Traffic Act and we intend to get tough with them. Because the public is just fed up up to here and this includes -- what do they call them, these little bikes? - minibikes. The public is just fed up to here where they can't have peace no place. It's bad enough you can't have peace at home but you can't have peace at the beach anymore, you can't have peace when you're out in the bush in the wintertime. They want something done, we're doing it. If the opposition feels that I am being dictatorial or this is a terrible bill I hope that they will take this opportunity to say so and I'll certainly pay attention.

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

MR. GIRARD: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make a few comments on this bill. I don't feel well-prepared, however, I would like to make the comments now in order to avoid delaying it if I can.

There's a few questions I would like to raise. I would first of all agree with the Minister wholeheartedly that it is a tough bill. In fact I would call it a rather punitive bill and in that respect I would like to see some changes. I think the penalties outlined in the bill are a little strong. I would rather see penalties that are not quite as strong but enforcement of the bill that is strong. In other words I'd like to see the bill enforced as well as possible but yet not be as punitive as this one is. When you speak of fines up to \$1,000 and jail terms for either three or six months for mufflers that are not acceptable to the standards set out in the bill, I think that we're talking about pretty stiff penalties for maybe rather minor infractions compared to other penalties and other infractions in our laws in Manitoba.

I would like to ask the Minister if the restrictions placed on the quality of the mufflers means that in some cases machines that are out today might have to have mufflers changed. If that means that the muffler would have to be changed machines that met standards that were

(MR. GIRARD cont'd.) . . . . satisfactory and were bought with the idea that they were satisfactory machines now suddenly are legislated obsolete and would have to be remodelled somehow at the expense of the owner and I think it's a little unfair to have this kind of retro-active legislation. I would suggest that the bill should apply for new machines possibly, but to cause now the present owner to incur expenses that they had not foreseen at the time they had purchased might be a bit unreasonable.

With regard to races - and I'm in agreement with the Minister that we've had a tragedy last year if I remember correctly because of races that were held by an organization. I'm all in favour of very rigid safety measures when it comes to organized races; but to outlaw races totally, and this is what the bill says, seems to me to be a little difficult to accept. Maybe I'm misinterpreting the bill but it would seem to me that the bill says the same thing as two boats on the lake cannot compare speeds and I think we're going a little far if that's the intention of the bill.

With regard to standards of the manufacturer, the bill spells out that the provincial standards are set and I'm wondering if the same standards are set in all provinces in Canada, because it's quite conceivable that someone from Manitoba or somebody moving into Manitoba would move in with a machine that has the standards satisfactory to that province and suddenly he moves into Manitoba and he finds that his machine is not to be used. In fact if he uses it he's subject to pretty heavy penalty. If all provinces have the same kind of standards, if there's an assurance that people will not be caught in this kind of trap it's all fine, but if not I would suggest that we're being a little unreasonable in our legislation because these people will likely be moving in without the knowledge that this kind of thing exists, be caught, found guilty and fined very severely. Again I might reiterate that the sections on the penalty I would submit are very stiff. I would even call the bill a punitive bill.

With regard to the certification - and again I meet with some agreement, the suggestion that people ought to be aware of the consequences of driving this machine, without being qualified or prepared is not a good thing and not desirable. I'm in full agreement when we speak of people having to take instructions of some kind, courses of some kind, tests of some kind and so on in order to operate these machines and especially the higher powered machines. However, I'd like to know what costs will be incurred by someone who plans to buy this kind of machine. Are the courses going to be available to anyone on demand? Will it be inconveniencing the people having to come from the far south or the extreme north, having to come into Winnipeg to take some kind of a test? Is there a group going to go around the province giving these tests? Are tests going to be made available so they can write them by correspondence? I'd like some clarification in that area, because if it's going to mean that the people from Sprague have to come and spend a day in Winnipeg to take a driver training test on one of these machines, I think again we're being a little unreasonable.

I would like to ask the Minister what will happen to my constituents in St. Pierre or St. Malo that happen to be unilingual and who happen to enjoy their machine tremendously, and who happen to be unable to write an English test. I wonder if he has any answers in that direction. -- (Interjection) - Yes. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that I have some people of Ukrainian origin and German origin and so on who might have the same kind of problem.

I would like again to suggest to the Minister that if this legislation is passed as is and if there are skating rinks that are built on a river - and it does not need to be the La Salle River, it might well be the Seine River or it might well be the Rousseau River - or even the Swan River if there is a Swan River. I know there's a swan but I'm not sure about the Swan River. This would mean in practice, Mr. Speaker, whether we like it or not that someone is able to blockade the river and someone is able to blockade the river so that no snowmobiles will be able to go by during the time when the skating rink is in use. At least this is my interpretation of the legislation as is. And I think in those cases, Mr. Speaker, it might be well to check the validity of this kind of law because I understand that rivers are supposed to be under federal jurisdiction as far as the waterways are concerned; I'm not so sure whether this is possible for the Manitoba Legislature to legislate this kind of blockade on a river. I know that this might not be the intention of the bill and I can realize the inconvenience of people who might be using the skating rink. At the same time I think we have to be aware that the sports-minded snowmobilst also has a right and we should not curtail his right necessarily if we can do something to avoid this. I would prefer to see the five mile an hour limit imposed but not the barricade saying that he cannot go.

(MR. GIRARD cont'd.) . . .

With regard to the towing mechanisms on cutters, as we well know there are many snowmobile enthusiasts who have a cutter and sometimes a manufactured production that is towed behind a snowmobile. Now the bill sets out that in any case anything drawn by a snowmobile must have a solid hitch and must not be longer than three feet and I'm wondering why it is that we have to restrict it to three feet. I don't think that we normally see this kind of sport exaggerated and I can't understand why a restriction of three feet. I disagree totally, Mr. Speaker, with the section that says if you're towing a cutter or something else that you are not permitted to cross a road. I think that section should be deleted completely because we have -- I've participated in this kind of thing myself - situations where someone takes his family out in a cutter and someone who might well live in the wilderness but there might yet be roads, because this is south and not north, and occasionally, Mr. Speaker, it is required of him to cross a road. I could see legislation that says he may not cross the road with someone in the cutter, that I can understand, but I cannot understand legislation that says he must unhitch his cutter then move the machine across the road and then pull the cutter across after. I think that is ridiculous legislation, if you'll forgive my choice of words, because I can't find a better one.

I am in full agreement with the idea that races will be authorized by permit and by that I don't mean the two toboggans somewhere in the swamps of Sundown testing out their motor. I mean the organized kind of races that usually takes place in or near the urban or suburban areas. I think that this is a very dangerous kind of thing that should be well prepared and I'm in full agreement that a permit should be obtained and that premises ought to be inspected and security or safety be assured the spectators and the participants.

The bill suggests also that someone who obtains a certificate has a sticker of some kind to be placed on his licence plate and that is not clearly set out in the Act and I would like the Minister if possible to explain a little more in detail what procedure this will take; how much cost will be involved, what is the procedure to obtain this kind of sticker and just how will this work?

I said on the occasion of the introduction of the last snowmobile bill that I found that particular bill discriminatory and I also find this one discriminatory in the sense that a certain portion of Manitoba is exempt from the past bill in terms of registration and this one of course follows the same suit. Those further north than a given line are not affected by this bill and will not have to be incurring the inconveniences and costs. I'm of the agreement - I'm with the Minister in recognizing that this is a good thing but I don't like the fact that we draw a line and we say these are exempted. I know that the problems are that especially in the area surrounding Metropolitan or a city area that we have a large number of machines in the city that go very short distances and therefore surrounding the city I can see where we need stiff regulation and control of these machines, but I cannot understand why it is, Mr. Speaker, that my inhabitants of the swamps of Sundown and Sprague in the far southeastern part of the province who live under the same conditions and who frequently have the same way of life are exempt. Now I don't have a better line to offer, I don't have an easy solution to this kind of problem but I suggest that I don't like the fact that it is discriminatory in this sense.

I would like very much to hear presentations that will be made by snowmobile clubs in committee. I would be very interested to hear the comments of those people who are, as I am, snowmobile enthusiasts but I would not see myself defeating the bill just on the observations that I have made. I am not in full agreement with the bill because I find it discriminatory and I find it punitive, but I would like to reserve the right now not to make amendments at this stage but to prepare amendments for committee stage.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. PHILIP M. PETURSSON (Wellington): Mr. Speaker, I just want to raise one or two questions in connection with the bill. There are four or five months before snowmobiles will be in the ditches, on the rivers and on the lakes but there are other machines which are coming into use and will be used in ways similar to that of the snowmobile, that's the minibike and motorized miniwheel, and I just wondered whether the Honourable Minister proposed somewhat similar legislation, somewhat similar restrictions, if not even greater restrictions on the use of those. I understand that these machines are now, while they're prohibited as far as roads are concerned or highways, that they are being used in open areas, in schoolyards and on the beaches where great numbers of people will later on in the summer congregate, children and adults. These minibikes can be used mainly only by juniors, that is youngsters who are small

(MR. PETURSSON cont'd.) . . . . enough to fit on them and handle them, which adds to the danger considerably particularly if they are new to them, they haven't been used to operating them and have not operated any other kind of vehicle other than to say perhaps a bicycle. I would be interested in knowing just what in connection with that particular means of transportation the Minister proposed to bring in, if any.

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

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Member for Killarney, that debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: No. 60, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW presented Bill No. 60, an Act to amend The Crop Insurance Act, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, the proposal here has to do with a further extension of coverage under the crop insurance legislation. It's to provide for coverage on land that is intended to be seeded but because of weather conditions may be prevented from being seeded and therefore we're setting up provisions within the Act that would take this into account and would insure for that possibility. Up till now we've had a system which allowed for insurance on fallow acreage only under those conditions. As members opposite that are acquainted with the industry would appreciate there are many farmers today that practice farming in a much different manner than in previous years and they do repeat the same field many times over before they fallow and it is reasonable to allow them to insure these fields that they may be reseeded year after year, or seeding year after year, and that it should not be restricted to fallow acreage only. That is the main point in this amendment to the Crop Insurance Act. The coverage is going to be somewhere in the area of \$6.00 to \$10.00 per acre for that particular section.

There is also an error in the present act which defines test areas which no longer exist. That is just a housekeeping change and amendment No. 7 deals with the question of the age of majority which has been changed and which will enable us to enter into contract at age 18. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. EINARSON: Well, Mr. Speaker, having perused this bill, I listened to the Minister's comments and I can concur there as the word "test" has been deleted and the word "resting" put in. The word "test" I readily agree that it's no longer applicable as we think of crop insurance today, and also the other amendment where the words here "summerfallow to unseeded acreage" is possible. But there's just the one - in Section 6 (3), Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure that I understood the Minister correctly. Is he referring to here whereby a farmer can get insurance on unseeded acreage and probably it's negligence on his part that he hasn't put in his crops for some reason or other. I'm just wondering if the Minister could explain this portion of it and then I would like to make a comment further. Section 6 (3).

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. USKIW: I would be closing debate, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: That's precisely what I was going to indicate to the Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, on that point of order. The honourable member will get some answers when the Minister closes but he can ask further questions at committee.

MR. EINARSON: Right, Mr. Speaker. I should have realized that. As the bill is now and just with that one particular section that could be clarified when we go into committee and then -- (Interjection) -- That's right, yes. So as far as we're concerned on this bill we can let it go through.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. PETE ADAM (Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, I would like also some clarification on this particular bill. Such is the situation as we've had in the Glenella area and McCreary area this year whereby the people in that area, there are not very many that will be able to do their summerfallow this year as a result of excessive rainfall. Next year this land will not be



(MR. ADAM cont'd.) . . . . suitable to be seeded because it has not been able to be worked this year because of excessive rainfall and I would like some clarification how this particular type of loss will be covered by this particular bill.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the Minister.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, the section that the Member for Rock Lake was referring to deals with the question of negligence in the operation of one's farm and whether or not coverage would be provided. The section provides that where there is negligence there of course is no coverage; the insured would lose any entitlement to benefits and he would not be entitled to a refund of his premium. On the other hand, if it is found by the adjuster that his land was not really fit for cropping, was not in condition and therefore would not qualify for a payment in any case, in that circumstance the premium would be refunded.

Now on the point that the Member for Ste. Rose made, if these people that have had severe flood problem to the point where they are not able to seed in any given year, they will express by contract their intent to seed early in the spring and if they pay their premium or enter into contract and they are unable to seed those acres they of course would be compensated up to the amount stated in their contract; and that will be somewhere in the area of \$6.00 to \$10.00 per acre.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Bill No. 68, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Agriculture. The Minister.

MR. USKIW presented Bill No. 68, an Act to amend The Wheat Board Money Trust Act, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER present the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, as some members opposite are aware, perhaps not all of them, in 1928 an amount of \$128,000 was set up as a fund to promote co-operative education in Manitoba. These were the residual dividends owing to members of pools who could not be located at that time. Some ten years ago there was an amendment made to the Act which allowed for these funds to be used in the promotion of co-operatives by way of loans and guarantees as well. Well as has been indicated, Mr. Speaker, we are introducing -- it's on the Order Paper -- a co-operative loans act which makes it now unnecessary to continue the present operations of The Wheat Board Money Trust Act, and for this reason we are reverting back to the original intent of that particular piece of legislation and that is to use it strictly for education and promotion of co-operative development in the Province of Manitoba. We are also removing the Minister as the chairman of this particular board and replacing him with the Deputy Minister of the Department of Co-operatives. There was also a section here which will allow remuneration to members of the board if they are other than civil servants. That's really the intent of this legislation.

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

MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE (Roblin): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek, the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Bill 57, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Labour. The Honourable Minister.

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour) (Transcona) presented Bill No. 57, an Act to amend The Remembrance Day Act, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. PAULLEY: I thought, Mr. Speaker, that possibly my honourable friends would have read the bill and by this time it would be clear to them the import of the bill.

At the present time The Remembrance Day Act prohibits work to be performed on Remembrance Day except in certain specified industries and occupations, continuing plants, etc. Where an employee other than a watchman, furnace tender or janitor is required to work or to be on duty on Remembrance Day and is receiving no more than his regular pay he must

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.) . . . . be granted within 30 days before or after Remembrance Day equivalent compensatory time off with pay at regular rates.

Under the proposed amendment to The Remembrance Day Act it would be a requirement that any employee, including janitors and watchmen, who work on Remembrance Day would be paid for the time worked on that day at a rate of wages not less than his regular rate of wages and in addition thereto be granted a day off with pay within 30 days before or after Remembrance Day upon two days' notice, or at a later time if the employee or his bargaining agent and his employer so agree. The amendment would have the effect of eliminating the present exclusions of clarifying the intent of the existing provisions and adding some flexibility to the existing provisions. Technically at the present time if an employer wants to grant to the employee an additional five cents per hour or five cents for the day, technically as I say, he would not be required to give an additional day off at the regular rate of wages and the purport of the amendment is to overcome this in order that the employee would be entitled to receive an extra day off.

Now I might say, Mr. Speaker, in connection with this bill I have already had representations made to me of a circumstance under which there is a collective agreement in force at the present time making a provision for double pay for any work performed on Remembrance Day and I will recommend to the Industrial Relations Committee a slight amendment to provide that where an employer already is paying double time for the day that he would not be forced then to give an additional day off within the 30 days either prior to or after Remembrance Day.

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

MR. GIRARD: Mr. Speaker, I've had a chance to look at this particular bill and I don't wish to take the time of the House at this point. I think we should pass the bill and we might have some suggestions to make on it but we will be making it in committee.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, apparently Bills Nos. 66 and 77 are companion bills and that the proper chronology would be to call 66 first so that the debate will have a more logical sequence. So I would like Bill 66 called, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING presented Bill No. 66, The Public Trustee Act, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, the Public Trustee Act will provide a similar facility for the administration of Estates of persons of the Mentally Disordered and Infants that is presently available in a number of our sister provinces who have Public Trustee Acts, providing for the administration of such estates by government appointed trustees.

As you are probably aware, we presently have the administration of the Mentally Disordered Persons under the Mental Health Act, and that organization is self-financing, that is the cost of the administration of the estates that are conducted under the administrator, are compensated by charges against various estates. This will provide an administrative vehicle for the administration, not only of those same estates, but also of infants' interests. The consolidation of these functions under one public official will provide for greater efficiency and improved service, particularly in cases of small estates which are unprofitable from the standpoint of fees, for a good many solicitors to be concerned with.

Presently the official guardians of infants are trust companies and existing estates and arrangements, interests that trust companies have will be gradually phased out, that is any estates or interests which they presently have under administration will naturally be left and the new cases will be referred to the public trustee. The public trustee will act as the official guardian for infants, persons under 18 years of age. This is necessitated where there is litigation, where an infant is either sued or wishes to bring an action, he must bring an action by his next friend, that is generally the parent, or in the case that there isn't a parent to act as next friend, then it's by the official guardian and the official guardian has heretofore been some trust company or some organization that acts on behalf of the infant. Under the proposed legislation a public trustee will provide this function.

Generally speaking then, Mr. Speaker, this will provide for a facility for handling both estates and infants' interests in a very business like and practical manner. I think that the legislation is very straightforward is in accordance with similar legislation elsewhere and I warmly recommend it to members of the House.

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

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, with respect to this Bill, I was glad to have the assurance of the Attorney-General that this bill which would appoint a public trustee would not provide any additional expense on the taxpayers of Manitoba but that the total expense of this new administrative set-up would be borne by the estates of those that would be managed. I'm also assured by the Minister that this would not be in addition to the present machinery we have for the administration of the estates of the mentally disordered persons, that the public trustee would undertake this responsibility as well.

I'm wondering, Mr. Speaker, what - and the Bill doesn't seem to be clear on this point, to me at least - it doesn't seem to have any direct reference to deposits of money held in trust and this matter came up in the debate on a previous bill. It seems to me it would be reasonable to expect that there should be some provision in this legislation to insure that money held in trust for estates would be held in interest-bearing accounts. There was a suggestion previously in some discussion of other legislation that this was not always the case, where estates were being held in a legal way for clients and that they did not always receive the benefit of interest which might have accrued for these monies.

So I'm wondering, Mr. Speaker, if the Minister in his closing of the debate would explain whether or not this has been considered and whether, if it has not been considered, whether it should not be part of this bill, that it should be provided that any deposits of money in trust should be held in accounts -- and it may be necessary to specify some minimum amounts that would be required to be held in interest bearing accounts and that it also be provided that interest accrued to the accounts be credited to the estates of those people for whom the service is being provided.

This is the main point that I would like to have clarified. I'm satisfied that there will be no additional expense as far as administration goes to the taxpayers generally, that all expenses will be charged to the estates that are being handled and we would just like some clarification on that point of the money in trust.

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

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Member for Rock Lake that debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Bill No. 77, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING presented Bill No. 77, an Act to amend The Mental Health Act for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, the provisions of Bill 77 relate in part to the questions of the Honourable Member from Brandon West in connection with what I term the companion bill. The provisions are that where there is money held then in connection with an estate under the Mental Health Act that the monies pending investment shall be deposited in a bank or trust company or credit union, or any other corporation empowered to receive a deposit of monies by the province, under the laws of the province and where the committee is the administrator of the estates, with the Minister of Finance. And then there are further provisions providing that where a committee other than the administrator, the official administrator, or a trust company registered to handle transactions in Manitoba is the committee, then there shall be a holding of a separate account. This deals with a private individual who is a committee under the Mental Health Act. As members probably know, if there is a person who is related or is in such interest directly to the extent that the court is satisfied that the person can act as committee then the court may appoint an individual as committee for the Estate of the mentally disordered person and provisions of this Act provide for separate and proper accounts to be kept by a committee under those circumstances. I think that the bill also indicates, clarifies the provision for allocation by the Administrator of interest among the estates where two or more estates have monies deposited with him, so I think that it does provide for the situation that my honourable friend was concerned about.

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

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Labour that the House do now adjourn.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, just before the question is put, we expect to be in the House tomorrow morning at 9:30, to leave after the question period for Public Utilities Committee with members on hand. When the bells ring it will mean that Public Utilities is over and we could come back to the House, presumably, if Public Utilities Committee finished early. If not, we would meet again at 2:30 in the afternoon.

MR. SPEAKER put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House now adjourned until 9:30 tomorrow (Thursday) morning.