

## THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Tuesday, April 9, 1968

Opening prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions

Reading and Receiving Petitions

Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN (Provincial Secretary) (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, I present the second report of the Standing Committee on Public Utilities and Natural Resources.

MR. CLERK: Your Standing Committee on Public Utilities and Natural Resources begs me to present the following as their second report:

Your Committee met on Tuesday, March 26, 1968, Tuesday, April 2, 1968 and Tuesday, April 9, 1968.

On March 26, 1968 the late Dr. D. M. Stephens, Chairman of the Manitoba Hydro-Electric Board, addressed the Committee on the subject of the development program of the Manitoba Hydro. The Chairman's remarks in printed form were distributed to all members of the Committee. Your Committee received all information desired by any member of the Committee from Dr. Stephens and the officials on the matters pertaining to the subject under discussion. The fullest opportunity was accorded to all members of the Committee to seek any information desired.

On Tuesday, April 2, 1968, the Committee met at 10:00 a.m., and out of respect to the memory of the late Dr. D. M. Stephens, who was to address the Committee, it adjourned immediately after passing a unanimous vote of sympathy to the family of the late Dr. Stephens.

On Tuesday, April 9, 1968, Mr. W. D. Fallis, General Manager of the Manitoba Hydro-Electric Board, was asked by the Chairman to answer questions which were put by members on the estimates of the Department of Public Utilities and Natural Resources, also additional questions put by members of the Committee.

Your Committee has examined the Sixteenth Annual Report of the Manitoba Hydro-Electric Board for the year ending March 31, 1967.

Your Committee received all information desired by any member from the officers of the Manitoba Hydro and their staffs with respect to matters pertaining to the Report and Business of this Utility. The fullest opportunity was accorded to all members of the Committee to seek any information desired.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Education that the Report of the Committee be received.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motion

Introduction of Bills

Before we proceed, I have a communication from Ottawa which in part is personal but I feel I'd like the honourable members to share with me the pleasure at receiving this letter on their behalf.

Dear Mr. Speaker Bilton, Although I expressed my appreciation at the time as best I could, I should like to add this note of thanks for the privilege and honour of being received by you and the members of the Legislature of Manitoba in the Chamber itself. Furthermore, we enjoyed very much the subsequent reception at Government House and the opportunity to meet and chat with so many members and their wives. My wife joins me in thanking you and Mrs. Bilton and the members of the Legislature most warmly and in expressing our appreciation for the fine spirit which was evident in your address and the ceremony of the inauguration of the Centennial Concert Hall. And it's signed by His Excellency Roland Michener.

I should like to take a further moment and introduce our guests. We have with us today 60 students of Grade 11 standing of the Garden City School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Groff. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks. We also have with us today 28 students of Grade 8 standing of the Earl Oxford Elementary School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Kitz and Mrs. Kitz and Mrs. Dickinson. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Brandon. On behalf of all the Honourable Members of the Legislative Assembly I welcome you all here today.

(MR. SPEAKER cont'd.)

Orders of the Day. The Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce.

HON. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q.C. (Minister of Industry & Commerce) (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to lay on the table of the House a Return to an Order of the House No. 6 and No. 8, both dated March 14, on the motion of the Honourable Member from Logan.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with I would like to direct a question to the House Leader or the First Minister. Is it the custom or habit of the government to present copies of all bills to the press prior to first reading or immediately thereafter. I'm prompted to ask this question in light of the whole story in yesterday's press, on "Metro area to gain 5 Legislature seats." And it goes on to the whole story of it. Well we haven't seen the bill yet, or I haven't seen the bill yet. How does the press get this inside information or advance information?

HON. WALTER WEIR (Premier) (Minnedosa): Well, Mr. Speaker, if the Honourable Member from Gladstone could answer that question he'd solve problems that take place in I'm sure every government office in a free country. The fact of the matter is it's their story. It's there. I know not how they got it and I don't know of any policy of presenting bills to the press prior to them being presented in the House. Where they get their information is anybody's guess. Sometimes it's accurate, sometimes it's inaccurate.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of N.D.P.) (Radisson): Mr. Speaker, may I ask a subsequent question on this matter. Was the newspaper report accurate?

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, that will be told in due course.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, I want to direct a question to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. Are we going to get the Annual Report of the Manitoba Development Authority during this Session? Is there not an annual report?

MR. WEIR: I gather my honourable friend is talking about the Manitoba Economic Consultative Board. As I understand their terms, they have three months following the closing of the year which gives them until June. I have no information as to when we can expect the report but I expect it as soon as it's ready.

MR. DOERN: A supplementary question. Is it not required that they must report at least during the Session or is there no such time?

MR. WEIR: No it's not as far as I know.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, a subsequent question. Could we not have this changed so that this report would be out earlier for the benefit of the members?

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the First Minister. I asked a question last night at the conclusion of the Budget Address regarding any possibilities of a rate increase in the premiums for the Manitoba Hospital Services. Is the First Minister in a position to give us any information at this time?

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, I have nothing to add on that. If there is an announcement in that regard it will be made in due course.

MR. LEONARD A. BARKMAN (Carillon): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Urban Development and Municipal Affairs. Can the Minister tell me if the deadline date of April 15 for municipal budgets will be extended, and if so to what date?

HON. THELMA FORBES (Minister of Urban Development and Municipal Affairs) (Cypress): Mr. Speaker, we have no intention at this point of extending it beyond April 15.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce. I wonder if my honourable friend can inform me when I might have a Return to an Order that I made respecting the Informational Services Department of Government.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, that information is requested of all departments. It's now being collected and I would hope to be able to return it very soon.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, may I ask my honourable friend whether we'll have the Return in time for consideration under discussions of the estimates of the Department of Industry and Commerce, which is most important.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I can't answer that. The Order for Return requested information from all departments.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Industry and Commerce

(MR. DOERN cont'd.) . . . . when I will receive a reply to my Order on the cost of the Manitoba Business Summit Conference?

MR. SPIVAK: Very soon, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. SAUL MILLER (Seven Oaks): Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the Minister of Municipal and Urban Affairs. In replying to the Member for Carillon she stated that there was no intention to extend the date, the April 15 deadline for municipalities. From that are we to infer that she is this way giving the answer to the Mayors and Reeves Association which requested that the government give consideration to adjusting its share or participating share in the educational costs which are being imposed on the municipalities?

MR. FORBES: No, Mr. Speaker, I was just replying to the question.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the New . . . Did you have a supplementary?

MR. MILLER: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Well in that case, Mr. Speaker, the problem is this: if the April 15 deadline has to be met then how can the municipalities impose their municipal mill rates unless they have an answer to the question posed by the Mayors and Reeves Association?

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for Portage.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders are called I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs. Is it proper or indeed is it legal for a member of a municipal corporation, that is an elected member, to do business with the said corporation? In other words if he has a store or a garage can he do business with the corporation?

MRS. FORBES: We have a section of The Municipal Act which deals with this. I think it's fully explanatory, Mr. Speaker.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, a supplemental question. I checked the section, I believe it's 306, and it is not clear enough for the purposes for which I need it. Could the Minister give a clearer explanation? My understanding is that it is not legal for a member of a corporation to do business with his own firm.

HON. STERLING R. LYON (Attorney-General) (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, I'm afraid my honourable friend is asking a question the answer to which would be a legal opinion which is really not in order on Orders of the Day.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I may have been in error a few moments ago in directing my question to the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce in respect of Informational Services because he indicated -- I asked him the question as a Minister of a particular department and his reply was that this covers a number of departments. Possibly I should direct my question again either to the Honourable House Leader or the First Minister seeing as it embraces other departments than that specifically of the Minister of Industry and Commerce. May I ask then, Mr. Speaker, of the First Minister or the House Leader when I might expect a reply to my Order for Return respecting Informational Services and could the Minister indicate what departments have not forwarded the information. And thirdly, can I receive a partial Return to my Order from those departments that are not delinquent in forwarding the information requested.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Industry and Commerce is co-ordinating the information asked for in the Order. As soon as it is responded to by the departments it will be tabled in the House. His question about a partial Return and who has replied I'm in no position to answer at the moment.

MR. PAULLEY: I wonder then if the Minister of Industry and Commerce might reply as to the possibility of getting a partial Return to my request.

MR. SPIVAK: I have nothing to add to what the First Minister has already said.

MR. PAULLEY: Thank you.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable Provincial Secretary. Will the report of the Operation Productivity be tabled in the House this Session and -- I have two parts to the question -- what firms or consultants are involved in doing the study and what is the cost?

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Provincial Treasurer) (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, I presume that I should answer that question. There will be no such thing as a report by Operation Productivity. It's an internal study carried out by Treasury officers and is being implemented as the new methods are discovered. If my honourable friend wants further information he

(MR. EVANS cont'd.) . . . . should put in an Order for Return.

MR. PAULLEY: I wonder if I may direct a question to my honourable friend the Provincial Treasurer. I possibly should have given him notice of my question. He may take it as notice. Reference is made in his Budget Address last night to the proceeds of the sales tax, Revenue Tax Act for the present fiscal year and all we had in the budget as presented by my honourable friend was a comparison of the estimated revenue for the preceding year and of course for the present year. I wonder if my honourable friend can indicate to us what the actual receipts of the 5 percent sales tax were for the last fiscal year.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition has been asking for his Order for Return repeatedly. I told him yesterday that I expected to have it -- I really expected to have it today or tomorrow. I'm reminded a little of the poem that says, "With thee began, with thee shall end the day." I spent most of the day with him yesterday until 12:30 at night. I haven't had a chance to look into it since. Will do so and expect to return the information month by month inclusive of the month of March, within a day or two.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I also would like to address a question to the Honourable the Treasurer. When can I expect an answer to the Return in connection with an interim financial statement as of December 31 last?

MR. EVANS: Well I'm relying on memory now, Mr. Speaker, but I think I informed my honourable friend that there was no such statement and that I was not in a position to provide him with one.

MR. FROESE: The Order was accepted, Mr. Speaker.

MR. EVANS: I shall certainly check on it, Mr. Speaker. If I accepted some part of the Order, which I think I may have done, I shall see that it's brought forward as promptly as possible. I should have to remark however that I do not think that I accepted the part of the Order which called for an interim financial statement on the part of the government.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, a following up question on the matter of the sales tax. If it was possible to get the information sooner by not having the month of March included I would rather have it only to the end of February and have the information at the very earliest possible date. Could that be done?

MR. EVANS: I'll do my best.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question - I think it should go to the Provincial Secretary - it's with regard to Chapter 22 of the Statutes of last year, An Act respecting the Protection and Preservation of Historic Sites and Objects. That Act provides for the acquisition of historic sites by the Provincial Government. Are there funds available for this and where would we find this information in the estimates?

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Speaker, the funds are provided for in respect of the Historic Sites Board which I believe will be found in the Executive Council portion of the estimate book.

MR. MOLGAT: A subsequent question, Mr. Speaker. Have any sites or any projects been purchased under this section?

MR. McLEAN: Not during my term of office as the responsible Minister.

MR. SPEAKER: One little matter I'd like to bring to the attention of the House, if I may for just a moment. Reading Hansard for yesterday and discussions that took place, I would like to acquaint the House with the reasoning of the calling to order on a third supplementary question. I hope it will eliminate any misunderstanding in the honourable members' opinions and minds. That came about by the examination of the rules in 1966 and a recommendation was made that the Speaker allow not more than two supplementary questions. Whilst it's not in the rules, it is a practice that was adopted at that time with the unanimous consent of the House and my endeavours are simply to keep within that practice in order that the business of the House might proceed accordingly. Of course, if the honourable gentlemen wish to change that, it rests in their hands to do so.

Orders of the Day.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I'd like to address a question to the First Minister. In last year's estimates there was the amount of one-half million dollars set aside for the Pan American Games grant. There is no figure set aside for this year. Has the First Minister any report to give to the House yet on the financial information regarding the Pan Am Games?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I believe in past votes and including last year, enough

(MR. EVANS cont'd.) . . . . money has been provided for the government to meet its obligations under the Pan American Games activity.

MR. MOLGAT: A subsequent question. Has the government received yet the final statement of the financial results of the Games?

MR. EVANS: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have received "a" statement. My honourable friend uses the term "the final statement". I am not able to recall the title across the top of it, but certainly I have received a statement from the Pan American Games. The reason I hesitate is as follows: I believe there is some thought of the disposition of some remaining assets which may or may not yet have been marketed and there may be a final Final Statement, as it were; but certainly I have received a statement, yes.

#### ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: Resolution of the Honourable Member for Emerson. The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. JOHN P. TANCHAK (Emerson): Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to read the resolution because I introduced it in the dying minutes of last Tuesday's session, therefore it will not be necessary to reintroduce it. The members have the resolution before them and they can read it.

I'm going to summarize what I said in those few minutes, it was just before the session closed. I had said at that time that I introduced the resolution in 1966 and I did not reintroduce it in 1967, hoping that the government would do something about it in the meantime. Then in 1966, we had three speakers speaking on that - three members speaking on this resolution; three members supported it and three members spoke in opposition to it. The members who supported it, supported it because they believed that it was necessary, that it was a good resolution and that the farmers had a legitimate request there. The other three spoke on it; they didn't give too many reasons for opposing it but to me it seemed at that time it was typical of the government, or they represented the typical attitude of the government towards requests made by different farm groups, such as the Farm Bureau, the MFU and other agricultural organizations. The attitude taken by this government seems to be that the best way to dispose of these request, these resolutions, is to simply ignore their requests hoping that these organizations, farmers' organizations, will get tired of presenting these resolutions and eventually forget about them and go in some other direction. I don't believe that's the right attitude. The government should study them seriously and then if they're worthwhile and do not cost a lot of money, the government should accept these.

I believe that the resolution in 1966 did do some good because since then, and I do not think it's through the government action, we have had some improvement in the weather forecasting. We understand now, and I've heard it myself, that the CBC is broadcasting, announcing a five-day weather forecast. Now this is developed I understand, not in the Province of Manitoba, it's simply a copy of the United States five-day forecast from North Dakota.

We know that just south of us, south of the United States border, though the farmers in the United States enjoyed or they took advantage of this five-day broadcast for several years, the farmers to the west of us in two different provinces, Alberta and Saskatchewan, also received these five-day broadcasts, and regional broadcasts daily. They're called Farmers' Weather Forecasting. Those kind of forecasts are very valuable to the farmer.

Although I said that we have a five-day forecast, most of the farmers and the farm groups feel that this information is not sufficient for the farmer to properly plan his program for any length of time. It is not frequently enough being broadcast and not exactly for the benefit of the farmer. It is just a forecast that's rattled off in quite a hurry and so on.

This resolution is very simple. I'll read just the last part of it, it says "that the Government of Manitoba consider the advisability of co-operating with the Government of Canada and the news media in providing detailed local and regional, daily and long range weather information primarily for the benefit of agriculture." We've got the five day; we haven't got the local and the regional broadcasts. Therefore we would like the government to re-examine this and give the farmers the kind of broadcasts that they wish.

I have copies here of resolutions presented on two occasions by the Manitoba Farm Union. They asked for similar action - one was in 1963; one was in 1967. I'm not going to read these resolutions because they're very similar to the one that I have presented. And in the latest one, a request came this year, and I'm sure that the members are aware of it

(MR. TANCHAK cont'd.) . . . . because most of them have briefs presented by the Manitoba Stockgrowers Association - on Page 3 - they're asking for better weather forecasting. I'll just read two sentences out of this: "They believe that it is now possible for weather bureaus to forecast with reasonable accuracy what the weather may be for several days ahead. What we would like to see is a once-a-day comprehensive meteorological report where the announcer would give in detail some of the possibilities for the next several days. We feel the government should sponsor such a report aimed primarily at and for the benefit of farmers." Now I'd like to add here that it wouldn't be only the farmers who would benefit by this but it would be other groups. We are sure that even industry would benefit. The tourist trade would benefit by that and practically all the residents in the Province of Manitoba would benefit. Now when we come to the cost, there was some reference made that it's going to be costly. I do not think that this will be very costly. In fact I don't think it should cost anything at all because the information is available at the present time. It's simply getting the information, putting it together in the form of a report and passing it on to the people. And I'm sure that if the government worked with the news media, with the radio stations and even television stations, they would be just too happy to sponsor this, because this would be public information, something worthwhile. I am also sure that we could get some industry or some business even to sponsor this and pay for it; so I doubt whether it would cost any money whatsoever in that.

I hope that the members will look at this resolution again and see fit to support it.

MR. PETER FOX (Kildonan): Mr. Speaker, if no one else wishes to speak, I move, seconded by the Member for Brokenhead, debate be adjourned.

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

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I should remind the honourable gentleman, under the new rules, if he wishes that matter to stand, he's eliminating himself from the debate.

The Honourable gentleman has already stood it once and under the new rules he cannot stand it again. Does he wish . . .

HON. HARRY ENNS (Minister of Agriculture and Conservation) (Rockwood-Iberville): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Is it not that it merely goes to the bottom of the Order Paper? It certainly doesn't -- (Interjection) -- Oh, I'm sorry.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Springfield.

MR. KLYM: Mr. Speaker, I really did not intend to speak this afternoon because I haven't the full information on the resolution and the sub-amendments and so forth. However, I'll have to do my very best under the circumstances and I hope I'll be able to come to some particular solution on this.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the original motion as proposed by the Honourable Member for Virden. I think that his resolution was quite timely and was in order for that particular purpose, because in the first place we know the plight of the farmers, especially during the present day. No farmer is a salaried person. When he gets paid, he gets paid once a year if he's a grain farmer and then at a very low ebb because his crop is always under a quota basis. Therefore I think it should be reasonable enough to ask the Wheat Board and the Government in Ottawa to see to it that probably something could be done for the farmers of Canada with regard to receiving their payments as early as possible. Surely they say it is impossible to get certain things done at certain times because the sales of wheat are not effected and so forth in time for payment to come around the 1st of February. I think anything is possible if one wants to put their shoulder to the wheel. Wasn't there a time when advance payments could not be given to the farmers? It was definitely stated at Ottawa that that is impossible. No matter who approached them, they said no, it is impossible. Until the right people got hold of it - the right Minister. He made it possible.

Today, of course, those advance payments are not high enough but they are there. The farmer is stuck with many things. He has to get his fertilizer, the seed; he has to get his machines in order, whether to get replacements or repairs. He also must have his gasoline

(MR. KLYM cont'd.) . . . . and oil bills and diesel bills paid for. The Oil companies have been carrying many farmers a long long time and they're generally dissatisfied. Now, how long could we go to work and see those things are prevailing amongst our farmers. Now true enough, we can say the farmer can borrow money to that end. Why certainly he can and pay a fine nice tidy sum of money in interest while his own money is lying idle. I think it is high time that somebody got after something to allow us farmers to have things on time. You know, when I owe a bank money, or anyone else, I must have it by a certain date. Of course there's three days of grace but that's about all. That's the only grace one is going to get. However . . .

MR. DOUGLAS CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Grace who?

MR. KLYM: Well, it could be Grace Darling. However, Mr. Speaker, I do not think that there is too much to say about it but as one of the sub-amendments stated, probably rye, rapeseed and flax could be put under the same Wheat Board. Well they administer it insofar as numbers of bushels that could be allocated at a certain time at the elevator because of the fact that the elevators could be plugged with other grains which are not as important as wheat and probably barley and oats and therefore the Wheat Board takes care of that but does not sell it for the farmers. I think that that is still in the offing somewhere and it will have to be looked after in the not too distant future somehow to satisfy both. But I think that at times we have our elevators pretty well plugged and even now it is so. We as farmers won't be selling very much more grain than we've sold already and we'll have to build bins and so forth, therefore in the future I think it would be advisable for the Canadian Wheat Board to re-assess their position and in a very nice way, see to it that the farmers get paid before the 1st of February at least. I thank you.

MR. SAMUEL USKIW (Brokenhead): Mr. Speaker, I'm very happy to notice that the Honourable Member for Springfield tells us that there are many things possible, it's a question of whether there's a will to do them. This is at least his opinion and because he says that many things are possible, and suggests that possibly we might be looking at some subsequent date at the proposition of the amendment of the Member for Ethelbert, that is the amendment related to the grains which are not included under the Wheat Board now which the amendment suggests should be, that if the Honourable Member for Springfield feels that all things are possible, if there's a will, then I would hope at least the honourable gentlemen on the government side of the House this afternoon, might decide to endorse the proposition of the Honourable Member for Ethelbert. I don't intend to participate too greatly on this particular motion. I think a lot has been said on it. I just thought I would make this observation.

I think also I might observe that it is not impossible for the Canadian Wheat Board to close their pools at a given date and to subsequently issue their final payments much sooner than they have been doing in the past and I do take exception to the Honourable the Member for Gladstone who suggested that it was impossible. In doing some checking with the Canadian Wheat Board I find that they tell me it is not impossible; they are not sure whether it's desirable but it's not impossible.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. PAULLEY: Yeas and Nays please, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the Members. In the meantime, I'd like to thank the Honourable Member for Springfield in making an effort to abide by the rules on this occasion.

A STANDING VOTE was taken the result being as follows: YEAS: Messrs: Cherniack, Doern, Fox, Hamuschak, Kawchuk, Miller, Paulley, Petursson, Uskiw.  
 NAYS: Messrs: Baizley, Barkman, Bjornson, Campbell, Carroll, Cowan, Craik, Dawson, Desjardins, Dow, Einarson, Enns, Evans, Froese, Guttormson, Hamilton, Hillhouse, Jeanotte, Johnson, Johnston, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McGregor, McKellar, McKenzie, McLean, Masniuk, Molgat, Patrick, Roblin, Shewman, Shoemaker, Spivak, Stanes, Steen, Tanchak, Vielfaure, Watt, Weir and Mesdames Forbes and Morrison.  
 CLERK: Yeas 9; Nays 42.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the amendment to the amendment of the main motion lost. Are you ready for the question on the amendment to the main motion?

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the Members.

A STANDING VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

YEAS: Messrs: Barkman, Campbell, Dawson, Desjardins, Dow, Guttormson, Hillhouse, Johnston, Molgat, Patrick, Shoemaker, Tanchak, Vielfaure.

NAYS: Messrs. Baizley, Bjornson, Carroll, Cherniack, Cowan, Craik, Doern, Einarson, Enns, Evans, Fox, Hamilton, Hanuschak, Jeannotte, Johnson, Kawchuk, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McGregor, McKellar, McKenzie, McLean, Masniuk, Miller, Paulley, Petursson, Roblin, Shewman, Spivak, Stanes, Steen, Uskiw, Watt, Weir and Mesdames Forbes and Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas 13; Nays 37.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the amendment to the main motion lost.

Are you ready for the question on the main motion?

MR. SPEAKER put the question.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Boniface that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for LaVerendrye. The Honourable Member for St. Matthews.

MR. ROBERT STEEN (St. Matthews): Mr. Speaker, I had adjourned this debate for the Honourable the First Minister who is now in his place.

MR. WEIR: Well, Mr. Speaker, I rise to take part in this debate on this resolution with rather mixed emotions, because it is rather peculiar that I can agree with, pretty well all of the "whereases", and it's only when you begin to resolve what the whereases have said that I come into any disagreement with the resolution that is before us.

I believe that the Department of Agriculture is equal in importance with the other departments of government or any government department. I agree that the Department like the farmers it serves has to adapt itself to rapidly changing and continually changing conditions. I agree that the Department, under normal circumstances, requires a full-time Minister. And I can also agree that at the present time the Minister of Agriculture has to divide his time between the Department of Highways and the Department of Agriculture. But if I was to amend the resolution I would probably amend it, Mr. Speaker, to resolve that this House express its appreciation to the Minister of Agriculture who is also accepting the added responsibility, temporarily, of Minister of Highways and that by recognizing that accepting this responsibility extends his day so that when he separates it he probably still devotes pretty well full time to the Department of Agriculture. I have had the experience of having to share extra portfolios and I know what it's like to carry these added responsibilities. Therefore I think that if I were developing this resolution - a special vote of appreciation to the Minister, the Honourable Harry Enns for carrying out the additional responsibilities of Acting Minister of Highways at the same time as he was carrying out his responsibilities as Minister of Agriculture.

It would almost be left to the imagination from the things that have been said by members opposite that this is the first time in the History of Manitoba that agriculture has shared a ministry under varying circumstances. I happen to know from a personal experience that it is not the first time, because it just so happens the individual that I contested my first election with back in 1959 had formerly been Minister of Public Utilities and while still holding that position he was appointed Minister of Agriculture and Immigration as it was known in those days. There wasn't any acting about. I'm sure that the First Minister of that day who is still here, who is still with us, probably had temporary thoughts in mind at the time that that was established even though it wasn't reflected in the wording of the appointment of the Ministry. Just after that, and after the change of government, the Honourable Errick Willis held Minister of Agriculture and Immigration and also Minister of Public Works at the same time for a short period of time. This isn't to say that it wouldn't be well, it wouldn't be well under normal circumstances to have Agriculture under the administration of a full-time Minister. But I think that a vote of appreciation to the present Minister of Agriculture carrying his added responsibilities as Minister of Highways at a time when the full organization of government is up for appraisal, at a time when we are examining the structure of the organization or the administration of the government that we have, to find out what areas we should go. It's kind of peculiar I think the -- the points that have been made on the other side have been that Agriculture is an important industry and that Agriculture does have many problems

(MR. WEIR cont'd.) . . . . and there has been varying comments about my colleague the Minister of Agriculture, about him being a rookie, by one of my honourable friends, and paying off political debts. Well, Mr. Speaker, if payment of a political debt is to ask one of your colleagues to carry the additional responsibility of a portfolio for a temporary period of time, then I guess probably it may be considered paying off a political debt as a Minister of the Crown and being asked to carry additional services at no increase in remuneration and having the additional responsibility and the additional workload. I have never really considered it paying off a political debt. I think the fact that Acting Minister of Highways was included in the Order-in-Council was indication in itself that this was intended as a temporary situation which I make no hesitation now at saying that it's intended that the double portfolio is a temporary situation pending the appraisal that we are presently carrying on of the structure of government within the Province of Manitoba.

I think the consistency of some of the recommendations of friends opposite could best be summed up if you were to reread the remarks that the Honourable Member for Hamiota made on the Throne Speech, at which time I think he asked us to get rid of portfolios and I think he suggested three or four new departments and suggested we didn't need full-time Ministers and so on and so forth. The consistency of the thoughts on the other side I think are both there. But I think the debt, if there is one - the debt if there is one, the political debt, is one that is being paid by the Minister to his colleagues in the government caucus on this side and the people of Manitoba in carrying the additional heavy responsibilities of an added portfolio. I think I'd like to repeat that the responsibility of these appointments, as everybody in this House knows, lies with the leader of the government at the time. While there is an administrative responsibility that must be considered there is also a collective responsibility of government and reorganization is necessary from time to time. I make no apology to the House for asking and placing my confidence in my colleague the Honourable Harry Enns in carrying temporarily the very very heavy load that he is carrying in a double portfolio -- recognizing everything that it entails on the strength of that.

I might say while I've got the opportunity not only do I have great confidence in my colleague the Honourable Harry Enns, I have equal confidence in all of the other members of the front bench and those of the back bench on this side of the House and make no -- (Interjection) -- while I have deep respect for the fellows on that side of the House my confidence doesn't go quite so far. There are areas where I must establish reservations when it comes to members on the opposite side of the House. But, Mr. Speaker, as sometimes happens in this House, we go for amendments and so on and so forth, even though I agree with most of the "whereases" and while I disagree with the "Resolved" section of the resolution, I have come to the conclusion that it would be in the interests of the House and the interests of the people of Manitoba rather than amend it, to express the appreciation that I feel to my colleague, that I will vote against the resolution.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, may I first of all in the same vein as my honourable friend the First Minister in expressions of gratitude and thanks I think that the House should express to the honourable the sponsor of this resolution our thanks for getting our honourable friend the First Minister up in a debate.

I tried the other day with a different banter to get my friend the First Minister involved in a debate without success and I want to thank the Honourable Member for LaVerendrye for achieving what I failed to do with the subject matter of that particular date. -- (Interjection) -- I'm so who? One of these days, too, Mr. Speaker, we might even get so far as to get the former Minister of Health up in a debate on a matter of supreme importance to the people of Manitoba. And if there are any other Ministers who would like to choose this particular time to interrupt what I am saying in respect of agriculture and a Minister with a dual capacity -- and it looks to me as though he has vacated his seat now and gone to greener fields. I don't know whether he's gone out snowplowing or harrowing -- a Minister of such flexibility of talents I suppose we should excuse him for absenting himself at this time of the year in any case. I see my honourable friend the Minister of Welfare is talking about shovelling it. I think if he could shovel some of the deadwood away from - the cobwebs above his shoulders maybe the people of Manitoba would be a lot better off.

I don't know whether there will be any further comments coming from opposite but if any of the other honourable members over there desire to get anything off their chests I invite them to do so and I would welcome this opportunity, because I haven't been able to

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.) . . . . cajole them into becoming full participants in the process of democracy in Manitoba as yet. -- Interjection)-- No, I know my honourable friend the present Minister of Education. I presume that he won't be kept under the thumb too much longer and will take part in the debates in the House.

Now my honourable friend the First Minister in defence of the government in opposition to the resolution says, in order to justify the present position of the government, that this isn't the first time we've had a part-time Minister of Agriculture. And he's right. It isn't the first time that we've had a part-time Minister of Agriculture. We had it before. And he is right when he refers to a former member of this House, Mr. Shuttleworth, having a couple of portfolios. But, Mr. Speaker, I say to my honourable friend the First Minister, it was the Conservative Party in Manitoba seeking the support of all of the peoples of Manitoba that decried the attitude at that particular time toward agriculture in having a part-time Minister. And now, the Honourable First Minister defends what, in their opinion, was indefensible a few years ago. It doesn't seem logical does it, Mr. Speaker? But then of course when one speaks of logic I suppose that we should not couple the word logic or logical with anything that the government is doing these days because it just doesn't add up that we should consider one with the other. And if my honourable friend the First Minister who just now suggested that rather than express our disapproval because the government has got a part-time or dual headed Minister in Agriculture and Highways, and extolls the virtue of the present individual in that position, I ask my honourable friend the First Minister when you were the Minister of Highways, did you have sufficient time at that time as Minister of Highways so that you could have also been a part-time Minister?

My honourable friend in one of his statements a moment ago said that the operation of government is up for appraisal. Well I thought from the speech of my honourable friend the Provincial Treasurer of last night that it primarily dealt with the question of civil service, in the ever growing numbers within the civil service. Now my honourable friend the First Minister says, "Oh, no, it also includes the question of the responsibility in the number of members that we have in the Cabinet," apparently. So it's up for appraisal. Well, I'm sure all of the members of the House are going to be most interested to see how far the appraisal as to the operation of government, particularly of the Cabinet, is going to extend. First of all he gives accolades and applauds his colleague -- and as my friend the Member for Brokenhead said the other day in this debate his greatest supporter in his venture to stardom -- heap accolades on his shoulders for the magnificent job that he is doing in the field of agriculture, in the field of highways, that he's perfectly capable of doing the two, and then finished up by saying, "It's temporary." Well how can we justify that? How can we justify a position which is part-time at the present time and then say the man is doing such a marvellous job that it's all worthwhile? How can my honourable friend who represents a rural constituency in this House, after all of the speeches that he has made throughout the length and breadth of Manitoba as to the importance in the field of agriculture or the importance of the field of agriculture, stand up and justify, even on a temporary basis, Mr. Speaker, a part-time Minister of Agriculture?

Now, maybe, Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend the First Minister is correct that there should be more part-time Ministers. Maybe he should have picked out some other department and put it on a part-time basis -- and I'm not suggesting which one -- but surely of all of the departments in the Province of Manitoba that least deserves to have to get along with a part-time Minister, is the Department of Agriculture. Even my honourable friend the Minister of the Treasury yesterday in his Budget Speech devoted a considerable period of time to extolling the foundation, the basic foundation of Manitoba as being agriculture. So I say to my honourable friend, maybe you're right in suggesting that the operation of government is up for appraisal; but for heavens sakes you cannot justify, in my opinion, a part-time Minister in agriculture.

I remember when my honourable friend the Provincial Treasurer, who has about three or four different classifications or portfolios at the present time, was Minister of Highways and Public Works; there seemed to be some relationship to those two portfolios. And it may have been justified and I don't think there was much question about it. But this was split. And now to relieve the burdens -- and Agriculture was established as a full-time ministry so that we would be able to have a person responsible in this very important area of the economy of Manitoba. And now what have we got? A Minister, as I said the other day,

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.) . . . . who is sharing a plow with a road patrol. It isn't compatible and I can see no justification at all for the stand taken by the First Minister. Ach sure, sure maybe the Honourable Minister of Agriculture - Highways is a nice presentable charming fellow, and I don't dispute that, but I don't think that either the present Minister of Highways-Agriculture, or any member opposite or member on this side either, can find sufficient hours in the day to look after both portfolios and do a job with either one of them, and do a job with either one of them, and it seems to me that this is the most important consideration that we have before us.

And lest anybody fault me, Mr. Speaker, for suggesting that I'm advocating additional Cabinet Ministers, let me just refer them to the estimates and the budget of my honourable friend the Provincial Treasurer based on the estimates and the estimates make provision for a Minister of Agriculture and a Minister of Highways. So the increase is not going to be there. But I think that the increase would be that our basic industry -- and it's still our basic industry in Manitoba, namely agriculture -- should have in that particular department a man whose contribution to the well-being of Manitoba can be directed toward the agricultural industry and not have to compete with highways and by-ways, and as far as I am concerned and my colleagues, we join in support of the resolution presented by the Honourable Member for LaVerendrye and as I started out, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the Honourable Member for LaVerendrye for giving us the opportunity of hearing the First Minister partake in the first debate in this Session that we've been in now for a month.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. ALBERT VIELFAURE (LaVerendrye): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Carillon, that debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for St. James, and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks in amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for St. James.

MR. DOUGLAS M. STANES (St. James): Mr. Speaker, may I request the indulgence of the House to allow this matter to stand?

MR. SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have leave? The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Inkster. The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. FOX: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the honourable member, may we have the indulgence to have this matter stand?

MR. SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have leave?

MR. FOX: But if anybody else wishes to speak they may do so.

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition, and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Inkster in amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

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

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. On the previous resolution does it not have to come to a vote because his position is already . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie has lost his privilege to speak by not being present.

MR. FROESE: I'm referring to the previous one where the Member for Burrows was supposed to speak. -- (Interjection) -- No, it will be a second time won't it?

MR. SPEAKER: I didn't quite hear the honourable gentleman.

MR. FROESE: It's marked as though it's stood over already. It says, "Stands."

MR. SPEAKER: . . . amendment to the main motion and I'm calling on the Honourable Member for Portage. That matter has stood once as indicated and in that he is not present, as I understand the new rules, he has lost his privilege to speak. But of course if there's any other member wishes to adjourn this it's his privilege to do so -- or wishes to speak. Otherwise I put the question.

Are you ready for the question?

MR. MOLGAT: I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lakeside, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member from St. Boniface,

(MR. SPEAKER cont'd.) . . . and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for St. John's in amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, it seems that it's practically a waste of time to try to work for the people of Manitoba here when we look across and see all the interested members of the government ready to listen to our suggestions and maybe accept the odd one. The First Minister was defending his great Ministers not too long ago; but where are his great Ministers? Where are the strong Ministers? Where's the Minister of Health on this thing? -- (Interjection) -- He's at a funeral? Well, he'll probably be leading the funeral of the Conservative Party if he doesn't do something on this.

Where's the Deputy Minister of Health? Isn't that the reason why we have deputy Ministers? Where's the Minister of Education? He was here awhile ago. He's not interested in this at all. Where's my one-and-a-half Minister? Where's he? He's not here either. It seems that we spent an awful time last year discussing the raise of the members of this House but when you're discussing something as important as Medicare they're all gambling on the leadership convention. Well, this is finished now. Why doesn't the Minister of Health stay? Maybe we can tell him what happened at this convention. Why isn't he here?

Mr. Speaker, certain resolutions seem to lend themselves quite nicely to the playing of partisan politics. When the resolutions are less important, less vital to the people, we might be excused at times to bring in the partisan aspect in the debate, but when we're dealing with welfare, the health and maybe the lives of the people of Manitoba, I think that it is quite regrettable to bring in partisan politics in such debates. I think the positions of the three different parties - or four parties - has been made quite clear on this question of Medicare. For instance, the members on this side, the Members of the Liberal Party, have always stated that they wish a voluntary plan and that they would go to a compulsory plan only if and when it was the only way, and we still feel, in all fairness and all justice, we feel that this is not the right way to bring a plan. We're not hiding behind anybody on this, we're not defending Ottawa in this at all; but, we are saying in view of the increases in doctors' fees -- and what is that? -- maybe up to 45% increases in some cases -- these increases brought about because this government insisted on passing Bill 68 last year and also because the people, the citizens of this province must also share in paying taxes for the financing of this plan. Therefore we say that we must have some Medicare plan for the people of Manitoba, for our citizens.

At first when I read the amendment of the New Democratic Party, I was inclined to think that this maybe was an amendment that was going to introduce partisan politics in the debate. But after listening to the speeches, especially the speech of the Leader of the NDP, I now choose to believe that this was only a way, another way to give them an opportunity to put more force, to insist that the government take another look, and look at this all-important question of Medicare. And if this is the reason, I certainly don't agree with the resolution, which seemed to be strictly political as I said and we might as well deal with this right now and inform the members of the NDP and especially the Member from St. John's who introduced this resolution, that we will not vote in favour of this resolution at all. They know where we stand on this and we will not waste time discussing this. But if, and as I said, I choose to believe that this is the main reason, because after all the members of the NDP New Democratic Party voted for Bill 68 last year and I don't think they're serious in wanting us to vote in favour of this resolution; they know there isn't a chance in the world that it will pass. But, I'm sure that they will back us in our original resolution, and as I say if they want to use any methods to try to remind, have more time to remind the government of the duty that the government has, well I'll go along with this.

Yesterday the Premier of this Province said that the new national leader of the Liberals, and the future Prime Minister of Canada, will be judged by the way he accepts the advice that he receives from us - meaning from the Provincial Government. Am I right in quoting these words - at least the meaning of it?

MR. WEIR: Part of it.

MR. DESJARDINS: What part is right?

MR. WEIR: That's part of what I said.

MR. DESJARDINS: It's part of what you said. I can read it all -- (Interjection) -- Beg pardon.

MR. WEIR: I said it accepts some and rejects some.

MR. DESJARDINS: Oh I didn't see that in Hansard. All right.

Well I say that the First Minister, the new First Minister of this Province has the same responsibility. I say that he has to listen once in a while to some of the things that are said in this House and I suggest that he should call a caucus and slap some of his Cabinet members on the wrist and ask them to come back in the House once in a while and look a little more interested and take -- there's three Ministers, and a total there - one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight, nine, ten - ten members out of 30. Excuse me, there's two Ministers coming back. This will be a little better. -- (Interjection) -- I'm making my speech, and then you can -- I wish you'd stand up after it. Because you've been hiding under your desk. You're afraid to take part in this debate. You're afraid to take part in this debate because it goes against everything that you ever said before.

HON. J. B. CARROLL (Minister of Welfare) (The Pas): Hogwash.

MR. DESJARDINS: Hogwash?

MR. CARROLL: Hogwash.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, let's remember what he said to the citizens of Manitoba when he tried to discuss Medicare. "hogwash". This is the Minister of Welfare. This is the brave Minister of Welfare, that's talking about hogwash when we're trying to bring in a plan to take care of the health of the people of Manitoba. This is the man. Last year he was all for voting for Bill 68. So was the Attorney-General; so was the Minister of Health and the assistant to the assistant Minister of Health, the Minister of Education. They were all in favour last year. You remember, Mr. Speaker, I suggested that we wait, we wait before passing this Act. But oh, no, this was fine. And all of a sudden, no - we're back-tracking. Well, we thought that all the other provinces were going to do this. This is what I like - leadership. Leadership like we're showing right now! So then we send a telegram to the - this is the first part of the telegram sent by this government: "Manitoba would defer participating in the Medicare scheme under Medical Care Act for at least one year beyond July 1, 1968. It is our hope that changes and amendments will be made during the next year to the formula which your government propose." When this telegram was sent there was no question of maybe the government will change their mind. Then in this leadership campaign - well Mr. Sharp and certain people said certain things. Well, now this was the main thing. The Premier of the province had a reason now because Sharp might be elected the First Minister and he was going to change all that. This is what he said. This is what he said. We always insisted that we're going to press the government of Canada as much as we can to change this. We're talking about changes. In the meantime does that mean we should just quit and drop dead? This is what they're asking us to do. Never mind taking care of the health. This is hogwash, the Minister of Welfare said; hogwash when you try to give help to the people of Manitoba. Let's wait until next year. Well, all right.

I was in Ottawa for a couple of days and I talked to some of these members before the -- (Interjection) -- What was that? Your words are so precious I'll give you a chance to speak. Go ahead.

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Education) (Gimli): Well, give us the line up.

MR. DESJARDINS: All right. I'll give you the line up. First of all we got rid of Judy. Judy came here and she says I will not work under this Minister. Just like another lady Minister in this Cabinet said I will not work under that so-and-so, the letter starts -- but she's still here and I hope Judy leaves. It's all right. I'm out of order but this is -- (Interjection) -- Maybe you should get her in here too; we'd have a little fun.

MR. SPEAKER: I'm enjoying it too but I believe we should stay within the rules of the House if the honourable gentleman. . .

MR. DESJARDINS: They told me to give them the line up. All right. I'll stick to the leaders.

MR. JOHNSON: Give us the left wing and the right wing.

MR. DESJARDINS: Right and left wing? We'll start by your left wing and right wing. On the left wing, there's Dr. Johnson, there's the Minister of Welfare, the Minister of Health. They were going to stick together. They were the left wing of the Conservative Party; they wanted more action, more welfare, more of these things. What are they doing now? What are they doing now when somebody else is speaking? Yap, yap, yap! But when it's time to talk, why don't they get up and speak. When I sit down, get up and tell me why you changed your mind. Will you? Give me one of those "By gum" speeches right after this.

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd.) . . . . How about that? Okay? And in the meantime, send this guy - he must be back from the funeral - I want to hear from the Minister of Health too.

MR. SPEAKER: I think we might respect the fact that the Honourable Minister of Health is at a funeral.

MR. DESJARDINS: All right. This is not -- all right. This Minister here can maybe get up and tell us all about it instead of hiding behind his desk, you know.

Then that was the left wing, George - I mean, Mr. Minister - this was the left. Then we have the other one that - well they couldn't turn their back on Duff. Duff was backing them. That was the Attorney-General, and the Minister that said that she wouldn't work under the Minister but still is here - that one - and then there was another one. Oh one that's gunning for the Premier's job right now, the Minister of Mines and - not Mines and Natural Resources, - he can't open his mouth - but the other one, the Minister of Industry and Commerce. They were in the middle. We're not going to spend any more money but we will not turn our backs on any work of the Roblin Government. They, by rights, should vote for this also. I can understand the First Minister, this is how he got in. I can understand he had assistance from the now Minister-and-a-half, I call him one-and-a-half, the one that's got all these jobs; then the Minister of Labour, they were all in cahoots for that. And of course the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, if he didn't get his just reward. Was that - you didn't speak about him when you were talking about these political favours? Oh but that's another story.

But anyway these are three groups. Well, we're 30. Mr. Minister of Education, there's 30 members on this side - 26, 27 here. If your group of left-wingers come with us we've got them beat; so why don't you come? Some of those backbenchers they can't move. You know this talk, this Ministry either of Agriculture or Highways, you know why they're re-assessing? They want to wait till this Medicare thing is passed. This is what is held over their heads. They can't move. But you! What can he give you? What else can you get? You've got the most important department of all so why don't you come in and tell us about this. And the Minister of Welfare too. You will? That's a promise, Mr. Speaker, he's speaking next. This is what he said.

Now, for the First Minister -- the future or the next Prime Minister of Canada stated very, very clearly that he feels that we've gone far enough on these compulsory plans. I agree with him and I'm sure you do. But he also stated clearly that this plan is here and it will start operating on July 1st. Now I ask you. Don't gamble any more. Don't gamble. This election is past. Mr. Trudeau is there now and he will not change anything -- I assure you. And listen to this side of the House. Keep on fighting for what you believe but don't punish and penalize the people of Manitoba. And if you have some reasons, get up. Get your Minister of Health, your former Minister of Health, your Minister of Welfare, get him up and at least defend your actions. Gosh, they're paid enough for this. This is an important thing which we're discussing here. It's not fair that they should not take part in any debate. What do we hear? In due course we'll have an announcement. Nonsense, in due course? We want to hear what you're going to do for the people of Manitoba and this is the time to do it. You have a Minister of Health, you have an assistant, you have his helpers out there; get them up on their feet. Maybe we'll learn, maybe we'll see the real reason; but in the meantime with this high cost of premiums we cannot afford to stay out. Try to better the plan. We'll help you 100%. We'll do everything we can in Ottawa. We're a little closer. -- (Interjection) -- Beg pardon? He's so afraid that he's going to lose all his NDP seats next Federal election. Come on in, the water's fine. Come on this side and see. No, we'll do everything we can to help you to improve these things. But in the meantime, I say this is serious. The Leader of the NDP Party brought in a very good example and there are many more like that, at certain times way even worse than this. People that are living on a pension, a small pension, school teachers, widowed school teachers, I know one that is paying to stay in this guest house, whatever you call it, there's no place anywhere else, they can't even get any Medicare. Probably be forced to get out of there and the government will have to take over, spend all this money, will have to take over and pay either at one of these old folks' homes, or so on because we cannot give her help, we cannot guarantee that she will get Medicare.

Now you've made your point. You're going to be just as strong when you go to Ottawa and say this is what we want. And other provinces too. But you don't have to be - your pride will not be hurt if you say "All right", on second thought, and after we wanted to show,

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd.) . . . . we wanted to bring this point out. Now we feel that the important thing, the important thing is not the concern of the Liberals or the New Democratic Party - the people of Manitoba. And you tell me what protection these people have for this year - this year doesn't look like much. You say for at least this year, maybe further. Tell me about the protection. Are you taking care of - have you a plan that will protect these people for the time being? Get up. Get the Minister of Health to get up and tell us what's going to happen at the end of June when the MMS disappears. Who is going to take over? Get up and tell us why you passed Bill 68; you form this Board, you're paying the Chairman \$22,000 and five others \$3,000.00. Get up and tell us these things. Then we'll be able to represent and discuss certain things that are important to the people of Manitoba. I think that it is high time and it is a disgrace to see these Cabinet Ministers hiding behind their desk and the odd word here and there when they have a chance, to get up and when - I'm going to sit down in a minute and I hope that one of them is man enough to stand up and say why we're not going to have Medicare and how we're going to protect the people of Manitoba.

HON. J. B. CARROLL (Minister of Welfare)(The Pas) I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Labour that debate be adjourned.

MR. SPEAKER: I didn't get your seconder.

MR. CARROLL: Minister of Labour.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Gladstone. The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Logan unfortunately was called because of illness to go to the Province of British Columbia, and he was holding this in my name or for me in any case, and therefore I'm prepared to proceed at this time. I realize how difficult it is to follow after such a bombastic contribution to Medicare delivered by the man that I have the honour of representing in this House and --(Interjection)--Pardon? Yes I have him where he wants me but he's often expressed a desire really to have me where he wants me, and unless I can enjoin my honourable friend the Minister of Welfare to improve benefits for funeral allowances I doubt whether my friend will really get me. --(Interjection)--Yes that's so true.

However, Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the proposition of the Honourable Member for Gladstone, which calls for a review of the application of the sales tax imposed upon the people of Manitoba by this government. At the last session when the Revenue Tax Act was introduced, our party opposed the implementation of a Sales Tax on Manitobans, because of the fact that it is not based in any way, shape or form on ability to pay. And if you recall at that time, Mr. Speaker, we had at one time during the debate, an alternative to the 5% sales tax that was proposed by the Liberal Party; and at that time their alternative to the 5% sales tax was a 3% sales tax, and of course, we rejected that forthrightly because it doesn't really matter does it, Mr. Speaker, whether it's a 3 or a 5 percent sales tax. If the foundation isn't a proper one, the amount above the foundation really doesn't matter.

And since that time, since that time the adverse affects of the sales tax on Manitobans has become more and more evident. It's not only reached into the coffers of those that are on normal incomes, it's reached now into many, who because of the facts of life, are finding themselves in some of our elderly citizens homes, and our hostels and it's adversely affecting many of them. I've had just recently a number of letters from people who are in our old folks homes, whose monthly rates have gone up \$5. \$7.50, \$10.00, and the reason expressed by the managers of some of these elderly citizens homes is because of the imposition, in part at least, of the 5% sales tax which results in increased costs of operation in our elderly citizens homes. We have tried from time to time to get the Honourable Minister of Welfare to take this point under consideration, increase the allowances, to take up some of the added burdens placed on these people without avail.

It seems to me that the government are just as concerned or more concerned with headlines in papers, "tax line held," than they are considering the people who count. The Minister of Mines and Natural Resources as I referred to the other day, in his opening epistle headlined it "people count", which of course, is not the case insofar as the government is concerned. People do not count in my opinion in the opinion of the government. So I say that it is time that we had a review of the imposition of the application of the sales tax. We said last year, and I repeat again today, that children's clothing, children's shoes, are subjected to added tax.

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.)... A relatively low income family for shoes for their children, get the shoes tax exempt, but if they want a new sole put on their shoes, they have to pay a tax imposed by the government. If they had the wherewithal it would be far cheaper of course for them not to have new soles put on their shoes but rather throw them away into the garbage. Maybe the Honourable Minister of the Treasury considered all of this and wanted to help out some of the manufacturers of soles for shoes instead of looking after the souls for people.

But there is another area, there is another area that I think it's time for a review insofar as sales tax is concerned. My honourable friends opposite claim despite the fact that they have a two time Minister of Agriculture, they claim that they have grave concern for the agricultural industry of Manitoba; but I wonder how many of my honourable friends opposite know of some points of the application of the 5% sales tax in agriculture. I wonder if my honourable friend the Member for Fisher knows that if in his agricultural, although he is not an agricultural - as far as his occupation is concerned, but I wonder if he knew that if his farm was operated by a tractor, that tractor would be exempt from the 5% sales tax, but if he bought a horse at an auction sale, to do the work -- (Interjection) -- no, well you are one of the more affluent farmers I admit - but if he was the type of a farmer and did use horses for the historic use of horses in agriculture, he would have to contribute an additional 5% to the coffers of the Provincial Treasury because he wasn't wealthy enough to buy a tractor.

My honourable friend from Rock Lake shakes his head. I wonder if he would like to read the epistle No -- Oh, it's not an epistle -- it's called The Farmer's Letter No. 10 regarding the application of the 5% sales tax to farmers. I think if my honourable friend would take a look at this he'd realize that I am correct.

I wonder if my honourable friend realizes under the application of the 5% sales tax of Manitoba that a garage behind a house is tax exempt from the imposition of the 5% sales tax, but if it was a barn sold by an auctioneer even if it's going to stay there, the farmer pays 5%. This is the type of imposition that we are getting from a so-called farmers' government in Manitoba. I wonder how many of my friends really know how the 5% sales tax is being applied in many instances in the agricultural industry in Manitoba. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, the members opposite, particularly the farmers -- and I'm sure that they are all itching to get out on the land, and do their harrowing, and what have you -- I think though before they go, it would be well for them to support the resolution calling for the review as suggested by my friend from Gladstone and they will know then, they will know the imposition placed upon the agricultural industry by the so-called rural government of Manitoba.

You know Mr. Speaker, basically I really don't think that the honourable members beyond the front row and one or two odd seats in the second row, really know of the policies adopted by the government. I know they are all busy fellows; the Honourable lady member for Cypress too is a very busy lady. I doubt if they really have time or have taken the time to investigate into the inner policies of the Conservative Government in Manitoba. I suggest, I suggest Mr. Speaker, that if they would only support this type of a resolution, that they would then go into a committee, we would be able to get the officials of the department to come forward and explain and inform us and then my honourable friends opposite would come to the realization as I have done by reading this letter No. 10 - a tractor exempt, a horse taxable. The horse's harness however - and I must say and confess Mr. Speaker, as far as the horse's harness is concerned, we don't have to pay tax on that, but we do, as I read this, on the horse.

So I suggest to my honourable friends opposite, that they should support this resolution. I don't expect the front bench to, really Mr. Speaker, because I think they are in living fear, I think they are really in living fear of expose, but I would suggest to my honourable friends in the back row, that they consider the implication of the resolution before us, add support to it, allow the committee concerned outside of the House to have the experts appear before them, so that we can have an investigation into all aspects of the 5% sales tax which is hurting, hurting the economy of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. BARKMAN: I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Assiniboia that debate be adjourned.

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

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

MR. STANES: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Provincial Treasurer is unavoidably out of

(MR. STANES cont'd.) . . . . the House and I'm afraid the rules will have to take care of it.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I could make my usual small contribution; or perhaps, Mr. Speaker, I could speak on behalf of the Provincial Treasurer, because he has lost his right I believe now to speak.

Now I believe that this resolution that is on the Order Paper here has appeared on every Order Paper since I was elected in 1958. I think it has. If not, it certainly has appeared 8 or 9 of the years and the government keep turning it down year after year. I don't know what new points can be raised. I imagine that most of the Members in this House has checked in the Library to get the annual report of the Federal Auditor-General, and if they have, they certainly have found that the Auditor-General at the Federal level has revealed some very surprising, startling and amazing figures and points of interest. I mentioned this one at the provincial level, back in 1966. In fact, I asked a question of the Ministry, a written question of the Ministry in regard to some hay that was purchased by the government totalling \$7,510.00. Now there is an advantage, Mr. Speaker, as you know of asking written questions, because the answers are given in the journals. So the questions and the answers appear on page 50 of the Journals of 1966 and I simply asked these questions: Did the Grand Rapids Forebay Committee authorize the purchase of hay to feed in the Moose Lake area during the 1965-66 winter? If so, what quantity of hay was purchased for this purpose. Is this quantity sufficient for the season or will more be required. From who was the hay purchased. By what method or methods was the hay transported from supplier to the final destination. What was the total cost and how many horses are being fed under this program?

These are the kinds of questions that the Auditor-General is being asked and the answers that he supplies to the Federal House. I was prompted to put this question to the Ministry back in 1966 as a result of a newspaper story that said "Moose Lake horses puts bite on taxpayer" and I learned, not only from the advance newspaper report but from the answers given to me by the Ministry, that they bought 100 tons of hay - 170 tons of hay, excuse me - 170 tons of hay costing \$7,510 to feed 74 horses, or it cost more than \$100 a piece to feed the horses for the winter. Well you could have bought the horses for less than that. There's no argument about it. Because what happened, Mr. Speaker, and you know very well yourself, when they put in the dam at Grand Rapids it flooded all that area there and then the Indians and their ponies had to be removed to Easterville I think it was. And so the flooding of the area there stopped the Indians from putting up their usual winter supply of hay and the government said, "Well we're responsible; we'll buy you hay to feed the Indian ponies." And they bought hay all right; they bought 170 tons of it at a cost of \$7,510 to feed 74 Indian ponies. Now someone might say: Well, they could have bought how many skidoos with \$7,510 and the Indians would have been -- they're tickled to death to have skidoos in place of the Indian ponies.

These are the kinds of things and these are the reasons that we need an Auditor-General. We spent days and weeks and months, I guess, in this House in the ten years that I've been here trying to get answers from the government on the Bain Estate, for instance - and some of the questions and answers we question yet - the Bain Estate, the Centennial Centre, and I don't know how many other things, and we spend days and weeks and months on trying to get these kind of answers. Surely these would all come out in the Auditor-General's Report, would they not? This is what I would think an Auditor-General should do. --(Interjection)-- They don't want them to come out, someone said. Well, an Auditor-General -- I don't know what the cost of it would be, but if we in this Assembly could save weeks and months of our time, 57 members, surely it's worth some consideration to appoint an Auditor-General to supply us with the kind of information that we ask for nearly daily in this House.

The Honourable Provincial Treasurer told us last night when he presented the budget - and he mentioned the word "restraint" time and time again in the budget - but he did say that they only hired 214 new civil servants last year and they hired 733 the year before, and gee, I question whether our population increased that much. But it does point up that government is growing daily - it's growing daily. In this famous little booklet that was put out by Mr. Greene, the Minister of Agriculture in Ottawa - didn't get too far in the leadership race but he did put out a good little booklet here - and he points out how governments grow and grow and grow, and he says that in two departments alone that have been created since 1960 they have now employed something like 4,000 new employees - two brand new departments. The Provincial Treasurer last night in making apologies more or less for hiring 214 new employees said, "Well,

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd.).... with the introduction of the new revenue tax, it was necessary to take on some new staff." No doubt about it there was, and I hope that someone in replying to this resolution that's before us will tell us the number of new employees that were required.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I don't intend to speak at any great length on this resolution because we've been asking for an Auditor-General for ten years at least. We haven't got one. We need it worse now than we ever did and I look forward to some of the backbenchers at least supporting the resolution this time.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Lakeside, that the debate be adjourned.

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

..... Continued on next page.

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

MR. STANES: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Minister is still absent from the House -- unavoidably, I'm afraid.

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

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this motion by my honourable colleague.

I think if you look back over the last twenty-odd years one will recall that it wasn't really until the late 1940s that the United States had what you might call television on a mass scale and it wasn't until the early 1950s that Canada was in the same position. It was also I think around the early 1950s that the use of television became involved with politics and I think we can all recall some of the more famous happenings on television, particularly the political conventions in the United States and also the Senate hearings which became watched by millions of viewers.

For example, around 1953 or 1954 the very famous McCarthy Army hearings were shown on television and this occupied the attention of the American public for weeks on end. The Kefauver Crime Investigations too were extremely popular. The United Nations which have a fairly strong public following, I would suggest, is partly due to the use of television, and not only do they televise general proceedings of the United Nations which might be considered to take place in the General Assembly but they also show the most intimate of discussions which go on in the Security Council. Of course there are things that they don't show such as private conversations and pressuring, etc., but in the formal parts of the deliberative processes they do show them on television.

In Canada, if we look at the use of television in public affairs, we have some fairly well-developed public affairs shows. Outside this Chamber there are interviews taking place almost every day on radio and television and I think some of the most interesting uses of television have taken place only in the past year. For example, for the first time, I suppose, we had what might be considered to be a big popular American-style convention on television. I think this started in particular with the Conservative Convention won by Robert Stanfield, or as my colleague suggests, the New Democrats in 1961 also, I recall that as well, had big coverage on television.

But if you look at public interest in the political conventions, I think they've skyrocketed within the past year. The Conservative Convention, now followed by the Liberal Convention, have aroused a great deal of interest on the part of the general public and I attribute this largely to the influence of television. Similarly, we had constitutional conferences which were carried during the daytime for a number of days in the past six months starting in November and then again in February, and I think these, too, aroused a great deal of interest on the part of the public.

If we look at this Chamber itself, these deliberations and these debates are not private. We have first of all a public gallery with varying numbers involved there, from last night full to I guess this afternoon with a sprinkling of citizens. The press is always present and they are, I suppose, the pipeline to the general public. Radio and television though are involved as well. As I said, as soon as one steps outside the Chamber these interviews and news broadcasts and so on are being made directly from this building. So the question is why not radio and television in the Chamber?

I suppose the people who are concerned about tradition or perhaps abuse or disadvantages might bring up certain arguments and I want to run over some of them. They might say that the whole process is rather boring - and I suppose there's an element of truth in that - but I hardly think that we would get five or six hours of television coverage every day. I think it's obvious that proceedings would be televised or recorded for radio and that there would be selected and selective editing. This too, of course, may cause some concern on the part of members as to showing particular biases, but this is done in the press. The press also uses its discrimination and reporters decide what they will use and what they will play up. Similarly, the television and radio people who are just as responsible and just as capable will I think do the same.

One thing that might be considered to be harmful, which perhaps is a reason for our present rule, is the political use of photographs either to show that a member is not present and not active in campaign literature; or, on the other hand, that a member is present and is active when that may not be the case. This is an area which perhaps could be laid down in some sort of general rule. Perhaps this is an area where the Speaker, who seems to by tradition

(MR. DOERN cont'd.) . . . . have authority as to the use or non-use of photographs, might have some discretionary powers.

Another consideration is that perhaps members will turn into TV stars and will start hamming it up for television cameras. That too is possible, but I might point out that some members ham it up now and some members go through great histrionic displays. We saw some this afternoon as an example, and this is always a danger, but I think that over a period -- (Interjection) -- In fact as my colleague says, it may be a virtue. Perhaps this is what is needed. But in any case, I think that it will be going on for weeks and hours and so on and that members never know when they are being listened to or they will not know also when they are being televised.

Just briefly, the use of television is relatively a new medium. Those of us who have tried to understand Marshall McLuhan, who I think is incomprehensible, his discussions about the medium is the message and the TV the global village and so on -- very hard to understand. I think some members may have a fear which may simply be a fear of the unknown. It may simply be an unfamiliarity; a number of inarticulated fears.

In short, I would say that television in particular, and radio secondarily, are relatively new. Radio has a much longer history but these are the new technologies. They are being used to cover political conventions; they are being used to interview members; we have news broadcasts and so on; we have new arrangements taking place. Years ago we had in theatres Newsreels; these are now gone. Television news has taken over in this particular area. I don't think the press is ever going to be wiped out or eliminated - the writing members of the press. This has not been the case. Radio has not died in the face of television, and I think that bringing in the new technology is a step in the right direction.

The main reason I say this is that I think it might create interest. This is the main premise of my argument, that I think one of the important things is for the public to take an interest in political affairs, in public affairs. I don't think enough of the public do and I think that the live use of radio and television might stimulate more public interest in public affairs and in political affairs, and I see this as an unqualified good thing. The least that I would say on this question, and the final thing that I would say, is that if members are afraid, if any are afraid of the use of these newer mediums, then it could be tried on a trial basis. There is talk of this in Ottawa. I think there's talk of this in Great Britain and so on. Those who are opposed could at least be willing to have this done on an experimental basis, maybe during so many weeks of the Session or during one Session. After that time, I think members would get accustomed to the idea and I think the public would like it, so I urge members to support this resolution.

MR. SPEAKER : Are you ready for the question?

MR. EARL DAWSON (Hamiota): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Member from Emerson, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder if I might point out to the honourable members that on Page 4, Item No. 5, the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Inkster completely escaped my sight, and I wondered if the House by leave would go back there in order to deal with that or shall we continue as we are.

MR. FOX: Mr. Speaker, I believe I stood the motion in the absence of the member and I suggested if anyone wished to speak on it they could go ahead, and that's the way you accepted it.

MR. SPEAKER: . . . put forward to me before I misconstrue it again. I apologize to the House.

We will move on to the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Portage and the proposed motion of the Honourable the Member for Inkster in amendment thereto, standing in my name. The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, for reasons already stated, I ask for leave of the House to withdraw the amendment which I proposed.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Honourable Member have leave to withdraw? -- Agreed. The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. PHILIP PETURRSON (Wellington): Mr. Speaker, I would move, seconded by the Member for Elmwood, that this particular motion be amended in this particular form: by (a) eliminating the 1st, 2nd, 4th, 5th and 6th paragraphs thereof and adding after the 3rd paragraph

(MR. PETURRSON cont'd.) . . . . thereof the following: "Whereas many of the publications of this branch are in the nature of political propaganda - (in the copy the word is misspelled, but it can be corrected) - as distinct from the necessary dissemination of governmental information. Therefore Be It Resolved that the government be censured for misusing the administration of the branch to further the political interest of the Progressive Conservative Party.

MR. SPEAKER: I believe in what has gone before that I would ask the indulgence of the House. I'll take this matter under advisement and rule on it again.

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

MR. STANES: In the absence of the honourable member out of town, may I have permission to have this matter stand. And the next one, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: And the next one too. The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Gladstone,

Whereas alcohol is a positive factor in more than 50 percent of fatal traffic accidents in Canada; and

Whereas alcohol is one factor which is a major contributor to traffic accidents generally; and

Whereas programs of education have not proved effective in the cases of persons who drink and then drive; and

Whereas the use of breathalyzers has proved effective in reducing the frequency of motor vehicle accidents in other jurisdictions where breathalyzer tests are compulsory;

Therefore Be It Resolved that the requisite legislation be enacted enabling the law enforcement agencies to require drivers, who are believed on reasonable and probable grounds to be under the influence of alcohol, to submit to a breathalyzer test.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I was glad to see that a considerable amount of interest was shown in breathalyzers when the Honourable Minister of Public Utilities had his estimates before the House. I know quite a few members on that occasion took an opportunity to speak under the Motor Vehicle Branch and their remarks were almost restricted completely to breathalyzers, and I was glad to see that the members were interested in this type of legislation.

I was somewhat surprised and could not agree with the Honourable Minister of Public Utilities when he said that his own personal feeling was that there would be many hardships that would be worked by a breathalyzer, because any time you see a mechanical device to say whether or not someone is guilty of an offence, you run the very great risk that there will be those who, because of their physical make-up, will push the needle up and it may not work. Well, all the information that I was able to find and read on, I understand that breathalyzers are very accurate and have worked extremely well in other jurisdictions.

I know that the Honourable Minister had made other remarks that he thought it would certainly play a very great hardship on many people who would be tested by breathalyzers and would have to pay the penalty. Again, if there is people who are charged with impaired or drunken driving, I don't feel that this House should be concerned about the penalty that's going to be imposed on these people.

I would just like to make a reference to one accident that I'm personally knowledgeable of, and I know many people from the legal profession or the lawyers know this gentleman quite well, and that's Tony Draper from St. James who was in the law firm of Morrison and Draper. A year and a half ago he was involved in an accident around MacGregor. This gentleman was only in his late twenties or early thirties, just married, and was called to the Bar, and I'm sure it must have cost him or the province for all his education anywhere in the neighborhood of probably \$50,000. This gentleman did have his Bachelor of Science degree. He taught school for a couple of years and then took Law. He was involved in this accident at MacGregor and was killed and left a wife behind. The other party that was involved in the accident, he happened to be drinking at MacGregor almost all of the afternoon. He was charged, I believe, with criminal negligence and driving while intoxicated, and he received 30 days in jail. You can use examples of this type many many times, so I feel that there is certainly reason for this House to consider that breathalyzers may not stop all the accidents or may not stop the people from drinking, but I think that certainly breathalyzers would be a deterrent just like

(MR. PATRICK cont'd.) . . . . we have radar on the highways today. I know many members, probably even in here, they probably press on the gas just a little too heavy and when they see the speedometer at 75 or 80 and notice a sign on the highway that speed is controlled by radar, naturally they slow down quite quickly, and I feel that the same thing would apply in breathalyzers.

Mr. Speaker, we have come to accept road traffic as a normal condition of our life. The car itself is a blessing and not an evil, but automobile accidents kill more Canadians than anything else, more than disease, more than all other accidents put together, because last year for 1967 in Canada we had somewhere in the neighborhood of 5,393 accidents and in Manitoba the figure was 202. I feel if we care for the safety of our families and care for the safety of our citizens who use streets and highways, I feel this House must be concerned about the slaughter and destruction that is caused by drivers who are impaired and drunk and drive on the highways, and perhaps I think this House should consider introducing breathalyzer tests in our province.

I know that the automobile has revolutionized the economy of our country. I think it is a source of delight to many people, but it is also a killer and a maimer and a destroyer of property.

Mr. Speaker, the question of increasing numbers of impaired and drunk drivers has received a great deal of attention lately and many people believe it is time for action and for stiffer penalties. One of the main reasons for breathalyzer testing stems from the danger of impaired motorists on the highways. They constitute a greater hazard to other people than they do to themselves. More and more accidents are being blamed on drinking drivers and the figures keep climbing because population of cities and numbers of cars are also climbing on our highways today. Mr. Speaker, there must be a measure of control put on the drivers or motoring public and there must be a deterrent, and I feel that this deterrent is testing of the drivers and using the breathalyzer.

In Metro Winnipeg in 1967 we had 12,611 accidents. We had 4,028 injuries and 43 fatalities in Metro Winnipeg. I know breathalyzers are being used in many provinces in Canada now - British Columbia, Alberta, Saskatchewan, Ontario and the Maritime Provinces - and also in Great Britain, just I believe quite recently as of last fall.

Most of the western world has accepted the need for legislation which sets a maximum level of alcohol above which the accident liability is unacceptable to society. I know in England this level was set at .08 percent while Australia is .05. I understand the Federal Government in its legislation were proposing a higher percentage and I know there was some complaint about that, because 0.1 which was proposed by the Minister of Justice in Ottawa, is equivalent I believe to seven bottles of beer or six or seven ounces of liquor, which I believe is probably enough to get many people drunk and I would agree is probably much too high.

Mr. Speaker, since the breathalyzer was introduced in Great Britain, the drop in road accidents has out-paced all predictions. At first the Ministry of Transport officials were cautious about how much influence the legislation had on the improvement in the accident situation, but now the evidence is so striking and the government is satisfied that the new law is the principal reason for the striking improvement. If the trend continues in the reduction of road fatalities in England, it is estimated that at least 1,000 lives will be saved, and I think it's remarkable if it is because of the use of breathalyzers.

Mr. Speaker, I know there are arguments against the use of breathalyzers such as personal rights and infringements, but in my resolution I pointed out that the breathalyzer would not be used in stopping all the people coming out of a hotel or a bar; there would have to be reason to stop the people and take the test.

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to quote some of the accidents that happened in the City of Winnipeg just in the last year. Beginning January 20, 1968, two cars met in a head-on collision. Six people died; five in one car and the driver of the other. After hearing testimony that the driver of the single occupant car was drunk, the coroner's jury brought in the following recommendation: "We find that under the present Manitoba highway traffic legislation and federal legislation on impaired or drunken driving, that the freedom for the majority to drive while impaired is jeopardizing the lives and safety to the public. We recommend the Province of Manitoba proceed without delay to institute breathalyzer tests on meaningful and safe levels of blood alcohol content."

On Christmas eve, 1966, four St. Boniface sisters crossing Provencher Ave. at St. Jean

(MR. PATRICK cont'd.) . . . . Baptiste Street were struck by a car. Three of the four were injured, two seriously. The two seriously injured died in St. Boniface hospital, one immediately following the accident, the other a short time later. Subsequently in court, the driver of the car admitted to drinking four to six bottles of beer before the accident.

January 8, 1967, two cars collided head-on on Highway 75 near Ste. Agathe killing two people. At the inquest, Dr. L. S. McMorris, Pathologist at Winnipeg General Hospital, testified that the alcohol level in the blood of one of the drivers was 151 milligrams, consistent with the consumption of at least six bottles of beer.

On March 24th, an 18 year old youth returning to his home at Warren following a party fell asleep at the wheel of his car and was involved in an accident which cost two lives.

On March 26th, in a one car accident on McPhillips, a nine year old girl was killed and the driver paralyzed from the waist down. Drinking was involved.

On May 13th, a car went out of control at the corner of Grosvenor Avenue and Guelph Street hitting a tree. There were two passengers in the car; one was killed, the other injured. Dr. Peter Morrow, pathologist, testified there was alcohol present in the stomach and blood.

On June 24th, a young man was killed as a result of a two car crash at the corner of Grant Avenue and Stafford. Alcohol was involved again.

On July 16th, a serviceman stationed at Fort Osborne Barracks was returning to barracks about 1:40 a. m. when his car went out of control and overturned. He suffered a skull fracture from which he subsequently died. He was intoxicated at the time of the accident.

Mr. Speaker, there's a whole sheet of people who were killed, and I named at least 43 that were involved in the Greater Winnipeg area. All these accidents occurred in the area near Winnipeg and all involved drivers who had been impaired by alcohol, and all brought death to one or more persons. This is not a complete record but this is the result of people drinking and driving. I think that this resolution should be considered in this House.

We know that there is some concern, and I have a report which was introduced to the Attorney-General's office in Ontario when they introduced breathalyzers in that province. "The research at that time showed that a properly performed test can be as accurate as a blood test and it offers many advantages over a blood test.

"(1) A sample can be readily obtained by the police officer whereas a qualified medical practitioner is required to take a blood sample.

"(2) There is no question of assault on the individual in the collection of the breath sample.

"(3) Since a breath sample is taken directly into the analytical equipment, there is far less chance of contamination of the sample and no problem of identification of it.

"(4) There is no problem in proving the continuity of this sample as evidence.

"(5) The result is obtained immediately. This is far the most important advantage of the breath test, and in the final analysis, the most important reason for the choice of the test that has been established in Ontario.

"About how accurate tests are, this precision is within minus or plus a standard error of .003 percent under conditions when the psychological factors have been carefully controlled and there ought to be agreement between breath and blood. Breath testing has proven itself to us to be the only practical method for wide-scale chemical testing in Ontario, and our results show that it is more than sufficiently accurate."

I just want to quote some of the points where some of the members of the House have showed concern that they weren't too sure that they were accurate results. The results of breathalyzers in Ontario. "The breathalyzer has proved itself to be an extremely valuable tool in law enforcement. It provides for the extra evidence that is sometimes necessary in critical cases and it has also proved itself to be a valuable tool in sorting out the sick from the drunk. There are at least many people in Ontario who probably owe their lives to the breathalyzer since these are people who had been arrested for being impaired or drunken drivers, and who in the normal course of events would have been locked in the jail at least overnight. These people, however, were given breath tests and in all cases were found to have no alcohol whatsoever in their system. As a result, they were immediately taken to the closest hospital and were admitted there for various reasons. In all cases, the doctors couldn't say too much about the value of the breathalyzer to those people."

So according to the development of the breathalyzer in Ontario, they are quite sold on it and it has worked quite well.

(MR. PATRICK cont'd.) . . . .

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Greater Winnipeg Safety Council had a questionnaire. Many people filled out the questionnaire and over 90 percent of the people who filled out the questionnaire on breathalyzers were in favour. This was in the Greater Winnipeg -- this questionnaire was sent out by the Greater Winnipeg Safety Council. I know that when Dr. Shulman was speaking to the Safety Council's Annual Traffic Seminar, he stated that 50 percent of all car accidents resulting in fatalities showed the driver was under the influence of alcohol.

Mr. Speaker, in the last while I have had many letters from many organizations and people who feel that this government should consider the breathalyzers and enact legislation for the use of breathalyzers. Again I would like to say that there is concern in many people that it would cause hardship. I would like to disagree with that, because if people are impaired or drunk they have no business driving. -- (Interjection) -- I agree. I had the resolution on voting a few years . . . Mr. Speaker, I feel that it will not be a cure, a complete cure, but certainly it will be a deterrent, and many of the other things that we have been doing in highway safety and so on is also deterrents. Your radar control of speed in the same way is a deterrent, and I feel that breathalyzers would certainly be a deterrent and would go a long way in reducing the fatalities that we have in our province.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: Resolution of the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks. The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I would ask the indulgence of the House to let this matter stand.

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: I would again remind the honourable member of the new rule. -- (Interjection) -- I appreciate the indulgence of the House for this new rule today; we've been struggling through it. I am informed the intent is that the honourable gentleman has moved this resolution, he still can stand it once more as he wishes to speak to it. So if that is his intention, probably he would move that it be . . .

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

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

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

Whereas a revision of the British North America Act has been the subject of recent federal and provincial conferences; and

Whereas the people of Manitoba should be given an opportunity to express their opinion on the social, cultural and economic questions involved in the proposed Canadian Constitution; and

Whereas the Government of Manitoba would benefit from a direct expression of public opinion on these matters;

Therefore Be It Resolved that the Government of Manitoba consider the advisability of establishing a special committee of the Legislature to hear and receive public presentations regarding the Canadian Constitution.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, some of the problems that have been prominently in the news concerning all these constitutional questions really came to the forefront, I think, with the so-called quiet revolution in Quebec in the 1960s and we saw such phenomena as the actions of the FLQ, the rise of the Separatists Party. More recently we have seen national conferences like the Confederation of Tomorrow Conference and the recent Constitutional Conference in February.

In spite of all this, there is a great deal of ignorance on the part of some sections of the public concerning these questions, and I think particularly in the questions regarding the Province of Quebec and the special problems of French-speaking Canadians. For example, in a Gallup Poll of last November, people were asked whether in fact they had heard or read anything about what is called a Two-Nation policy for Canada, and on a national basis 57 percent

(MR. DOERN cont'd.) . . . . said they had and 43 percent said they hadn't. The didn't ask them in that question whether or not they knew what it was or to explain it, simply whether you had heard anything about it or read anything about it, and 43 percent showed little awareness of the question.

I would suggest that national unity is in a sense our number one problem in this country. We saw recently the Constitutional Conference on television and the two views of two leading members of the Province of Quebec. Daniel Johnston, the Leader of the Union Nationale Party, who appears at least to be asking for more rights for his province and his people in a moderate tone, and we saw him represent perhaps the major segment. We saw - and we know that there is a Separatist element, however small - and we also know that Mr. Trudeau who was the Justice Minister at the time represented the strong position of federalism, and in fact was in a direct confrontation with the provincial leader, perhaps the reason for his successful rise to become leader of the Liberal Party. I hope on the grounds that he is a strong person and a good leader, not on the ground that he can either stand up to or put down Quebec, which may have been the motivation for some people supporting him.

We also know that in regard to national unity that we saw the unfortunate interference on the part of General de Gaulle who was a most welcome guest during our centennial celebrations, and then he said that he felt this "wave of liberating passion," to use his words in Quebec. He was carried away, I think, and then began to say such things as "Vive Quebec libre", which proved to be no accident, and he spoke of what might be equivalent to independence for Quebec and talked of a French Atlantic community.

Another big feature concerning this whole question was the Confederation of Tomorrow Conference. As I mentioned once before, I was fortunate in being one of the people who attended this conference. It was an impressive spectacle and I think it was of great value. It may not have accomplished anything in the sense of a concrete platform or a bill or some dramatic resolutions, but I think it was a most useful conference. I think it was a meeting of minds and of personalities and I think it was also useful as a dialogue. It brought out some very interesting positions. For example, the Premier of Newfoundland said it was not of much interest in his province, that bread and butter interests came first. The Premier of Saskatchewan said if there were 100 problems that Saskatchewan had to deal with, this would be the 101st and so on. Our new Premier of course was only just in office a few days and he made some statements there but he did not at that time play a large role in the proceedings of that particular conference.

At this point I wanted to address some remarks to the Member for Wolseley but unfortunately he is not present. It seems to me that the idea behind this resolution and the purpose of it is to in effect have a useful discussion or dialogue with the people of Manitoba and to allow them to come before at least a committee of this Legislature and present their views. I also think it is of value for the members of this Legislature to make some of their views known to the public. And I think for this reason that I for one, and I know there are many others, would like to hear the Member for Wolseley speak on this resolution or on questions of national unity such as they may affect the Province of Manitoba. I think that we have a right to expect this, a right to expect him to speak. I think the people of his constituency have a right to hear him and I think that the people of Manitoba want to hear and are certainly willing to listen to his comments on this whole question. So I hope he doesn't remain silent throughout this Session but that he would feel compelled to participate in some of the debates, and I think this might be a good place to start.

The question might be then what value would this special standing committee or special committee be. For one thing, Mr. Speaker, it would provide information to the Legislature on the views of our various ethnic groups. It would in particular provide information to the government, so that when they are formulating policies, and they are the people charged with representing our province, they I think should know, and they I think should encourage the public and our many organizations, our ethnic groups and other interested groups, to appear and give their feelings, make their opinions known to the government, and of course it would be an opportunity for the public to get some things off their chests perhaps.

I notice that in an article written by Maxwell Cohen taken from the Free Press a few months ago called "Behind Federalism", he felt that the provinces must come prepared with the maximum of technical homework when they go to these conferences and there were indications that some of the provinces were not adequately briefed, especially for deep and detailed

(MR. DOERN cont'd.) . . . . . juridical discussions. There's also talk of establishing permanent standing committees on a federal basis, or on a federal-provincial basis, and so on. I think that Manitoba needs to get in on this, and Manitoba can only do this by being aware of the public views and by encouraging the public to speak out and by educating the public as to some of the issues in question.

Our own Premier, for example, said, when he went to one of these conferences, that he would give fair, realistic and positive consideration to all views on how best to assure our progress as a united country. Well, I take him at his word, but I ask him how he will know what the views are of the people of Manitoba if we don't have this kind of an arrangement.

Mr. Speaker, when we get into the question of bilingualism and biculturalism and that whole area there, I think this is something that is very much misunderstood. I think it's the responsibility of the government to attempt to make plain what the purpose of this expensive commission is - or was. Its main aim was not to make Canadians bilingual but its aim was to make language and education opportunities available to both French and English minorities. There are nine more reports to come, reports on Social Economic Status of Canadians of Different Ethnic Origins; Report on Education and its Relationship with the Official Languages and Different Cultures; the Federal Capitol; Parliament; the Cabinet and the Supreme Court of Canada; Voluntary Associations; the Other Ethnic Groups and Their Contributions to Canadian Culture; The Arts and Letters; the Mass Media; and General Conclusions.

Well, I would like to know what the government is doing. I would like to know what special committee the government has set up, what sections of the civil service, what sections of the government, what parts of the Conservative Party, what plans there are to examine these very extensive and very bulky reports. The B and B Commission suggested that there were four Manitoba census divisions listed in this report having an official language minority equal to 10 percent or more of the population, and if this is going to be made official in the province and if we're going to accept this recommendation, then we're going to have to start thinking about it and I suppose formulating legislation and policies. I see no evidence of this, and if the government has plans underway I think they should let us in on it.

The Federal Government is planning an all-Party committee to study the question of constitutional reform. What about the Manitoba Legislature? I don't think this is a question for Ottawa alone; I think it's a question for us as well. I'm happy to say that my own Party on a federal basis is going to look into this whole question and work on a survey on the social, economic and constitutional reforms called "Operation New Canada." They're going to have workshops and public polls, etc. The result will be a declaration of common objectives which will be the basis of new policies.

So, Mr. Speaker, in short, I think that the government should have, first of all, its own special committee to advise the Premier and to advise the government, experts from the community at large. We have a number of prominent professors in this province who are experts on the Constitution, historians, etc., who could well advise the Premier and his government.

But in addition to this, I think we need this special committee which will hear what the public has to say and will encourage the public to come forward and make presentations. This is being done right now. Our ethnic groups and other groups in the community are making presentations, are making statements, did speak to the B and B Commission, and so on. So why don't we funnel this to a particular area and hear them out?

I also think that another value would be the educational factor, that the government has a responsibility to, in effect, educate the public on these very complicated issues. I can say from some experience of talking to some of the young people and so on you would be agast at some of the opinions held on how Quebec should be handled or how some of these issues should be solved. It's quite shocking that some elements of our community think in a certain way.

So we have a responsibility to make some of these things known to the public and establish a dialogue. And then the other value I think is to know exactly what the public is thinking so that we can take certain action. I hope that the Premier himself may speak on this resolution, or even the former Premier, because I would like to know what their opinions are and also what they plan to do.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. WILLIAM HOMER HAMILTON (Dufferin): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Rock Lake, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. FOX: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Burrows, Whereas the Minimum Wage and its application have been the subject of much discussion, debate and dissension; and

Whereas the existing criteria or terms of reference used by the Minimum Wage Board to determine minimum wages are not in keeping with the objectives of Manitoba for the well-being of its citizens; and

Whereas the cost of living is continually changing and the Minimum Wage Board has no specific guide lines on how often it is to recommend its submission to the Government;

Therefore Be It Resolved that the criteria for establishment of a minimum wage be such as would provide an individual with an income sufficient to meet normal living conditions consistent with the standard of shelter, food, health, education, recreation, and such other amenities of life as are considered basic to the enjoyment of life in Manitoba; and

Be It Further Resolved that the Board be required to report when conditions require but no less than annually as to its recommendations to the government.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. PAULLEY: I wonder, in all deference to my honourable colleague for Kildonan having introduced the resolution at this particular time, 25 past 5, you, Your Honour, may call it 5:30 so that his trend of thought will not be broken when next we meet.

MR. SPEAKER: I thank the honourable gentleman for his opinion. Is it the feeling of the House that I should call it 5:30? — Agreed. It is now 5:30 and I am leaving the Chair to return again at 8:00 o'clock tonight.