

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Tuesday, April 29, 1969

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

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

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: I'd like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery and introduce our young visitors. We have 22 students of Grade 11 standing, from the Pine Falls Collegiate. These students are under the direction of Mr. Gervais and Mrs. C. R. Cook. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet.

We also have with us today 20 students of Grades 9 and 10 standing, from the Ross L. Gray School of Sprague, Manitoba. These students are under the direction of Mr. Hovorka. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Emerson.

We have 33 students of Grade 11 standing of the St. Mary's Academy. These students are under the direction of Mrs. Grier. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable the Minister of Finance.

We also have with us today 25 students of Grade 10 standing, of the Nelson McIntyre School. These students are under the direction of Mr. McPherson. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable the Minister of Youth and Education.

We have 40 students of Grade 9 standing, from the Pilot Mound School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Duncan and Mr. Kerr. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

On behalf of all the honourable members of the Legislative Assembly, I welcome you all here today.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

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

MR. PETER FOX (Kildonan): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Labour. It has come to my attention that the Workmen's Compensation Board's Safety Director has resigned, and I gather from the information, because he has had no recent authority as Safety Director. Can the Minister of Labour tell us what the situation is?

HON. CHARLES H. WITNEY (Minister of Labour)(Flin Flon): Mr. Speaker, the Director of the Accident Prevention Safety has resigned.

MR. FOX: Is the Minister going to let us know why?

MR. WITNEY: No, Mr. Speaker. I don't, really. He just simply said that -- he thanked us for the amount of time that he'd been able to spend at the Accident Prevention Association Centre and that was all. I got a copy of the letter to the Chairman of the Board.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, as a supplementary question: Is the Minister of Labour interested to see whether there are, in fact, deeper reasons for the resignation? Does he intend to find out or is he satisfied?

MR. WITNEY: Mr. Speaker, a meeting is being held with the Workmen's Compensation Board tomorrow.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Health and Social Services. Mr. Speaker, my understanding is that there is a woman in Vaughan Street, the mother of a young child, who is in custody under sentence, not awaiting trial, and for some reason she is being detained at Vaughan Street and my information is that she is required to sleep on the floor because of the apparent lack of accommodations. I wonder whether this is correct and why this should be.

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Health and Social Services)(Gimli): Mr. Speaker, I'd be pleased to take that question as notice and make an immediate inquiry.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Matthews.

MR. ROBERT STEEN (St. Matthews): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct your attention and the attention of the members of the House to 36 students from the General Wolfe School Grade 8, who are occupying seats in your gallery. The information was not readily available prior to the opening so that you could include them in your general welcome, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: I regret very much this matter was overlooked; however, you are welcome, and I bring you greetings of the honourable members of the House.

The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. BEN HANUSCHAK (Burrows): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Honourable the Minister of Consumer Affairs. Is his department investigating the matter re Vacation Sweepstakes Incorporated which appears to be engaged in a promotional campaign that is, in fact, frowned upon by the Better Business Bureau of Winnipeg?

HON. J. B. CARROLL (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs)(The Pas): Mr. Speaker, our department has seen the newspaper advertisement; we have also contacted the agency that represents the Mid-Canada Sports Show, the organization that was promoting the show at which these alleged infractions were to have taken place. They made contact again with the companies involved and indicate that they have not in fact been guilty of any misrepresentation. I regret that we're unable to confirm at this time the exact nature of the advertisements or whatever might have been held out to people who appeared at the booth. I know at least one person who was there who was told that he would in fact have to pay his own transportation to and from the particular vacation area. There are very substantial savings on accommodation and food. This is, in effect, a discount plan that enables people to enjoy holidays in these areas during off-peak seasons, and we understand that there are substantial savings involved. However, we haven't been able to ascertain the exact nature of the alleged misrepresentation.

MR. HANUSCHAK: A subsequent question, Mr. Speaker. Do I take it, then, that the department is continuing its investigations?

MR. CARROLL: Yes, I think I can say that we'd be very happy to hear representations from people who feel that this may have been a misrepresentation of the actual promotion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. JOE BOROWSKI (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, some time last week a miner was killed in a blasting accident in one of the Thompson mines. The jury recommended that certain precautions should be taken in future, especially by people who handle explosives. It appeared that the chap in question wasn't too familiar with handling explosives and as a result he died. I'm just wondering if the Minister could indicate whether they're going to take the recommendations of this jury or whether the Minister would consider bringing in some other regulations compelling the companies to allow only experienced personnel to handle blasting material. And also, has the Minister made a decision on placing a permanent mining inspector in Thompson?

HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Minister of Mines and Natural Resources)(Rockwood-Iberville): The ... Mr. Speaker, referred to by the Honourable Member for Churchill, are under active consideration by both my department and the Department of Labour, and further government policy will be announced in due course.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Honourable the Minister of Labour. Is the matter of the fatality, which occurred over the weekend - I believe it was on Friday - at a construction site of an apartment block in the Central Park area of Winnipeg, under investigation by his department?

MR. WITNEY: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, over the weekend I received a letter which was kind of a petition - I believe the government have received the same thing - from the people of Pukatawagan, requesting the government to consider putting in a telephone which is just seven miles off the main line from The Pas to Lynn Lake. Is the government giving consideration to hooking up a telephone line to this community?

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Finance)(Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, the government does not direct where the telephone lines go.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. Can the Honourable Minister give us a further report on the Pembina River Basin Development and the Pembina Dam? And also, as a result of the flooding of the Pembina, will extra efforts be made to hurry the project?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I have nothing further to report than has already been said in

(MR. ENNS cont'd.) . . . the House a short while ago. A tentative meeting has been established or agreed to by the acting Minister of Energy and Resources - that is the federal government - the Honourable Mr. Laing and myself. It's tentative because of the difficulties in scheduling time at this moment but since our meeting in Ottawa we have corresponded and we have arranged for a future meeting to be held, hopefully within the first few weeks of May.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: A subsequent question, then. According to radio and press reports, the North Dakota people are going to prod the federal government, their federal government, for prompt action on this. Will we have anything in this line by this government, that some prodding will be done to have the project hurried along?

MR. ENNS: I think, Mr. Speaker, the fact that I undertook to travel to Ottawa and to speak personally to two or three Ministers directly involved, including the Honourable Mr. Mitchell Sharp, the Minister responsible for External Affairs, through whom some of the negotiations with the Washington government would have to be proceeded with before we can successfully conclude these negotiations, would indicate to you and the House that we are certainly doing the prodding on this side as well.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. PHILIP PETURSSON (Wellington): Mr. Speaker, in the Manitoba Hospital Commission's bulletin published for March, it is mentioned that construction of 12 major projects is expected to start in 1969, of which four are in Metro Winnipeg, and nine additional are in the planning stages; three are for Metro Winnipeg. I wonder whether the Honourable Minister would be able to give me an idea as to which units these are, or is the information easily available in some other place? That is, the Metro Winnipeg projects that would be hospitals or hospital units.

MR. SPEAKER: . . . urgency of that particular question, having in mind of course that the Minister's estimates are before the House. I wonder if it is really an urgent matter. The Minister, of course, can answer if he so desires, but I question that.

MR. SAUL M. CHERNIACK, Q.C. (St. John's): On the point of order, Mr. Speaker, I did not understand that this question period had to have questions that were of urgency only.

MR. SPEAKER: I believe, for the information of the Honourable Member for St. John's, that that has been the feeling generally, that the questions are somewhat of an urgent nature and an immediate reply has been asked for.

MR. CHERNIACK: That is not my understanding, Mr. Speaker. I'll be glad to look into it and learn whether you're right or not.

MR. SPEAKER: I believe the Minister intends to attempt to answer the question anyway.

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, if it pleases the honourable member, I would be happy to give a list of the projects under way in '69 and the projects anticipated as being under way in the coming year - this evening, if that's soon enough for him.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. Has he received a report from Mr. Weber, who was chairman of the hearing dealing with the South Indian Lake flooding application?

MR. ENNS: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: You have a supplementary question? The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: . . . Mr. Speaker. Could the Minister give some indication as to when he expects to receive this report?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I do not expect to receive a report from Mr. Weber.

MR. HANUSCHAK: A further subsequent question then, Mr. Speaker. Is it not correct that the hearing was conducted with the intention of enabling Mr. Weber to report to the Honourable Minister on that matter?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I think it's apparent to the Honourable Member for Burrows that the action now under way in this House supersedes those hearings and the anticipated report that he refers to.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q.C. (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, on a question of privilege. On Page 1685 of Hansard, the second line, I am alleged to have said yesterday: "Mr. Chairman, like the other two members who have just spoke." I would like to have that error in grammar

(MR. HILLHOUSE cont'd.)... corrected because I'm quite certain that I never made such an error.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. BOROWSKI: Would the Minister of Finance, then, undertake to find out the information in regard to this telephone to Pukatawagan, check with the Manitoba Telephone and see if they are contemplating building such a line? And one other question: in the absence of the Attorney-General, could the First Minister indicate what the situation is in Thicket Portage about the liquor store, which was brought up several weeks ago?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I'll make inquiries about the telephone matter. I have no knowledge of the second question.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, does the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources not consider that a report would be helpful for the deliberations of the legislators on the question of South Indian Lake, since the hearing was conducted and Mr. Weber presided at the hearing?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. J. DOUGLAS WATT (Minister of Agriculture)(Arthur): On Friday, April 25th, I introduced for first reading to the House, the Bee Bill. It's not recorded in Hansard.

ORDERS OF THE DAY - PRIVATE AND PUBLIC BILLS

MR. SPEAKER: Proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Inkster. The Honourable Member for Inkster. Order please. The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, if there was general agreement in the House, I would propose that we call, on Page 12, the second readings of Private Bills and Public Bills and I'd be glad to hear the opinions of the various groups as to whether that would be suitable.

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): Mr. Speaker, we would approve of that move.

MR. GREEN: Agreed.

MR. EVANS: I think everybody has spoken except my honourable friend from Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: I haven't given consideration to all the bills and I'll be able to adjourn them, so I'll agree.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, may I ask you to call, on Page 12, the items beginning with the second readings of Private Bills, No. 58 and follow the list from there?

MR. SPEAKER: Second readings, Private Bills. Bill No. 58. The Honourable Member for Brandon.

MR. R. O. LISSAMAN (Brandon) presented Bill No. 58, an Act to amend an Act to incorporate The Brandon Community Chest, for second reading.

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

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie) presented Bill No. 65, an Act for the Relief of Janet Pearson Morton Alexander, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I was asked to bring this bill into the House and I must admit that I do not know a great deal more about it than any of the other members who see the bill for the first time. I have in my hand a letter of explanation from Miss Alexander's lawyer and I would like to read it into the record, then make the suggestion that the bill be allowed to go to Committee where both Metro officials and Miss Alexander's lawyer can appear and answer questions.

This letter is from Mr. Michael Skwark, B. A., LL. B., a lawyer in the city of Winnipeg: "Dear Mr. Johnston: Regarding an Act for Relief of Janet Pearson Morton Alexander. Further to my attendance upon you on April 9th, I would briefly set out some of the background pertaining to the above matter. My client, Miss Alexander, was served with a Notice of Intention by the Metropolitan Corporation of Greater Winnipeg on February 23, 1967, and under the provisions of the Expropriation Act, since the land was being expropriated for a park and not for highways, lanes etc., Miss Alexander had only 15 days in which to file a notice of claim with the Corporation. Miss Alexander states to me, and I believe this to be true, that she personally attended at the offices of the Corporation and spoke to Mr. Lennox pertaining to this. However, she did not file any written claim, although she stated to Mr. Lennox that she expected to receive approximately \$1,000 per acre for the land expropriated. Mr. Lennox or anyone from the Corporation acknowledged her visit and at this time I am informed there is no indication on this particular file with the Corporation or in any notes which Mr. Lennox

(MR. JOHNSTON cont'd.)... may have on this visit. I am told that he cannot honestly recall the personal attendance and I would be inclined to, of course, accept this version since no doubt he must deal with many people during the course of a day and this occurred two years ago.

"As a matter of fact, when Miss Alexander brought the file to my office approximately one year ago from another firm which had been handling it, I had also assumed at that time that the two year limit for filing a claim would apply, and after conducting intermittent negotiations with the Law Department of Metro, which were not satisfactory to either side, I had prepared a notice of claim in the month of January 1969. However, prior to filing the notice, I telephoned Mr. Steele to inquire whether or not a notice had already been filed previously by the other firm, although I had no record of this being done on the file which I had assumed. Mr. Steele informed me that no such notice had been filed and then discovered for himself, and brought this to my attention, that this was a case where the 15 day limit applied. This had never been brought up over the past year during which, as stated, negotiations had been conducted with Metro. I believe Mr. Steele was as much surprised on this point as were all other parties concerned, including myself.

"I then discussed with Mr. Steele the matter of proceeding with a claim and unfortunately, in this particular case, since Miss Alexander contends that her land is worth much more than what the Corporation was prepared to offer, (even though the Notice of Intention does not offer any amount as compensation), the special grant could not be put through the Corporation in payment of the claim, but a private Act would have to be passed by the Legislature to extend the time for filing the claim.

"This is the point at which we are at present, and Mr. Steele has indicated to me that in view of the circumstances involved and the fact that this is not the normal two year situation" - that is, regarding expropriation notice - "that the Corporation would not have any objection to the Act being passed. I trust that the above explanation will be of assistance to you in the event that any questions are posed with respect to this Act. I wish to thank you for your assistance."

Now Mr. Speaker, my only suggestion to members is to allow the bill to go through second reading and then Metro officials and the lady's lawyer can appear before the committee and answer pertinent questions.

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

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak on this bill, not in opposition to the relief sought by the applicant herein, but to bring to the attention of this House two or three matters which have been dealt with previously, which have been proposed previously, and which to date have not been taken under advisement nor acted upon. My first observation, my first criticism of the legislation setting out this limitation is this: that I feel that the legislation setting this limit should also include within it, a right granting the Metropolitan Corporation, in this case, the right to extend the period for filing its notice of disputing or of negotiating the matter of expropriation of the land as is involved in this case. The Metropolitan Corporation of Winnipeg, if reason could be shown to it, ought to have the right on its own to extend the period of time allowed for this purpose.

It also brings to mind another point, Mr. Speaker, and this I recall was raised by the Honourable Member for St. John's last year or the year before - the need for a piece of legislation setting out the statutory limitation imposed upon, be it suit brought in our courts or limitation of any type restricting the rights of an individual, because there are many different limitations contained in different pieces of legislation; the Municipal Acts; one could go through the four volumes of the Revised Statutes of Manitoba and the statutes of Manitoba following it, and find different periods of limitations set for different events, and I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that it would be wise to present to this House a Bill listing the limitations set out under the various pieces of legislation, because they do vary, and then an individual would not have to search through all the legislation that might affect him to determine whether there is any legislation which sets a limitation period shorter than that, that one is entitled to at common law in most actions.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I do not rise to oppose this bill but simply to bring to the attention of the House two matters concerning which I have given a great deal of thought and attention, and one deals with the fact that I think that we should have in Manitoba an Expropriation statute which would be applicable to all public bodies, and failing that, I think we should insist, where we give to a corporation or a public body a right of expropriation and the time

(MR. HILLHOUSE cont'd.), . . . set in that Act is less than what is considered to be the ordinary period of limitations, it should be incumbent upon that corporation, when it does serve a Notice of Intention to expropriate, not only that they set out the time limit within which that person has a right to reply, but they should also set out too the amount of money they intend to give to that person. I object to this idea of giving to any corporation, whether it be the Metropolitan Corporation of Winnipeg or any municipal corporation, the right to serve a Notice of Intention without advising that person what they are willing to pay.

I will vote for this bill on second reading, but when the matter comes before the committee I would like to see the type of notice that the Metro Corporation does serve on these people and what it contains, because I am quite satisfied that if this lady had seen, in bold print, the fact that she had to reply within 15 days, I am quite satisfied that she would have done it or her lawyer would have done it.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker I rise not with the specific purpose for speaking as to the details of the bill, but I am having some difficulty in accepting the manner and way in which the bill is to be dealt with in the House. We were told to approve in principle of this bill by the member moving this bill, and that we would receive the expert testimony of the lawyers and people from the Metropolitan Corporation at the Committee stage of the bill. I rise only to make comment about the manner and way in which this bill is being put forward, as I understand, Mr. Speaker, you have a ruling before you on a procedural matter of how another bill should be handled.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. John's.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I listened carefully to what was said by the Honourable Minister of Mines and Resources and I confess to you that I don't know what he was talking about, and I think it's -- (Interjection) -- am I the only one? I'm assured that I'm not the only one who didn't understand him, and I don't even know, Mr. Speaker, how he's voting on this bill, so I would appeal to him to whisper to one of his seat mates an explanation, so that we could at least understand what he said. I'm not sure of what ruling he is speaking about that you have made, Mr. Speaker, as to procedure, and I'm really not sure just what he doesn't like.

I am wondering if we are both speaking about Bill 65. It would be helpful if we knew that. I have heard somebody say, "We'll know," but surely, since it would appear that the government is taking a position - or at least the Minister is - it would be helpful if we knew which way he or the government was going to vote, so we'd know whether this is a matter that should be debated more fully or just allowed to go into committee and dealt with there. I'm really very serious, Mr. Speaker, because it's a matter of principle involved and I honestly don't know whether the government is going to let it go to Committee or not. Possibly the Minister would care to interrupt me and indicate, and then maybe save a lot of time. Well there is no indication that the government is voting either way, so I'm at a loss Mr. Speaker. I expected this bill to go through very quickly and now it seems to be bogged down for a peculiar reason, an inexplicable one, because usually we know what the government intends to do and then we can discuss it, but I'm still in the position - apparently I'm not the only one who doesn't know the government's intention.

Well Mr. Speaker, I'll have to appeal again to the Honourable the House leader and particularly to the First Minister who is here, and ask of him to see to it that we know the government's position on this, or if the Whip is off and the government doesn't have a position, then it would be well that we know that that is the case. I think it's incumbent on the government to indicate to us what it will do with this bill.

Having made that appeal, I want to come back to the comment made by the Honourable Member for Selkirk and tell you, Mr. Speaker, that having spoken for a few minutes I could without any difficulty make a speech lasting forty minutes, less the time I have already spoken, on a matter which has been discussed in this House at this Session on a number of occasions, and that is the fact that we are not getting any progress out of the government in connection with the drafting of proposed bills, because the points raised by the Honourable Member for Selkirk were discussed by the Committee on Statutory Regulations many times, and a bill was presented - a draft was presented - was ripped apart and studied carefully and then was taken back by the government and the government brought in a lengthy statement of principles which would be involved in the drafting of a new bill, and we were then told this is now going back to the draftsmen and will come forth in due course; and, as you know, Mr. Speaker, due course

(MR. CHERNIACK con't.)... hasn't arrived yet. That's a pity because a new bill would not have taken care of this particular situation, but would for the future, and we don't have it.

I might indicate to the Honourable Member for Selkirk, who I think is not a member of that committee, that we did discuss the very points he raises, that there shall be sufficient time allotted, that notice of the limitation period shall be given, so that a person receiving the notice will know what has to be done within the time allotted. That, I think is very important and I think he will be pleased to know that the entire committee agreed with what he said today, and all we are doing now, as we are doing with so many other bills of this government, is just waiting to see the products of their efforts. The bill itself before us seems reasonable particularly since it is pointed out in the letter from the solicitor that was read to us that both parties were not aware of the limitation period, and apparently both parties bargained in good faith for a much longer period of time than they needed to had they known about the limitation period, and if both, indeed, were not aware of it, then surely it's only right that it be sent to committee to be studied. On that basis, I would certainly urge that the majority of the members of this House do indeed support the bill for second reading. I still hope, wish, entreat the Honourable Minister to see to it that those of us who are slow in picking up what he said have a clear picture, and I hope it will be today, Mr. Speaker. I'd hate to walk out of this Chamber still in the dark, not knowing what he meant or what was said. So again, in all sincerity, I request that we get clarification as to just what it was that the Minister meant when he spoke in a - he must admit - cryptic fashion on this matter.

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

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the bill as well, because the title "An Act for the Relief" already implies that a certain wrong has taken place and the parties, as explained already by other speakers, not having known of the time limit, I feel it is quite in order for them to come back and have a bill of this type passed so that the matter can be corrected. I definitely intend to support the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 66. The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. JAMES COWAN, Q. C. (Winnipeg Centre) presented Bill No. 66, an Act respecting Victoria General Hospital, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. COWAN: Mr. Speaker, Victoria Hospital is an old established hospital in the City of Winnipeg. It was established in 1911 and operated as a private hospital by Victoria Hospital Limited, a corporation incorporated by letters patent. In 1924, it was changed and it was then operated as a public general hospital without private gain to any individual and without remuneration to the directors and to shareholders. In 1957, this Legislature passed a special Act to incorporate Victoria General Hospital and it is under this 1957 Act that the hospital now operates. The hospital, as members know, is now building a large new hospital in Fort Garry and the hospital is reorganizing itself in preparation for its move to the larger hospital being built, and that is the purpose of the Bill before this Legislature. The hospital feels that certain of its objects and powers are too narrowly expressed for the broader areas of activity to which the hospital will shortly pass. Furthermore, many matters of internal organization, such as the appointment of trustees, the officers of the corporation, the management of the hospital by an executive committee, are too rigid when contained in the Act and should be the subject of by-laws which the Board should be empowered to enact.

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

MR. PETURSSON: Mr. Speaker, I rise more in ignorance than in knowledge or understanding, but there are a couple of questions that I would wish to ask. That is, this is an Act respecting Victoria General Hospital, setting out certain terms and conditions under which the hospital operates, and this is to take the place of the present terms of incorporation, is that right? Does this mean that that previous incorporation or previous bill of incorporation is wiped out, all except the fact that the hospital was incorporated? Then this appears as something brand new. It isn't a matter of amendments to -- (Interjection) -- it's a complete

(MR. PETURSSON cont'd.) . . . replacement. Then nothing of the earlier bill remains. This is one thing that I'm glad I got settled in my mind because, as I say, I'm not of a legal mind and there are some other deficiencies as well which I don't want to take time to enumerate.

But in Article No. 5, it's specifically stated that there is no discrimination, and I approve of this. I like it very much. But is this peculiar to the Victoria Hospital alone? Are there similar statements made in the articles of incorporation or in by-laws or other regulations of other hospitals, which open them up completely to all people regardless of race, creed, colour and so on? If this is peculiar to Victoria Hospital or if it applies only to a few hospitals, if there are only a few that apply it, then I would feel that our Department of Health and Social Services should take steps in some way or another to see that this is a common condition under which hospitals operate to make the hospitals open to all men alike. The same would apply to nursing homes. Personally, I see nothing to which I would be particularly opposed in this, or critical of in this proposed Bill, and I would be quite prepared to give it my support.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debates on second reading. Public Bills. Bill No. 43. The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, I think that this is a very important subject because we are dealing with helpless children who can't make representation. I am taking this matter very seriously. I have studied the section in question. I have read and re-read every word that was said in this debate, and I'm now ready to accept the challenge of the mover of this Bill and let my conscience be my guide. I certainly agree that the welfare of the child should be the prime factor to be considered. I believe in religious freedom. I believe that we should not legislate in favour of any particular religion, that we should respect the rights of others. I believe in the individual's natural right of freedom, of conscience to worship or not to worship, and to profess, to practice and to promulgate his religious beliefs, or to change them, according to his conscience or opinion. I believe that we are all brothers indeed and I believe in ecumenism. But I believe most of all in the sincerity of those who took part in this debate, especially the Member from Selkirk, and if I single him out, Mr. Speaker, it's not because I believe that he is more sincere than others, but simply because he introduced this Bill and because of his great concern, which is well-known to all the members of this House, for children, especially those that are orphaned, retarded and handicapped.

The sincerity of the Member for Selkirk, as I said, impresses me greatly, and I wanted so much to support this Bill, but some statements made by my honourable friend keep coming back to me; statements that in conscience I cannot accept; statements such as: "How can anyone in his senses say that a child one month old has any religion?" "I am of the" - and these are different statements that I am enumerating here - "I am of the sincere conviction and belief that a child has no religion, that the sole and only consideration should be the welfare of the child." Restore to the Child Welfare Act its main purpose, that is, the welfare of the child."

Then there were statements, Mr. Speaker, made by the Honourable Member for Churchill, such as, and again I quote: "I really can't understand how any of these concerned could possibly vote against the bill." Another one: "A child that's one year or two years, even five years, has no religion." Another one: "90 percent of these children are illegitimate children or children born of unwed mothers. The mother obviously doesn't care; she's given the child up; that's the reason it's up for adoption; but if the mother doesn't care, why should the legislators care?"

Mr. Speaker, I said that I believed that the welfare of the child was most important, and I do, but I believe that it should not only mean his material welfare. I agree that no church should receive preferred treatment, and as far as I'm concerned, there's no question in this Act or in this section of doing this, but only of recognizing parental rights. Sir, I am a firm believer in parental rights. It is a God-given right and it is also a natural right for those that might not believe in God, and it is a right, I say, that will protect the child and that will usually work out in his favour and for his welfare. A parent has not only the right but the duty to choose what he feels is best for his child. I do not accept that a child has no religion, not more than I say that he has no nationality. I realize that he is not aware of his religion, of his nationality, and also that later he might wish to change it, and this I accept is his right, but if this were not the case, then no parent, be he natural, legal, adopted, what have you, would have the right to bring up his children in any religion, take them to his church. We

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd.)... might have a situation where, at a certain grade only, the course would be given enumerating the different religions, a few words of explanation be given on each, and then we would also have to explain the views of the atheists, but the parents would never be able to exercise any influence or try to influence their children. The children themselves would have to decide without the guidance of their parents.

But, Sir, I object more strongly to the statement made by the Honourable Member for Churchill. He doesn't know the situation or he has been ill-advised, to say the least, when he claims the unwed mothers who give their children up for adoption don't care. I consider this to be a most irresponsible statement and I am sure that if the member gives this a little more thought, he will wish to withdraw this statement. Especially if he talked to some of these mothers, some of the nurses, some of the social workers and adoption workers, I think that he will change his mind. I'm sure that he didn't mean what he said. Because a girl has made a mistake, especially in this day and age, and she doesn't get away with it, Mr. Speaker, certainly doesn't make of her a monster. Let us not be too high, too almighty, too holy, and let us have a little compassion for some of these girls - I would say a lot of compassion, for a poor lonely girl who has paid many many times over for her mistake. She might have nothing left for this child but because of her great love, because, I say, of her great love, her motherly love, she is ready to tear her heart out in order to give the child a better chance, a chance she knows that she can't give him. Let us not throw a rock at this mother but rather be proud of her courage and marvel at this great thing, that is, the love of a mother. I cannot accept that we disregard the rights of parents. Our intentions might be honourable, indeed, but we are on dangerous ground, to say the least, if we let the state take over. It might be that the state will take over completely.

I wish to make it clear that I do not consider that a child can have no religion, but rather that he have the religion chosen by his parents and then later, when he understands, he may choose to keep or to reject this religion. This is certainly his right. Having said that I cannot accept some of the statements made by some honourable gentlemen, I must reassure them, especially the Honourable Member from Selkirk who moved this Bill, and tell them honestly that I endorse his ultimate goal 100 percent. I am sure that the Minister of Health also has the same desire and is working towards the same. In fact, I would not hesitate a minute in taking it for granted that every member of this House feels like he does, like the Minister, and like I do. What is the ultimate goal, then, Mr. Speaker? Well then, I believe that every child should be placed in a good home, that we should do everything possible to place these children in an adopted home that is of the same religious faith of the child, but if this is impossible, then no child, and I repeat, no child should be deprived of a home, of parents who will give him the love he needs.

We might not all agree, Mr. Speaker, that we should start by doing everything possible to find a home of the same religious belief, but we all agree I'm sure that no child should be deprived of a good home if one of the same religion is not available. And I am sure that both groups can be satisfied as well as the parents, natural and adopted, and that it be working for the welfare of the child. Deleting the religious clause would not be the answer, Mr. Speaker, and would be dangerous. This does not mean that we cannot see if the facts can be improved, if it cannot be made easier for us to achieve an ultimate goal of placing all our children in good homes. I am sure that every single member here can accept this. After all, we thought that we had a good Act prior to 1961, but we took a look at it and improved it in 1961 and again in 1963, and we've got nothing to lose. The 1961 amendment, enabling a surrendering parent to state that she had no religious preference for a child, was an improvement, a big improvement, Mr. Speaker. The 1963 amendment, providing that "if, after a reasonable time, the child for whom there is a stated religion has not been placed in a suitable home of such faith, an application can be made that the provision regarding religion be waived to permit placement with parents of a different religion," was also a great improvement.

Mr. Speaker, let me say to the Minister of Health, I do not say this at the time that the Act can and should be changed. I'm not stating that it should, or that it can be changed. I don't really know. From what the Minister said, it seems that it is working rather well, and the Honourable Member from Selkirk was speaking mostly on a question of principle and in general. At least, this is the way it appeared to me. Nothing, he said, would indicate that children are deprived of a home because of this Act now, but surely, Sir, and I say surely, Mr. Minister, it won't hurt to take a look, to review the situation instead of having this Act or

April 29, 1969

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd.)... this possible amendment brought back every year. Everyone here I am sure can accept this, can live with this, and I will be disappointed if the Minister cannot accept my suggestion. If we can improve the welfare of our orphans by only one iota, it would be well worth it, and if no improvements are needed we will leave it alone, and I for one will not feel that this exercise would be useless. We will at least keep in touch with this problem. The Royal Commission on Adoptions, as quoted by the Honourable Minister, expressed concern over the possibility of a new and further delay in the adoptive process because of a further court reference. The Minister quoted that himself. It might be that after study we find that this can be improved, Mr. Speaker, and that in itself would be worth it.

It might be that instead of going to a court, a Review Commission with power to act could be set up. I'm not again making a suggestion; I'm saying that this is a possibility. I'm giving this as an example. I'm not, as I say, saying that there's anything wrong now, or that we will find ways to improve this Act, but I do believe that we should have a look at it. The Minister repeatedly stated that our major problem is the adopted placements of children with physical and mental impairment, and particularly children of mixed race; and who knows, we might be lucky enough to come up with some bright idea that might help the poor children in this category to find a home, and this certainly would be a step in the right direction.

Mr. Speaker, today I implore the members from all sides of the House to take time out from - maybe the partisan politics that we've had, from taxes, from economic programs, and let's take a breath of fresh air today, let us look at this as humanitarians, as fathers, and yes, as simple human beings. Let us recall the saying that was said, that always struck with me, that "No man is so tall as when he stoops to help a child." Mr. Minister, I say to you, don't rush to answer me, to answer the amendment I'm about to make; bring back my amendment to your caucus; discuss it. What have you got to lose? And our orphan and handicapped children might be the big winners on this.

So, Mr. Speaker, at this time, I would like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Gladstone-Neepawa, that Bill No. 43 be not now read a second time but that in view of the serious question of basic human rights and of parental responsibility on the one hand, and the obvious desirability of providing the best homes for adoptive children on the other hand, that the subject matter thereof be referred to the Community Welfare Planning Council and the Children's Aid Society, and that the Children's Aid Society and the Community Welfare Planning Council be asked to report its findings and recommendations to the House at the next session.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Speaker, on a question of order, have we any right to accept an amendment which would refer a Bill in this House to an organization which is under no obligation to this House and an organization which we do not control?

MR. SPEAKER: Bring me that motion. Order.

MR. DESJARDINS: Was it accepted? I believe that the amendment was accepted - it was read and called for, Mr. Speaker.

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN, Q. C. (Minister of Transportation)(Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, if I might just make this observation, that I think perhaps the Honourable the Member for Selkirk has raised an important point which you might wish to take under consideration.

MR. SPEAKER: . . . the opinions of the honourable gentlemen and possibly that might be the thing to do. I realize that following the normal practices of the House that I did read this, but in view of the opinions given and the questions made, I think in the interest of all concerned it might be well if I take this matter under advisement and report at the next sitting of the House.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, this certainly would be acceptable to me as far as I'm concerned. I wish to speak on this point of order also before you make a decision, that I'm not suggesting by this amendment that these people referred to will make the decision. I'm suggesting that they make the study and then report to the House. I think this would solve something in the future.

MR. SPEAKER: I thank the Honourable Member for St. Boniface for his co-operation and we'll move on to the next item. In the meantime, I will hold this matter for study.

The proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Selkirk - Bill No. 30. The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Well, Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that this was held for the purpose of deciding on what the proper procedure would be in referring it to the Professional Association Committee. Isn't that right, Mr. Clerk?

MR. SPEAKER: I couldn't hear the honourable gentleman as there is considerable noise.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, it was my impression that the Honourable Member for Selkirk was to bring in an amendment, I think was the thought - not an amendment, a resolution. Well now, I don't know what he was to do but there was to be something done.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Well, the Clerk advises me, Mr. Speaker, that the Committee on Professional Associations will meet on May 7th at 9:00 o'clock, and it is my suggestion to the House, waiving the rules with the consent of the House, that this Bill be referred to that committee.

MR. SPEAKER: Dear dear.

MR. CHERNIACK: . . . consent of the House, then surely that is acceptable. I haven't heard from the other side, but as far as we're concerned it's acceptable.

MR. SPEAKER: Are there any further opinions?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I'm a little at a loss to know what the proposal is at the moment. If it is proposed -- is there a motion at the present time to refer this to a committee before it is read a second time?

MR. HILLHOUSE: Well, during the course of my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I did mention the fact that this Bill ordinarily would be referred to the Committee on Agriculture but the Honourable Member for St. John's felt that it should go to the Committee on Professional Associations, and I stated that I have no objection to it going to that committee provided that committee would be vested with the necessary jurisdiction to deal with it and that that committee would sit during this session. Now that committee has been convened, at least the notices have gone out that the committee will meet on May 7th, and in order to accommodate the wishes of the members of the House, I feel that perhaps it should be referred to the Committee on Professional Associations rather than to the Committee of Agriculture.

MR. STANES: Mr. Speaker, I was under the impression on one of your rulings, or a decision was made a week or two back, that we cannot, as a House, refer a Bill at second reading to other than a Standing Committee. The Professional Committee is a Special Committee of this House. I understood that the procedure would be in this, and any other Bills, that we would refer to the normal committee - standing committee, and that standing committee, if it thought necessary, could refer it then to the special committee without losing the Bill. As I understand it - I may be incorrect - but to refer a Bill at this stage, at second reading, to a special committee of the House kills it. -- (Interjection) -- I'm incorrect?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. My chief concern at this particular time is I realize that the Honourable Member for Selkirk has asked leave of the House that it be referred to a committee, and my purpose is merely to emphasize our ruling 84, "Every Bill shall be read twice in the House before being referred to a committee or amended." That rule I am trying to maintain, but whether the House wishes to go beyond that and refer it to this committee, it's their responsibility; but at the same time, I would like to remind the House of the problem all round in this particular direction that it is being faced with in the last few days. As I stand before you now, this Bill must either be approved or rejected second reading before it goes to any committee.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, on that point of order, I think there isn't the slightest question that you will be asked to put the vote and I think we are all ready to have the vote, but it's a question of which committee it be referred to. Now the Honourable Member for Rhineland has indicated to me that he's consenting, so it's really a question if the government consents then obviously it can go.

MR. DESJARDINS: Can anybody speak on this or is the Member for Selkirk closing the debate? Or was that left in this way until we arrived at a decision as to what committee it be sent to?

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question, and that is the second reading of the Bill.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, has the debate been closed, or what?

MR. SPEAKER: I believe the Honourable Member for Selkirk has closed the debate on this particular Bill.

MR. DESJARDINS: When?

MR. SPEAKER: That's what I am told.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Now it's for the House to determine as to which committee it'll go to.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I would move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lakeside, that the Bill be referred to the Committee on Professional Associations.

MR. SPEAKER: I am informed that it has been agreed, so there's no purpose in any further discussion on the matter as to which committee it will go to.

MR. DESJARDINS: I would welcome this amendment, Mr. Speaker, this motion, because I'd like to say one or two words on it, and if this a -- I'll speak on a point of order. The only thing I want to say is that it seems to me that over the period of the last year, or the two last years, it was the intention, whenever somebody comes in with a Bill like that, either the solicitor or in the House, we would suggest to them that it would go to this committee, and I feel that if we do this for that particular Bill, I have no objection, but if there are any - somebody said last time that they didn't believe there were any - but if there are any more this session or last session, I think they should be dealt with exactly the same way. This is all I wanted to say.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, would you be good enough to read the motion that's before the House?

MR. SPEAKER: Complying with the request of the Honourable the Minister of Finance, we're talking about the adjourned debate on second reading of Bill No. 30, The Veterinary Medical Association of Manitoba Act, which has been put to the House and approved for second reading.

MR. EVANS: At the moment then there is no motion before the House respecting this Bill as to where it's being sent?

MR. SPEAKER: I understood that it was agreed, beyond the confines of the Chair, as to which committee it was going to. Correct?

MR. EVANS: That is not my understanding of it. My understanding is that the Bill has now been passed second reading, without division, and it is now my understanding that it would be open to any gentleman who wishes to, to move a motion that the Bill be sent to any committee that he wishes it sent to.

MR. SPEAKER: I was in the process of doing that a few moments ago and I was given to understand that there was agreement as to which committee it would go to, beyond the confines of the Chair. I have no knowledge, but I understood there was general agreement as to which committee it would go to, but if in the opinion of the Minister of Finance that there is no agreement, could I have a motion and we'll put it.

MR. HILLHOUSE: With leave of the House, I would move that this Bill be referred to the Committee on Professional Associations for the 7th of May.

MR. WATT: Mr. Speaker, my understanding when the Bill was introduced into the House - I could stand to be corrected on this - that the Bill would go to the Committee on Agriculture, and if it was the wish of the committee, it could from there be referred to . . .

-- (Interjection) --

Well, Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Labour, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Virten - Bill No. 35. The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I adjourned this matter for my honourable friend the Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. SAUL MILLER (Seven Oaks): Mr. Speaker, normally there'd be no question of going along with this Bill, but when I read the explanation given by the Member for Virten I wanted some clarification. Apparently the work was undertaken by the Town of Virten after having received a petition, representing 100 percent of the people affected, requesting that this work be done. The work was then done and apparently the actual cost was far greater than the estimated cost by about some \$1,400, and in the explanation given by the Member for Virten, he said that the cost was \$1,400 higher than anticipated and that this over-expenditure was more than could be raised by frontage of property owners benefitting. Now when he says it was more than could be raised, is it they have refused to pay the extra amounts, and could they refuse since they signed a petition requesting the work be done? Or was it that the Town of Virten felt it was too costly and therefore didn't want to levy that much against the six property owners?

The other question is this: If the extra amount is going to be charged over the entire local improvement district, I'm wondering is the local improvement district, other than the

(MR. MILLER cont'd.) . . . six owners, are they going to be in any way benefitting by the work that has already been done, because if there's going to be a charge over the district generally then it should reflect some benefit to the district generally and not simply to the six property owners that were affected. Although I don't imagine the member may have this information available, I would ask him to have this information available at committee, or perhaps the Minister of Municipal Affairs could enlighten the House at this time on why this Bill was necessary and why there's a feeling now that the actual costs shouldn't be levied against those people who are benefitting from the service.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. John's.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Honourable Member for Virden would close debate, I'm taking this opportunity to state that I was not aware of the nature of this Bill, and having heard the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks, I would think that it's a pretty important principle that he has raised and I am wondering whether we couldn't ask of the Minister of Municipal Affairs that he should - not at the moment - but that he should give us his opinion in the House before the question is put and naturally I would expect that he could adjourn debate in order to acquaint himself with it, but the principle I think is important and rather than have the debate closed by the Honourable Member from Virden, I think it would be a good idea if we could hear from the Minister of Municipal Affairs. As I say, in due course, he may not have looked into it yet.

HON. OBIE BAIZLEY (Minister of Municipal Affairs)(Osborne): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Tourism and Recreation that debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 49. The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. COWAN presented Bill No. 49 an Act to amend the Optometry Act for second reading.

MR. COWAN: If this Bill is read a second time it will go to Law Amendments Committee.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. COWAN: Mr. Speaker, there are three different principles in this Bill. The first section refers to the first principle. At present the Optometry Act provides that before a person can practise optometry in Manitoba he must serve a one year apprenticeship. When the Act was passed, the Optometry Course was a four year course and so this made it five years before one could practise optometry - five years after starting a course. Now the course in optometry at the University of Waterloo in Ontario is a five year course, and the optometrists see no reason for a year apprenticeship. As a matter of fact, Manitoba is the only province that requires an apprenticeship year after the course.

The second principle in the Bill deals with the optometrists using the term "Doctor". At present the Optometry Act provides that no optometrist can use the prefix "doctor" unless he has received a degree of doctor from a School of Optometry approved or recognized by the Senate of the University of Manitoba. The proposed amendment will bring the right to use the term "doctor" in exactly the same terms as it is now provided for in the Act we have in Manitoba dealing with Osteopathy, Chiropractors, and Chiropodists and the proposed Section 17 is worded exactly along the same lines as the right to use the word "doctor" is used in the three Acts that I have mentioned - those dealing with osteopaths, chiropractors and chiropodists. In addition of course, we know that others use the term doctor such as dentists, veterinarians. The proposed Bill further says, as in the other Acts, "that each person authorized under this Act on the 1st day of May 1969 to practise optometry in the Province of Manitoba may use the prefix or title doctor or the abbreviation Dr., if at the same time he displays or makes use of the word "Optometrist" immediately preceding or following his name." So there should be no confusion with regard to using the term "Doctor" because wherever it is used the word Doctor of Optometry will be put immediately before or after his name.

Manitoba is the only province which requires one university to pass upon another university as to whether or not a course in that university should be approved or recognized by the Senate of the University. In March 1966 an application was made to the Senate of the University of Manitoba for the approval of the term "Doctor" for a graduate of the University of Illinois. The University turned down the application. They didn't like the idea of having to pass on another university. At that time Mr. Justice Freedman, Chairman and former Chancellor of the University, observed as follows; "That when the Optometry Act was enacted in Manitoba it seemed that the Legislative Assembly contemplated that optometrists should

April 29, 1969

(MR. COWAN cont'd.) have the right to use the title Doctor if the Senate approved of the school where the degree was earned. However, a person who treats callouses is entitled to use the title Doctor without reference to the Senate of the University of Manitoba but optometrists may not do so without reference. It is also clear that legislation in British Columbia, Alberta and Saskatchewan either explicitly grants to optometrists the right to use the title doctor or allows the matter to go by default."

Again, on October 24, 1968, the Manitoba Optometric Society made an application to the Senate of the University of Manitoba for the approval and recognition of the School of Optometry at the University of Waterloo. On October 22, 1968 the University replied, stating in part: "The committee draws to the attention of the Senate, that Senate is placed in a unique position in that, to the best of the committee's knowledge there is no other province in Canada which has legislation requiring a university to carry out investigations as laid down by Section 17 of the Act to regulate the practice of Optometry in Manitoba. The committee requests that Senate express to the Provincial Government its reluctance to proceed with other cases." So again, the Senate of the University would not answer the question that was put to it, would not give the approval, and asked the Province of Manitoba if it could be relieved of this obligation.

New Brunswick, I might mention, has just passed in its Legislature a new Bill on Optometry which becomes effective on June 1, 1969, and the Statute explicitly provides that if a person has a certificate from the Optometric Society and if they have a degree from a College, School or University recognized by the Council, that person may use the title Doctor of Optometry or initials O. D. The Province of Saskatchewan permits the title Doctor, as does Quebec, Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia and Newfoundland. With regard to Ontario, the University Act permits the granting of the title Doctor by the School of Optometry at the University of Waterloo and therefore one Act says it can be done and the doctors argue that it cannot be done. A survey made of the statutes in United States so far as survey has been able to determine, shows that there is nothing which prohibits the use of the title Doctor of Optometry in the various states.

So Mr. Speaker, the optometrists are asking that this Legislature entitle them to use the term doctor in the same way as Chiropractors, Osteopaths, and Chiropractors as theirs is another health service serving the people of this province. The Legislature evidently has already approved of using the term Doctor in principle but it is impossible to get that permission because of the attitude of the Senate of the University of Manitoba and so it is necessary to amend the present Act.

The third item in this Bill is to do with actions of the Council that administers the Act, and the way it reads now, if a member of the Society is convicted of a criminal offense, then the person must either be dismissed from the Society or suspended or be reprimanded. Now in some cases a criminal offense may be of a character that does not constitute professional misconduct. For instance, if a member of the society became justifiably very angry against someone and struck him, he would, technically speaking, be guilty of a criminal offense of assault and accordingly, he must be found guilty of an offense by the Optometric Society. The proposed amendment would make it possible that the Society in such a case might consider the offense so trivial that the charge against the Optometrist could be dismissed when his case is being considered by the Optometric Society.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, would the honourable member permit two questions? Am I correct in assuming that there are practising Optometrists today who do not hold a doctoral degree from a University? And if I am correct, is there some restriction on future Optometrists to practise if they do not hold a doctoral degree from a University?

MR. COWAN: The answer to the first question is "yes", and with regards to the future, the amendment simply provides that he must be a graduate of a school of optometry. In Canada there's only two schools, one at the University of Montreal, one at the University of Waterloo, so that University of Waterloo graduates become a doctor - or graduates from that Society - he would automatically of course become a doctor and be entitled to use the term doctor.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, what about a graduate in the future from Montreal which does not give a doctoral degree? As I understand this Bill he would not have the right because there seems to be a grandfather clause here, but nothing for the future.

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

MR. MILLER: I would like one question Mr. Speaker. I wonder did the Member say that Ontario was permitting the use of the term Doctor. Where the University of Waterloo is,

(MR. MILLER cont'd.) in Ontario, are they recognizing the term themselves?

MR. COWAN: In Ontario, the University Act permits the title doctor to be used by graduates of the University of Waterloo. There's a conflict there because the medical doctors say they can't use the title doctor. In practice I understand some use the title doctor and some do not.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I would have to say that the debate obviously was closed by the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre when he was answering the questions of the Honourable Member for St. John's. I believe that the rules have established that on previous occasions.

MR. SPEAKER: I thank the Honourable Minister of Transportation but the gentleman as I understood it, simply got up to ask a question of the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre, and he consented. I take it the Honourable Member for Elmwood has a question.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood): I have a comment, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Beg your pardon.

MR. DOERN: I have a speech or comment.

MR. SPEAKER: I think the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre has technically speaking closed the debate, but . . .

MR. CHERNIACK: On a point of order, when I spoke, and I heard the Member for Seven Oaks speak, both of us got up and asked if we had permission to ask a question. We were granted that permission and we asked our question; we certainly did not indicate we were speaking; nor did the honourable Member make a speech in reply, he only replied to the direct questions that were asked.

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Speaker, it's of no consequence to me, but with great respect, the Honourable Member for St. John's didn't ask leave to ask a question. As a matter of fact, he didn't have to have leave to ask a question. The point is that the Honourable the Member for Winnipeg Centre having at that point answered the question, it has been held by Your Honour on many previous occasions that that closed the debate. I was on the point of going to interfere with the Honourable the Member for Winnipeg Centre at the time, because I was aware of what was coming, but since no one else seemed to feel it was a matter of concern -- it's only just that we keep our rules more or less consistent.

MR. SPEAKER: This happens to be one of those days, it seems to me.

MR. GREEN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Surely there have been numerous persons introducing a resolution, or introducing a bill, who after they finish introducing the bill, sit down and another member of the House says, 'would the Honourable the Minister permit a question and the Minister says yes, and he answers the question. Well, Mr. Speaker, I can demonstrate to my honourable friend at least ten examples of that happening this year, and that's all that happened on this occasion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood may proceed.

MR. DOERN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think in general on this bill there are a number of questions that really only concern the profession as such. For example, the question of an apprenticeship is one that I think if they feel that this provision is no longer necessary and they now wish to disband that requirement of one year, then no one will quarrel with the profession.

I think that there are two areas in the bill which are of general interest to members in our group and I might add that this is not really a question of a party position, but a question of individual judgment, but based on what the Member for Winnipeg Centre just said, it seems to me that the interesting section in the bill concerns the use of the title "doctor", and also the apparent grandfather clause, because the member himself pointed out that there are now some excellent courses, for example at the University of Waterloo, with rigorous requirements and also the University of Montreal is granting degrees. And of course the question in regard to the grandfather clause is what about the other universities or what about the other optometric schools which grant the degrees, and I suppose that the overwhelming majority - I would hazard a guess of perhaps 90 percent of the optometrists practising in Manitoba did not graduate from the University of Waterloo but from some American institution.

So the question there which I think will come up undoubtedly in committee is whether or not it is advisable for the Legislature to approve degrees that were not granted by the two Canadian universities but were granted by other institutions, or whether we're going to give a blanket approval of degrees of optometry. I might point out that there have been studies made of the whole question of the extension of the word "doctor", which of course concern people like

April 29, 1969

(MR. DOERN cont'd.) optometrists, and of course general practitioners and specialists who from their point of view feel that their degree is being weakened. The optometrists on the other hand feel that they have the right to use this degree. I might point out that the Hall Commission recommended in one section - 213 - and I quote: "Legislation be enacted to provide that no practitioner of any healing art without a doctoral degree granted by a recognized university be permitted to designate himself as a doctor or to use any letter following his name indicating the same or to advertise himself as such." So if these are approved universities, the two Canadian, then the question arises as to what about the other institutions. I'm not certain, Mr. Speaker, that it is essential to use these letters. I think this is something that we will decide upon after we speak to the representatives of the optometric profession in Law Amendments and so on.

My honourable friend in bringing in the Bill pointed out that other provinces allow the designation, but he only told part of the story because I think there are other professions in other provinces which do not have the same right. For example, I understand Ontario allows chiropractors to simply call themselves chiropractors. My understanding is that they are not allowed to use the designation Dr. or Doctor, but are in effect advised that they may refer to themselves as chiropractors period. I think it's an interesting point as to whether or not it isn't sufficient for a man to call himself an optometrist or whether it is desirable for him to use the designation Doctor so and so, Optometrist.

So I think some of these questions will be cleared up in Law Amendments and I think that after further study that members of the House will be able to make a better decision.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. James.

MR. STANES: Mr. Speaker, I share many of the thoughts of the Honourable Member for Elmwood, and I think that we have to be extremely careful in continuing to allow people to use the title "Doctor". I have no particular reason for stopping with this particular Act except that we are on this point, and I think perhaps in many cases we've gone too far. I think in the view of the average member of the public they look upon doctor as a medical doctor, and I think that if we continue pursuing the path we have been going we're going to have what the senior medical practitioners and surgeons in England do; they have gone beyond the Doctor, they've become Mister; and I'm afraid we're going to get to a situation where in the arena when they say is there a doctor in the house that everyone will stand up. I think it destroys the very purpose of the term doctor.

I'm not saying anything against those who have got a doctorate in this, that or the other, but I think the purpose, in my humble view, of the term Doctor in the ears and eyes of the average public is that of a medical doctor, and I honestly and sincerely wish to convey that thought to the honourable members, Mr. Speaker, and suggest they look at this thing very carefully. Again, I have nothing against the optometrists or anybody else who are presently called Doctor, but I think that we should re-examine this whole matter for the public in view of the way they look upon the term Doctor, and perhaps we should have a completely new view in this case and in many other cases.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I agree with the last speaker except that I don't feel that a doctor necessarily means a doctor of medicine. As far as I am concerned, a doctorate is a degree. It's a degree; it's something that you achieve after being an expert in a particular field. It's more than a Bachelor's Degree, it's the next step, it's a doctorate. I don't care who we call Doctor, but I feel that we in this House should not take this right - I guess it is our right - to confer titles on anybody or any group, and by passing Bills such as these, this is exactly what we're doing and I think that it is unfortunate.

If you remember a few years ago I brought in an amendment that would take the title Doctor away from the chiropractors - I shouldn't say from the chiropractors - if the chiropractors are going to study, if they have a doctorate in this science, in this branch, I've no objection that we call them Doctors, but my guideline on this is very easy, and it's not that I'm against any group or in favour of another group - I know that at the time I received a lot of phone calls and letters that I was against this special group, and that is not the case - but as far as I'm concerned, those degrees should be conferred by universities. If the University of Manitoba doesn't do it, if there is a recognized university that does it, and if this particular person has received a doctorate degree from Waterloo, call him Doctor; he's entitled. We don't have to come here for that, but that we should be asked to take a stand on this and say: well this group, the fact that they call themselves this, should be doctors. This is wrong.

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd.) . . . And then I'll go and agree with my honourable friend; why do they want to be called doctors? There's got to be only one reason. It's that they want to more or less prey on the reputation of the medical doctors; it's got to be that. Well, why else? I mean if they earn this degree, I say yes. In other words, any degree given by a university - yes; but I don't think that any government or any Legislative Assembly or House of Commons should confer degrees on a certain group.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. PETURSSON: Mr. Speaker, I would wonder as I listened to the debate whether medical doctors have some special - what do you call it? - dispensation is the word, going for them that they and they alone should use this particular title Doctor. There are all kinds of people going around, travelling around the world calling themselves Doctor, whom others call Doctor, and these titles have been conferred on them by universities; that is, they have the highest qualification. This debate leaves me just a little cold. It reminds me of the jingle: "There was a man called Fiddle who was offered a degree, and he said it's enough to be Fiddle without being Fiddle D. D."

Now there are doctors of - let me run down the line: Doctor Lockhart of the Winnipeg University, he's not a medical doctor; Doctor Saunderson of the University of Manitoba is not a medical doctor but he uses the title Doctor without qualification of any kind or any other indication that he is not a medical man. There are doctors of literature - that is Lit. D. I take it, there's Doctors of Laws, there's a Doctor of Divinity, there's Doctors of Philosophy, there's Doctors of Theology, and you could go on down the list, and none of these men have to indicate anything else that they are doctors of -- they use the title Doctor without having to indicate what special field that they cover, and it just leaves me a little bit cold, Mr. Speaker. I can't become excited or disturbed about what title a man carries because there are some men who have been conferred with the doctoral degree from the smallest two-bit colleges down in the States and they accept the title and nobody questions their right to use it except those who know where it came from. And so, Mr. Speaker -- (Interjection) -- Well, MLA is in a category by itself. But I don't know that this is a matter that need particularly worry us or concern us or disturb; it doesn't disturb me.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. EDWARD I. DOW (Turtle Mountain): I have some concern in regard to this in regards to the trend of optometrists in Manitoba over the last number of years. It seems that in Canada outside Manitoba the members of the optometrists society that have qualified are allowed to use the term Doctor. Might I point out to you that in the past 10 or 12 years the qualified optometrists in Manitoba have decreased from 66 to 55, and in 1968 there was only one new graduate came into Manitoba, whereas in Alberta there was 14 came to Alberta.

And following along the question of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, I'd like to read a paragraph from the School of Optometry, Faculty of Science, University of Waterloo, Ontario: "The Optometry Program General within the Science Faculty. The School of Optometry offers a five-year program leading to the degree of Doctor of Optometry. The first is a pre-optometry year preparatory to the four years of professional program. Knowledge and skills required in general science courses provided the foundation upon which courses in subsequent years are based."

So, Mr. Speaker, I wish to submit to you that I think the Optometry Society have a valid program, of which the University of Manitoba apparently will not repeal the Bill or give consent to the Bill that was passed in 1907. I think this present Bill is bringing into line currently to allow the qualified optometrists who have qualified as a Doctor of Optometry from the Waterloo University to carry this title to their name. And again I am concerned in the fact that if we are going to be the only province in Canada that is not going to agree to this, surely we're not going to "Grow to Beat '70."

MR. DOERN: Could I ask a question of the honourable member? Is the honourable member suggesting that by accepting the designation Doctor that this will cause an influx or an increase in the number of optometrists in Manitoba - that very change?

MR. DOW: Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether I'm supposed to answer that question, but with your permission, Sir, I suggest that if the other provinces in Canada are allowing these young people that graduate from Waterloo University to carry the title of Doctor, they're going to go to the other provinces and not go to Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: May I ask a question of the last speaker please? Is it the intention of the last speaker to let only those that receive a doctorate, either from Waterloo or any such other university, use the title of Doctor, or all the members of the optometrists here in Manitoba?

MR. SPEAKER: I suppose the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain would answer that question.

MR. DOW: Mr. Speaker, I didn't propose this Bill. I haven't got all the answers, but my answer to the Honourable Member for St. Boniface would be that due to the fact that the old optometrists that came into Manitoba years ago got their qualifications on a three-year course and Waterloo University has increased their course to a five-year, which does away with the apprenticeship that they were required to have in coming to practise optometry, and I would think that in my interpretation of it this Bill is designed that these people are graduates of Waterloo University, accredited by them, and I understand further that anyone that applies for a licence in Manitoba to practise optometry through the Society has to be cleared with the Waterloo University before they get that.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Matthews.

MR. STEEN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that the debate be adjourned, seconded by the Honourable Member from Roblin.

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

..... continued on next page

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 61. The Honourable Member for St. James.

MR. STANES presented Bill No. 61, an Act to amend The St. James-Assiniboia Charter and to enlarge the boundaries of the City, for second reading, and that it be referred to the Municipal Affairs Committee.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. STANES: Mr. Speaker, when I first saw this Bill I wondered why there was a Bill and not an agreement, but apparently any change in boundaries must come in by way of a Bill or an Act. There is a small piece of land at the north side of the airport which is a quarter of a section in total area, which is surrounded on the three sides, east, west and south, by land owned by St. James. At the north there's a road, north of that is Rosser. All but two acres of this land is controlled and owned by the Department of Transport and there is just two acres which is owned by Rosser. On that two acres of land there is the gravestone company which members may be familiar with. They have been trying for some time to get sewer and water into their premises. The only place from which sewer and water can come is from St. James. At the moment, or up to two days ago, the Department of Municipal Affairs was helping Rosser and St. James-Assiniboia to either agree on a price, or what is likely to happen and may have happened in the last two days, is an agreement of an exchange of property.

But the reason for this Bill is this two acres of land in order to get water and sewer to this piece. The only way it can be done is by means of such a bill as this, and there will be an agreed amount of compensation by exchange of land or by price between St. James-Assiniboia and Rosser.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 62. The Honourable Member for Brandon.

MR. LISSAMAN presented Bill No. 62, An Act to amend The Brandon Charter, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. LISSAMAN: Mr. Speaker, I think before this goes to second reading I should make it known to the members that I have a letter in my pocket which I shall produce at Committee, that Section 1 concerning the removal of excavation soil, that this section be deleted from the Bill - withdrawn, and I didn't want it to pass second reading until that were made known to members. Section (2) where the fraction one-half is changed to three-quarters, this is the penalty in paying arrears in redeeming land, the interest penalty; and the (b), subsection (b), the 25 cents becomes \$1.00. This is the issuance of a redemption certificate. The other section - 3 - is relating to the redemption of land again, but in the taxes which have been subsequent to taxes for which the land was sold, so that they're reupping the rates to a little more in line with current money rates.

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

MR. MILLER: Just a question, Mr. Speaker, I notice the increase from one-half to three-quarter percent. Is it the intention of Brandon therefore to charge three-quarters of one percent per month on the entire arrears of taxes even though some of these arrears might go back three years, or is it just the intention to charge three-quarters of one percent since they enacted their present by-law which calls for that interest on arrears of taxes?

MR. LISSAMAN: I'm afraid, Mr. Speaker, this is a question that I will have to have the answer for by the time the Bill reaches committee because I am not certain just what their actual intent is at the moment in this regard.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 82. The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. WALLY MCKENZIE (Roblin) presented Bill No. 82, An Act to enlarge the Boundaries of The Town of The Pas, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, possibly I should explain the Bill. This Bill 82 enlarges the town of The Pas by including some five new parcels of land. Parcels 1, 2 and 3 are referred to as The Pas Annex and were originally part of the town but were dropped a number of years ago because it was felt that the area was not needed by the town of The Pas. However, I am happy to say that the town now requires this land for immediate development. Parcels 4 and 5 are required for Churchill Forest Industries development. The original plant site was found to be unsuitable to carry the weight of the foundations required for their plant, so they

(MR. McKENZIE cont'd) . . . therefore acquired new property which is suitable for their purposes. Section 7 deems parcels 4 and 5 the land required by Churchill Forest Products - or Churchill Forest Industries, to be included within the plant site pursuant to the agreement of the 24th of February, 1966 and described in Chapter 82 of the statutes of this province, 1966.

This in effect, Mr. Speaker, enables the company and the town to enjoy the benefits of this agreement in the new area which of course is covered by these extended boundaries. The town will assume full responsibilities for any residents within the new area as of January 1, 1969, and the town of The Pas will assess all properties liable for assessment within the new area and shall notify each person so assessed. The normal right to appeals from assessment are preserved in the Bill, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I do have one or two questions. The Member for Roblin in giving some information and introducing the Bill mentioned that certain sections pertained to Churchill Forest Industries. I would like to know from him why he brings this Bill in and having it approved by the Legislature. Does this in any way relieve them of any commitments made to the government on previous occasions or to any other sources by providing and extending moneys for the development originally? I am just wondering because of the change of site whether this has anything to do with that. I notice that no award is required. I take it that this is the government's decision if there is no award required, because this is land not under municipal jurisdiction and therefore is probably not required. I wonder if the member could give us information on the point I raised.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. MILLER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make sure that we do have this information. The suggestion was that the parts 4 and 5, which are part of the plant required for Churchill Forest Products, would come under a certain agreement referred to by the member who introduced the Bill. Is it the intention that these sections or parts of land would not be subject to the usual municipal property taxes or would they be relieved in any way from any of the costs of services of the municipal taxes? Is this why this mention was made? I am wondering why specific mention was made to the agreement between Churchill Forest Products and The Pas. Was this the implication that I am drawing from it? Certainly I think before it goes into Committee, or certainly at Committee we should have this answer.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Mr. Speaker, I was wondering whether or not the Boundaries Commission has recommended these changes to the government, or does the Boundaries Commission in fact have questions such as this referred to them? I think this is rather important. And then I concur in what the Honourable Member for Kildonan has said in respect to Churchill Forest Products. Has there been any tax concessions made to Churchill Forest Products of any kind that would affect the revenues of the town? And maybe my honourable friend could tell us briefly the extent of the Churchill Forest Products at the moment, and the assessment, the amount of assessment that they are presently paying -- the extent of the assessment of their property there.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. CHERNIACK: The speaker will be closing debate will he not?

MR. SPEAKER: Exactly.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks, that debate be adjourned.

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

PRIVATE MEMBERS' RESOLUTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: I take it we return to Page 2. Proposed resolution No. 28 of the Honourable Member for Inkster. The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I introduced this resolution very briefly last Private Members' day and I just want to recap that three important things have occurred since an identical resolution was on the Order Paper at last year's session.

First, Mr. Speaker, and what I think is most significant, is that a Bill was passed last year in the Legislature amalgamating the municipalities of St. James and Assiniboia, and I want to, Mr. Speaker, briefly recall to the members of the House their attitude when that Bill was presented, because all of the arguments that have been used to spur the Legislature to act with respect to Greater Winnipeg as a whole have been either dismissed or parried with

(MR. GREEN cont'd) . . . the notion that some commission will be looking after the question. I think that it is very significant that an introduction of a change in boundaries is being made today although a Boundaries Commission is sitting and there has been no report from the Boundaries on that question. But every time somebody talks about consolidating all of the municipalities in Greater Winnipeg into a more rational unit, it is suggested by people, who should know better, that this can't happen until there are studies; this can't happen until it's referred to the Boundaries Commission; this can't happen unless we have a review of some kind by some independent tribunal. But, Mr. Speaker, last year, when St. James and Assiniboia wished to consolidate their boundaries, I recall that the Bill was introduced at probably - and I hope I'm being accurate, Mr. Speaker - it was around 11:30 or 12:00 o'clock at night. It was during that part of legislative activities that the members call "speed-up", and I believe it was the Honourable Member for St. James who introduced the resolution. I got up and I said, Mr. Speaker, I move, and seconded by an honourable member that the debate be adjourned. I did this at approximately midnight, and Mr. Speaker, there was a storm of protest from the municipal people involved as to how anybody could ask to adjourn debate, not to ask for a commission, but just to adjourn debate at 12:00 o'clock at night so that the Bill could be studied. There was a storm of protest that anybody would suggest that you could stop this kind of consolidation, or even request time to consider it when the two municipalities had come forth and wished to have their boundaries consolidated.

So, Mr. Speaker, this is significant because I think that it demolishes the suggestion that this resolution requires a great deal of study. This resolution is a simple resolution which calls for a rational solution of the problems of Greater Winnipeg local government administration, and Mr. Speaker, I venture to say that if the twelve municipalities came to us with a unanimous suggestion that this be done, that the Legislature wouldn't stop for a moment on the question, that it would think that debate was useless and that it would pass whatever bills these twelve municipalities presented without further study.

Now that being the case, Mr. Speaker, I think that the passing of the St. James-Assiniboia Bill showed that the true argument against amalgamation, against consolidating municipal services under one government in Greater Winnipeg, and the only substantial argument is that some local politician will be against it, and therefore to ameliorate any of the problems which might be experienced with local politicians who are against it, we have to put the thing off no matter whether this does damage or benefits Greater Winnipeg. Now that's the first significant event, Mr. Speaker.

The second significant event was the passing by the Metropolitan Corporation of Greater Winnipeg of a resolution in identical terms, by a vote of something like 7 or 8 to 1, that all municipal services in Greater Winnipeg be co-ordinated under one central government. And I say this is significant, Mr. Speaker, because it is often thought in the community that it is the Metro Council which opposes or prevents amalgamation, and indeed there is probably some degree of credibility to that notion, because this resolution was presented in 1965 to Metro Council under my name when I was then a councillor and was defeated by a vote of 5 to 4 - 5 to 4, Mr. Speaker - so there could be some notion that it was the Metropolitan Corporation which was seeking to retain its position as it was, that was against consolidation of these governments. But last year, Mr. Speaker, by a vote of 7 to 1, the Metro Council passed a motion in identical terms, with the appropriate amendments as being in a different form but otherwise in identical terms, approving the incorporation of Greater Winnipeg into one municipal government. And I think, Mr. Speaker, that this is a very important motion coming from a very important source, because we must remember that the Metro Councillors now represent all of the communities in Greater Winnipeg that are affected. So if one is looking for the best type of municipal approval, and the people by the way who would immediately disintegrate if such a motion were passed, the Metro Council has voted 7 to 1, and I believe that the vote would have even been more were other councillors there, because since then I have heard most councillors endorse this principle that municipal governments be put under one administration.

So that is, Mr. Speaker, I think the second significant event that this House should pay heed to in dealing with this Bill. And I say, Mr. Speaker, if there was reason for opposing the Bill last year, and it was only opposed by government members and we are led to believe not even by a government vote, that each of the government members, all 30 of them who voted against this Bill, we are told, came to the conclusion independently and out of their own conscience that this was a bad resolution, which, Mr. Speaker, sounds very unusual. It was not

(MR. GREEN cont'd) . . . government policy, we are told, but they all 30 of them - or whatever number were in the House - even though it wasn't a policy question happened to come to the same conclusion on this particular resolution. Well, Mr. Speaker, I speak to all of them again as individuals, because we have no government policy, I say to you, Mr. Speaker -- I say to these members, I say to these members that three things have happened and these things should dismiss any notions that they had last year, and surely one or two of them could find themselves able to support this resolution.

Thirdly, Mr. Speaker, we have a very sophisticated and well thought out report called the Target for Economic Development, and I am not going to read from the report, there are five pages which the members are perfectly capable of reading for themselves. I hope that their understanding will be just as effective as their ability to read the legislation, and this report, Mr. Speaker, says that "the future of Greater Winnipeg, that its status as a metropolis in North America, depends on a rationalized form of metropolitan government," and it suggests one civic administration to consolidate all of the services which are now being administered by roughly 13 administrations - the Metro administration and the 12 municipal administrations. So I would ask honourable members to take those three very significant factors into consideration and to approve what I believe, and firmly believe, to be the much needed - and as a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I would go as far as to say vital change in local administration in Greater Winnipeg in order to make sure that Winnipeg is a thriving city on this continent.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to repeat everything that was said on the Bill last year. If members feel that they would like to review what was said, then I submit that they can look over the debate in Hansard last year. I don't think that there was any significant arguments put forth by government members; there were some suggestions as to difficulties which would be involved in making one municipal government, but I would ask them to review the remarks that were made on the subject last year, and that's in the interest, Mr. Speaker, of brevity.

However, I would like to deal with some of the questions in an abbreviated form. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that it's necessary for Greater Winnipeg to be administered by one central government in the interest of several key features. First of all, Mr. Speaker, in the interest of planning, because we now have the unusual situation, Mr. Speaker, of the Metropolitan Government being in charge of the planning of Greater Winnipeg without at the same time having control of the revenue which is received from industrial activity. And to make the example more illuminating, the Metropolitan Corporation could presumably say that there will be no industrial development in the City of St. Vital, that it should be, it is, and should continue to be essentially a dormitory residential area. And I think, Mr. Speaker, that that's true and that it is good, that you wouldn't want to take a meat packing industry or an abattoir or other industrial uses and put them into St. Vital which is one of our most beautiful residential areas. But by implementing proper planning, Mr. Speaker, they are confining at the same time the municipality of St. Vital to receive its revenue strictly from residential uses, which means that the municipality is denied the offsetting industrial taxation which a municipality like Tuxedo has, which a municipality like St. Boniface has, which a municipality like St. James has, and Metro is in the position of cutting off - and the member for Selkirk raised this with regard to an outlying area the other day - but in the interests of good planning, they are in the position of cutting off industrial revenue to the municipality of St. Vital by their planning power and being completely powerless to doing anything about the fact that the revenues that are received from industry remain within the municipalities where the industries are located.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I submit that the industrial revenues of Greater Winnipeg, which is a one social, economic and geographic unit - by anybody's standards, by any town planner's standard we are geographically, socially and economically a unit - that the industrial revenues should belong to the entire Metropolitan area, that it should not be a consideration in the planning authority that it has to offset some of the problems that a municipality has by allowing an industrial use because otherwise they would have no industrial tax base. And so, Mr. Speaker, that is one of the most important areas which I think should be considered in deciding what type of local administration Winnipeg is to have.

Mr. Speaker, two of the most obvious services necessitate a single administration in Greater Winnipeg, and these are fire and police. I'm sure that the members of this House are all acquainted with the study that was made by the Metropolitan Corporation of Greater Winnipeg, headed by Mr. Charles Huband, on the study of police forces in Greater Winnipeg which recommended that there be one police force in Greater Winnipeg, and Mr. Speaker, doesn't everybody

(MR. GREEN cont'd) agree that this is obvious? Does anybody suggest that crime or criminals know the boundaries of Greater Winnipeg and that they confine themselves to their own areas because they are provincial in their criminal thoughts and they don't want to have Winnipeg incur an expense which they as residents of St. Vital should have incurred by the St. Vital police, or vice versa. And isn't it impossible and even ludicrous to try to figure out which municipality should pay for the greater portion of police services in Greater Winnipeg? Isn't the Huband report so obvious that we don't need a study, that police services in Greater Winnipeg should be one central administered force with appropriate regional offices.

Mr. Speaker, isn't the same thing true of fire? Does fire know any boundaries? Haven't we been perplexed from time to time when we have found out that different fire departments were unable to handle blazes without permission from another fire department because they didn't happen to occur within their civic administration? Isn't it more obvious? Do we need a commission, Mr. Speaker, do we need a Boundaries Commission or do we need any other kind of commission to tell us that the fire-fighting in Greater Winnipeg should be handled by one central administration? And these things, Mr. Speaker, three of which I've mentioned, are compounded in every single service that is provided by municipal government.

I can well recall, Mr. Speaker, that when I sat on Metro Council that various local administrations would come and resist planning of commercial uses in their area and would say that the supply of water, which was handled by themselves rather than by the Metro Council, would somehow be withheld, which of course they had no right to do, if the planning authority went ahead with what it had a perfect right to do, and that is to plan for the use that would take place in that particular constituency.

And I say, Mr. Speaker, that these areas - and I repeat, in the interest of brevity I'm not going to introduce every single one of them - but I say, Mr. Speaker, that all of them are affected by the present situation and by the general confusion that exists within the areas concerned as to which government is doing a particular thing. And I submit that the administration should be single, with one elected body, and I'm not, as I said last year, I'm not asking that that body be the Metro Council. I'm not asking that it be the City of Winnipeg. I don't agree with what recently appears to be coming from the City of Winnipeg, that amalgamation should take place by annexation. I think that would be a bad idea. I think amalgamation should take place by the elimination of all of the municipal governments that presently exist and that we should start a new one, and the most cogent reason, Mr. Speaker, for suggesting this is that the existing situation is ridiculous. The existing situation is one, Mr. Speaker, that if you ask any planning authority to start with a city of 500,000 people in an area of approximately 30 square miles such as we have in Greater Winnipeg - I may be wrong about the mileage but I don't think I'm far out - but if you started with that type of situation, would any planner that attended any school of planning set up what we now have in Greater Winnipeg? Would anybody be able to justify the existing situation? Surely the existing situation grew up like Topsy; it has no rationale to it at all. It's time we looked at the area as to what it should be rather than as it has been allowed to develop. I said last year, Mr. Speaker, and I think that this is worth repeating, that the present municipal government structure in Greater Winnipeg resembles an octopus with a nervous breakdown, and that nobody would be able to make any sense out of it except somebody who had studied it for years and years, and after that study, Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that they would say that it doesn't make sense.

Now, I want to deal, Mr. Speaker, for a moment then with why we haven't moved in the direction which I say, and which I sincerely feel is obvious we should do and I touched on it at the opening of my remarks, that there is - and I'm not blaming anyone - there is a built-in resistance on the part of municipal councils presently existing. Not on the part of the people in the municipalities, Mr. Speaker, because we did a very interesting survey and we did it some three years ago, and the survey I suggest to you was accurate because it was taken under a completely bland atmosphere. The Member for Elmwood at that time was in charge of a booth at the Red River Exhibition at which I think some four or five thousand people were asked: Do you agree that all municipal governments in Greater Winnipeg should be administered by one -- that all municipalities in Greater Winnipeg should be administered by one government rather than the situation that exists? And Mr. Speaker, the answers were, "I do" or "I don't" and then "I live in" - and it named the municipality - and in every single municipality in Greater Winnipeg, including St. Boniface, Mr. Speaker, where we are led to believe that they are against it,

(MR. GREEN cont'd) . . . registered a vote of over 50 percent in favour of one central government in this city.

So we are dealing, Mr. Speaker, with the municipal governments themselves when we talk about amalgamation and not with the people who reside in these areas. And why is it, Mr. Speaker, that these municipal politicians are against amalgamation? And I repeat, I don't blame them. Each municipal government, Mr. Speaker, is now constituted so that it is in the interest of their particular government to try to get the advantage of living within a total urban area while disabusing itself or avoiding as much responsibility as it can possibly avoid, and Mr. Speaker, that's the nature of a municipal council. How much can we get out of the area? How much can we avoid the payment of taxes, and the municipal councillor who does this most successfully is the municipal councillor that the people will elect. If they can - and I'm going to demonstrate this graphically - if they can take advantage of the urban area while paying as little as possible to the costs of maintaining the urban area, then they have successfully done their job as a municipal councillor. And I don't blame them. I have nothing against the municipal councillors; I say that they are all fine people. I say that if you took 150 named people - and you can name the most intelligent, articulate and sophisticated people in Manitoba - and you took these people and put them onto the municipal councils as they now exist and with our present municipal structure, they would behave in exactly the same way within a very short period of time as the municipal councillors are now behaving, because it's in their interest and in the interest of their constituents that they behave this way.

And, Mr. Speaker, I can prove it, because I can cite you instances with regard to every single municipality of how each municipal council wanted those things that were a benefit to him by one big city, but wanted to avoid the administration of one big city as it affects his area.

Mr. Speaker, the City of St. Vital has often expressed itself against amalgamation. Members of that council have expressed themselves against amalgamation, but they are in favour of having the industrial revenue divided amongst all of the areas in Greater Winnipeg rather than amongst those locations that presently have them. So they're against amalgamation but they are for distribution of industrial revenue.

The City of Transcona has expressed itself against amalgamation, but they were the biggest fighters for eliminating the zone fares. And what was their argument? Their argument was that we shouldn't have a zone fare on a bus because we are all part of one economic unit and our people should be able to get down town for the same price as a person in North Winnipeg should get down town. Against amalgamation but for the elimination of the bus fare. And what did the City of St. Vital say when they want to share industrial revenue? They say that the industrial revenue belongs to the entire urban area; they don't belong to the area where the industry happens to exist. Against amalgamation; for the distribution of industrial taxation.

The City of St. Boniface - the municipal councillors, they said they were against amalgamation but they did say, Mr. Speaker, that Pan Am facilities which were going to be purchased at one time by Metropolitan money should be located in the City of St. Boniface because it is part of the general area. Against amalgamation; for a special facility being in their area because they are part of Greater Winnipeg.

Fort Garry, Mr. Speaker, has come out against amalgamation, but they fought very strongly, Mr. Speaker, they used every kind of lobby that they knew how, to make sure that the taxation on the reservoir that was in Fort Garry be charged on the basis of a local improvement to their area, on the basis that this was something they were entitled to by virtue of the existence of that plant in that area.

St. James, Mr. Speaker, against amalgamation. This is one of the most hypocritical stands by that particular municipality. First of all, they were quite for amalgamation to get together with Assiniboia and they were quite for keeping their industrial revenue, the revenues that are being obtained by the industrial parks that are created there and by the Air Force that is there, but, Mr. Speaker, what did they want and what did they lobby for and what did they insist on? That the Metropolitan Corporation develop Ness Avenue because it was an arterial thoroughfare. Yes, they said that this is a street that has to be paid for by the entire municipality.

The same thing with Seven Oaks, Mr. Chairman. The municipal councillors against amalgamation, but I know what they did to make us pay for Salter Street, which after it was paid for by the Greater Winnipeg area was taken back as a municipal street rather than as a Metro street. At that time they said it was a Metro street, definitely a Metro street, has to

(MR. GREEN cont'd) . . . be paid for by Metro, going north into a new development. And we did pay for it, and then when they started to figure out what were Metro streets, Salter street was suddenly no longer - after it was paid for - was no longer a Metro street, it now became a municipal street and it's now a municipal street as far as the greater portion of West Kildonan is concerned.

Mr. Speaker, the same thing is true of Assiniboia. Local politicians against amalgamation, but they say they should be able to get water from the reservoirs of Greater Winnipeg because they are a part of Greater Winnipeg.

East Kildonan - some local politicians against amalgamation, but they said that the garbage picking up is a total Winnipeg area and that Metro should get into that area for the purpose of facilitating the total community in that particular respect, because they built a new garbage disposal incinerator which was too expensive to run and therefore this should have been run by the entire area rather than by the city itself.

The same is true, Mr. Speaker, of every municipality in Greater Winnipeg, and the biggest example was the one that I brought up last year of the streets. All of the urban areas came and said that they didn't want to be part of Metro Winnipeg, they didn't want to be part of the total tax base, but they had streets which were economically vital to the operation of Greater Winnipeg and these should be paid for by the total community. Against amalgamation, Mr. Speaker, but for the total community paying for streets in their particular constituency. Mr. Speaker, as long as we have the existing situation, as long as we have the situation that we have now, every municipal council will try to take advantage of the Metropolitan area insofar as getting services to his community while avoiding the responsibility of becoming part of the total tax base while it's in their interest to do so. Mr. Speaker, on that basis we can't support the existing system, and I submit to you that the existing system should be changed and changed quickly, because, Mr. Speaker, we're running out of time.

There is something else that is going on in Greater Winnipeg which will make amalgamation and a rational solution to this problem more and more difficult. The first is the so-called partial amalgamation where you will have two or three municipalities getting together and becoming stronger and stronger and bigger and more powerful opponents to a rational scheme.

But there is a further thing that is happening, Mr. Speaker, that makes it even more difficult, because when the Metro Act was originally written and as it now stands, there is a section in it which provides that the Provincial Government could, at a particular period of time, pass a certain provision or give approval to a certain by-law - and I can't remember the exact machinery by which this was to become about - whereby any community indulging in a capital expenditure in its community would have to get approval from the Municipal Board. And I suggest to the Minister that that provision was put in there for one reason, and that is that there would not be a lopsided capital debt in any particular community in Greater Winnipeg, because if there is a lopsided capital debt it becomes more and more difficult for the entire community to decide that its tax base will take care of a debt that was obliged for in the first place by one particular municipality, and therefore there was that section which was put in in order to attempt to control capital debt.

But, Mr. Speaker, the government has never had the desire - and I'm being kind - I think that it has never had the courage to go ahead and enforce that particular provision, so that we don't know what is happening, Mr. Speaker, and I venture to say that the Minister can't tell us what is occurring with regard to the capital debt in the various areas of Greater Winnipeg. So that you may have capital projects being undertaken now by small municipalities which will make it more and more difficult and less and less equitable for the entire community to take the costs of paying for that capital debt should amalgamation be decided upon as a rational conclusion.

And that is happening, Mr. Speaker, and it'll be worse as time goes by, and while commissions are sitting and while we are engaging in studies and while we are procrastinating, I'd say that the situation becomes more and more difficult and I ask the members of this House to end the procrastination; to approve what I say, Mr. Speaker, is merely a resolve to move in a certain direction. I'm not saying that when we pass this Bill that tomorrow the governments disappear, but when we pass this Bill, at least we give notice to Greater Winnipeg that this is the direction that we are going to move in. And once we know where we are going, Mr. Speaker, once you say that our destination is to be a particular locality, then it's relatively easy to tell

(MR. GREEN cont'd) . . . a person which street he follows to get to that locality; but when we don't know where we are going, when we don't have any destination in mind, when we don't know what Metropolitan Winnipeg is going to look like in ten years from now and in 15 years from now or 25 years from now, then there is no course which we can advise, either the Provincial Government or the municipal governments, to take in order to get there.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that this resolution merely confirms what the government has said. It has approved in rather general principle, and I wish it were specific, but it has approved in rather general principle the objective of the Targets for Economic Development. One of the targets which is therefore generally approved is that we have one municipal government in Greater Winnipeg, and all I'm asking the government to do is to say so. We've approved of the targets generally. Will the Minister of Municipal Affairs say yes, that one of those targets which we wish to indicate that we approve specifically is that we have one municipal government in Greater Winnipeg.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish to close my remarks by repeating something that I did say last year, and that is that I don't look upon Metropolitan Winnipeg rationalization of government as being particularly a tax saver. It may not save anybody tax money, it may cost some people more tax money. But, Mr. Speaker, there are two ways of saving taxes; one is to reduce the amount of taxes that a person has to pay, and the second way is to give him a better product for the taxes he is now paying. If I could get a Cadillac for the same price as I am now paying for a Ford or for a Chevrolet, then, Mr. Speaker, I have saved money because the product is better, and I suggest that we will have a better product, and at least, Mr. Speaker, and most important, we will have a means whereby the citizen can identify his government. We now have the situation, and I've seen it in practice, where one municipal politician will say that the citizen's complaint is justifiably — it should be brought to Metro; or the increase in the levy that is made, that it's Metro's fault or Metro will say that it's the city's fault.

Well, Mr. Speaker, in the interests of democratic government, which I believe is paramount and which is the paramount reason for bringing in this resolution, people should know who are the responsible representatives, and that would happen if we had some municipal government in the area. The government would be identified, the representatives would be identified, and I submit that as a result of that identification we would have better government.

So, Mr. Speaker, in summary, I suggest to you that the reasons are now different than they were last year. They are more compelling; the areas of municipal jurisdiction all, almost without exception, demand rationalization; and that the opposition to a central government in Greater Winnipeg is neither a valid one and can be understood to continue, if it's permitted to on the present basis; and that in the interests of democracy generally there be an identifiable government.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to indicate that this inability of the citizen to focus on his political representative because of the breakdown in government has resulted in what I submit is the great apathy that takes place now in municipal elections. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I was first elected to Metro Council by five percent or five and a half percent of the electorate, and I'm ashamed to say it but it couldn't be otherwise, that's the number that came out. Ten percent voted and I got just over half of that ten percent vote, so my electoral record as far as that council was concerned was that I was elected to the council to sit as a councillor with just between five and six percent of the vote.

But it's worse, Mr. Speaker, when we come to the municipalities, because if you will look at the record of municipal elections you will see that almost without exception — and you can't be entirely general — but almost without exception the turnout is atrocious. In many places acclamations take place because the citizen is just not interested and he's not interested because he has lost touch, for the very reason that the municipal councillors say that there should be local government, he has lost touch with his local government and no longer pays any attention to it either at election time or at any other time. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Logan. The Honourable Member for St. James.

MR. STANES: Mr. Speaker, as I'm awaiting information, I wish to have the indulgence of the House to allow this matter to stand.

MR. SPEAKER: (Agreed.) The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition. The Honourable Member for St. James.

MR. STANES: Mr. Speaker, generally in the preamble I do agree. There are one or two minor points that I perhaps don't agree, but I do agree with the intent. What was the resolution is really saying is that we've got to have in this day and age in this complex society of ours more communication. I agree. During my term on St. James Council, and since then I've had the privilege like most of the members, Mr. Speaker, of meeting many of our municipal people, and I think that we would all agree that by and large we are very fortunate in Manitoba in having a very high calibre of men and women who have offered themselves, very often at great expense to themselves, in serving the public in their community. I do think that this gives another reason why we have to have communication.

However, I cannot accept the resolution for two reasons, one because we have been informed during this session on I think two or three occasions, certainly once by the Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs, that there is either being set up or is set up a tax structure committee consisting of provincial and municipal people in order to commence this communication, the sharing of ideas, not only all money but also responsibility. This of course takes time; this I believe is in being and will of course gain momentum as time goes on.

The other reason why I cannot accept this resolution is the last part of the resolution, "Be it Therefore Resolved that all Members of the Legislature be invited to such a conference." I may be wrong, Mr. Speaker, but I believe that we in this Legislature are not here in an executive capacity, and therefore as individuals we might be but not collectively as members. The province, in our system of government, is run by the Executive Council and we as members of the Legislature come here and agree or disagree according to our Party affiliations perhaps or maybe our own personal feelings and so on, but I do not think it's right in a resolution of this kind to include per se members of the Legislature in such a conference. I think perhaps that probably as this Tax Structure Committee develops, and I'm sure it will develop and I'm sure before long the Honourable the First Minister will have something further to say on this matter because I believe he feels very strongly on this matter and has said so on numerous occasions, that there will be occasions when we as individual members will probably attend some of these meetings, maybe the ad hoc part, maybe in some capacity, but to put in the resolution the members of the Legislature to be invited to such a conference I believe is not correct and I cannot buy it.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, in brief, I agree with the intent, I think it's excellent and we must go in this direction, but I believe we're already on the way to doing it and therefore at this time I cannot support the resolution.

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

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I wish 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 adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Portage. The Honourable the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

MR. CARROLL: Mr. Speaker, the resolution that is before us is an extremely interesting one to all members of the House. I believe that it's the intention of the — I hope it's the intention at least of the proposer that this should create an interest in northern Manitoba and its development. I think we see something in the preamble here that we have not had acknowledged by members of the opposition, at least the members of the Liberal Party in the past, and that is the third "Whereas" in which they recognize that northern Manitoba is on a threshold of great development.

I think this is an acknowledgment that I would like to draw to the attention of the members of the House and certainly quite different from many of the things that have been said in past years by members from St. Boniface and others. I believe that in the interest of regional development and economic development I think government and governments have a responsibility to encourage and to stimulate all sectors of our country and our economy and to help our residents to adjust to new environments and new situations. I think I know as well as anybody in this House the frustrations of people who live in northern Manitoba. It's the frustration of people who live often in isolation, sometimes vast distances from their friends, lacking

(MR. CARROLL cont'd) . . . in amenities, lack of just general contact with society. I can recall not many years ago under a former government where contact in the north was very difficult, where there were inadequate communications, no radio contact in many parts of the province, certainly none of the amenities to which southerners are accustomed - lacking in health services, in dental services, and many of the things that northerners generally take for granted today. So I welcome this resolution and welcome the opportunity to voice some opinions on it at this time.

I'd like to comment on the portion of the resolution that refers to Roads to Resources, and in this regard I would say that we will welcome all the help that we can get from the Liberal caucus in this House. I think one will recognize and admit today that this is one of the great programs of the Diefenbaker era, and I'd like to say that it got very scant support from members on the opposite side in the days in which that program was running, and of course we know how short-lived it was when the time came to change governments in Ottawa. They could hardly wait to put the axe to that program. In fact we all recall the scoffing remarks by members of the Liberal Party as to what the purport of this resolution was. We know here today, and I'm glad that the Liberal caucus recognize it, that this is something we need in this province if we're to push into our northern frontiers and to have the kind of development and to have the kind of progress that we all want. So we welcome your support. It's late, but we're glad to have it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. It has been such a peaceful afternoon, can't we go another 10 minutes in the same manner and listen most intently to the Honourable Minister.

MR. CARROLL: Mr. Speaker, he was nattering so hard I could hardly hear myself think. That's a difficult thing to do. He's a very distracting fellow. One can hardly overlook him when you're standing where I am here and seem to be facing in his general direction.

Well, with respect to the next item in this resolution, income tax credits for residents in northern Manitoba, I think we have something here that one would recognize might be a very desirable thing if it in fact could be implemented. I think we recognize that with the tax collection agreements that we have that we rely on the Government of Canada to collect our income tax, and the rules under which the income tax laws are administered are within their making and it's up to them to make the necessary changes.

Now I would not oppose consideration of some kind, as is suggested here, being given as an incentive for northern development. I think we all agree that incentives are highly desirable. The Leader of the Opposition mentioned Russia and some of the things that they have to teach us, and he mentioned specifically the north-south transportation study and the fact that our commissioner went there in the course of his studies. I think it was a very fine thing to do. I think we're not proud; we will take good advice wherever we can get it, and if the Russians have advice to offer then we welcome it. I know that officials of Manitoba Hydro have gone there to find out what they're doing by way of long distance transmission. We may have considerable to learn from them about other matters of northern living as well. I think we'll all agree though that we don't have the same flexibility with respect to incentives that the Russians have. I think they are not accountable in the same way that we are to our electorate and therefore have a great deal more flexibility.

I do welcome the change in philosophy that seems to be evident, that they are now espousing some of the free enterprise principles that have worked so well in other parts of the world. I think government has some responsibility to give leadership with respect to incentives for northern living. The Government of Manitoba have developed some incentives to encourage our people to go north - certain housing incentives, certain transportation facilities that are available to them, certain help with respect to food costs if they're located in isolated areas, and certain cost of living bonuses. These are things we think are desirable in helping to make up for some of the difficulties that people face in living in our north country.

I think there are many companies in Manitoba that provide similar incentives, maybe even better incentives. There's one company I know that pays holiday trips for certain of their employees after they have spent a certain period of time working with them. They provide transportation allowances to people who come in and go out if they stay a certain period of time. They certainly provide incentives by way of wages, because one has to pay somewhat higher wages to attract people into these parts of our province. There are certain housing incentives that are created. Certainly a great deal is done by way of recreation and recreation facilities, and these we think are all highly desirable things, and I think the responsibility rests with the

(MR. CARROLL cont'd) employer to provide the kind of incentives that would enable them to attract people to their particular place of employment.

I'm not sure what the complications are of providing the kind of income tax differential that has been suggested. I would think there might be other complications. There might be other areas where we would want to attract people to live as well. With the speed with which we are depopulating some of our rural areas, maybe this kind of an incentive would have application there as well. Maybe we would have to use this kind of incentive to pay people for jobs that are dangerous or unpopular or whatever. So I think there are some complications in making application of this particular principle.

I think there are other ways in which government can help. We can help in providing the communication facilities and this has happened to a remarkable degree in northern Manitoba. I notice in tonight's paper where all dial telephone systems north of 53 are now -- at least all systems of telephones are now dial-operated north of 53, which shows the degree of sophistication that the telephone system is employing in that part of the province.

We know that we have regular contact with most of our more isolated areas. We have good radio service in most parts of our province today. This wasn't a fact even as long ago as five years. Certainly 10 years ago there were many areas that could get no radio communications at all, or if they did it was only sporadically. We now have television available to a larger number of residents in northern Manitoba, and we think these are areas that are properly the responsibility of government to provide. I think we can do much by way of providing incentives for the development of recreation programs, helping to spread the arts and culture and other amenities of that kind throughout the province as well.

There is some suggestion of a Ministry of Northern Affairs and I think this is a very popular idea, but I'm not sure that it would hold out the same advantages in practice that it appears to have on the surface. Presumably if you had one Minister of this government responsible for northern development you would only have one Minister that had a specific interest or a concern or would take the time and effort that's necessary to understand the complicated problems that exist in northern Manitoba. I think there are many advantages in having all Ministers involved and interested and concerned in programs operating in that part of the country.

I think that we must recognize that some of the most difficult problems in every department of government exist in northern Manitoba. The problems of education are much more complicated north of 53 than they are south. The problems of providing health services are much more complicated in the north than they are in the south. We know something of the difficulties in dealing with probably our largest social problem, the under-employment of people in the north scattered throughout the length and breadth of northern Manitoba, and the kinds of problems in providing services to those people to help them get out of a situation into which they seem to be locked at the present time. We know something of the more difficult law enforcement problems that exist in the north. The provision of municipal services, in essence, was one of the main purposes of the Northern Commissioner's Office to provide these services as well as to be an agency to provide services for other government departments and the coordination of those kinds of services as well.

So I think if we had to give one Minister the administrative responsibility for all of these things, we would have to allocate to him our best expertise and our best skills from all of the other government departments if he was to administer all government programs in northern Manitoba. And I would think that while this looks good in theory and seems to be providing greater emphasis and greater encouragement to the north, I think in fact it would have quite different results in practice and so I would think that I would not be prepared to support that idea at this stage.

I would like to say with respect to decentralization, which seems to be one of the ideas -- at least expressed by the Leader of the Opposition -- we have gone a long way with respect to the decentralization of most government departments with respect to their operation

MR. SPEAKER: I regret I must interrupt the Honourable Minister. I'm sure he has a few more remarks to make but it is now 5:30 and I'm leaving the Chair to return again at 8:00 o'clock this evening.