



Legislative Assembly Of Manitoba

DEBATES and PROCEEDINGS

Speaker

The Honourable A. W. Harrison



THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
2:30 o'clock, Monday, February 19th, 1962.

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

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

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier) (Wolseley) introduced Bill No. 20, An Act to amend The Insurance Act.

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN (Minister of Education) (Dauphin) introduced Bill No. 12, An Act to amend The University Act.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders are called may I lay on the table of the House a number of returns. Report of the Treasury Board on the statement of Public Accounts for the Province of Manitoba for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1961; a detailed statement of all remissions made under authority of Section 50 of Chapter 272 of the revised Statutes; a regulation respecting matters under the Insurance Act; a report of any overdrafts or lines of credit arranged since the last report of the Legislature; statements prepared pursuant to Section 20 of The Public Officers Act and a statement prepared pursuant to The Lunacy Act and the Administrator of the Estates of the Mentally Incompetent.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Speaker, with leave I should like to lay on the table of the House the report of the Board of Governors of the University of Manitoba, the Annual Report of the Legislative Library and the Annual Report of the Department of Education.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. PETER WAGNER (Fisher): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question or two to the Public Works Minister. Who has the contract on the bridge which is being built across the river on the access road to the Village of Fisher Branch on Highway 7? Also the cost of the bridge? Second: will the said bridge have an extension to accommodate school children to cross on their way to and from school -- that is a crosswalk? And third: when will Public Works construct a sidewalk along this access road for the school students -- that's high school students -- coming from town and back as a safety measure?

HON. WALTER WEIR (Minister of Public Works) (Minnedosa): Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the Honourable Member for Fisher for having given me notice of these questions. The answers in the order in which he gave them are: Harper Construction Company Limited have the contract at an approximate cost of \$22,000.00. The answer as to whether or not there will be a pedestrian walk on the bridge is yes, on the north side of the bridge; and there will be no sidewalk as far as the Department of Public Works is concerned. The only time that we have the sidewalks built in relation to the road is when they are an integral part of the bridge. If there is a sidewalk needed it will fall as a responsibility of the school board or other interested party.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. Adjourned debate on the proposed motion for an Address to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor in answer to his speech at the Opening of the Session. The Honourable the Leader of the Opposition.

HON. GILDAS MOLTAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, it's been a pleasant custom in our House in the past that at the opening of this debate we take a few moments to look over some of the events that have gone on since we last met as well as to congratulate some of the members of the House who have been involved in some of the changes that normally occur in between sessions.

I am very happy on this occasion to be able to compliment you, Sir, on your return to the

(Mr. Molgat, cont'd.) House and being seated as Speaker. I know we can look forward to your wise and learned help throughout the course of our debates. I'd like as well to congratulate the mover and the seconder of the Address. I was very interested in the comments they had to make. I would like to say to the mover that I too have been privileged in receiving the same literature which he used during the course of his speech and I have found it most interesting, and trust I will have other occasions too when I can use it at later dates.

The seconder, I thought, brought some very interesting comments on developments in the north and some interesting suggestions which I think would bear looking into in further analysis. On this occasion too, I would like to congratulate the two new Ministers who grace the Chamber at this Session: The Minister of Public Works, I believe -- I'm not sure if I should say Municipal Affairs -- in any case whatever post he is occupying in a full-time capacity, I wish him well in his work. Similarly with the Minister of Health, who unfortunately is absent this afternoon, but he has our very best wishes as well. I should say Welfare. We may have comments of a different nature to make later on in the course of debates but we certainly wish them well in their work.

I'm very happy as well to see the Minister of Public Works, the previous Minister that is, back in his seat with us in the House and looking as well as he is.

Since we last met too, Mr. Speaker, we've had a change in the group to my left. They have gone through some metamorphosis, have changed their name and have got a new leader, old leader, I'm not quite sure what the process is. I would, however, like to compliment my friend, the Leader of the NDP and wish him reasonably well in his work in the future. I'm afraid that today must be a rather blue day for my honourable friend when he's seeing the beginning of the disintegration of his party in Ottawa, it surely must lead him to wonder and look around in his seats behind himself. This is an unfortunate occasion on which I have to compliment him, but really I didn't choose the timing.

(Mr. Molgat spoke in French. Translation in later issue of Hansard.)

Pleasant as it is, Mr. Speaker, to observe these amenities, the duties of my office, however, compel me now to turn to matters less amicable but rather more urgent -- and that is the examination of the record of this government. Before undertaking this task I would like first to turn to the Speech from the Throne which was read to the House last Thursday -- and I must say this is truly the most amazing document I have heard read to this House in the past. Many phrases come to mind as one leafs through the eight pages, but the most persistent image is one of the Ministers across the way running about hurriedly sticking their fingers in holes in the dike, making sure that anything that they might anticipate from this side of the House is blocked off in advance and that any proposals and criticisms are anticipated.

Now I have no intention of dealing with all the matters that they bring up here, but I can't resist the temptation to touch on a few. I couldn't help in particular to be amused when I turned to page six and I see there that my honourable friends state at the bottom of the page that "the development of the Memorial Park will proceed as weather permits." Now we're certainly making sure, Mr. Speaker, that there is nothing left that anyone can touch if it's possible -- we're even covering ourselves against the elements.

Then when we turn as well to the remainder of the speech, I see on the first page that my honourable friends take credit there for an economy that's bouyant and its prospects hopeful, which we would all agree with. But I wonder if they are so willing to accept the, apparently the responsibility for this, are they equally willing to accept the responsibility for the weak spots in our economy and for the tremendous unemployment which is still facing all of us in this country.

Reading on we find a proposal for an increase in the gross amount of unconditional grants to municipalities. I contend, Mr. Speaker, that it is indeed high time that our hard-pressed municipalities do receive additional financial aid from this government, not on the basis of growth of population, but on the basis that since this government took office the promises of the First Minister to the contrary, municipal taxes have risen sharply largely as a result of the policies of this government. Council after council across this province have been forced to come back again and again to its ratepayers and increase its taxes on the basis largely of this government's policies. And I repeat that this is despite the firm promises made by my

(Mr. Molgat, cont'd.) honourable friend the First Minister on platforms up and down the country when he said that if he were elected there would be no increase in taxation in Manitoba, and he said more than that, but he promised that the tax burden on homes and farms in this province would be eased. Now some three years later the municipalities having carried for that time the heavy burden of tax increases, this government proposes that it will give increased unconditional grants on the basis of changes in population. This phrasing in no way guarantees that all the municipalities in this province will receive additional money. What is needed at this time is an undertaking from this government that an immediate increase in the per capita grants to municipalities will be given. Only by such an act can the government assure this House that all the municipalities in Manitoba will receive equitable treatment and short of that statement, then the statement in the Throne Speech is almost meaningless. The same page of the Throne Speech contains what I can only term an amazing revelation -- the Federal Government policy is now being made in Manitoba. The Government is, and I quote, "concerned with the dramatic changes in international trade and with the effects of Britain joining the ECM." It suggests that we would take advantage, or prepare to take advantage, of these new developments. Well, the first Minister's chief in Ottawa will be rather surprised to hear this. His spokesman at Accra took a view diametrically opposed to the position expressed here, and in spite of the attempts of the Minister of Finance on his return to rewrite history, the Prime Minister of Canada himself has displayed nothing so far except antagonism, truculence and complete lack of co-operation with Britain on this subject of ECM. Now is the First Minister forming Federal policy? Is he once again protecting his so-called friends in Ottawa; or is he preparing a channel by which our Prime Minister can get himself off the hook on this policy? I can assure him that we Liberals who have for long advocated a sane approach to this question of ECM, will agree with this turnabout, if that's what it is. We certainly think it's high time to take advantage of this situation.

We will agree as well with another item appearing on the same page, in which the government announces its intention of introducing legislation regarding credit purchases. I'm sure the House will recall that just last year, at our regular session, my colleague, the Member for Selkirk, after having considered the subject very carefully, proposed exactly that sort of legislation here in this House. Similarly our own party in our convention last April proposed a resolution exactly of this nature. So he will have our agreement on that, and I would congratulate the First Minister on his intrepid use of policies from any source which happens to come along.

Unfortunately, the item in the next paragraph is, in my opinion, a disappointment to Manitobans. I'm completely in accord with increased funds to the public schools and the University of Manitoba. But why stop there? Surely no one can disagree that Brandon College and the other affiliated colleges cannot conceivably continue to operate without further aid. It was a Liberal Government, I would remind my honourable friends, in this province that established the policy of giving capital grants to these colleges. This was in connection with a Federal policy at the same time. In our opinion it is more than time that the affiliated colleges were given operating grants in order that they may continue to perform the valuable services which have benefited Manitoba in the past.

In common, I'm sure, with many Manitobans, I welcome the establishment of the Law Reform Committee by my honourable friend the Attorney-General, but I must say not if the results and the work of this Committee are going to be given the same treatment as the Commission on Judicial Boundaries. That Commission reported to the Attorney-General last November -- he kindly sent us copies at that time. Since then, we've heard nothing. I was looking forward to hearing something about it in the Throne Speech; but I must say that my confidence was misplaced. I trust that the new committee will be listened to more quickly than this past one.

I come now to a matter in the Throne Speech which is very close to my own feelings and those of my colleagues -- and that's the proposed changes in The Hospital Insurance Act. Now last November we met in session here to consider the imposition of provincial income tax. At that time the regulations of The Federal Income Tax Act were satisfactory insofar as my friends opposite were concerned. They said nothing at all at that time about the dependent as enunciated under The Income Tax Act. Now under the Federal act, any dependent, regardless

(Mr. Molgat, cont'd.) . . . of his age provided he is a bona fide dependent, is included in exemptions. Why then, does this government now turn around and propose that dependent under The Hospital Act should be different from that? It's true that the Act as it reads has a difference, but in proposing a change, then why not accept the change and take the definition of dependent as it is in The Income Tax Act -- which, as I say, has been already accepted by my honourable friends when they approved and set up the provincial income tax. My honourable friends I'm sure are well aware that in present circumstances few students going on to higher education can complete their course by age 21. My honourable friend, the Minister of Education, sends out brochures and pamphlets and encourages people to go on to higher education, and then they turn around and establish that the birth date should be the determining factor, not the length of the course they are taking, or the fact that they are a bona fide dependent. It seems to us that what the government should do is reconsider the statement that it made in the Throne Speech and accept the resolution that we have presented, which is now appearing on the Order Paper, which establishes dependent under the Hospital Services Plan exactly the same as dependent under the Income Tax.

There are any number of proposals, Mr. Speaker, in this speech that would bear comment at this time, but as I said, I don't intend to go through all of them. I want to single out only one more. We'll have time to cover the others later on during the course of our session. I want to refer to the vague reference made to amendments to the Labour Relations Act. We've had good labour laws in Manitoba for some time, and over the years, certainly the last 20 years or so, we've had excellent labour-management relations in this province. This does not mean, of course, that our laws should not be brought up to date as time and conditions change. But the history of the treatment accorded the labour problems in this province is one of negotiation, cooling-off periods, conciliation, voluntary arbitration. That is the logical progression in matters affecting labour and management.

This House and this Government would be wise to apply these basic principles in our labour legislation to any changes in our labour legislation itself. To make changes in our labour laws in the atmosphere immediately following the scandalous Brandon Packers affair would be an error. Not only labour and management are concerned with these matters -- the whole community is. Sound labour laws are essential to the continuing development of our province. These can only be arrived at by cool and objective assessment.

Therefore I solemnly urge that no changes in legislation be proposed or made at this time, but that the Standing Committee of the House on Industrial Relations be instructed to sit following the termination of this session, and that it receive briefs and presentations from all interested persons and organizations. And further -- (Interjection) -- No, you are proposing a special committee, if I recall, my honourable friend, and I am proposing that we have a committee of this House, which is a Standing Committee, which has a job to do, the members of this House are the ones who will determine in the final analysis what the laws will be and I'm proposing that we use exactly that committee for this purpose. -- (Interjection) -- No, that was not your recommendation. If you'll reread your letter you'll find out yourself. --(Interjection) -- Oh, yes, yes, I read the stuff that you publish as well as what my honourable friends across. But it's time as well for this committee to study not only the briefs and representations made in this province, but to study too what is going on in other provinces and other jurisdictions. There are other areas of our country that are much more concerned than we are with labour matters by reason of greater industrialization, longer history in this field, more people involved in labour matters, and so on, and we should study what goes on there before jumping in and making changes in our own laws here.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to turn from these general comments on the Throne Speech -- this amazing omnibus presented to us last week -- to deal in more detail with the record of this government. Manitoba has now had three years of the policies and the administration of this government, and I think it's high time that those policies and that administration be subjected to analysis. I think the people of Manitoba want and are entitled to a dispassionate assessment of its works. In order to discern the nature and effect of the policies set out by this government one must first tear aside the facade built up by an army of public relations experts and 11 cabinet ministers running around the countryside -- doing, I will say, a great job of public relations -- but this you have to tear aside so that you can really find out what

(Mr. Molgat, cont'd.) this government is doing, and what it isn't doing. Only in this way can the actions of my honourable friends stand up to proper analysis.

The question that many people are asking, and which must be answered is -- what's really going on in Manitoba? That is the question that I propose to answer today in some part, and which my colleagues and I will continue to elucidate throughout this session.

I should say though that there's one achievement on which I would like to congratulate the First Minister. I refer to the establishment of the Committee on Manitoba's Economic Future. I think that the idea of setting up such a committee was a sound one, and while I sincerely applaud my honourable friends for establishing it, I would also like to congratulate the citizens who have agreed to work on this committee and whose advice and counsel I'm sure will be most valuable to the government. Now it's regrettable that the happy accord in which we meet on this one matter does not extend to all other policies. But before dealing with a few of the many points with which I take issue with the honourable gentleman, allow me, Mr. Speaker, to assure the House that I have whittled my list down to a relatively few items, and I'll touch only lightly on those now in order not to keep them here for the very long period of time which would be required to make a detailed analysis.

MR. D. L. CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Hear! Hear!

MR. MOLGAT: But as I said before, there'll be ample time during the course of our session to make this analysis. Now, three years of government provide a fair period of time for fair judgment, and with the facade that I mentioned earlier removed, a far different picture emerges than what the P. R. experts tell us. In my opinion, it's a disturbing picture. Now I want to be fair to my honourable friends, not everything that they've done has been wrong but there are entirely too many unfortunate examples of on the one hand, haste so precipitate that the people of Manitoba are paying an ever rising tax bill in order to support the result of badly-prepared and hastily executed plans -- and yet again on the other hand procrastination, delay in matters for which there's no excuse for anything other than prompt and efficient action.

In haste this government froze hospital budgets; it formed the Metropolitan Government without providing it with adequate resources; it leapt the Greater Winnipeg Floodway and the Portage Floodway without proper planning, and worse still, with no adequate guarantee from the Federal Government. For political reasons it hurried into the School Divisions Plan, and now it turns around and blames those who administer those divisions for the increases in taxation. And above all, this government sold down the river our hard-won provincial rights, that the First Minister and Treasurer of this province, meekly and without protestation refused to stand up to his Federal chief in the matter of Federal-Provincial relations. Yes, he knuckled under and accepted a deal which the taxpayers of Manitoba can only lose by. Then in a most bewildering about face, this same government, the same people, they procrastinated on teachers' pensions; they lagged on river pollution, they put the onus for it on Metro; they dragged their feet on urban renewal and they stood absolutely still on the urgent problem of the Churchill townsite.

On the matter of the hospital budget freeze alone, Mr. Speaker, this House has the right -- more than that, it has the duty -- to find out if this government has been guilty of mismanagement, or of deliberately misleading this House on the whole question of hospitalization, hospital insurance and the related matters. What's the story as we know it of this development. Well, on the 3rd of February, 1961, the Government received the report from the Manitoba Hospital Services Plan, which was a projection of the costs of the plan until 1963. This was presented to us, as I recall it, during the '61 session. Now it was apparently on the basis of these figures that last year my honourable friends increased -- or I should say, 1960 -- increased the hospital premiums rates, by 50%. On page 10 of this same report we find that the statement of the Plan itself which the government has accepted, indicates that the minimum increase, minimum annual increases in cost that the hospitals could expect would be 12.5% and up to 15.1% -- but again 12.5% minimum by the government's own estimate. On the 16th of October this House assembled and sat until the 20th, in special session, to consider and see implemented a provincial income tax. The avowed purpose of that tax was to take the premiums back to their original level and to provide money for the Hospital Services Plan. The Premier himself insisted at that time on calling it a hospital services tax. We had a lengthy debate on that matter; we told my honourable friend that he should not call it that if he was not going to turn all the funds over to the Hospital Services Plan. He insisted on leaving that portion

(Mr. Molgat, cont'd.) . . . in the bill, in spite of the fact that he was turning it over to consolidated revenue. We were not told then that this would not provide enough money to the Plan to carry on as it has in the past, or that it would have to clamp down on the hospitals. Nothing was said in the House, that special session, that the tax was insufficient to supply the needs of the Hospital Services Plan. And yet barely a month and a half after that session, like a bolt from the blue, hospitals are told that they must limit their budget increases to three percent.

This situation, Mr. Speaker, would be ridiculous if it wasn't as serious. Is this mismanagement or is it deliberate misrepresentation. Why was this House not told all the facts about the financial situation of the Plan? Did the government not possess them? If not, how does it dare call a special session, present fundamental changes in our tax structure, allege that these changes would make the plan solvent. Did the government know at that time that they shortly would be curtailing hospital budgets. The First Minister in his capacity of Provincial Treasurer surely couldn't be so slipshod in his methods as to enter this House last October without all the facts, and all the figures. Yet one's constrained to this interpretation of his actions as being the more charitable of the only two possible alternatives: mismanagement or misrepresentation. What, Mr. Speaker, I ask this House, will be the effect of this intolerable measure on the people who need hospital treatment? Now I know the First Minister said at that time that this would not affect the hospital care. How can he possibly say that when his own people provide him with figures, some months before that, indicating that the minimum increases that the hospitals can expect are 12.5%; that they have no control over such things as medication, salary increases, equipment, out-patient services, or the number of people who go to hospital, and he turns around and tells them you can't increase by more than three percent. The attempt of the hospitals to meet this arbitrary demand cannot help but be reflected in their operation, and this in turn will certainly have its effect on those who need hospital treatment. Pressing though this problem of hospitals is, Mr. Speaker, there's another vital concern that all of us in this House must have for this situation, and that is -- what's the true story behind this whole affair. If the provincial income tax isn't sufficient to support the Hospital Services Plan, is it because of miscalculation? Or, is the revenue from the income tax -- and remember again that it's not going directly to the MHSP, it's going to the general revenue -- is this revenue being diverted to other uses? Or is this whole incredible picture now before us the result of plain mismanagement? Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that the choice is clear -- it's either mismanagement or misrepresentation, and this question demands an answer from my honourable friends.

Again, evidence of lack of planning is evident in the plight in which the Metro Council now finds itself. What did this government do? They created a new level of government - Metro. They gave it responsibilities entailing expenditures, and then in effect it said - "council go away from my door". This isn't the time for a lengthy debate on Metro, but it's time to examine the manner in which this government has completely abdicated its responsibilities towards the council it created. Before Metro had been in operation one year it had to set up its own commission to investigate its own financial situation. The fact that Metro had to do this itself, that my honourable friends across the way did nothing to investigate the situation, after having created the Metro Council, is a clear indication that this government has simply cast Metro adrift. Now this morning on the news we're told that this government has now decided not to act upon the recommendations of this Metro Commission, the Blake-Goldenberg report, but we're told of no action by this government, or any alternative, that it proposes to take up its proper responsibilities in this matter. The responsibility for the difficulties that have arisen in the past year in the local government, at both the metro and municipal level in greater Winnipeg is the responsibility of the Provincial Government and it cannot wash its hands of it and pretend that it has got nothing to do with the situation at all.

Mr. Speaker, I now want to turn to what I think is the clearest example of unpremeditated action attributable to this government. Unfortunately I have to say even more than that -- it's attributable to the First Minister, who in a fit of temper threw away Manitoba's bargaining position on the whole question of the floodway, when in a fit of temper he threw away a great sum of Manitoba money when he said "I'll go it alone". And since that time the people of Manitoba have been under great difficulty in this issue and the long-run cost to this province will be much greater than should have been the case if he had acted in a sane and sensible

(Mr. Molgat, cont'd.) manner on this matter. -- (Interjection) -- We're not having any difficulties, Mr. Attorney-General. You will before the end of the session.

I would like to pause here, Mr. Speaker, and turn to some newspaper clippings of last November. This contains the announcement of what Manitoba has finally wrested from the Federal Government, and I'm quoting from the Winnipeg Free Press, November 18th. It says, "Prime Minister John Diefenbaker announced Friday that the Federal Government has agreed to pay some 60% of the cost of the Greater Winnipeg Floodway. The Prime Minister made his announcement at the end of an election-style speech to the Annual Meeting of the Manitoba Progressive Conservative Association. -- (Interjection) -- Premier Duff Roblin rose in his seat and led a standing ovation to acknowledge the announcement. -- (Interjection) -- After the speech Mr. Roblin said, and I quote, "the announcement was a very satisfactory solution to a tremendous problem". Well, Mr. Speaker, how does this very satisfactory solution to a tremendous problem square off with what our neighbouring Province of Saskatchewan has obtained from the same Prime Minister and the same Federal Government? -- (Interjection) -- Well, I might even in some cases be prepared to admit that it could very well be better government than the one across. --(Interjection) -- Here are some facts and figures, Mr. Speaker, on what Saskatchewan obtained from this same government. The costs of the dams is to be shared 75% by Canada and 25% by Saskatchewan. A straight 75 - 25. Manitoba apparently, by the figures that we've obtained, is getting some 60%, but if you analyze it carefully you find out that really it's only 58.6 -- and this on the Greater Winnipeg Floodway alone. When you consider that a related project, which are part and parcel of the whole proposition, that is, the Shellmouth Dam and the Portage diversion, and/or the Holland Dam -- when you consider these others on which we're only getting 50%, then how does this square off with what Saskatchewan is obtaining? And I'd like as well to point out one other factor and here ask a question of the government. Under the South Saskatchewan Plan, the Saskatchewan share is limited; it's not to exceed 25 million. Have my honourable friends obtained the same guarantee from the Federal Government insofar as Manitoba, and that is that Manitoba's share is limited and that should the costs be higher than anticipated that the Federal Government will cover the balance? This is a most important addition. I might add, too, that in Saskatchewan the Federal Government is paying for a portion of the power developments in connection with the South Saskatchewan Dam. I know of no assistance in Manitoba to power developments in this province from this Federal Government. So there we have it, Mr. Speaker, this fit of temper of my honourable friend costing this province and the people of Manitoba great sums of money, great sums by comparison to other provinces directly our neighbours.

Speaking of the Portage Floodway, Mr. Speaker, I can't help but comment as well on the unbelievable hassle that's developed over it. Here's the Premier planning a floodway and there's the M. P. for Portage-Neepawa crying aloud in bewilderment and indignation -- he was never consulted; he doesn't approve of the scheme. In fact he says he was double-crossed, and he adds that it could be a 12 million dollar flop. Now, what a spectacle! I'm not interested, Mr. Speaker, in fights between my honourable friends; fights within the Conservative Party. But I am extremely concerned about flood control in the Province of Manitoba. And what faith can Manitobans have in governments that don't seem to consult each other; in governments that don't seem to know where they're going; that after a project's been announced by my honourable friends the M. P. from the area directly concerned gets up in the House of Commons and contradicts what they have been saying here. How can we possibly have faith in what these people are proposing?

Well, there it is, Mr. Speaker. On the one hand haste, hurry, bad management, poor planning. And then on the other hand, procrastination. And there are plenty of examples of that in my honourable friends as well. Now I can't deal with all of them today, but I would like to touch on a few. What's the record of this government, for example, on teachers' pensions? Now my honourable friend, the Minister of Education -- (Interjection) -- don't worry about the old government -- I'm not concerned about the old government. What we're dealing with is what my honourable friends across here are doing. They were the people who were going to go across Manitoba and change everything. They had the solutions to all the problems. My honourable friend got up on platforms up and down the countryside -- he was going to be the saviour of Manitoba; he was going to do everything, but the big thing is, he was going to do all

(Mr. Molgat, cont'd.) . . . these things without adding to taxation. He was going to do everything that he talked about and not increase taxation in the Province of Manitoba. Well, I'd like to know how you analyze the results of my honourable friend's work.

So let's come back to teachers' pensions. What's been the record of my honourable friends across the way and, in particular, the Minister of Education? I'm quoting here from a booklet -- it's the Manitoba Teacher, November - December issue, an article on teachers' pensions. It gives the history of the way that this subject has been treated by the Minister and if I may, Mr. Speaker, I would like to include some of these in the record. It starts by quoting from the report of the Royal Commission which apparently said that the service type pension was basically unsound, unrealistic and outmoded. Then, subsequent to this, the Minister informed the Manitoba Teachers' Society that the government would postpone action on the teachers' pension until the matters of finance, secondary divisions and boundaries had been attended to, but that he would establish a committee to make a thorough study of teachers' pensions. This apparently was not too long after he received the report, part of which he acted on with great haste, I will say. Then in November, 1960, a brief on pensions and one on group insurance were presented to the Minister. He at that time expresses his interest, particularly in the type of plan and proposals for funding and he promised to start the brief on its way through proper channels, November 1960. June of 1961, the Society, in a brief to the Minister said -- they referred to the 1960 brief and to subsequent meetings and the statement of the Minister that he was to initiate a study of the matter and they urged him again to initiate an immediate study with a view of implementing their provisions at the next session. The Minister then promised to begin a study of the brief on pensions with the teachers as quickly as possible and said that the details of this resolution would be considered then. This was June, 1961, so there we have it after the receipt of the Royal Commission report. He's very interested in this; he's going to do something, in fact he's going to set up a study. November, 1960 he received the brief, still extremely interested; he's going to do something about it. June of 1961, he's still very much interested, and he promises a study of the brief. September of 1961, the Society again called upon the Minister with respect to pensions. At that time the Minister indicated that he could not foresee any likelihood of action to improve teachers' pensions. Now, Mr. Speaker, procrastination is a mild word for such cavalier treatment. It's true that the Throne Speech says that the question is under active study, but how long does this Minister need to study these matters? He's been studying this since 1959 when he received the original brief. He promised to set up committees then and here we now find that it's under active study. More cover-up, more delay, more procrastination -- (Interjection) -- Quit worrying about previous administrations. You've got plenty to worry about in your own, and if you take your responsibility as a back bencher properly you'd be pushing your Minister. Get to work.

MR. R. G. SMELLIE (Birtle-Russell): that you're never coming back, anyway.

MR. ROBLIN: Let the honourable gentleman continue his speech in peace. It makes excellent listening and I don't want to interrupt.

MR. MOLGAT: I can assure my honourable friend the First Minister I don't mind being interrupted at all. If my honourable friends have some comments they want to add, I'm glad to get them. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the attention I'm trying to draw to this problem will galvanize the Minister into action for a change, instead of more studies and more investigations. Let's get to work on the problem.

Let's go on then to Urban Renewal, Mr. Speaker. Yes, there's another fine example of foot dragging, I must say a tiresome but accurate term, procrastination. That's a topic that's been under discussion now for two years. Over a year ago this government received representations and briefs from many organizations in the City of Winnipeg urging prompt action on this matter and urging the creation of a policy and of providing aid for a comprehensive program, but the big thing was to have a policy. Last Thursday what did we get? A vague reference for support of public housing. Well, I suppose better late than never. But if my honourable friends are going to drag their feet, I would suggest they pick on issues less important than this one. Now this government, Mr. Speaker, this see-saw government rising in great haste and fits of temper to take action and plunge into matters without proper planning, and then on the other side falling down to procrastination and delay, in my opinion is not worthy of the confidence of the people of this province. But in order to do this great see-saw of theirs I suppose they need

(Mr. Molgat, cont'd.) . . . a fulcrum, and they found that one in stagnation, and the case of Churchill is the best example of sheer and pure stagnation by this government. For three years now the development of the Town of Churchill, notwithstanding the comments of my honourable friend the Member for Churchill, has been almost halted. This, Manitoba's only seaport, a port that is going to gain importance in the future in spite of my honourable friends across the way, and a port that should gain greater importance, a vital link insofar as Manitoba is concerned, what has the situation been in Churchill? Well, merchants have been afraid to add to their businesses, to build, to even repair in some cases, because they don't know if the townsite will be remaining where it is. Fifteen thousand dollars right now is sitting in a bank account to build a new arena in Churchill and it can't be built until this government decides what it's going to do about the townsite. Over-crowded housing conditions exist and no one will build homes until they know what this government is going to do about the townsite. Now in the face of all this what do we get from the government? One move alluded to in the Throne Speech -- they're going to improve sanitation. Well now, no one is going to object to the improvement of sanitation in Churchill, but surely this isn't enough. Surely after three years my honourable friends should be able to make up their minds. I know, I know my honourable friends are very careful. They bring the Federal Government into this affair and they carefully avoid any reference to the report my honourable friend, the Minister of Industry and Commerce, said earlier this year would be produced, an interim report, which I understand was produced, but which I must say they have not sent me copies of yet, but they're bringing the Federal Government in this as an excuse for this lack of action and this stagnation. My honourable friends have a clear responsibility in this matter, to state clearly what they intend to do in Churchill. This shilly-shally, this lack of decision is an impossible situation for the people of Churchill, but even more than that, Mr. Speaker, they haven't even been consulting with the elected people in Churchill. As far as I know the unincorporated urban district committee of Churchill has neither been consulted nor advised what this government intends to do, and there they are, responsible for the operations of that townsite, not knowing what this government intends to do or does not intend to do, and the Town of Churchill is stagnating as a result.

Mr. Speaker, I am not a lawyer, nor is this a court of law, but like a lawyer, today I am pleading a case, and a cause, in what is surely the truest court of all, this freely elected assembly. Now my case is presented, Mr. Speaker. I believe it proves the failure of this government to fulfill its obligations and its promises previous to the election to the people of Manitoba. My cause is for those who, like me, share the results of this inaction and they reap the costly yield of ill-judged and ill-planned action. So, Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lakeside, that the motion be amended by adding the following words: but this House regrets that Your Honour's Government by taking action in numerous fields without adequate preparation and by failing to accept in other fields its clear responsibilities, has lost the confidence of the people of Manitoba.

..... (Continued next page)

MR. SPEAKER: It's been moved by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lakeside, that the motion be amended by adding the following words: but this House regrets that Your Honour's Government by taking action in numerous fields without adequate preparation and by failing to accept in other fields its clear responsibilities has lost the confidence of the people of Manitoba. Are you ready for the question?

MR. A. PAULLEY(Leader of the NDP)(Radisson): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Inkster, that the debate be adjourned.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Proposed motion standing in the name of the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce.

MR. G. EVANS(Minister of Industry and Commerce)(Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Attorney-General, that whereas a Special Committee of the House was appointed on the 14th day of April, 1960, to enquire into all phases of the live-stock marketing system in Manitoba; and whereas the same Special Committee was reappointed by the Legislature on the 17th day of October, 1961, for the same purposes and with the same powers and the same members consisting of Mr. Shewman, Chairman; Messrs. Weir, Geo. Wm. Johnson (Assiniboia), Roberts and Wagner; and whereas the Honourable Mr. Weir resigned as member of this Special Committee on November 1st, 1961; and whereas in order that the membership of the Committee might not be unduly reduced, Mr. Watt acted as a member of this Committee on and after November 1st, 1961; Therefore be it resolved that Mr. Watt be appointed member of the Special Committee of the House to enquire into all phases of the live-stock marketing system in Manitoba and be deemed to have been a member on and after the 1st day of November, 1961, replacing the Honourable Mr. Weir.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to make the explanation that it is required to have a resolution of the House appointing Mr. Watt in order that any expenses that may be incurred by him or on his behalf may be refunded to him, and so the Comptroller-General can pay those expenses back to him directly without contravening The Legislative Assembly Act.

Mr. Speaker put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Proposed motion standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. M. GRAY (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I would like to have the leave of the House to have this matter stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Order stand; Proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, I ask leave of the House to have this matter stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Order stand. Proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, in view of the reference to part of this subject matter in the Throne Speech I would ask leave of the House to allow this matter to stand until the government brings in its legislation.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, if I may speak to the point of order here, I'm just wondering whether that would constitute any recognition of the fact that it might be alleged that the resolution was in order. My feeling is that this resolution contravenes the rules of the House respecting anticipation and that, as such, it is out of order at the present time and that perhaps it ought to be dealt with on that basis rather than having it stand on the Order Paper for the next little while. I think probably the honourable member recognizes this difficulty in his suggestion.

MR. HILLHOUSE: The only difficulty I find myself in, Mr. Speaker, is I have no idea what the government's legislation is going to be excepting from what I gathered from the Throne Speech. Now it may be that the government's legislation covers the majority of the points in my resolution, so for that reason I think that the proper thing to do is allow the matter to stand until such time as the government brings in its legislation, and if I find then that I have anticipated government legislation I'll withdraw my resolution.

MR. ROBLIN: I don't really think that's the point because my honourable friend knows that

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd.) when the government legislation comes down, if he finds it unsatisfactory in any particular he is able to make suggestions at that time as to what changes should be made. The way I feel about it is that this matter is out of order on grounds of anticipation and it would be better to have it dropped and clear the Order Paper, and then if my honourable friend finds the government legislation unsatisfactory he has his opportunity then to suggest the changes he thinks necessary. However, Sir, I simply put it to you. You're the Speaker and you can rule on it as you see fit.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I hate to bob up and down like a jack-in-the-box but at the same time all I know is that the government in its Throne Speech says that it's going to introduce legislation. Now we don't know as a matter of fact whether that legislation is going to be introduced.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, may I suggest for your consideration that I believe there has been a precedent established in this House for this matter. If I recall correctly, either at the last regular session or the session before, I believe it was a resolution at that time standing in the honourable name of the Member for Turtle Mountain respecting schools. There had been some indication from the Ministry opposite of something being introduced which members on this side of the House were not aware of, and by consent of the House, if I recall correctly, the resolution was allowed to stand until such time as the resolution from the government side of the House was introduced. I respectfully suggest to you, Sir, that if you're going to consider the point raised by the Honourable Member for Selkirk, that if you go back over the Record Book of the House, I believe, Sir, you will find that there has been a precedent established for doing what the Honourable Member for Selkirk has requested.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, speaking to this point of order that's just been raised by the Leader of the CCF Party . . .

MR. PAULLEY: New Democratic Party.

MR. ROBLIN: Well, I have so much trouble keeping up with those elusive initials that I'm not quite sure what the name is, and perhaps there may be a change in name after recent events. However, regardless of that . . .

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege at this point, and I believe it is a point of privilege properly taken, subsequent to the Manitoba Convention of the New Democratic Party I wrote to the Clerk of the House informing him of the change of our Party's name from that of the CCF to that of the New Democratic Party and requested that in the Journals of the House that the new name, or the name of the new party, the New Democratic Party, be used in our debates; and I respectfully ask, Mr. Speaker, that that be done in the House.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, on the same point of privilege, I appreciate that my honourable friend is rather touchy today and I'm sure all the members of the House will be glad to accommodate him.

MR. SPEAKER: To deal with one point of order at a time, let's get back to the original argument.

MR. ROBLIN: I accept the observations made by the Leader of the New Democratic Party and he at least ought to know what the name of his party is. He'll have to pardon those of us who take a little time to get used to these permutations and combinations, but I daresay that even we will understand the new name in time and we'll do our best to remember that, although we'll probably find that it's the same old nag, Sir, with a different label. However that may be, I was speaking to the point of order and I think it perhaps is wise that you should follow the suggestion of my honourable friend and check the records. My recollection, however, is somewhat different from his because under the present circumstance the item is clearly noted in the Speech from the Throne and I think perhaps it's quite clear that something will be done in connection with relieving certain classes mentioned in the resolution that we're talking about with respect to hospital premiums. In the case which my honourable friend has referred, it was after the resolution was presented by the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain, as I recall, that one of the Ministry advised the House that the subject matter of that resolution was being considered, and he very kindly did agree to have it stand in order that it should not prevent the introduction of the legislation that we had in mind. Now that, of course, is quite a different situation from the one we have here, but it's precisely the point at issue with respect to anticipation and, therefore, I would like that to be taken into account. But my recollection is, Mr.

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd.) Speaker, that the two cases are not similar in the point that has been made with respect to them.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, it seems to us that no harm would be done whatever by leaving the resolution stand on the Order Paper by leave of the House, then we'll see when the government brings down its actual legislation. From the statement made in the Throne Speech it appears to us that the resolution goes beyond what my honourable friends are proposing to do. If that is the case, then it seems to me that the resolution is in order because it is asking for something over and above what my honourable friends are proposing to do. In the light of those circumstances we would suggest that the proposal made by the mover be accepted; that it be left on the Order Paper; then when the legislation is definitely introduced we can proceed to deal with it.

MR. SPEAKER: The opinion on this matter is that a ruling should be made whether this resolution is in order or not, and in view of some of the arguments that have been presented this afternoon, I will review the situation and I will bring in a ruling tomorrow which will either clear it off the Order Paper or leave it on.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, there being no further items on the Order Paper today, I will move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce, that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House adjourned until 2:30 o'clock Tuesday afternoon.