

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
9:30 o'clock, Saturday, May 25, 1968

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
Orders of the Day

The Honourable the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to address a question - I presume it will go to the Provincial Treasurer or the Minister of Welfare. I have received a communication from some people in Norway House who having seen that the government has a surplus of some \$700,000 are wondering if any of it will be used in the Norway House area, particularly for housing. Has the government any plans in fact for work at Norway House this year?

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Provincial Treasurer) (Fort Rouge): Well, Mr. Speaker, the government works on the consolidated revenue principle and no particular funds are allocated to any particular purpose.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Provincial Secretary. This morning as I was driving here I noticed signs on the Disraeli Freeway pointing to the Cultural Centre. I wonder whether the name of the centennial complex has been changed.

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN, Q. C. (Provincial Secretary) (Dauphin): Not that I'm aware of. I call it the Centennial Centre myself.

MR. DOERN: Another question: I wonder if the Minister could check into this in the event that some confusion might arise. I don't see why it isn't called the Centennial Centre.

MR. McLEAN: That's a good point, I'll be glad to do so.

HON. WALTER WEIR (Premier) (Minnedosa): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, may I lay on the table of the House a Return to an Order of the House No. 31 standing in the name of the Honourable Member for St. John's.

MR. MOLGAT: . . . question of the Minister of Public Utilities. In a Return to an Order of the House of the 17th of May regarding power generation in Manitoba, the indications there are that the Grand Rapids station dropped substantially in production in March, in particular from February when it produced 157 million kilowatt hours, it dropped to 51 million in March. At the same time the production at Selkirk and at Brandon were substantially increased. Now the Selkirk and Brandon require fuel of course and are costly. Is there a reason for that use of steam power rather than hydro?

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Speaker, I can't answer with any great degree of certainty other than to suggest perhaps that may be tied in with the additional units that are presently being installed at Grand Rapids.

MR. MOLGAT: I wonder if the Minister might enquire, Mr. Speaker, and let us know at a later date.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Health. Since there is no province-wide legislation on the pasteurization of milk, does the government intend to introduce any?

HON. CHARLES H. WITNEY (Minister of Health) (Flin Flon): No, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. RODNEY S. CLEMENT (Birtle-Russell): Mr. Speaker, if I may have the indulgence of the House to make a very very brief statement of about 30 seconds, I want to say this is undoubtedly my last morning in the Legislature. I want to wish each and every one well. I have enjoyed it, and after twelve years it's not without some sadness that I leave. Thank you.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, if I may say one word in reply, we wish him success but we would also like to have him back.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MOLGAT: I would like to address a question to the First Minister. There are a

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd.) number of Orders for Return still outstanding. Can the members of the House expect to get them as soon as they are ready and have them mailed to them after the session?

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q. C. (Attorney-General) (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, this is now covered, as my honourable friend knows, by a rule of the House, and the rules will be observed and the practice that is implicit in those rules will be observed, that is that where Ministers are ready to file Orders between sessions, they can do so with the Clerk of the House who will then arrange for the usual distribution.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, that was the part that I was particularly concerned about, the practice that when they are ready they be sent to the members.

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder if I may ask the indulgence of the House for a moment. Having heard the words of the Honourable Member from Russell, I wonder if and when that hour comes, damage is somewhat inevitable, but I wondered if the honourable members at that hour would be good enough to move their microphones to their fullest height and let them stay that way during the celebrations at that moment to avoid a considerable amount of damage - up to the fullest height they will go.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition. The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Mr. Speaker, the whole subject matter covered in this Order for Return, as you know, received substantial debate at this session and lasted pretty well throughout the entire length of the session. It is certainly too bad that the information was not available to members of the House, that is the information that is asked for in the Order for Return, so that members on this side of the House could have used statistics to support the charges that they made at the government.

Many of the questions that we asked, we believe we know to some extent; others we are completely vague on, and I would certainly hope that the government will see fit to issue this Order for Return and table the Order for Return well in advance of July 1, 1968, because the people of Manitoba — (Interjection) -- well, Mr. Chairman, my honourable friend the member for St. Boniface asked how we could receive the information. I hope that it's the intention of the government to supply at least copies of the Return to the various House Leaders and then the — or the opposition of our Party, the Leader of our opposition, Mr. Paulley and Mr. Froese, so that they can distribute the information to the members of their caucus. The people of Manitoba have a right to know well in advance of July 1st what is going to happen in this whole field of MMS; the premiums they are expected to pay; the deductibles that are going to be implemented, and according to rumors we are going to have a deductible MMS plan after July 1st; and many of these other features that are asked for here. So, Mr. Speaker, I urge the government to let us have this information at the earliest possible date.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, if no one else wishes to speak, it's not my intention to revive debate on the question of medicare; we have had a number of them to date. I simply want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I hope - and I haven't been able to look up the exact words of the Minister when he spoke on this originally - I hope that it is his intention to give the full information on this Order. There is no question that the information is available now to the Minister because it would have been impossible for the government to make a decision on the question of medicare without knowing the answers to the questions.

I cannot conceive that a government would decide first of all to proceed with medicare and then subsequently not to proceed with medicare without knowing the full impact on the people of the province, and that means of course knowing the number of people who were previously covered, the cost to the people previously, the cost under the new program, and the manner by which the government intends to pay for it. Without this information it was simply impossible for the government to make any kind of a decision, so the information must be available to my honourable friend exactly in the form in which I asked for it now. I would hope that you would supply it, as my colleague mentioned, before the 1st of July, because I think the people of Manitoba have a right to know exactly what the impact of the government's decision will be on them. And I repeat that the Minister must have that information. He could not possibly have made a decision one way or the other without knowing these full facts.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

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

MR. SPEAKER: Address for Papers. The Honourable the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I regret that I was not in the House when this order was moved the other day. I notice it is left open. I haven't either been able to get the exact wording of the government reply. Am I correct in understanding that the government does not intend to acquiesce to this address?

Well, Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret then that I learn of that by the nod from the Minister because I do think that this is information that should be available to the people of the province. The other day when it was discussed originally on a motion to adjourn the House by my colleague the Member from Portage la Prairie, the government did not indicate that they were prepared to do anything at that time, but on a subsequent debate on the capital estimates when I asked the Minister, he said that he was considering the possibility of some public hearings, and if there are public hearings or even if there are not, Mr. Speaker, I think that the people of Manitoba have a right to know exactly what studies have been conducted and what conclusions have come.

My understanding is there have been a number of studies, Mr. Speaker. I understand for example that the firm of Gibb, Underwood and McLennan have conducted probably at least two surveys on the area, and on the alternatives I understand that a firm by the name of Crippen, or an individual by that name, have done the same. My understanding is the government approached the University of Manitoba to obtain from that body a recommendation in this regard. Mr. Speaker, I think that this is information that the people should have.

There is more at stake here than simply the question of Hydro production. There is the whole question of a great area of land, a large number of people at South Indian Lake, the effect on the overall economy of Manitoba, the question of fishing, mining, recreation, the whole development of Northern Manitoba, and this is information the public have a right to have, Mr. Speaker. I would appeal to the Minister to reconsider his position, because it would be much better for the public now to have the full facts, to have the information before them, than for the information to come out in some later year, as it undoubtedly would, much better to have the full situation on the table so the people can make up their own minds. So I would appeal to the Minister to agree to the Address.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party) (Radisson): Mr. Speaker, I just wish to make a comment on this order, or Address for Papers. I join the Leader of the Liberal Party in his appeal for consideration. I do so even more particularly now that the Honourable the First Minister has tabled a copy of the Return asked for by my colleague the Member for St. John's in respect of a report or a survey made by Hedlin-Menzies and Associates into problems of reallocation in the north. I note now from the Return that the First Minister tabled this morning that this was a joint effort by Van Ginkel Associates in association with Hedlin-Menzies and Associates, a survey which cost \$37,000, of which 78 percent was paid for by the federal authorities through FRED-ARDA agreement; 22 percent by provincial contributions from Manitoba Hydro.

We find in this Order for Return that there were a limited number of copies distributed, approximately 29, that went to certain cabinet ministers and departments concerned in May of 1967, a year ago. We were interested in this Return and we asked whether or not or how and when will copies be available to members of the Legislature. The answer in the return is none - none to the members of this Assembly, none to the public, and yet, Mr. Speaker, we asked -- the final question was what action was taken, and the reply of the Honourable the First Minister is this, that this is a confidential study prepared for inter-departmental use in consideration of certain problems in the area of Southern Indian Lake. I respectfully suggest, Mr. Speaker, that all of us in this Assembly, in addition to certain Ministers, are gravely concerned with the reallocation that is going to be necessary, not only in Southern Indian Lake but other areas as well.

We had an emergency debate the other day on this particular problem, and in addition to that debate, it was obvious at least two years prior to this when the Committee on Public Utilities had before it the representatives of Manitoba Hydro and considered the whole of the Nelson River development, that we knew at that time that there was going to be problems created; the government knew it; its agency, Manitoba Hydro knew of it. It's mentioned in the report on the development of the Nelson River.

Following that has been this study which was made available to the government a year ago.

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.) I think, Mr. Speaker, we are entitled to two things at this stage: to know what was contained and the recommendations made in this report; and also what action the government has taken or intended to take in respect of that report.

So, Mr. Speaker, I join, my group joins that of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition in appealing to the government to acquiesce and to accept this Address for Papers because it deals with problems so vital to certain areas of Manitoba.

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Speaker it is a matter of regret that I cannot agree with the entreaties of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition and the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party. I know that it would not be expected that I would give any discourse on the functioning of Government in democratic society, but I'm certain that the honourable members will understand the fact that the Executive Council, which has the responsibility for formulating policy and of course also the responsibility of carrying it into effect and defending it, receives advice on all matters which are within its purview from a multitudinous number of sources, and as has been the long-established custom in the Legislature and in the Government of Manitoba, it has not been considered advisable to table or file or make public these many, many recommendations, many documents, many studies that are often made. I suppose that if one were to take a count, that out of every 100 such proposals, 98 are, for one reason or another, not acted upon. In other words, it's the duty and function of the Executive Council to make its decision on the basis of what information is available and, as I say, it comes from many sources. And it must surely be recognized -- and I make the distinction of course, with those inquiries that may be undertaken as a public undertaking, the clearest distinction of course, being that of a Royal Commission, which obviously is a matter fully within the public domain.

The matters referred to in this Address for Papers, all come under the first category, and it is for that and in accordance, as I say, with the long-established custom in this House, and I'm sure in other Legislative Assemblies that we must, in the public interest, decline to accept this address.

With respect to the Churchill River Diversion; that was the subject matter of a debate on a motion to adjourn the House, and subsequently the same matter was referred to at the time of the Capital Supply Bill, and I undertook, I said on one or other and I don't just recall which occasion, that of course we would ensure that all alternatives were considered, but I do remind the -- and as a matter of fact, in getting my material together, all I'm going to have to do is to simply extract what the late Chairman of the Manitoba Hydro fully explained to the committee of this House on Utilities and Natural Resources some three or four years ago, what the alternatives were, and I believe gave an indication of the alternative costs involved and the various factors which had to be taken into account, so that the members have already had an opportunity of hearing, at least, about that particular matter, and I think that no useful purpose would be served, of course, for my debating the matter to any great extent. All of the information asked for, in my opinion, come within the purview or within the group of documents which are, in a sense, confidential, which are part and parcel of the documentation upon which policy decisions are made, and of course for which we must accept the responsibility, and that it would not be advisable to begin, to alter the practice which has been followed, and under the circumstances I will have to decline to accept the order.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, would the Honourable Minister permit a question? Did the government, in fact, ask the University of Manitoba for a specific report and study on this?

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Speaker, I could only answer that question by saying that I had heard indirectly that the University of Manitoba had conducted a study. I have never seen any; if they did so, and if they prepared any report, I have never seen it. I'm not aware that it's ever come officially to the attention of the government, and therefore I would have to answer the best I can by saying that if they were asked, I am not clear on who may have made that request, or indeed whether they may have done it on their own account.

MR. MOLGAT: Do I understand correctly the Minister, that he understands that a study was made?

MR. McLEAN: I can only answer by saying that I understand there was one and one of my colleagues says - kindly suggested - yes, and that's the best information I have.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, after hearing the Minister's reply, there's probably not much point in speaking to the motion before us, but I would like to know from the Minister at what point will the members of this House have the right to know the information that was given

(MR. FROESE cont'd.) through these studies, and when can we expect that information of this type will be made available to members of the House?

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Speaker, if I'm permitted on a point of order to answer the question of the Honourable Member for Rhineland, I would say that it could well be that there would never be any point at which members of the Legislature would know the details of all of the documentation that might possibly be considered. What you do know in the end is the policies adopted and which must be, of course, justified or we suffer the consequences. But there'll be all kinds of material that may never - indeed I would expect would never - come to the attention of the members of the Legislature.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. DOUGLAS CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, I'm interested in the answer that the Honourable the Minister gives with regard to the reasons for not allowing this Address for Papers to be accepted. I would like to ask the Honourable Minister if he is able to quote an authority that would hold these papers, this particular report, to come within the class of confidential matters that he has discussed. Now, it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that when public money - not only public money but apparently funds from both the Federal Government and the Provincial Government - have been spent in order to secure a report in this manner, that that clearly is removed from the area of confidential information to which my honourable friend refers, because my understanding of the realm of confidentiality is that it is quite limited; naturally it pertains to discussions and memoranda and such-like in Cabinet, and - (interjection) -- it doesn't? - (Interjection) - Well, I was going on to some other things when my honourable friend interposed. I was wondering if my honourable friend the Attorney-General was getting up to say that it did not pertain to discussions, memoranda, etc., in Cabinet. Naturally, it applied to them. My understanding is that it applies to, of course, communications between Ministers outside of Cabinet; it applies to communications between Ministers and their Deputies, and confidential matters of that nature. But when it comes to a question of the public money of both Canada and Manitoba having been spent in an area that is public itself, surely, Mr. Speaker, surely this matter of confidentiality does not apply.

Now, if my honourable friends wish to take the position that because they, for some reason, are adverse to having the information that is contained in the report become general knowledge, and that they take the responsibility of saying, "No, we consider it to not be in the public interest," then that's a position for which they must accept responsibility and maintain their position. But to place it on the basis of confidentiality, I certainly think, Mr. Speaker, that it is taking it too far. We have here a group of people paid money from ARDA and the province, according to this Return, to get certain information, public money on a public matter, and I certainly think that the members of the Legislative Assembly who are called upon to vote large sums of money for the works in connection with the project - which is directly concerned with the area under investigation - should be in possession of these facts. However, whether we should or not, that's a matter that the government has a right to make a decision on, based on their policy, but I certainly do not think that they can base it on the question of confidentiality.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I hope not to prolong this debate because I think it is reasonably clear-cut from all the precedents, not only from this Legislature, but indeed from the whole British parliamentary system, that the type of information that Ministers of the Crown from time to time seek, whether from civil service or from outside sources, is not information that is ordinarily callable by the House. It's a matter of fact that my honourable friend from Lakeside will know much better than me from his many years in the Executive Council that all kinds of advice is received from the Civil Service, from people outside of the Civil Service; memoranda are sometimes addressed at the initiative of private citizens who have a particular interest in a subject matter, urging a particular point of view upon the government and so on. And studies are sometimes commissioned. And from all of this mass of information, the Executive Council, in its executive responsibility which is a clear-cut and distinct and separate - and I underline that "separate" - entirely responsibility from the legislative responsibility which we all join in here, the Executive, the responsibility to govern, is much different from the legislative responsibility. And in order to govern, you've got to have advice, and to get advice you've got to have people who are willing to prepare reports, studies, information or whatever, confident that the kind of information that they are giving and so on, is not the kind that is going to be kicked around or aired publicly, because otherwise why should

(MR. LYON cont'd.) they be so frank? And some, very often they wouldn't be. We all know the well-worn citation - 183 from Beauchesne - where Disraeli is quoted as saying once in the House of Commons, Disraeli said in the House that if the House were to insist upon a production of papers and correspondence which concern the preparation and preliminary consideration of measures, confidential reports given frankly and freely for the heads of departments would be discontinued and we should have a system of reports framed for laying upon the table of the House.

And this is precisely the problem. It's not an easy problem but it's precisely the problem. It's not a question of any Executive Council; whether this one, the one that preceded ours, or whatever, trying to deny the Legislature information. It's a question of the Executive Council at the present time being in a situation where a matter is under study and receiving information. There have been no final decisions made in this matter. We're talking about something that I believe the Minister has said from his information from Hydro - if the proper approval is given, something that will take place in 1972. So, during these preparatory years, it is necessary to get information to study and to work upon. Another aspect of this matter that certainly the Honourable Member from Lakeside will recall, was that --- and there are evidences of it in the records of this House, while this government was in office and I believe while his government was in office - that even such ordinarily callable items as correspondence between one government level and another will not be produced by either government while the matters are under negotiation, ordinarily. Because it's liable to prejudice, in some way, possibly prejudice the negotiations that are taking place. That's just another example of why it's done. Not to deny the Legislature information but rather to permit the executive to get on with its job, its separate job, a job separate and apart from the Legislature, of governing. So, these basic and sort of elementary principles, I think maybe have to be restated from time to time, and my honourable friend from Lakeside, I'm sure, could state them much more incisively than I can, because he lived in the atmosphere much longer than anybody in this House has. But, basically, that is the position that the Minister is taking. I think it's quite proper that he should take it, and that what the House will be interested in, I think, eventually, is what results from all of this. But for the House to try to involve itself in the executive process, then I suggest you get into the kind of situation that you have in France or some of the other countries where there isn't a clear-cut division between executive, legislative and so on, and each division knowing what their place and part is in the over-all governmental process. I can assure my honourable friend from St. Boniface I was making no imputation against him; I was talking about a foreign government; but I suggest that when we have this system we should follow it, and that the Minister is well-grounded in precedent and in practice for the decision that he makes in this case, and that, furthermore, it's in the public interest that he should make this decision at this time.

MR. CAMPBELL: May I ask the Honourable the Attorney-General a question? Might I ask my honourable friend the Attorney-General who prides himself on being up-to-date on all matters, first, if he would quote us on authority a little more recent than Disraeli, and secondly, when he's quoting Disraeli would he not again consider the fact that Disraeli was referring to heads of departments - not studies paid for out of the public purse.

MR. LYON: I really don't think that a valid distinction can be made, because a head of a department is paid for, his salary is paid for out of the public treasury, and it doesn't matter much to me whether the advice that you'd get, . . . using in this argument, if you get advice from a \$20,000-a-year civil servant or you pay \$15,000 for a report out of public money, it's still coming from an outside source or from an inside source, and it's a hallowed rule within the parliamentary system that inter-departmental memoranda - that is, from one department to another - from my Deputy Minister to me, this material is not callable. My honourable friend would never think of calling for it. It would be horrendous to think that this could be done. And that's what my honourable friend the Minister means when he says that probably 90 percent of the material upon which decisions are based - executive decisions are based - are not callable and are never seen by members of the Legislature, and hopefully never will be seen, because there's an awful lot of trivia and nonsense and so on that gets into reports and into documents and documentation that you get in front of you, and it's your job, as a member of the Executive, to sort out everything, and hopefully, in a majority of the cases, to arrive at the right decision.

But my honourable friend said, did I have any more recent example, and all I can produce

(MR. LYON cont'd.) is a Speaker's ruling from this House made by Mr. Speaker Bachynsky, I guess it would be, 1956, and I'm reading from the ruling on Friday last, and this is a quotation: "While the Honourable Mr. Roberts, the Minister of Agriculture and Immigration, was addressing the House, reference was made to a document, being: 'Minutes of a committee meeting,' the committee having been appointed by the Deputy Minister of Agriculture and Immigration to consider the program of a veterinary laboratory. The Minister stated this document to be of a confidential nature." I interpose by saying, quite properly, I would think "The Leader of Her Majesty's loyal opposition, Mr. Roblin, objected to the Minister of Agriculture citing a document without laying it on the table of the House. May I refer the House to Sir T. Erskine May's Parliamentary Practice, 13th edition, Page 329 on this matter, which reads as follows: 'On the 10th of August, 1893, the Speaker ruled that confidential documents or documents of a private nature passing between officers of a department and the department, are not necessarily laid on the table of the House, especially if the Minister declares that they are of a confidential nature.' May I also refer to Citation 278, Page 111, of Beauchesne's Parliamentary Rules and that is: '278: It has been admitted that a document which has been cited ought to be laid upon the table of the House if it can be done without injury to the public interests. The same rule, however, cannot be held to apply to private letters or memoranda. On the 18th of May, 1865, the Attorney-General, on being asked by Mr. Ferrand if he would lay upon the table a written statement and the letter to which he had referred on the previous day in answering a question relative to the Leeds Bankruptcy Court, replied that he had made a statement to the House on his own responsibility and that the documents he had referred to, being private, he couldn't lay them on the table. Lord Robert Cecil contended that the papers, having been cited, should be produced but the Speaker' — and here I've run out of that quotation, but in any case it's Citation 278, Page 111, in Beauchesne 1943 edition. But again, there's a mixed point here as to when the document was cited and so on, but again the argument is buttressed all over the place: May, Beauchesne, this House; documents of this kind are not producible, and I'm sure by my honourable friend from Lakeside's knowing smile that he really agrees with the position that's being taken here.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, may I ask a supplementary question? Does my honourable friend — and I assure him that my smile was because I was seeing through the policy of his argument — does my honourable friend not draw a distinction between memoranda and other documents between government departments and government civil servants, and studies that have been made and paid for by funds of the taxpayers to an organization that is open to employment by anyone who has the money to pay for them.

MR. LYON: It's all advice, Mr. Speaker.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q. C. (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, I think there is a very fine distinction here between what my Leader is urging and the Honourable Member for Lakeside is urging as against what the Honourable the Attorney-General is stating. Now the position I take is this, that certainly documents consisting of advice given by heads of departments to Ministers or to the Executive Council are privileged documents, but my submission is this: once we embark upon the spending of public funds for having a study made by someone outside of this Legislative Assembly, it's a denial of responsible government if that study does not become available to the members of this House who are responsible to the public for the expenditure of that money.

Take for instance, Mr. Speaker, supposing this had been an expenditure in respect of education. Supposing we had not appointed a Royal Commission to study education at which all hearings were public, and the report of that Royal Commission was made public; supposing the Minister of Education had simply hired the services of some experts on education and used public money for these people to make a study; would the Minister of Education come into this House and say that that study was not available to the members of this House when public funds were used to make that study? I think that there's a distinction between that aspect and communications passing between heads of departments and Ministers. They have to be privileged.

MR. LYON: If, for instance, the Attorney-General were to commission a study on a legal point from a downtown law firm and paid money for it, as is done occasionally, is my honourable friend seriously saying that that legal advice, that opinion, should be callable and tableable in the House, even if the same opinion prepared by the Deputy Attorney-General would not be tabled?

MR. HILLHOUSE: Well, I think once you go outside of the House to hire somebody to get an opinion and use public money for that purpose, I think that opinion becomes available to this House.

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder if all the aspects of this question have not been sufficiently aired? Is the House ready for the question?

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I will close the debate on the matter if no one else wishes to speak.

MR. LYON: I didn't know if my honourable friend was closing the debate when he spoke -- obviously he wasn't. The item had been left open.

MR. MOLGAT: A whole lot of other people spoke so I . . .

MR. LYON: Yes, that's right.

MR. MOLGAT: But I'll be very brief. I won't take up any of the time of the House.

MR. LYON: No precedent.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, the situation that's before us, I think we can argue the legality of it for a long time. There are obviously some documents which are privileged. I think, on the other hand, that there are many documents requested here in my Address which should be public documents, and if the government were to say, "Well, there are some that we cannot give and these will remain privileged; we will give you those reports which we consider should be made public," I would say the government has a reasonable stand, but for the government to say out of hand, "We'll give you no explanation whatever," is not a reasonable position, Mr. Speaker. The Ministers in fact are saying to us, "Trust us completely. We won't give you any of the information but trust us that we're doing the right thing." What we're saying is: give us the information; give the public the information, and we'll make up our own minds. Now the Minister of Public Utilities said something this morning which I find appalling. He admits that he knows that the University of Manitoba made a study on this, but he says he hasn't even bothered to find out what's in it. A Minister responsible . . .

MR. LYON: Not on this necessarily. The Minister has a study done generally but not necessarily on this one specific area.

MR. MOLGAT: I asked the Minister specifically if he knew of the study and he admits he knows of the study but he hasn't even bothered to find out what's in the study or what the recommendations are, Mr. Speaker, and then they expect the members on this side of the House to simply give them a free hand and say; go ahead fellows, you're absolutely right. Now what sort of nonsense is that, when a Minister doesn't even try to find out what's in a university report on the subject?

So, Mr. Speaker, I warn the government. I warn them now. They know full well that secrecy in government operations is pretty slim. They know full well that that information will come out; and I warn them now that if information comes out indicating that the government received recommendations against what the government is doing, that their attitude of secrecy right now, their refusal to give information, will have a very serious effect on the confidence of people in government.

Mr. Speaker, we're dealing here with a very important aspect to the Province of Manitoba. To date, the Minister seems to have taken the position that there's only one thing that can be done and that's to raise South Indian Lake by some 35 or 40 feet, move out the people who live there, and proceed with that diversion. The inference has been left with the people of South Indian Lake that that's the only thing that can be done. The facts are that there are alternatives, Mr. Speaker, and these alternatives should be clearly known, obviously to the people of South Indian Lake, and clearly known to the people of Manitoba before a final decision is taken on this matter; and any other course of action, Mr. Speaker, is unfair to the people of this province, and the attitude of secrecy of this government will fall back on its heads.

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

MR. MOLGAT: Ayes and nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

For the benefit of the honourable members who were not present during the discussion, we're dealing with the Address for Papers of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition on Page 2.

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

YEAS: Messrs. Campbell, Clement, Desjardins, Dow, Doern, Fox, Froese, Green, Guttormson, Hanuschak, Harris, Hillhouse, Kawchuk, Molgat, Pauley, Petursson, Tanchak, Uskiw, and Vielfaure.

NAYS: Messrs. Baizley, Beard, Bjornson, Carroll, Cowan, Craik, Einarson, Enns, Evans, Hamilton, Jeannotte, Johnson, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McGregor, McKellar,

(STANDING VOTE cont'd.) McKenzie, McLean, Masniuk, Spivak, Stanes, Watt, Weir, Witney and Mesdames Forbes and Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 19; Nays, 27.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost. The proposed resolution of the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if we could hold that until we have made some further progress with the private members' - we'll be asking to call it at an appropriate time.

MR. SPEAKER: . . . proceed to Private Members' resolutions.

MR. LYON: Private Members' resolutions, Page 4.

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Virden, and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Lakeside in amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

MR. SAMUEL USKIW (Brokenhead): Mr. Speaker, this is one of the resolutions that was introduced at the very early start of the session and it has received a great deal of comment. I'm not going to indulge too much this morning into extending my remarks beyond what was said during the course of other Private Members' days. I simply want to say to the House that I don't support the amendment because I recognize that all political parties and all members of the Legislature do have an "in" to Mr. Parker or Mr. Runciman, that if they are interested to find out their viewpoints, that all of us could, independently or individually or as a party, get the information that Mr. Parker or Mr. Runciman may offer, so I don't think that we have to have a Committee of the House to talk to these gentlemen. I'm sure that they are good diplomats, they will talk to any one of us, and I just can't see any need for this type of amendment. I'm sure that our group on this side is going to do all it can to search out the necessary information from all people concerned in the grain industry. So, Mr. Speaker, I just simply want to make those few comments and let the amendment go.

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Inkster. The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. PETER FOX (Kildonan): Mr. Speaker, I just wished to check some of the comments that were made in Hansard on this. I have done so and I'm prepared to let the motion go to a vote.

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

MR. MOLGAT: Ayes and nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members. For the benefit of the honourable gentlemen who were not in the Chamber, we're dealing with the adjourned debate of the Honourable Member for Inkster - on the bottom of Page 4.

Order, please. I'm sorry, I've overlooked something here. Would you mind resuming your seats for a moment until I explain my problem. I overlooked the amendment. We're calling for the vote on the amendment.

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

YEAS: Messrs. Campbell, Clement, Dow, Doern, Guttormson, Hillhouse, Molgat, Tanchak and Vielfaure.

NAYS: Messrs. Baizley, Beard, Bjornson, Carroll, Cowan, Craik, Einarson, Enns, Evans, Fox, Green, Hamilton, Hanuschak, Harris, Jeannotte, Johnson, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McGregor, McKellar, McKenzie, Masniuk, Pauley, Petursson, Spivak, Stanes, Watt, Weir, Witney and Mesdames Forbes and Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 9; Nays, 32.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the amendment lost.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question on the main motion?

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, you will notice that I abstained from voting. I would like the record, nevertheless, to indicate that I was present, and my reason I think was stated in this House previously. I supported the amendment and I take the same attitude supporting in the motion, but this would have to be conditional as expressed when I tried to bring in an amendment that was declared out of order. So I think that the record should bear this remark.

May 25, 1968

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, if I may, just before the motion is put, for the consideration of the members to once again reiterate that the resolution introduced by my colleague from Inkster is a personal resolution and not a Party resolution. I am not satisfied with the contents of the resolution myself. I believe that while the Boundaries Commission are charged with the responsibility of investigating all aspects in the Greater Winnipeg area, we should not adopt this resolution until such time as they have completed their findings.

I would also like to point out that there is one great area in the Greater Winnipeg area that I haven't heard mentioned in the debates or given consideration to in the debates, and I refer to the question of hydro-electrical energy. At the present time, Mr. Speaker, the Manitoba Hydro serves all of the outer areas other than the City of Winnipeg - the City of Winnipeg has its own hydro system - and I don't think sufficient consideration has been given, up to this time at least, as to the effect that the loss of Winnipeg Hydro to Winnipeg itself may have on the process of amalgamation. I recall back in 1954 or '55, we had quite a debate in this House because at that time we felt that Winnipeg Hydro should become part of Manitoba Hydro, or at least that there should be one agency serving all of the electrical requirements in the Greater Winnipeg area, and I remember Charlie Simonite, Alderman of the City of Winnipeg at that particular time, and myself saw eye to eye that this could be a barrier, if only partially, to total amalgamation. I haven't seen any investigation into that since, and, as I stated at the offset, I think that it would be advisable to defer a resolution of this nature until after we hear from the Boundaries Commission.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster. Order, please. The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. JAMES COWAN, Q. C. (Winnipeg Centre): I am surprised, Mr. Speaker, that the Liberal Party are in favour of amalgamation in Greater Winnipeg and so many of the members of the NDP Party, because amalgamation would mean greatly increased taxes in Greater Winnipeg. It would seem at first glance that if we do away with twelve or thirteen councils, municipal councils, that we would decrease expenditures, but that is not the case, because with regard to most council members, Reeves and mayors, we can regard them as being watchdogs of the public purse, people as doing their best to keeping expenditures down and at the same time give good municipal services in their respective municipalities. And they are more successful in the smaller municipalities maybe, because they are closer to the people; they can exercise more control and supervision over municipal expenditures because of the smallness of their municipalities rather than in the case of Winnipeg, which is a large municipality.

You can well imagine how you can check more easily on, say, a municipality with ten policemen as compared with a municipality of 450 policemen, or a municipality with 20 employees in the engineering department compared with a city with 650 employees in the engineering department. And in the city, in the large municipality, if one person is sitting around or not working very hard, how will the councillors, how will the aldermen and the mayor find out? They don't find out in a large city. But if there's one sitting around in a small municipality he'll soon be noticed and he will soon be checked up and put to work or replaced.

In the smaller municipalities they have very few highly paid civic employees, and on the whole, in the smaller municipalities around the city, the level of wage rates is lower; they pay lower wages; they give quicker action, because of course they don't have so far to go or through so many channels to go when some action is required. They look after a comparatively small area. And in smaller municipalities there's more voluntary work done, both by the councillors and the employees and the people in the municipality themselves. There's a greater municipal pride in the smaller municipalities than there is in perhaps a large city. And proportionately more people are involved in a small municipality, in civic affairs and in civic ventures and community clubs and so on, and that the members of the smaller municipalities, the council members, are doing a good job, as pointed out in the Greater Winnipeg Investigation Commission Report in 1959, when those men said that in spite of all the evidence that had come before them, that there was no complaints about the work that was being done by the councillors in the smaller municipalities.

I don't say that the councillors in the larger municipalities don't do their work conscientiously and do their best, but they can't exercise the control and supervision over large expenditures and large numbers of people as is possible in the case of small municipalities.

I remember one day when I was on the Winnipeg City Council, I went to a meeting of the Finance Committee where they were having a review of the estimates for the coming year, and

(MR. COWAN cont'd.) into this meeting came Chief Taft, Chief of Police, with his estimates for that particular year. The Chairman of the Finance Committee looked over the estimates. He said, "Well, Chief, where can we cut out a few dollars out of this budget of yours?" And the Chief said, "You can't cut any dollars out of that budget. I've only put in there what I need." And the Chairman said, "Ah, Chief, surely there's a few thousand dollars we can cut out here and there. There's always some places where money can be cut out." And the Chief said, "No, there's not a thing that can be cut out. I need every dollar that's there." The Chairman said, "Oh, but Chief, there must be some places." He straightened up there at the head of the table, Taft, and he said, "There's not a dollar that can come out of that budget. If I'm going to be responsible for the safety of the people in this city I need every dollar that's in there and I need every man that's on my staff."

And he went out of that meeting with every dollar he had asked for. Every dollar. And what alderman would be able to say whether he needed every man or not? In the larger city, the alderman can't say that, whereas in St. James they recently had -- this year they had a request from their police department for an increase of six policemen. In St. James they know whether or not, the councillors know whether or not they need another six policemen or not, and they went into it carefully; they have regard for the fact they're going in with Assiniboia and they cut it out; they cut out the proposed increase of six policemen. In St. James this year, they had a proposal from the Parks Board that they have a budget of \$115,000, and the aldermen there looked after it carefully and they cut it down to \$75,000. And so it seems to be true that, on the whole, in the smaller municipalities because of this closer supervision and control principally, that costs can be kept at a lower rate. It is true that computers will reduce the cost, we'll say, of sending out tax bills and water bills, but that business of sending out tax bills by computers is a service that is already available to municipalities through our provincial government.

In this 1959 report of the Greater Winnipeg Investigation Committee, it gives us various figures based on 1956, showing that the costs of services in Winnipeg are far higher than the costs in the suburbs on a per capita basis. But rather than going back to that report, we have the figures from the 1966 statistical information in respect of the municipalities of Manitoba, and these figures show per capita costs in respect of various services in Winnipeg and the suburbs, and I could give you a great many on the per capita basis but I thought I would just give you as an example the differences between Winnipeg and St. Vital on a per capita basis.

I might say with regard to schools, in all the area Winnipeg has the second highest. It has a per capita cost in 1966 of \$72.00 - I'll miss out the cents - St. Vital \$57.00. With regard to public works, Winnipeg again is second highest. It has a per capita cost of \$9.00; St. Vital \$5.00. Protection, Winnipeg is at the top, \$32.00; St. Vital \$13.00. Sanitation, Winnipeg is at the top, \$6.80; St. Vital \$2.97. Winnipeg is at the top of health, \$3.58; St. Vital 52 cents. Welfare, Winnipeg is at the top, \$5.02; St. Vital 73 cents. Recreation, library and parks, Winnipeg is at the top, \$9.29; St. Vital \$2.70 - having a total for Winnipeg of \$197.11 -- I didn't give you all the figures. Miscellaneous, I might say, Winnipeg \$6.41, St. Vital 88 cents. Administration, Winnipeg \$7.72; St. Vital \$4.91. A total for Winnipeg of \$197.00 and St. Vital \$124.00.

And it goes through -- I've got the other municipalities here and they all more or less are on the same basis, with Winnipeg being considerably higher than the suburban municipalities. Perhaps bringing it up-to-date a little bit more shows the tax rates and the increase in mills for 1968, which shows that in Assiniboia the increase was only 6.77 mills this year, resulting in taxes, \$208.75; Charleswood an increase of only 4.24 mills, resulting in taxes of \$217.75; St. James an increase of 5.61 mills, resulting in taxes of \$209.30; and Winnipeg an increase of 12.2 mills, resulting in taxes of \$322.00 based on a house assessed at \$5,000. And so you see how the taxes are higher in a larger city than in the smaller municipality.

And, Mr. Speaker, in a smaller municipality we find that taxes are reduced for other reasons than just the fact that you have the closer supervision and lower rates of pay. You'll find, for instance, in Transcona a policeman is also a fireman. They don't have separate persons as being firemen and policemen; one man does the two jobs, and in addition they have volunteers. They have a Public Works Department that does all the work in the parks. In Charleswood, the fire department consists of one man in Charleswood and volunteers. There are very few sidewalks, very few paved roads, six RCM Policemen, and in some municipalities no kindergartens, and the people cut their own grass on the boulevards and so on. They work

(MR. COWAN cont'd.) with other municipalities and they keep their costs down. If we have amalgamation we will increase those costs, because of course the people in Charleswood, if they are going to be amalgamated with Winnipeg and going to have to pay the higher taxes, they will want the same services. Instead of the volunteer department, fire department, they will want a regular fire department. And in Transcona, instead of having one man do the job of both a policeman and a fireman they will want a regular fire department and a regular police department and the staff that is involved. And all these will bring up the costs. They'll want their boulevards cut the same as Winnipeg; they will want their kindergartens, and they will want degree teachers in their elementary schools, which they don't have in many of the suburbs. And we will find a great, great increase in taxes in this area if we have amalgamation, and I think this is borne out by this recent report of October, 1967, Report on Taxation in the City of Halifax by the Institute of Public Affairs of Dalhousie University. That report shows that in cities under 50,000 they have a much lower cost per capita for municipal services than in the larger cities. And in this Halifax report they deal with many of the large cities in Canada and it shows that Winnipeg is certainly not alone in having a higher per capita cost; the cost of expenditures per capita in Montreal \$254.00, Toronto \$294.00, and so on. Winnipeg is the eighth largest city in Canada and has the seventh highest per capita cost. The high costs go with the size of the city. The larger the city the higher the costs, so that not only will we have . . .

MR. DESJARDINS: Could I ask the honourable member a question? Are you then advocating that they should divide Winnipeg in 38 cities or something like that or . . . ?

MR. COWAN: No, I'm certainly not. I'm certainly not.

MR. DESJARDINS: They can have voluntary firemen.

MR. COWAN: No, I'm certainly not advocating that.

MR. DESJARDINS: . . . bucket brigade.

MR. COWAN: I'm saying that if we have amalgamation we would have considerably higher costs. Winnipeg costs are now, in 1966 were \$50,657,000 whereas the total costs in the area were \$86,946,000. If we had amalgamation and if the costs went up to the level of the Winnipeg costs, as they likely would, and higher if we are to believe what the Halifax report says, then our costs would be about \$100 million or an increase of \$13 million - or an increase of \$13 million in taxes to be paid by the citizens in Metro. And this is not a laughing matter; this is something that we should regard very seriously. If we want to increase taxes, sure, let's have the extra amalgamation; let's put the extra \$13 million on our citizens to be paid for by the citizens of Winnipeg to raise the services in the suburbs, and to be paid for by the suburbs themselves to raise their own services.

Now, one other matter that I wanted to mention was with regard to a report that was made of a speech in Ontario in February of this year. In North America there are three cities with metro, three areas: Winnipeg, Toronto and Dade County in Florida. Now it is proposed that a fourth be established, and this in Ontario, and in February 1968 the Honourable Mr. McKeough, Minister of Municipal Affairs in Ontario said, "After full consideration and in light of its experience, the government will recommend to the Legislature that the required Council" - this is the required Council for the proposed metropolitan government in the Ottawa area - "with the exception of its chairman, should be composed of elected members from the Councils of the local municipalities." However, some are grouped to have one member to represent them, and the government of Ontario announced on that day that they were introducing legislation to establish this metropolitan government for the Ottawa region, which had 16 different governments, and they were giving to that regional council an assessment department, going to look after arterial roads, major waters, sewage and drainage works, regional planning, capital financing for both local and regional purposes, and mandatory welfare services. That's all they were giving to this local council and they were making no recommendation as to amalgamating these 16 communities, and these 16 communities were, in turn, having representatives on the Metro Council.

I think that that perhaps, their experience in Ontario, shows the way that if we are going to have an efficient Metro Council that carries on co-operatively with the other municipalities in Winnipeg, that it should be composed of members of the municipal councils and have no direct connection with them as is the case in Winnipeg at the present time. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, just a few words. I do intend to support the amendment

(MR. FROESE cont'd.) just in case the motion should be carried - although I have grave doubts on this, whether the main motion will be carried, after hearing the Honourable Member for Winnipeg South.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN (Inkster): On a point of order, I just wonder whether my honourable friend knows that he is now speaking to the main motion and not to the amendment. The amendment has been defeated.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: We are now on the main motion. The amendment has been voted on and lost.

MR. FROESE: Oh, I was not aware of this and therefore, then I need not vote on the amendment as this has already been disposed of. Then I can just make one or two remarks in connection with the main motion. I am very glad to hear the Honourable Member for Winnipeg South express his concern in this direction of total amalgamation and what the results would or could be, and I certainly go along with what he has said because this is my inclination to that, the experience that we have had that centralization does not cost less but costs more money; and certainly I will keep the material that he's been making available to us through his speech this morning, for future reference.

Mr. Speaker, I think this session has been the session of inconsistencies. If ever there has been a session where we have been inconsistent, I think this tops the cake, and I'm just wondering what the reasons are for this. In my opinion, it's this, that the government is retracting from some of its centralization programs; they do not want to do it all at once; and now they have a gradual retraction and this makes them vote for centralization in certain areas and opposing it in other areas. I can't draw any other conclusions than these and, as I said, I think this is the session of inconsistencies.

MR. COWAN: Mr. Speaker, I'm speaking for myself.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the last remark was probably the most incongruous remark that has been made at the Session, that the Member for Winnipeg Centre says he's speaking for himself. Who speaks for the government on this issue, which I regard as the most important issue facing over half the people in the Province of Manitoba? Mr. Speaker, it's the responsibility of the government to deal with this problem, and if we were in government we would have that responsibility, and if you don't accept that responsibility then say so, but we have the same type of situation where the Minister of Municipal Affairs can say that she is extricating herself from a problem which is vital to municipal affairs in the Province of Manitoba when she abstained from a vote on the Brandon bill.

However, Mr. Speaker, I didn't intend to spend a long time in closing this debate. I don't think that there has been a more eloquent speech in favour of what this resolution proposes than that which has been made by the Member for Winnipeg Centre. He spoke of the suburban communities around Greater Winnipeg as if they were communities of under 50,000 people where costs are down, and spoke as if they were such communities, but he knows full well that they are living in the places that they are living because they are living in a community of 500,000 people. Would any of those people who live in St. Vital, who live in East Kildonan, who live in Charleswood, would they move to a community which is a community of under 50,000 people? Of course not. Because although the urban community indeed costs more money, the advantages of the urban community are so obvious to everybody in this country that we see, if there is any phenomenon that we are able to see in the last twenty years, it is a shift in population to urban communities, and, Mr. Speaker, in playing truant on Tuesday evening - or Wednesday evening - I was at, well I wasn't exactly playing truant because I had the leave of my Honourable Leader to attend, and I was at a meeting of the alumni association where an architect was honoured as being the Jubilee Award Winner for the Alumni Association Award.

He was an architect from Toronto; his name was Parker; and he indicated that 80 percent of the population is going to be living in urban areas. And if anything would stifle and inhibit the growth of an urban area, it's what my honourable friend is talking about. He wants bucket brigades. If he had his way, people would move to the north pole, and if he doesn't then he is satisfied, then he is satisfied - and he's a representative of Winnipeg - he is satisfied that his people will live in an urban community but they will not shoulder their share of the responsibility for doing so; that responsibility will rest on the people of Greater Winnipeg whom he represents, and he has shown what is occurring with regard to municipal taxation in Greater Winnipeg. You have the people who are living in the core paying the greatest portion of it, the

(MR. GREEN cont'd.) people who are living in the surrounding communities paying a lesser portion of it; and what is going to happen - and I want my honourable friend to know this - is that on the rim of St. Vital, just beyond the municipal boundaries of St. Vital, there's going to be people trying to take advantage of St. Vital community and paying less taxes, just as they have done in the past with regard to Greater Winnipeg, and he approves of this. He says that this is the way of doing things. He is, and the government is, looking at this problem in the most reactionary - and I'm not using that word politically, I'm using it in terms of urban growth - if there were ever a way of stifling and inhibiting urban growth, it's the way that my honourable friend suggests.

Mr. Speaker, people are not moving to places and communities which have less than 50,000 people because there are lower taxations. They are going to communities with over 200,000 population with even higher taxation. Why? Because such communities can support theatres; because such communities can afford to support large arenas and sporting facilities; because such communities make it possible for people to participate in a more meaningful type of existence. They support universities. They support other things of that kind, and the people are moving to those urban communities, and the difficulty with Greater Winnipeg, Mr. Speaker, is that we for the last ten years have been hindered by the fact that we are not able to have a total urban plan because of our urban make-up.

Mr. Speaker, I'm reading from an editorial in the Toronto Globe and Mail and the heading is - this is in Toronto: "Manitoba; the outlook is gloomy." What are they talking about? They are talking about Greater Winnipeg and they are referring to a speech that was made by Mr. Levin, the Metropolitan Planner, and I'll just read the last two paragraphs: "The other was that the principal responsibilities of a municipal government such as taxation, revenue raising, planning, etc., be centralized in one government. Since Metro already has authority over almost all intra-municipal services, that would leave the Metro area's 14 local governments with very little to do except collect garbage, an unpopular idea with most of the 118 local politicians in the area. Unpopular and unpleasant or not, hard economic facts bear out the planner's warning, for Winnipeg has indeed become, as the Housing and Renewal report said last year, a branch office community, a place to live and work until a better opportunity comes along. Unless this situation can be changed, the prospects for the city are not bright."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I don't wish to mislead the members. This is in the Toronto Globe and Mail but it's a Manitoba report written by, of course, a Manitoba reporter, Ellen Simmons. But, Mr. Speaker, I think she has correctly pointed out the problem, and I would ask the honourable members to vote on this bill as they voted on the last one which dealt with co-ordination of municipal services. Nobody suggested -- but there were people in Assiniboia who suggested it; there was a strong movement in Assiniboia who said that if we get together with St. James we are going to have to share the tax load of St. James; we are going to have to level off services; our taxes are going to go up. Not one person raised that question in this House, because everybody realized that for the benefit and equity of the area concerned, that it was reasonable and logical to vote for the co-ordination of the services of those two areas. And I am asking this House to vote on this bill in the same way as they voted on the previous bill.

Mr. Speaker, I'm going to close and I want to make one remark with regard to the problem that has been raised by the Member for St. Boniface, because this is a problem which I feel singly concerned with. I regard Canada - and I spoke this way last year - as a country which is composed of many, many peoples and many, many cultures but which is based on two languages; that the people who come here know they are coming to a country where there are two languages, one French and one English, and that everything that has to be done throughout Canada to make sure the recognition of this fact, becomes a part of Canadianism, and I said that that fact is the one feature which protects other ethnic groups in this community - the fact that we are not a homogeneous culture protects me as a Jew, protects many of my constituents

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder if the honourable member has strayed from the content of the resolution before the House? He probably has something in mind but I'd like to hear it.

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'm calling for one municipal government but I want one municipal government that will recognize the nature of this city and the nature of this country, and I see nothing wrong with the government of Greater Winnipeg recognizing the type of country that we are in and recognizing the type of city that we are in, but I wish to make it perfectly plain, Mr. Speaker, that when I say that, I am saying that as a member of what we

(MR. GREEN cont'd.) call the third group, the group of minority, and I say that it is to my advantage and to the advantage of many of my constituents that we recognize this fact, the heterogeneous rather than the homogeneous nature of Canadian culture, so when I moved this resolution I take that as implied. I -- (Interjection) -- That's what Trudeau says? If Mr. Trudeau says it, that's fine. I say it; that's fine too. We have no objection with that and, Mr. Speaker, I say that the position that I am taking is a position which is implicit in the resolution, because in every resolution that I put, I underline it by the fact that I believe that my feelings as to the nature of this country are implicit in the resolution and need not be specifically - or to use a better word - particularly put out in the resolution; there need be nothing said about a particular status for the City of St. Boniface or for the French fact of our city in the resolution. That's part and parcel of the facts of our country. And therefore I would hope that the Member for St. Boniface would take that as being implicit in the resolution without being specifically pointed out and that this would relieve any objection that he has to one Greater Winnipeg.

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

MR. GREEN: Ayes and Nays please, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the Members. I should inform the House that we're dealing with Resolution No. 5, in the name of the Honourable Member for Inkster, on Page 4 of the Orders of the Day.

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

YEAS: Messrs. Campbell, Clement, Dow, Doern, Fox, Green, Guttormson, Hanuschak, Harris, Molgat, Petursson, Tanchak and Vielfaure.

NAYS: Messrs. Baizley, Beard, Bjornson, Carroll, Cowan, Craik, Einarson, Enns, Evans, Froese, Hamilton, Jeannotte, Johnson, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McGregor, McKellar, McKenzie, Masniuk, Paulley, Spivak, Stanes, Watt, Weir and Witney; Mesdames Forbes and Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 13; Nays, 28.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the resolution lost. The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface. The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, finally we've reached the last chapter of the great Medicare battle, or debate. Just another 40 minutes and it will be all over. No, not quite, Mr. Speaker. I wanted to see if they were asleep on the other side. -- (Interjection) -- Mr. Speaker, one more and I'll take the 40 minutes. Well, Mr. Speaker, there is only one thing; I think to the Minister and the government we've made it clear that we cannot support this resolution. There is no need for this at all, especially that we have another resolution asking for this type of a meeting with Ottawa. I just want to take two minutes, in closing this debate, because I find it quite unfortunate that - I'm not going to say the New Democratic Party as a whole, because I refer mostly to two members of the New Democratic Party, their attitude in this debate, but I'm referring to the Leader and the Honourable Member from St. John's. I think that when it comes to a vital question like this, members of the party that, if not claim officially, certainly try to give the impression that they are the only ones that are interested in the welfare of the people, I think that the attitude of these two members who try to, as far as I can see, to mix up what is being said, who seem to want to antagonize anybody that might support a Medicare program, who seem not to have any backing for any of the resolution, I think it is unfortunate. I certainly don't include all the members of the New Democratic Party because I certainly have respect for the way the Honourable Member from Inkster has debated this. I don't agree with him in a lot of ways but he always was fair enough to recognize our position, the position that we have been trying to make for a number of years now, not like the Honourable Member from St. John's who turned around and said that we're not clear; that we were not -- we should have stood in this House and chastised Ottawa; that was our main responsibility, especially in view of the fact that we had made things quite clearly.

The Member from Inkster stated his position; we stated ours. As soon as this debate started, the first time that I spoke in this House, I said there is no point in starting all the debate of last year on Bill 68. The position of the three parties had been made quite clear; very clear. I said this without sarcasm because I felt that the main thing by this resolution, the main thing we were trying to do is do something now. We agreed with the government in a lot of ways but we felt that we should do something now; and as I say, I think it is unfortunate that a few of the members took this opportunity to try to, instead of bringing the things in the open, to have a vote, to think of the people of Manitoba, that they tried to capitalize on this or

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd.) play politics or put somebody in a box, as you might say. I think that the Leader of the New Democratic Party tried to, when we had a delegation of the labour group on this subject, tried to turn this into a political meeting, and I don't think that this is right at all, and this is not -- if you're working for people this is not the way to help them when you try to antagonize other people. They come in to see us as members of the Legislature and I think that this is the important thing, the way it should be done.

Yesterday when I made an amendment, the Leader of the New Democratic Party stood up and said, "Well, all right. I'm not in favour of this kind of plan, but if it goes through I will vote for this." He was in a box, let's say. I got up and I said, "Yes, I respect this. I accept this because you made it quite clear on Bill 102 what your intentions were." And I think that he could have accorded the same courtesy because the next motion the shoe was reversed and he felt that we had no right to do this at all. In other words, I don't think that there should have been that type of debate. I don't approve; we're free to do whatever we wish but I certainly appreciate the remarks of the Honourable Member from Inkster as compared to the ones of his Leader.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate of the Honourable Member for Hamiota and the proposed motion of the Honourable the Member for Brandon in amendment thereto. The Honourable the Provincial Treasurer.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, for the reasons discussed earlier today, I am unable to agree with the last amendment - the sub-amendment - calling on me to table a report which will be in the nature of advice to me.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Are you ready for the amendment? I'm sorry. I misinformed the House again. Are you ready for the question on the sub-amendment?

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

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

MR. SPEAKER put the question on the main motion as amended, and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Inkster, and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Kildonan. The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, very briefly, the amendment is not what we would like as a final result. We do value the support of as many members in the House as we can muster. We presume that the Member for Hamiota spoke for the Liberal Party in proposing the amendment that he did. We don't know whether we're right in that presumption but we presume that that is the case. We don't think that it's necessary for the media, the particular media, to obtain the approval of the Speaker, and as a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I in principle would be very much against that kind of proposal ordinarily. However, we want sincerely to get this thing done. If this can be done as a transitional measure to show that it will work, then we would hope, Mr. Speaker, that you would be able to use your good judgment in the direction that we are talking about and we're willing at least to give it a try. If you don't make what we hope possible take place, then we'd come again and ask the Legislature to go further, but hopefully, Mr. Speaker, we see this as a demonstration that all of the fears that some members have expressed are needless ones, and therefore, we're willing to do this in terms of allaying some of the misgivings that we know would have no basis, and for that reason, Mr. Speaker, and because we are reasonable people who are always willing to compromise in order to get to our ultimate ends, we will go along with what we hope is a Liberal Party amendment, and in this way hope to also encourage enough members over there to support this proposition so that we can see whether or not what we propose is as much to be feared as some of the members have said it is.

MR. SPEAKER: Before I put the question, I realize that the session is coming to an end, but the rules still exist and it's still against the rules to be reading newspapers and magazines in the House.

MR. SPEAKER put the question on the sub-amendment and after a voice vote declared the motion lost.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, Ayes and Nays, please.

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

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I want to see Ayes and Nays on the sub-amendment, the amendment of Mr. Dawson.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members. For the benefit of the honourable members that were out of the House, we're dealing with Resolution No. 16, the sub-amendment of the Honourable Member for Hamiota.

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

YEAS: Messrs. Campbell, Clement, Desjardins, Doern, Fox, Green, Guttormson, Hanuschak, Harris, Kawchuk, Molgat, Paulley, Petursson, Tanchak, Uskiw and Vielfaure.

NAYS: Messrs. Baizley, Beard, Bjornson, Carroll, Cowan, Craik, Einarson, Enns, Evans, Hamilton, Jeannotte, Johnson, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McGregor, McKellar, McKenzie, Masniuk, Spivak, Stanes, Watt, Weir and Witney; Mesdames Forbes and Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 16; Nays, 26.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the sub-amendment lost.

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Emerson. The Honourable Member for Hamiota.

MR. JOHN P. TANCHAK (Emerson): Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Hamiota adjourned this for me, but if I speak I'll be closing the debate. -- (Interjection) -- I see there is agreement. I'll try to reciprocate and be very short. I only have one small quarrel and that is with our Minister of Agriculture. Evidently, listening to what he had to say, the government will not support this resolution and I am definitely disappointed in the Minister because I expected a completely different reaction from him. The Minister did not say, "I, as Minister, will do all I can to improve the weather forecasting for the farmers and all the people in the Province of Manitoba." He did not say that. And he did not say that he has done all he can to make this improvement. I would like to have heard him say that. He agreed that improvement could be made by saying that there could be improvements in it. And I would like to ask: is it not the responsibility of the Minister to serve agricultural industry to the best of his ability? I'm sure he's aware of that. He should have done something.

He told us that he is not prepared to exercise proper leadership and responsibility to have this service improved, not in the direct words but in a roundabout way. He shifted that responsibility from his own shoulders to the shoulders of the agricultural factor, to the agricultural organizations and the farmer, by saying, "Why don't these groups go and ask for this on their own? They should go to the television media; they should go to the people who do this service and ask for improvements." I don't think it was the proper thing for the Minister to do. I think he should have done it. I would say that this is precisely the responsibility of the Minister and I would implore the Minister to change his mind and take his responsibility seriously.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Portage, the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Wellington in amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): Mr. Speaker, I think I've said everything that is to be said on this debate.

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members. For the benefit of the honourable members who were out of the House, we're dealing with Resolution 19, the amendment thereto.

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

YEAS: Messrs. Campbell, Desjardins, Doern, Fox, Froese, Green, Guttormson, Hanuschak, Harris, Kawchuk, Molgat, Paulley, Petursson, Tanchak, Uskiw and Vielfaure.

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

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 16; Nays, 26.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the amendment lost.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Elmwood. The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I consider this resolution to be one of the most important that is presently before the Legislature and I consider that to be the case for several reasons. There seems to be some misconception that the B and B Commission is one that will be able to offer meaningful contributions to the discussions of the British North America Act, and I don't think that that is the case, Mr. Speaker. I think that that Commission was essentially concerned with the bi-cultural and bilingual nature of this country. At the present time, the concern is with regard to the constitution and as to how it will affect all Canadians. I know that the contributions that the Province of Manitoba is going to be making are not even based on any discussion in this House, which they should at least have the benefit of; and worse than that, they are not based on any attempt to determine what various groups in this community think about the Canadian Constitution. And I'm not referring to any particular group. I'm sure that the Manitoba Bar Association will have things to say about the Canadian Constitution; I'm sure that various cultural groups in the province would have things to say about the BNA Act; I'm sure that the academics of our community from the University of Manitoba and from the other, the University of Winnipeg and from other universities would want to be able to contribute to the discussion on this question. And as far as I know, Mr. Speaker, the Premier of this province has been participating in those discussions without any sounding out of various opinions from the public or from the members of this House. And from what I have been able to ascertain about his contribution, it reflects the weakness of his position, the weakness of his background in discussing these issues. And I therefore think, Mr. Speaker, that the resolution that has been put by the Member for Elmwood is one which should commend itself to all the members of the House, and I really don't know how Manitoba is going to play a meaningful role in these discussions without such a forum where Manitobans can view their positions.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I am not one that would strongly support the rewriting of the Constitution at this particular time when things are rather unsettled in this land of ours on many issues. However, should it be rewritten, then I think we should in this province also take a part in the discussions and I think then this motion would certainly be in order. To me, it seems that our trouble stems from not adhering to the Constitution rather than from any other thing, and therefore I will support the motion because if it should be rewritten and the decision should be made by the Federal Government in the meantime, then we should play a part in it.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I simply want to say that I recognize that this is a most important issue to Canada and I don't want in any way to belittle the importance of the whole constitutional question, but I don't think that this is the method by which we will solve it. I think that the government has previously had some studies on this; there were committees set up. Very few people actually appeared before those committees, and I don't think such a committee would resolve the situation that faces us. So I do not intend to support the resolution.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to say a few words in relation to this resolution. I served on one committee of this House respecting the proposed Fulton-Favreau Constitution, and I found that the meetings we held, after being thoroughly advertised, only resulted in three individuals coming to address that committee; and they were R. D. Gibson from the Manitoba Law School, a man by the name of Harris came as a private citizen, and an educational association of French Canadians in Manitoba. They were the only people that came. Now, the first two took exception to the proposals as to amending the constitution and the latter group was only interested in the question of bilingualism. But apart from that altogether, in dealing with a constitution we're dealing with a highly technical matter. But this resolution only confines itself to three aspects. It does not confine itself to the general constitution but simply to three aspects of that constitution, and these aspects are - if I can find it here - social, is it; social, cultural and economic. Now my submission is . . .

MR. DOERN: . . . propose an amendment.

MR. HILLHOUSE: No, I'm not going to propose any amendment at all. I'm going to vote against it. My proposition is this: that in dealing with these three aspects mentioned in the

(MR. HILLHOUSE cont'd.) resolution, we're dealing with something that would come within the jurisdiction of either a provincial government or a federal government, and these are matters of policy for the respective governments to decide. They're not constitutional matters at all. They're simply matters of policy, falling within the jurisdiction of the particular branch of government. And for that reason, I don't think it has any place in any meeting that we would have regarding a Canadian Constitution or a means of amending it. But so far, we have no proposed Canadian Constitution. The only discussion that we've ever had so far in this House regarding a Canadian Constitution was the proposals originally made by the Honourable Davie Fulton and subsequently amended by the Honourable Guy Favreau, known as the Fulton-Favreau proposals, but they only dealt with amendments. They didn't deal with the basic concept of the constitution.

But my main point is this: that these three aspects that have been raised by the honourable member in his resolution, are only dealing with subject matters which would come under the jurisdiction of either a federal or a provincial government, and my guess would be that they would come under the jurisdiction of the provincial government, and as such they're matters of policy that must be decided by that government; they're not matters which would be embedded in a constitution.

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

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, when I introduced this motion I was hoping that there would be some debate on it, and I suppose the debate we've heard just now is about as lengthy as the contributions we heard before. I was somewhat disappointed in the contribution of the government member who seemed to speak on behalf of all his colleagues, because he really didn't say very much. He didn't give any reasons in particular why this resolution shouldn't be supported. He felt that the Premier's contribution was great at the conferences.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I attended one of those conferences, the Confederation of Tomorrow Conference; I studied the press reports and read the press reports to this House; and Manitoba certainly did not make a very significant contribution to that conference. In fact, if a person read the press reports and columns written about it, Manitoba's contribution was considered by observers to be almost non-existent. I think the government failed, really, to prepare in advance for that conference. I don't blame the Premier himself, who only took office two days before, but I blame his entire Party because they were aware of this conference months before and they should have had some lengthier position papers prepared.

In regard to some of the comments from the members of the Liberal Party, that this resolution does not deal with the technical aspects of the constitution, that it only deals with the social, cultural and economic questions, I thought that's really what -- when you get beneath and you strip the technical constitutional questions in isolation, that really what they do deal with in fact are the economic relationships and the social relationships and the cultural and linguistic relationships of the Canadian people, so that I don't feel this resolution is restrictive. I interpret it to be all-embracing. And if the Member for Selkirk feels that he can't support it mainly because it leaves out an important aspect, then I say they should have proposed an amendment.

The Leader of the Liberal Party feels that a few years ago little interest was shown in this question, and I can only say in answer to that that times are changed; that a few years ago there was no separatism; there was no FLQ; there was no thought of Quebec seceding; there just wasn't the interest five or ten years ago that there is today. It's been an accelerating interest and there's been increasing concern.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't want to speak on length on this question. I just will sum up by saying the following: that I feel that Manitoba should have two committees or two studies or two areas that should have been examined. One is, the government should have had an advisory committee to support the Premier, to offer to prepare position papers for the Premier and for the government, a committee of academics and experts. I think the government would have benefitted a great deal from this. But this is not for me to bring up in a resolution; this is their business. I feel, however, that the public should have an opportunity to express their opinions to the government, and I also feel, on the other hand, that we have the responsibility to educate the public and that, by having public hearings and asking questions of delegations, we could have learned what the views of Manitobans are on these issues, which I think are most significant, and at the same time we could have involved ourselves in an educating process the other way, that the press would pick this up and that people would become enlightened and think more in

(MR. DOERN cont'd.) terms of national issues. So I urge the members of the House to support this resolution.

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

MR. DOERN: Ayes and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

MR. LYON: . . . would like to reconsider that?

MR. DOERN: Well, I'll reconsider it if you want to stop the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. For the benefit of the honourable members, we're dealing with Resolution No. 12 proposed by the Honourable Member for Elmwood.

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

YEAS: Messrs. Doern, Fox, Green, Hanuschak, Harris, Kawchuk, Miller, Paulley, Petursson and Uskiw.

NAYS: Messrs. Baizley, Beard, Bjornson, Campbell, Carroll, Cowan, Craik, Desjardins, Dow, Einarson, Enns, Evans, Guttormson, Hamilton, Hillhouse, Jeannotte, Johnson, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McGregor, McKellar, McKenzie, McLean, Masniuk, Molgat, Shoemaker, Spivak, Stanes, Tanchak, Vielfaure, Watt, Weir, Witney and Mesdames Forbes and Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 10; Nays, 36.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the resolution lost. The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Kildonan. The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. PHILIP PETURSSON (Wellington): Mr. Speaker, I, too, like the other members speaking on motions will be very brief. This has, as members know, to do with the minimum wage, and there seems to be an inclination on the part of the Honourable the Minister of Labour to keep it as it is, using as an argument that the employers cannot afford to pay the minimum wage if it were to be increased. His concern is for the employers. My concern is for the people who would be compelled, under certain circumstances, to work at the rate of the Minimum Wage; and in effect, to keep employers in business, they would in reality be subsidizing that employer so that he would be able to afford, as the Honourable Minister of Labour put it, to stay in business.

It is the purpose of people who get employment to endeavour to earn a living, and if they can't earn a living, as we understand it, at the present minimum wage then the minimum wage should certainly be increased. Everything else is being increased - it is going up by leaps and bounds - except the lowest rates of pay. An article in the Tribune bore this out not very long ago, written by Val Werier, who says: "The lowest incomes rise slower. The incomes of the lowest group," he said, "in the first ten percent of earners, increased by 49 percent in the 16-year period under review" - that is the period from 1949 to 1965 - "and at the same time," he says, "the incomes of those in the nine-ten percent of earners increased by 125 percent."

Now people who are being expected to pay taxes on their homes, increased Hydro rates, increased food costs, increased rental rates, increased rates in almost every direction in which they turn, should certainly be expected to receive rates of pay that will enable them to continue to live in a community as part of the community and not be threatened with the possibility of becoming dependent upon the community for support other than the wages which they are endeavouring to earn. I can't possibly understand the thinking of the Honourable Minister of Labour when he is so concerned about the employer not being able to continue to operate if he is compelled to pay the minimum. The minimum is set, not as a wage to hold people down to, but a wage below which it is not economic for people to go if they are to continue to carry on a living.

This, Mr. Speaker, is the sum and substance of my presentation. I had further and additional supporting arguments along this same line but I'll refrain from carrying it on any further and let it go at that. Thank you very much.

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

MR. PAULLEY: Ayes and Nays, please.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members. The House is dealing with Resolution No. 13, the Honourable Member for Kildonan.

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

YEAS: Messrs. Campbell, Desjardins, Dow, Doern, Fox, Green, Guttormson, Hanuschak, Harris, Hillhouse, Kawchuk, Miller, Molgat, Paulley, Petursson, Shoemaker, Tanchak, Uskiw, and Vielfaure.

(STANDING VOTE cont'd.)

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

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 19; Nays, 27.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the resolution lost.

. continued on next page

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate of the Honourable Member for Brokenhead. The Honourable Member for LaVerendrye.

MR. ALBERT VIELFAURE (La Verendrye): Mr. Speaker, like others, I'll be very brief. I would have liked to make a larger contribution at this time. However, I think anybody here enjoys a brief speech much more than a long one at this time.

We think this is a good resolution, Mr. Speaker. There are definitely problems in the marketing of agricultural products. The Honourable Member from Brokenhead is suggesting that the committee on agriculture look into all aspects. We agree with this, and in order to make a complete study we are aware that there is no easy solution. We think this committee should inquire through the whole province instead of just here in the Legislative Building so that farmers themselves in the different areas can bring their problems to the committee.

Therefore, I will be moving an amendment, Mr. Speaker, which simply says - and I will move the amendment now. I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Emerson, that the motion be amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "And Be It Further Resolved that this committee be allowed to sit in different areas of the province in order to study the varying needs in the several areas."

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the Minister of Agriculture.

HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Minister of Agriculture and Conservation)(Rockwood-Iberville): Mr. Speaker, I rise to comment very briefly on the resolution, or on the amendment as proposed by the Honourable Member from La Verendrye, and in so doing, Mr. Speaker, I'll be speaking really to the amendment and to the main resolution. I can't avoid it because of the similar nature of the two.

I would have to point out to the members simply that we have an ongoing federal passport charged with the same responsibility, that we have in this province a very capably and recently reinforced Manitoba Marketing Board. The main resolution deals with marketing procedures being to a large extent some of the problems that we have. I have myself recently instructed and authorized the Manitoba Marketing Board greater leeway in terms of adding to it marketing knowledge and strength that's capable of them. I would have to point out the work that's being done by the federal people, by the Ontario people, and other people. My main objection to this motion and the reason why this government will vote against both the amendment and the motion, is that to make it meaningful you must be prepared to attach at least a hundred, two hundred, or perhaps a half a million dollar price tag to it; that is what the Province of Ontario is paying for their study with respect to this matter.

I'm suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that we have a very close working liaison with the studies that are currently taking place in agriculture, and whether they're in Ontario or they're in Manitoba or federal, they're all inter-related. One of my senior staff members is an official delegate of the Ontario meetings with respect to this same subject. He attends the meetings; we receive all the data; there's a good flow of information moving on. It's somewhat similar, Sir, to the situation of the automobile insurance investigations; that we know where we have a very extensive survey of this matter being undertaken in B. C. I always thought it was advisable that this Legislature do not duplicate that kind of an effort, rather that we should await the results of that effort and learn and gain the economy of that.

Mr. Chairman, if I thought for a moment that by the adoption of this resolution we would automatically solve the farmers' problem, certainly I would vote in favour of it. What I'm suggesting to the committee, or to the House, is that we are always, the government is continually concerned with investigating these problems, that we have some of the mechanics already set up; the Manitoba Marketing Board as being one prime example. And our liaison with the Federal task force; I could inform the House that I just recently was informed that at the annual meeting of the Ministers of Agriculture for all the provinces, which will be taking place in Saskatchewan this year - we will be meeting - one of the main items will be to meet with the task force and to discuss these same problems with the Federal task force.

I'm suggesting that matters of this kind have been on the agenda and will continue to play a more prominent role on the agenda of the regional Premiers' Economic Council of the three prairie provinces along with the studies that are going on in other parts of the country, that at this point there would be no meaningful purpose served in supporting this amendment nor the resolution before us.

MR. MICHAEL KAWCHUK (Ethelbert Plains): Mr. Speaker, I would just like to rise

(MR. KAWCHUK cont'd.)... and say that we are in favour of the amendment as presented by the Honourable Member for LaVerendrye. I would like to just make a few short comments on the remarks made by the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture. It is in respect to the fact that he said we should wait until reports are available from other provinces. Well, I suggest to the Honourable Minister that we have now waited long enough, in my opinion. We have now identified the problem of the farm income and it is high time that we started to act on it, and a committee of this nature of course would be composed, I presume, of all parties of this House, and it would enable this committee to sit in various parts of the province thus enabling the farmers of that area, or whatever the case might be, to make representations far more readily. We will be supporting the amendment.

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

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

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if, on a point of order, if I might make a proposal at this time. We are now dealing with proposed resolutions that have not yet been introduced. Could we have the agreement of the House, in view of the time of the day, to simply have the movers move them by number, with the agreement that then the text will appear in Hansard as if read.

MR. LYON: I have no objection to that, Mr. Speaker.

MR. PAULLEY: No, I object to that, Mr. Speaker. It's not going to save any time and I think that the resolution should be read by the member who is introducing it in the normal fashion. It's a long day today, or could be a long day. We were here the other day until 3:00 o'clock in the morning. I'm not suggesting we do that today but I do suggest that the suggestion of my honourable friend will not really accomplish anything and I think it should be carried through the normal process.

MR. LYON: be here till 3:00 in the morning.

MR. MOLGAT: It was . . . a suggestion, Mr. Speaker. Obviously if there is no agreement in the House it can't be done.

MR. PAULLEY: I do not agree.

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Brokenhead. The Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Kildonan. Whereas the new International Wheat Agreement does not guarantee an increase in the price of wheat; and

Whereas costs of production of wheat continue to move upward;

Therefore Be It Resolved that this House urge the Government of Canada to institute a meaningful two-price system for wheat, and that the Federal Government negotiate with the farm organizations to arrive at a fair price.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, this is a resolution that we discussed at great length during the session a year ago, and one would, because of that, assume that one shouldn't make too much comment; that Members are all familiar with the idea in the resolution. But Mr. Speaker, I think we should recognize that the situation is substantially different today in the wheat markets of the world and in the price of wheat, that we ought to spend some time on an important resolution such as this, recognizing the fact that substantial changes have taken place since a year ago, and it's in this connection that I hope that I may indulge in, at least to some degree outline to the House just what I think ought to be considered to solve the problems, or help solve the problems, of income and particularly on the prairies, insofar as the wheat producers are concerned.

Last year, in presenting this motion, I was told by the members opposite, by the government, that they were rather sympathetic with the proposal but that the proposal was premature in that last year the trading countries of the world in wheat were negotiating a new agreement and that the government in Manitoba, at least, was confident that the results of those negotiations would be very favourable and that the wheat prices would substantially increase, and I don't have to relate to you what happened during the course of those negotiations and the subsequent agreement. I simply want to state that the price has not been increased; the allowable maximum price was increased, but the floor price, Mr. Speaker, was not increased beyond

(MR. USKIW cont'd.)... that which the market was providing, and that in effect, that if the wheat prices in the new three-year agreement are going to stay at the floor price level of that agreement, that we will be getting something like 20 cents a bushel less than we have been getting for two or three years, so that there is no improvement by way of the new international wheat agreement if it ever gets off the ground, Mr. Speaker. So I hope that the House will recognize that it is important and that we ought to give it some consideration.

Canada provided some 25 percent of the wheat that moves into international trade. Our exports in the 1950s, Mr. Speaker, were somewhere in the neighbourhood of 300 million bushels a year; in the 1960s, 500 to 600 million bushels per year, Mr. Speaker; and the projection is, at least according to our experts, the Hedlin and Menzies people, that we will reach the 3-billion-bushel world market demand for wheat or world trade by 1980, so that in essence, in essence there is good prospect for Canadian farmers in terms of the long run, that we should be looking forward and recognize that we probably will be in an improved position some time in the future. But because of this fact, Mr. Speaker, I think we must recognize that we ought to make sure that our farmers are able to tide themselves over, are able to tide themselves over during this interim period in which we may find some difficulty.

Last year we had losses in sales to the extent of 200 million bushels. World wheat trade fluctuates, naturally, according to varying production figures in respect of exporting countries or even importing countries, so therefore we can expect that there will be these fluctuations in the movement of grain, so I want to say to the House, Mr. Speaker, that it shouldn't be the farmer that is responsible totally to provide a granary for the world, that the nation has some responsibility to introduce some measures of stability into the whole wheat picture. And I don't think, Mr. Speaker, that the farmers should be the ones to keep the grain in reserve, waiting for the needs of the world, at their own cost. I think that we should give recognition that it does cost money to store grain, and during the time that you must store this grain that you also have to borrow money against it so that you can carry on, and this certainly is not a fair burden to place on the producers of the prairies.

One of the things I want to mention to the House is that the causes of our present difficulty is largely domestic in that it's really inflation that is putting the farmers in a tough situation and that is really bringing about a cost-price squeeze situation, and because it is inflation and the fact that the federal government has not been able to control the inflationary pressures or the economy, that there is responsibility on the part of the government of Canada to look after those people or to assist those people who find themselves in this kind of a squeeze, recognizing that they, the government, has failed to control the economy in such a way that we will not have inflation running away with us.

So Mr. Speaker, I think that these are important points; that we do have to look to government and that we should expect some form of assistance from the Federal Government, and it is the responsibility of provincial governments to apply the pressures that are necessary to bring this to the attention of our Federal people.

Now, Mr. Speaker, you may suggest to me that I am probably implying a subsidy, and maybe I am; but it can be termed in more ways than one. You can define it as a subsidy to producers of wheat or you can define it as a consumer subsidy, Mr. Speaker, recognizing that the consumers in Canada are really the ones that are benefiting or, logically speaking, could be benefiting from the fact that farmers are suffering a lower wheat price than they have had for some time, and what I am trying to say is that I don't think the consumers of Canada expect the farmers to hold the line on prices in view of the fact that cost of production keeps pushing upward, and that in essence what happens is that the farmer is subsidizing the consumer; so I am saying that we could name it the Consumer Subsidy, a subsidy that would provide the farmer some measure of guarantee so that he may offset the increased cost of production from year to year.

If you look at - and I'm sure you've all seen the Hedlin-Menzies report, it suggests that the purchasing power of a bushel of wheat -- I'm going to quote Page 25, if I may; the bottom of Page 25 suggests "that the farmers' position in terms of costs incurred and prices received during the post-World War Two period can be described in three propositions. The average price of wheat on the farm in 1950-51 was \$1.54 per bushel. In terms of purchasing power this is equivalent to a 1966-67 price of 99 cents." This gives you a very good illustration. "To achieve the same purchasing power as a bushel of wheat with a farm value of \$1.54 in 1950, the farmer in 1966-67 would have to receive an average price at his local elevator of \$2.38." Now,

(MR. USKIW cont'd.)... Mr. Speaker, these are some of the findings of Hedlin and Menzies that have taken some time in arriving at these conclusions.

Now on Page 31, on Page 31 Hedlin and Menzies have come up with some suggestion as to how to deal with the problem, and they recognize that what they are suggesting is not the answer; it is simply a measure to improve the situation; and they are recommending that the government should peg the price at \$1.95 1/2, and each year, recognizing that inflation seems to be increasing by about four percent a year, that each year the government pick up the tab for the increased cost of production to the extent of three percent, and let the farmer improve his efficiency to cover the other one percent; and that within the scope of the international agreement, by the year 1971, that the price of wheat would be \$2.13 a bushel. And I'd had some discussions with Ralph Hedlin on this point and I asked him why he decided to recommend such a minimal approach, and he said to me that he recognized that it was minimal but that it was merely a position whereby he thought it could be sold to the politicians of Canada and to the voters of Canada; that he recognized it wasn't sufficient but that this is probably as far as he would go to try and implement something at this stage of the game.

But Mr. Speaker, I want to point out that the Hedlin formula doesn't do a great deal for us. In a three-year duration of the International Wheat Agreement on which this formula applies, the farmers of the prairies would receive a subsidy of \$108 million, and I want to suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that a two-price formula would do substantially better than that and it would be more equitable, in that if we recognized that we have an average production of 600 million bushels of wheat in Canada and we recognized the fact that a quarter of that production is consumed in Canada in varying ways, that we should really be looking at supporting the price of one quarter of our total production, and that if we accepted the fact that wheat should be worth \$2.38 a bushel to put us back in the same position as we were in the 1950s, then we would really be saying that one quarter of our production should get a subsidy of 43 cents a bushel, which, Mr. Speaker, amounts to something like \$193 million during the duration of this International Wheat Agreement that's before us, for the next three years, and this is substantially better than the proposition which Hedlin is recommending, namely a \$108 million program; and I want to suggest to the House that we ought to adopt the position that the farmers should not be subsidizing the consumers of Canada and we should not get into competition through subsidies on the international market.

I can recognize the problems you would get into if we started that one, but we could, Mr. Speaker, recognize the fact that the consumer today is being subsidized by the prairie wheat producer; it is an unfair subsidization program; a cheap food policy; and I don't think that it's the farm community that should bear the cost of a cheap food program. So I simply want to recommend to the House that they do give this matter consideration; that there are many formulae that could be applied to this recommendation. It doesn't have to be any fixed formula. You could apply it on the one quarter of each producer's total production or you could graduate it; it doesn't really matter; but the principle I think is something that I'm trying to drive at today.

That's all I have to say on the subject matter, Mr. Speaker, Thank you very much.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, might I ask the honourable gentleman who has just moved the resolution a question? Mr. Speaker, as I heard my honourable friend quoting the domestic consumption, I had the feeling that he was a little high in estimating it at a quarter of the total production, but without arguing with the figure, is he suggesting that the added price for domestic consumption be added to both the part used commercially and on the farm?

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I'm suggesting that we recognize the fact that we put in, that we produce 600 million bushels of wheat, and a quarter of that production is consumed in Canada in varying ways, and that we ought to get support on that portion of our production that is consumed, either in the programs of feed, human consumption, and even the portion that we use as the requirement for seed purposes.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, to make it perfectly clear, it's not just on the part that is consumed commercially, but on the part that is consumed as feed on farms, as my honourable friend would apply the other.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I would love to get into this debate all over again. However, I've asked the Honourable Member from Arthur to be spokesman for the government on this occasion. As one of our better wheat farmers, I believe he is as capable as anybody to speak on this subject.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. DOUGLAS J. WATT (Arthur): Well, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the Honourable Minister for giving me an opportunity to say a few words. I rather hesitate to speak at this time, Mr. Speaker, because while I don't speak too often in the House and I don't speak too long, it seems that, particularly a short time ago, that even if I get up and speak for a few minutes and bring a few facts before the House, that it seems to pull the lid off of Pandora's box and I've even been chastised from my colleagues on this side of the House for holding up the progress of the House. So today I do not intend to go into the economics as my honourable friend from Brokenhead has, but rather to point out, to begin with, that I am not now, nor was I ever in favour of a two-price subsidized system for the farmers of Western Canada. It seems to me that it draws away from the dignity of any great industry, particularly that of the wheat-growing industry in Western Canada, to be subsidized by the taxpayers of the Dominion. And I do not believe, Mr. Speaker, that we now are in a position where we have to be subsidized. I think there is still some hope for the great industry of growing No. 1 hard wheat in Canada. I think, Mr. Speaker, that it lies, not in subsidy, but with the marketing of our grain, and I want to say here now, as I have said before in this House during this session, that under the system that we have of marketing our wheat in Western Canada that it lies directly the responsibility of government.

The Honourable Member for Lakeside does not agree with me, but I am happy to know in the last few days that the Prime Minister of Canada does, because speaking in Winnipeg a few days ago, he made it clear that he was aware that we were, as the press reports, knee-deep in trouble in respect of the marketing of Canadian wheat. And he has made it clear by his statements to the press that the trouble that we are in now is because of the policy of selling our wheat; that is, that we have not been aggressive in finding new markets in recent years. And I say this is clear, Mr. Speaker, that it's just another simple fact stated by the Prime Minister of Canada. And so I say to you now, that as last year, I am not in favour of a subsidized wheat industry in Western Canada; that I am in favour of improved and expanded markets. It has been stated clearly by the Prime Minister of Canada. No one can deny that the Prime Minister has said it in Winnipeg.

The Member from Brokenhead has pointed out that we said in this House last year that the proposals for a two-price system was premature, and I say if this was true last year it is even more true now, because presently we will be having a . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I hesitate to interrupt the honourable gentleman, but it's gone beyond our normal hour of one minute past 12:30. Is it . . .

MR. WATT: I'll be one minute, if I may.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed? (Agreed).

MR. WATT: I think it is premature -- if it was last year, it is premature now; it is even more so. To bring in and to pass a resolution asking for a subsidized program for western farmers would be wrong in the face of the fact that we now have an election for the Federal Government before us, and there is a hope for Western Canada that the policies may change in respect of the selling of wheat for Western Canada after the 25th of June. And I say that in the hope that this change will be in favour and that there will be a more aggressive selling program for wheat, that we should vote out this resolution and wait and see what happens. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? Order please.

MR. LYON: I believe there are other speakers, Mr. Speaker, so I wonder if -- I believe there's been agreement as well that we would have a shorter recess today. The suggestion has been 1.15. If there's agreement in the House, I would rather move adjournment; ask Mr. Speaker to leave the Chair until 1:15, and then we'll resume at this place.

MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, then we would ask you to leave the Chair until 1:15.

MR. SPEAKER: I'm now leaving the Chair to return again at 1:15.