

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
2:30 o'clock, Tuesday, April 30, 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

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN Q.C. (Provincial Secretary)(Dauphin): (Introduced Bill No. 93, The Manitoba Centennial Centre Corporation Act) . Mr. Speaker, I can inform you that His Honour recommends the measure to the House and I table his message in that connection.

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Education)(Gimli): (Introduced Bill No. 90, an Act to amend The Education Department Act.) Mr. Speaker, His Honour recommends the proposed measure to the House and I have been informed the Lieutenant-Governor has further directive, that he's been informed of the proposed amendments to the Education Department Act providing among other matters for increasing the amount of working capital that may be advanced as working capital for the Text Book Bureau in the Department of Education, and he recommends the proposed amendments to the House.

MR. JOHNSON: (Introduced Bill No. 99, an Act to amend The Teachers' Pensions Act). His Honour recommends the proposed measure to the House and to the Speaker, His Honour has said "I have been informed of the proposed amendments to the Teachers' Pensions Act providing among other matters for persons holding teachers certificates and employed by school districts or divisions as Superintendents, Assistant Superintendents, Deputy Superintendents or Deputy Assistant Superintendents to participate in the pension scheme under the Act," and recommends the proposed amendments to the House.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Minister of Agriculture and Conservation)(Rockwood-Iberville): (Introduced Bill No. 73, The Noxious Weeds Act.) I wish to inform you, Mr. Speaker, that His Honour recommends the proposed measure to the House.

MR. McLEAN: (Introduced Bill No. 100, an Act to amend The Civil Service Superannuation Act.) I can inform you, Mr. Speaker, that His Honour recommends the proposed measure to the House and I table his signed recommendation.

MR. SPEAKER: Before we go into the Orders of the Day, I would like to introduce to the honourable members our young guests today. We have 54 students of Grade 5 standing of the Hampstead School. These Students are under the direction of Mr. Brooks and Mrs. Badiuk. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Kildonan.

We also have with us today 18 students of Grade 6 standing of the Pine Falls School. These students are under the direction of Mrs. Cook. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet.

We also have today 34 students of Grade 11 and 12 standing of the Shilo School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Clark and Mr. Simmons. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne. On behalf of all the Honourable Members of the Legislative Assembly, I welcome you all here today.

Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. BEN HANUSCHAK (Burrows): Mr. Speaker, yesterday I moved an order for return. If I may have leave of the House, I would like to correct a typographical error that appears within it. It should read bounded on the north by Logan Avenue and on the south by Bannatyne rather than the way it reads on page 1416. At present it reads on the north by Bannatyne and on the south by Logan; it should be the other way around. If I may, Mr. Speaker, I'd appreciate this correction recorded.

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

MR. SIDNEY GREEN (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable the Minister for Industry and Commerce. I'm advised that there is a three section supplement to the Winnipeg Free Press today dealing with the Province of Manitoba and I just wonder whether this is part of the work of his department?

HON. SIDNEY SPIVAK Q.C. (Minister of Industry and Commerce)(River Heights): Mr.

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd.)... Speaker, this was produced by the Winnipeg Free Press.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day, I just want to inform members of the House that I'll be distributing this afternoon another educational informational kit as I like to refer to. This House has already received a kit of most of the matters dealing with the vocational and technical training programs in the province, copies of the brochures and so on; today I'll be distributing representative material, or examples of the Guidance Bulletin, Home Economic Bulletin, Department of Education Bulletin - material which is distributed throughout the school divisions and school districts of the province. I would have you note that the new calendar has arrived and is distributed with this material. The other day when the kit was distributed in it was included calendars from the previous year, Mr. Speaker, but this was because the new ones hadn't been printed. I can inform the House that about 2,000 of these are printed per year to distribute throughout the high schools of the province, placed in libraries and so on and I would hope that this material would be helpful to the honourable members.

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

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask a question of the Honourable the Minister of Education. Is it the intention of the Minister and the Government to give an answer to the delegation of students that we've had - an answer, favourable or otherwise, but an answer at this session, or whether their demands be ignored again?

HON. STERLING R. LYON Q. C. (Attorney-General)(Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, that is obviously a matter of policy that would not be dealt with in Orders of the Day.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Education was going to stand up. I think when there's a group that come in and if the Minister of Education wants to answer, there's nothing wrong with this.

MR. LYON: The honourable member is out of order.

MR. DESJARDINS: I think that we have a right to hear from him. --(Interjection)-- Does the Minister refuse to answer, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. LYON: There's no requirement, Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, for the Minister to answer my honourable friend at any time or at any ...

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I was talking to you, not to the Attorney-General.

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I wish to table a return to an order of the House No. 33, on the motion of the Honourable Member for Elmwood, April 16th, 1968.

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

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask another question of the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce. Was any part of the cost of this supplement that I referred to previously that appears in today's Winnipeg Free Press borne by his department?

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, there's an ad of the departments in the supplement.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Virden; the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Gladstone, in amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. M. E. McKELLAR (Souris-Lansdowne): Mr. Speaker, the debate on this resolution has gone on for some time and I want to congratulate the Member for Virden for bringing in this resolution on suggesting final payment be made around February 1st. To all the farmers in Manitoba and I guess all across Western Canada, I guess there's no greater group of people waiting for their cheques than the farmers, especially in this year that we have now just past, and I must say we all appreciated the cheques when they did come. I think the Member for Virden has got a very good point here, suggesting a date of February 1st, because we all realize the date of the crop year is from 1st of August to the end of July - each crop year. So by suggesting the date February 1st, is exactly six months after the pool closes, and while it might not be possible for just to be exactly on that date, I think what he's suggesting that it does give the farmers of western Canada a chance to plan their financial operations in a manner that they can make their payments on their machinery and also land payments. I think that we have to realize in this day and age that we cannot finance only on our own money, we have to finance quite a bit on borrowed money.

(MR. McKELLAR cont'd.)...

Now, there is a resolution moved by the Member for Gladstone to the effect that after the word "Wheat Board" in the first line that we practically eliminate the whole resolution, and decide that we should meet with the Canadian Wheat Board to discuss the problems of their whole operation and also the time of payments of pools, as to whether it is satisfactory to the Canadian Wheat Board to make these payments at a particular time. I think if we remember back, I think I can remember when we did get our payments in December some years, some years in January and some years in February and some years in March. Suggesting a date of February 1st, I think is kind of a compromise and I think the date - in my opinion - is very satisfactory because I think most years I don't think they will have too much trouble meeting that particular date.

Now, the amendment to the resolution does suggest that we meet with the Canadian Wheat Board to discuss the problems of the Canadian Wheat Board operations. And I would like to read - the last magazine of the Country Guide was published here in April, 1968 and I suggest any farmer in the Chamber here would be well advised to read this magazine because over the years I think it's brought out many excellent points on agriculture in Western Canada. It also brings in the weather forecast, and for the Member for Emerson, I think he'd be well advised to look at the weather forecasting because I think it's done by Mr. Krik or something of that name, down in Denver, Colorado and while he's not right all the time, he's right a lot of the time in his general forecasting and I think for that particular purpose -- while the people in the cities are always looking for a sunny weekend, we in the country are always ...

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I would remind the honourable gentleman we're not discussing weather today, but rather the Wheat Board.

MR. McKELLAR: That's quite true, Mr. Speaker, and I thank you for your comment. But weather is important in the agricultural industry and I can say that over again many times.

But I'd like to tell what Mr. Runciman says just in a few short words here, his comments at a talk he made to the Chamber of Commerce in Regina in March. He's very serious about the whole situation and he explains it right to the point, and it actually pertains to the operation of the Canadian Wheat Board who look after all exporting of the wheat, oats and barley, of grains that they purchase from the farmers of Western Canada. And he said in his speech there, the exporters have advised him that Canada will export only 360 million bushels of wheat by the end of the crop year July 31st. I'd like to inform the members here that we have 150 million bushels over top of that, which is used for seed and local consumption. I think about 75 million bushels are used for seed and 75 million bushels used for local consumption - such as bread, flour and pastries - and also feed grade wheat too that's used, low grade wheat. The sales will be down in 1968 as well unless there's some fundamental change in our wheat exporting approach.

As a result of the two record world wheat crops in a row, he said, the prairies is caught in a volume price dilemma, trying to serve the interests of the large volume producer who would sacrifice price to gain the benefits of extra volume and the smaller producer who requires a higher price per bushel because he does not produce enough bushels for sale. Exporters say the Canadian Wheat Board is not as elastic or flexible in its price policies as it could be, he stated, simply because the board is responsible to parliament. Any move by the Canadian Wheat Board to drop prices immediately results in an outbreak in parliament. This has happened even though some of the outbreaks are just horse feathers and some of the criticism well meant but ill founded. The result is that the Canadian Wheat Board which is responsible to parliament is under considerable pressure not to lower prices, when sometimes in the short-term interest, it would be desirable. Exporters for instance lose interest to Canadian wheat if the price seldom fluctuates. As a result, with insufficient wheat moving, less wheat is grown and the prairies waste three resources: farm labour, land and capital. All the people in Canada are hurt because with less foreign exchange recirculating there are fewer jobs and less income for those who have regular jobs. In calling for a wheat marketing study, he said, there is a tremendous knowledge gap between what the actual marketing situation is and what farmers think it is, that many of the farmers have fallen victim to indifference towards marketing ever since the Canadian Wheat Board was introduced to handle their marketing problems.

What kind of a study would he suggest? It should, No. 1. Be held in camera to avoid distortions associated with a public enquiry into a subject as politically loaded as wheat. No. 2. Come under the Prime Minister and the Minister of Trade and Commerce because the economic welfare of all Canadians is concerned. No. 3. Look into sales methods used by United States

(MR. McKELLAR cont'd.)... nations to find out why the United States have been making continued inroads into traditional Canadian markets. I must say on that point, that this past year our International Wheat Agreement has not been in existence and United States have went out on to the world market and told everyone they're going to sell 750 million bushels of wheat regardless of what happens, and they being a big enough country are able to do that, regardless of what happens and they being a - because if you look in the daily papers, the prices start, the Chicago markets right today for wheat, they're running around \$1.45, so you can see that the farmers down there are only getting about \$1.25 a bushel for their wheat and this in itself has put a tremendous strain on the export market. I only hope the International Wheat Agreement will be signed the 1st of July and get us all back under one price level again, hoping our exports will be increased after the 1st of July.

The next one is "Look into the Canadian Wheat Board Marketing System, including prices and quotas; at the influence of Grain Exchange like the Chicago Board of Trade on Wheat Board pricing and on the attitude of exporters who sell Canadian Wheat at what have been called inflexible prices. Study the impact changes in flour and bread making methods among importers are having and will have upon Canadian wheat sales. Study the implications of Canada growing a lower quality wheat and learn how much higher yields would need to be if this wheat had to sell for a lower price." I think what he's getting at in the latter statement there, that foreign countries now, it used to be that they had to have No. 1, 2 or 3 Northern wheat to make bread. At the present time now they're reverting to a lower class of wheat which has put us in a most difficult position in western Canada this year because most of our wheat was No. 1 Northern, with some No. 2 Northern. I think this is what caused some of our sales to drop, I will admit, because of our high quality wheat. But I think that he has brought home many points there which concern industry at large, he being president and general-manager of one of the largest grain handling companies in Western Canada, the United Grain Growers, and knows the problem full well, that if the farmers are not able to deliver their wheat, the company are affected financially and otherwise.

Also in this article here, there's an article from Mr. W.J. Parker, which resembles Mr. Runciman's article in many ways, and also Mr. Charles Gibbings of the Saskatchewan Wheat Pool - he too is greatly concerned. I would suggest if you get a chance that everyone here in the Legislature should read these particular articles. The heading is "Prairie Aroused Over Slow Wheat Sales".

Now getting at this amendment, looking at the amendment here, what it says, that we should meet with the Canadian Wheat Board and look into their operations in general. Due to the fact that I think we have in Manitoba here the heads of United Grain Growers, including Mr. Runciman, the heads of the Manitoba Wheat Pool, Mr. W.J. Parker, we have the heads of all the private grain companies, and I think it would be only right if we're going to deal with the Canadian Wheat Board, it would be proper at a later date that we should meet with all these people and discuss this very problem. At the present time I think this will have to be looked into, a conference of the nature of this. In the meantime I think we should vote against the amendment and vote for the resolution by the Honourable Member for Virден.

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

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): Ayes and nays, please.

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

YEAS: Messrs. Campbell, Cherniack, Clement, Dawson, Dow, Doern, Fox, Froese, Green, Guttormson, Hanuschak, Harris, Hillhouse, Johnston, Kawchuk, Miller, Molgat, Patrick, Paulley, Petursson, Shoemaker, Tanchak, Uskiw, Vielfaure.

NAYS: Messrs. Baizley, Beard, Bjornson, Carroll, Cownn, Craik, Einarson, Enns, Evans, Hamilton, Jeannotte, Johnson (Gimli) Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McGregor, McKellar, McKenzie, McLean, Masniuk, Roblin, Shewman, Spivak, Stanes, Steen, Watt, Witney and Mesdames Forbes and Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas: 24; Nays: 29.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the amendment lost. Are you ready for the question on the main motion? The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, I supported the amendment that we just voted on in the hope that we would be enabled to meet with the Wheat Board as a body and to discuss some of the problems that the Canadian farmer has in connection also with the payments and the pools that are presently in operation. This is an annual event; these pools

(MR. FROESE cont'd.)... are in effect every year; new pools are set up each year, so that payments can be made after they terminate.

I have no quarrel with the original motion as proposed in connection with payments. I certainly would like to see that payments were being made every year and that the farmers would know that they were getting moneys on their wheat at an earlier date or a given date that would be earlier than normal as has been in the past. However, I've been mentioning in the House the last several days when we discussed the agricultural item the matter of storage, and I feel this is a logical answer to part of the problem that the Manitoba farmer faces, that we should have greater storage facilities, larger increased storage facilities, enabling the farmer to deliver his grain to the Wheat Board so that he can sell it and get the necessary cash and because of this I am going to put forward an amendment to the resolution that is before us.

Mr. Chairman, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Brokenhead, the following amendment attached to the end of the resolution, and I quote: "And Be It Further Resolved that we make known our requests for increased storage facilities, especially inland storage, to enable farmers to deliver a greater portion of their grain to the Canadian Wheat Board."

MR. SPEAKER: This is in addition to the resolution, an amendment?

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. DOUGLAS CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Do you consider that to be an effective amendment?

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of N. D. P.) (Radisson): Mr. Speaker, I really only heard parts of it. I wonder if it might be advisable for Your Honour to take it under advisement.

MR. SPEAKER: I appreciate the opinions of the honourable gentlemen, but in accepting the amendment I thought possibly the House would be quite capable of dealing with it at this particular point. However, as the opinion has been given as to whether or not it's a suitable type of amendment I will take the matter under advisement and report when it next appears.

The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for St. James and the proposed motion by the Honourable Member for Selkirk in amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for St. James.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate of the Honourable Member for Inkster. The Honourable the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, the arguments in favour of total amalgamation have been given in previous speeches and I don't intend to cover the whole of the ground; I think that they were well made.

There is, in my opinion, a need for urgent action in this regard by the Manitoba Government. Metro was established in 1960 and since that time has, we might say, been abandoned by the present government. The results of Metro have not, in my opinion, been to the satisfaction of the people of the Greater Winnipeg area. I do not attach all of the blame for that to the Metro government. I don't think that they were given the possibilities of doing their work by the government that set them up in the first place.

Some two years ago the government finally recognized that something needed to be done and they established the Boundaries Commission. At the time the Boundaries Commission was established -- and it was certainly a high powered commission, with an ex-Cabinet Minister from this government, some full-time and expensive staff, 14 members -- it was stated then that the commission was expected to split into two sections; one will give priority to studying school division boundaries, including the creation of divisions for eight technical schools the government plans to build -- as an aside I might say that this has withered down to eight; original government promises had been for 10 or 12, but be that as it may -- the other section of the commission will study the reorganization of municipalities in Metro Winnipeg.

That, Mr. Chairman, was a commission that was established at the spring session of 1966; it was recommended to the House at that time by the government and generally had the acceptance of the members on this side of the House, because we were prepared to finally get some government action and get the matter going. The difficulty was, that no action ensued and in December of last year -- quoting now from the Tribune on Thursday, the 7th of December, 1967, "The Minister of Municipal Affairs stated" -- and I quote directly from the article: "that she has no idea when the Metro study will be started because the commission will

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd.)... investigate provincial education first." The Chairman of the Boundaries Commission interviewed at the same time, states in the same article, Mr. Smellie agreed that "we're not devoting much, if any, time to Metro Winnipeg." That was, Mr. Speaker, almost two years after the original establishment of the commission. They weren't devoting much, if any, time to the study of Greater Winnipeg problems.

In January, the same Chairman of the Metro Commission - of the Boundaries Commission I might say, is quoted again, this was the Winnipeg Tribune of the 19th of January - he states that "the Boundaries Commission will not start studying the possible reorganization of Metro municipalities boundaries until the end of 1968 at the earliest." Mr. Speaker, I bring out these points because I know that in rebuttal the government is going to say in opposition to this resolution: "Wait. The Boundaries Commission has not yet reported. Wait for the report of the Boundaries Commission." Well, if the Boundaries Commission was at work, members on this side of the House might say, well, we are prepared to be reasonable and to wait. But after these statements by the Minister, these statements by the Chairman of the Commission, and the obvious lack of action, Mr. Speaker, I don't think that the people of Greater Winnipeg want to wait any longer; I think the people of Greater Winnipeg want some action taken, and it's for this reason that through the months of December and January I at that time issued a statement appealing to the Minister to get this matter settled and not continue further delay, and then subsequently I made a statement that in my opinion total amalgamation was the solution. Not the one that'll satisfy everyone, I recognize that, but the one that is the best solution to the problems of the Greater Winnipeg area. I'm prepared to support the resolution that is before us as it covers the position that I stated before this House met and which I still think is the right one.

Now I recognize that the government in addition to saying to us that we should wait for the Boundaries Commission will probably be favouring a three or four or five or six city concept. Mr. Speaker, I think that such an action would simply be a delaying tactic, that it will not be a solution to the problems and that all it will do is create more confusion and that eventually, in any case, we will get to the point of one Metropolitan area. Because if you look at the problems that the Metropolitan area faces, reducing it from 14 to 5, doesn't change the problem; you still have to have that co-ordinated activity, that co-ordinated action. This is particularly so in the field of planning. Just last week the Honourable Minister, the Leader of the New Democratic Party, another Minister on the far side and myself were invited to a dinner of the Downtown Businessmen's Association, where we heard a most interesting and enlightening speech by the gentleman who is responsible for Metropolitan Planning on the question of the core of Greater Winnipeg, the central core of the City, and the things he had to say in my opinion were most important to the whole of the Metropolitan area and he was speaking about the central section of Winnipeg which is in a most unfortunate state at the moment. It's 50 percent parking lost. Instead of being a vital dynamic growing area it's at the moment almost a depressed area, here at the very centre of our City, and the Metro planner pointed out quite clearly that a healthy central core is vital to the whole of the area. But, Mr. Speaker, the problems of the core of the city are not exclusively that of the City of Winnipeg, the whole of the Metropolitan area is involved, because the people who live in St. James, or St. Vital or the Kildonans work in the various parts of the city. They happen to live in one area; they happen to work in another area, but the problems are the problems of the whole area and to isolate them into little packages doesn't help the solution of the problem, it complicates it. To make the package 3 instead of 14 doesn't solve it either because you will still have that problem of divided jurisdictions, of conflicts between various areas, and you will be faced with maybe not as much difficulty as dealing with 14, but you'll still have to in some way have a co-ordinating body, and so you will simply be putting off the day of getting to one main city, one metropolitan area administering those services for which the metropolitan area is responsible.

The position of the surrounding municipalities at the present moment is quite understandable. How can a suburb like, for example, St. Vital, which has no industrial base, how can such a suburb accept a planning concept which will give it no industry. If they accept it, they are simply vowing themselves forever to having a high tax rate to supply services to people, to supply schools, these costly services for the local area without an industrial base on which to work. So a planning proposition covering the whole of the area, which is the only way you can plan sensibly, cannot be acceptable on the present basis to many of the area municipalities, and yet how are you going to get sound planning unless you do it on an area basis. And I repeat,

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd.)... bring it down to 3 or 4 or 5, you still have the problem that each area will of necessity be pulling for its own area and you cannot get the sound overall planning that is necessary.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Greater Winnipeg in my opinion are deeply concerned about this and they want some action taken. I can say that when I made my statement back in January recommending total amalgamation, it didn't meet with universal approval; I didn't expect that it would. But I can tell you this, that I received more telephone calls and more letters on that issue than on any other issue that I have ever spoken on on previous occasions and that in general, in fact, 99 percent of the letters coming from average citizens -- not coming from people who are on councils for example, but from average citizens -- were favourable to the idea of total amalgamation, because the public wants some action taken.

I appeared on a radio call-in show with the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks. He was opposing the amalgamation concept and I was defending the total amalgamation idea. Mr. Speaker, every single call that came in that night, and I checked specifically with the radio station to see if they had done any screening, and they had done no screening, but every single call was from people who were in favour of total amalgamation, favourable to the idea. Well the government might say but the people don't know what's good for them. That might be their approach, that they just don't know the problems. Mr. Speaker, I think that the people by and large do know what's good for them and that when you have a representative position by the people that in the long run it's the best position, and that when you simply listen to the experts, that you may not be getting the best of advice and I am satisfied that in this issue, the majority of the people of Greater Winnipeg want action taken. They are not prepared to wait as the Boundaries Commission apparently is for another 3 or 4 or 5 years to move into this area.

I'm not suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that any one of the present structures be the one that should be responsible for total amalgamation. I frankly believe that the Metropolitan government has become so unpopular with the majority of people that it would be simply vowing it to a lack of success if it were told you become the whole new metropolitan structure. I think we have to simply start off fresh, because otherwise, there will be conflicts. I don't think it can be the council of the City of Winnipeg or the council of any other area or the Metropolitan Government. I think we start off from scratch and go to one municipal administration.

Now one of the problems insofar as the Metropolitan Corporation and its establishment was the feeling of many people in the Metropolitan area that this had been imposed upon them, that they had not had a say in what was going on and I think that this is reflected today in many of those who oppose Metro, that they oppose it on the basis that it was an arbitrary action by government and they were told this is what you will get and you'll like it or lump it. And maybe this is the vigorous sort of government that is required, but in the long run, Mr. Speaker, unless the people are prepared to accept something, then it can't work. And so, in proceeding with the total amalgamation which this resolution recommends, and with which I agree, and for which I would be prepared to stand up and argue and sell to the people of the Metropolitan area, I think that we should consider giving them a voice in this matter, giving them the opportunity in the Greater Winnipeg area of voting for or against total amalgamation. My main reason for such proposal, Mr. Speaker, is that I'm satisfied that they will vote in favour, but that's their choice, but whichever way they go, having had their choice on the matter, there will be public acceptance of the proposal; there will be public co-operation with the new body; there will be sufficient desire on the part of the general public to see it work; that it will have that degree of co-operation which it will need and the acceptance of the citizens.

So, Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lakeside, that the motion be amended by adding at the end thereof the following words "And Be It Further Resolved that before the amalgamation be proceeded with, a referendum be held throughout the Greater Winnipeg area".

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion .

MR. JAMES COWAN Q. C. (Winnipeg Centre): Mr. Speaker, would the honourable member permit a question?

MR. MOLGAT: Certainly.

MR. COWAN: Mr. Speaker, I was wondering what the Honourable Leader of the Opposition had in mind if we'll say a large majority in 5 municipalities or 4 municipalities voted against it and yet the overall majority was for it, should we have the amalgamation?

MR. MOLGAT: Well, Mr. Speaker, what I have in mind is that there would be an overall

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd.)... vote in the area and whichever way it went would be the deciding factor.

MR. COWAN: Regardless of the fact that 4 or 5 were really against it?

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I don't think that the problems can be solved by taking an approach here and an approach there. We will end up inevitably if we do that, by having the poor areas in favour of one thing and the rich areas in favour of another. But we are all altogether in this Metropolitan area and the support of each area is necessary to make the Metropolitan area function and so in my opinion the vote must be taken over the whole of the area.

MR. COWAN: Mr. Speaker, would the honourable member permit another question?

MR. MOLGAT: Certainly.

MR. STANES: The referendum that he has in mind, would this be a yes or no or would there be other alternatives at the same referendum?

MR. MOLGAT: I haven't thought out the whole thing right to the final point, but I think that this is something that could be left for discussion. My own view would be that it would be a yes or no. Are you in favour of total amalgamation or not?

MR. SAUL M. CHERNIACK Q. C. (St. John's): Mr. Speaker, may I direct another question to the Honourable Leader?

In reading the motion as it would be amended would he interpret that if a referendum is reported in the negative, that there should then be an amalgamation proceeded with?

MR. MOLGAT: This is the reason that I stated that the exact wording of the questionnaire I think is one that could be left open for discussion. I would be prepared to consider going to the point of having a formal plan which we would present to people and the wording could be - in my opinion a recommendation could be made, do the people favour or not. If they don't favour it then you don't proceed at that point. I think that simply means that there hasn't been a proper explanation to the people.

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

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Gladstone that the debate be adjourned.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion . . . The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Would I be permitted to speak first? Mr. Speaker, I have heard discussion of this resolution during the session and I think some of the matters that have been brought forward are quite interesting and also the amendment that is now before us.

When Metro was first established through legislation here in this House in 1960 or '61, I don't know the exact year, it was either one of the two years, I was a new member at that time, but I felt at that time that it was not a desirable matter, at least, not the way it was imposed on the people of Winnipeg, Greater Winnipeg. They at that time had no choice in the matter. Legislation was brought in, was passed and Metro was set-up. I did not support the legislation because of this fact that it was imposed on the people. I rather supported a voluntary federation of the various cities and municipalities for the purpose of co-ordinating those services that are essential and common to all. We had at that time, meetings of the various heads of the municipalities and the suburban cities as well as Greater Winnipeg and these matters had been discussed at great length, and there was some agreement on certain points. However, apparently this was ignored at the time and the legislation was imposed.

The other reason I objected to it at that time, and it still holds true in my opinion, is the matter of centralization. I opposed the legislation on the grounds of centralization and also on the grounds of setting up a new level of government for the Greater Winnipeg area, namely Metro. Here we set up a level of government that would be spending large amounts of money but were not responsible to collect the same; the matter of collection is handed down to the municipalities and to boards of the cities, councils, to collect. This in my opinion was improper as far as the monies that are being spent by Metro and today we find that Metro has piled up a large debt within a matter of 6 to 7 years. I feel this is a level of government that we could well do without and was not entirely essential for the Greater Winnipeg area.

On the matter of being more economical as the resolution proposes that we have amalgamation, I don't think this stands up. --(Interjection)-- It doesn't say in the resolution. I'm not sure whether they have said it this year, but it has been discussed on previous occasions that whenever you centralize the purpose of centralization is to save money for the people, and in my opinion this is false, this does not stand up. Certainly it has not stood up in the Department of government here where we provide services and have centralized. Whenever we did

(MR. FROESE cont'd.)... centralize, the costs rose and they keep on rising year after year, not once have we seen them go down. This is the case in Welfare, this is the case in Education, in the Health Department, the Hospital Commission fees or costs rose annually and by very large and substantial amounts. This holds true whenever you do centralize in cases of this type. Centralization does not cost less but on the contrary costs more.

It seems to me, too, that by the imposition of the legislation early 1960 that this has not been a success. If it had been a success, we would not hear the grumbling that we hear from year to year and the opposition that is there right through all these years. I believe at that time that we should have put it to a referendum, to a vote, and have the people decide it. I don't think if it had been put to a vote that we would have had Metro here in Winnipeg. I have no objection to the amendment that is proposed here of having the thing go to a vote, by referendum, I would like to see more and greater detail of what the proposition actually is that he's proposing in the amendment, to have it go in by referendum as already the questions that were raised here pointed up. There is a number of matters that could have a serious effect on the outcome of such a vote by referendum, whether you have alternatives or not. Mr. Chairman, I was going to speak on the original motion. Now that we have the amendment before us, it applies equally to the amendment, and I will support the amendment because if the resolution should go through then I would like to see it that way. However, on the main motion I am not in favour of the motion as it was brought in.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I've been waiting to hear from the government side, the silent government on this question, and I guess we'll continue to wait. One doesn't know really for how long or just what will prod someone into speaking, but I assume that whichever they vote, somebody will have to make a statement unless they just want to ignore the entire debate.

I do not propose to address myself to the main motion but to confine myself to the amendment because I expect that there will be occasion yet to speak on the main motion, or the motion as amended.

I should say though, that listening to the Member for Rhineland, I heard him raise a point which no one has referred to. He talked about the saving of money that would result from amalgamation or that form of combined services and then proceeded to attach that concept, and certainly I think he was wrong in suggesting that one seriously has stated here that one would save money, that I think certainly we can say that with a centralized form of service a better service could be provided, but not necessarily at less cost.

As to the concept of a referendum itself, Mr. Speaker, I must say that I have been opposed to referenda on a matter like this and our party traditionally has not favoured a referendum on a matter which requires a great deal of background and technical knowledge. It is my opinion that people who ask for a referendum do so either to avoid their responsibilities, or do so on issues which are emotional in nature and which do not require the detailed study which a proper decision has to have. Anybody in this Legislature who votes on the question of a Metropolitan government or of an amalgamation of services or of any other form of change in municipal government, is irresponsible so to do, no matter whether he's been a legislator for many years, no matter whether he's been an intelligent reader of newspapers for many years, unless in addition to his background of experience he is prepared to study the content - I don't mean in detail - but the content of the various reports that have been made. There have been reports and studies made back in 1953, I believe there was one which really was more like the present Metro concept than the one which was reported about 1957. The question of the various proposals involving one city, four cities, eight cities, all this has to be reviewed. Cost benefit studies would have to be reviewed and there has been a great deal written and a great deal spoken. I don't think that one can responsibly ask for a referendum unless one can guarantee that the voter before voting on a referendum will acquaint himself with all the complexity of the problems that exist and will vote therefore on the basis of knowledge.

I for one have not yet forgotten the referendum that was held on the question of Plan "C" a number of years ago when the Winnipeg Electric Company distributed its responsibilities amongst various other bodies. There was a campaign conducted mainly by the Winnipeg Free Press and by one alderman, I believe, strongly on this issue, where emotions were involved and where I believe the people in the referendum voted against the city's assumption of the gas utility to the extent that irreparable damage, I believe, was done to the services which could be

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd.)... provided to the people of Winnipeg by that.

Therefore it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the people who propose a referendum must be able to guarantee full knowledge and the Honourable the Leader of the Liberal Party stated that he is prepared to go out and sell the issue. Let me remind him of what happened - was it last year? - when there was a referendum on school divisions, on unitary school divisions where the Premier of the Province, the Minister of Education and indeed the whole Cabinet and the Leader of the Liberal Party and the Leader of the New Democratic Party on behalf of almost the entire Legislature of the Province of Manitoba, said we are in favour of unitary school divisions; we are prepared to go at every opportunity to meetings to spell out the advantages involved; we will go to the people and sell it. If you remember our party took the position that this is too complex a problem to become involved in a referendum and we said that you cannot really do the job of instant study, instant acquaintanceship with the problem, instant realization by the people about to vote on the questions involved. We said you cannot sell it that quickly and it's the responsibility of people elected to the Legislature to make a decision on this issue and to go ahead with it and we were strongly critical of the government for not so doing but rather sloughing off their responsibility and saying we will go to the people, but we will sell the people. I believe that those that were in favour of it did go out and sell it and I believe that the one person, the representative of - well the entire Social Credit Party of Manitoba, went out to sell against it and when the results came in he said I succeeded; I am the one who persuaded these people to vote against it; and we all said on this side, "Nonsense." What did it had nothing whatsoever to do with unitary school divisions. What did it had only to do with people's emotional reactions to the government, for which I did not blame them and for which people on this side did not blame them, and they involved a sales tax which was foisted on the people, not by referendum. As a matter of fact not even by reference outside of this Chamber. If you recall the concept is, the tradition, you don't take the sales tax out of this Chamber, you don't take it in Committee, you keep it here, and therefore a sales tax was foisted on the people and they expressed their resentment clearly against the government for that issue. They had other logical reasons to reject the Roblin Government but they didn't have the opportunity to vote at a general election; all they were given was an opportunity to vote on the question of whether or not they were in favour of unitary school divisions.

I remember the Honourable Member for Inkster suggesting that if the question on the referendum were posed "Are you in favour of continuing the present system", the answer would have been "no", because the government deserved an answer of "no" by the people of Manitoba regardless of what the government proposed. And when the government proposed unitary school divisions they got an answer of "no" because they deserved it for every other reason except for on the basis of unitary school divisions which was endorsed by the three political parties and by the vast majority of the people of this Legislature.

That should have taught a lesson to those in this House who still have some regard for referenda, and I believe should have taught a lesson to the Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party. You do not, I believe, go to the people on a referendum unless you are sure they are going to learn the details and in the case of Plan "C" they did not know the details and they voted without full knowledge of the consequences. In the case of the unitary school division they did not know the details and they voted without full realization of the consequences. And yet when the Metro Act was brought here back in 1957 or '58, I think the Honourable Member for St. Boniface I think was the only one who opposed it. But I may be wrong; I wasn't here.

MR. DESJARDINS: There was about five or six of us.

MR. CHERNIACK: He tells me there were five or six, but in any event no doubt the majority of each of the parties involved voted for it; it was considered the right thing to do, and they put it through without referenda. What they did do then, Mr. Speaker, is to dump it on the doorstep of the people of Metropolitan Winnipeg and walk away. No, they didn't walk away; They ran away, Mr. Speaker. I have on my wall some of the momentoes, one of the momentoes, momentoes that I have of my participation in the first Metropolitan Council. I have a cartoon of Mr. Kuch of the Winnipeg Free Press which appeared in the newspaper on the first birthday of Metro. It's a picture of a doorstep of Greater Winnipeg and on the doorstep is a basket with a little baby crying in the basket and that baby was Metro and the only other person in that picture was Mr. Duff Roblin sneaking away from the doorstep leaving the baby there on the lap of the city, Metropolitan Winnipeg. And it's true that he did because one of the first things that we realized in the Metropolitan Council was that the moneys that were being paid for

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd.)... improvements in the Greater Winnipeg area by the Province of Manitoba, somehow, somewhere were lost and that when we came to calculate our needs, how we would raise the money, we found somehow or other that undertakings by this government in support, in continuation -- that they would continue to contribute to Metro Corporation to the same extent as they had been doing formerly to the municipalities, and what they promised they would continue to do were negated, they did not continue on the same basis. I'm thinking particularly on the question of roads.

So not only was it dumped, not only did the government run away from Metro, but in general this government did absolutely nothing to sell Metro to the people of Winnipeg and at that time the Honourable Duff Roblin still had the confidence of a great number of people in the Metro area and had he gone out to make a sales pitch and had the Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party gone out to make a complete and continuing selling pitch on behalf of Metro then it would have received a different sort of acceptance by the people of Metropolitan Winnipeg. Instead of that, having created this corporation and having walked away from it, it left the corporation to the mercy of snipers from whatever area of Metropolitan Winnipeg, of whatever municipally elected person could get around to it, and obviously for the people who did not understand what Metro was about and what it was wanted that it should do. And the results was that snipers such as the Mayor of Winnipeg and others were able to gather a force behind them, to whom Metro became a dirty word, and for whom Metro was the cause of all the problems that occurred.

Now nobody can guarantee that Metro or any other organization such as suggested by this resolution would immediately cure all the problems of municipal government because it has been said here in this House that whoever who can cure the problems of growing municipal areas would indeed cure the real problem of living in our society. It wouldn't be easy for any corporation just to cure the problems and it certainly wasn't possible for Metro with all the restrictions and all the lack of power which it had and the result was that whenever there was a problem taxes went up; regardless of why they went up Metro was blamed. Of course one of the sad things is that people like the Mayor of the City of Winnipeg who was an amalgamationist before Metro was created, on the same Council on which I was an amalgamationist and on which the entire council were unanimous in favour of a Metropolitan form of government as an amalgamated form, that he then proceeded to attack it and I think did it irreparable harm - not irreparable, but great harm - and many of us who were and still are in favour of a combination of the provision of all services in the Metropolitan area through one form of government and who believe that Metro was not the solution but was a step in the right direction, were disappointed to find that the Mayor, who favoured amalgamation, was prepared to attack Metro to the extent that he could create harm for Metro itself as a step in that direction.

I think therefore, that it's not enough to say let's go out and sell it and then leave it to the people. I think one should make a decision. I think that one should say: we believe, after considerable study that this is the right step to take; we should take that step; we should then go out and justify the step to the people in order to convince them that we were right, because if we don't convince them then we face, properly, defeat at the next poll, which is really the best form of referendum.

The motion as amended would therefore read, if it carried, Mr. Speaker, "that this House recognized the effectiveness and desirability of integrating and co-ordinating municipal services for Greater Winnipeg, to be administered by one municipal government." So, the Liberal Party says we agree with that preamble; we recognize the effectiveness and desirability and we say that they should all be administered by one municipal government. He accepts the endorsement in principle of the implementation of such measures as would be necessary to establish one municipal government responsible for the administration of municipal services of Greater Winnipeg and then he introduces an amendment which says, "but wait a minute." Now I know that when he spoke he didn't say "But wait a minute." When he spoke he spoke in favour of this and I agree with him; I'm in favour of this too. But he said "But wait a minute; let's have a referendum." And he said the reason he wants a referendum is so that he could go out with all the others involved to sell the idea to the people and he is confident that such a selling job will succeed. But, and this to me is the kicker - if that's the expression - that should the referendum fail, then he said in answer to my question, well then it should not be proceeded with. Well, now as I read it, he first endorses the proposal that it is necessary to implement measures to bring all services under one municipal government, then he says let's hold a referendum, and then he says

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd.)... if the referendum fails, then we should not proceed with amalgamation. So what he's really saying is, let's have a referendum and if the referendum passes we'll have amalgamation and if the referendum fails, we won't have amalgamation. And having said that much, he added and said, well I favour it nevertheless so I'll go out and sell it.

Well, I can't go along with that, Mr. Speaker, because I feel that he and the rest of us have been put here to do what we think is right in terms of legislation and then to attempt to convince others, the people that elect us, that what we have done is right and that is the basis on which a decision should be made. Not again - what I believe this amendment does - turn over to the people voting the decision as to whether or not there shall be amalgamation and thus give up what I think is the responsibility of elected people and that is to vote in favour. So that, Mr. Speaker, I for one feel that I could not support the idea of a referendum in what I think is a negative approach to a real problem which I think should be dealt with and settled in this legislature and I suggest should be settled properly. But as I indicated earlier, I did not wish to speak on the resolution itself, but possibly we'll have another opportunity so to do. I hope sincerely that people on the government side would indicate that they have enough interest in this problem so that they too would participate in this debate.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface. The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Mr. Speaker, it's rather difficult to know what one can add to a resolution of this kind since so many members of the House have already spoken in great length on it. However, my guess is that there is not a single solitary member in this House that is opposed to Medicare, that is the principle of Medicare. I have yet to find a politician in Canada that's opposed to the principle of Medicare. I know that at a recent, or according to a press report reporting the Young Conservatives of Canada meeting in Ottawa, I believe, it was reported that just everyone present was in favour of the principle of Medicare. They said, "Not on July 1st, maybe August 1st - but not July 1st." Well, what is so objectionable about having it start on July 1st if everybody is in favour of the principle?

Now, I'm one of those unfortunate people I guess in the House that has had to pay about \$6,000 in medical bills in the last four years and most of the \$6,000 I paid out of my own pocket - even in consideration of the fact that I also had medical coverage. However, that's a different story. But nearly everyone that has spoken on this resolution has talked about this point of cost and most of them have stated, that is most of the members on this side of the House anyway, have stated that it was simply a transfer from private to public spending. Now, taking my own case as a striking example, the \$6,000 or more that I have personally paid for medical attention for our family in the last four or five years, would go a long long way in paying for a national and provincial Medicare scheme. It is quite evident, even at this stage of the game that the Federal Government does not intend to postpone beyond July 1st the starting date for the National Plan. Last year this was recognized, I think, by the Minister of Health and is reported on page 1713 of March 16th Hansard last year, when he said that it was evident that their campaign for a voluntary plan was not going to be accepted by the national government and so they were prepared, reluctantly, to go along with the national scheme. On October 14th, 1966, from the propaganda department, an article headed "Medicare by July 1st if Ottawa agreeable" and the first paragraph says that "Manitoba is prepared to introduce a voluntary system of Medicare by next July 1st" -- which would be July 1st, 1967 -- "if Ottawa agrees to contribute its 50 percent share of the cost. Premier Duff Roblin said Thursday." And it goes on to outline in this bulletin from the Department of Information Services the proposals made by Premier Roblin. And Premier Roblin said at that time - and that's now nearly two years ago - that his main concern was for the 30 percent of Manitoba's population that were not presently covered by any form of medical insurance, and he said, "that he must conclude", I'm quoting, Mr. Speaker, from the propaganda sheet of that day, he said, "he must conclude that most people in this category were not able to pay full premium and it was imperative to get a Medicare program operating as soon as possible to cover them."

Now he acknowledged and conceded two years ago that there was in fact 70 percent of our population presently covered by some form of a plan. He said that 60 percent of them were covered by MMS, 10 percent by all other private plans, leaving 30 percent that were not covered and as he says that he must assume that the 30 percent that are not covered were not covered because they couldn't afford to be covered, and he was pointing up the need at that time for a

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd.) Medicare plan. Now, it is true that not only the government but members on this side advocated a voluntary plan, this is what we were stumping for or campaigning for - but you can only go so far in this regard. There's no question about that. You can't - as expressed in an article that I have before me here: "It would be unrealistic to expect the Provincial Government to stand by its principles to the point of throwing 17 million out the window annually. Whether Manitoba is in a national health insurance plan or not, Manitobans will be paying their share of the cost of such a program through Federal taxes and entry into such a scheme is the only way of getting any of this money back." And so, Mr. Speaker, I think that it is imperative that the government act now in order to take full advantage of the plan - the national plan - that is going to go into effect on July 1st.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I hope my honourable friend will permit an interjection at this time. It appears to me as though there isn't anybody paying attention to him, so therefore I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. John's the House adjourn.

MR. SHOEMAKER: It's got to be put forthwith.

MR. PAULLEY: There are 22 members on this side and I believe 10 on the other.

MR. SHOEMAKER: The motion has to be put forthwith, doesn't it?

HON. CHARLES H. WITNEY (Minister of Health) (Flin Flon): Yes. It's not debatable.

MR. PAULLEY: It's not debatable - forthwith.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. WITNEY: Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. PAULLEY: It's not debatable . . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order. I think if we could have order for a moment. Order. The Speaker is just coming into his place and I think I'll leave him to make a ruling on this.

MR. PAULLEY: On a point of order, Mr. Acting Speaker, you are the presiding officer. -- (Interjection) --

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: If I could have the indulgence of the House for a moment, till I speak to the Clerk?

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

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Call in the members. The motion before the House, moved by the Honourable Member the Leader of the NDP Party, seconded by the Member for St. John's, that the House do now adjourn.

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

YEAS: Messrs. Campbell, Cherniack, Clement, Dawson, Desjardins, Dow, Doern, Fox, Froese, Green, Guttormson, Hanuschak, Harris, Hillhouse, Johnston, Kawchuk, Miller, Molgat, Patrick, Paulley, Petursson, Shoemaker, Uskiw and Vielfaure.

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

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 24; Nays, 28.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost. The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Speaker, I observe now that there are three times as many in the House, three times as many, nearly four times as many as there were in the House five minutes ago, but they are leaving pretty rapidly, so perhaps the next time the adjournment is called we will have more members here than they have. If we could just encourage them to leave the building completely and go out for lunch, then we could adjourn perhaps. But it does point up one thing quite clearly, Mr. Speaker, and you must have observed that, that the government are just not at all interested in this Medicare plan. There were only ten people over there when the Honourable Member of the NDP moved adjournment of the House. I think only two of the Cabinet members were present and perhaps after that exercise the government will be looking for a new Whip.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I am sorry to interrupt the honourable gentleman. It makes me feel sad to think that I was absent at that moment, too.

MR. SHOEMAKER: I appreciate my honourable friend's comments and appreciate too the fact that it is difficult for him to retain his Throne for five or six hours on end.

Mr. Speaker, before we nearly adjourned I was referring to a couple of publications put out by the Information Branch, in which they stated that they were going to proceed with the

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd.) plan, reluctantly. They stated that they were in favour of this voluntary plan that they had presented to the Prime Minister; the Prime Minister was not going to consider their request for same and that they found themselves in this embarrassing position that they would be forced to join the plan.

On the propaganda sheet dated March 17, 1967, it ends up by quoting exactly I think, word for word, what the Minister said, that is the Minister of Health, Mr. Witney said, on March 16, 1967, because it is all in quotes, and he sets out the criteria that is set down by the Federal Government that the province must meet, and I'm reading now what my honourable friend said: "In examining these four criteria and in particular the percentage of insured residents required for federal contribution, it became obvious that a province must introduce a compulsory plan. This became further evident when the province was not permitted to include in the figure of 90 percent those people already enrolled in the Manitoba Medical Service or private insurance companies, presumably because they were not a public authority and could not meet the other federal criteria." Then he said: "Where then did this leave us?" "First, we could do nothing, but doing nothing was an extreme that Manitoba rejected in its submission to the Royal Commission Health Services. Doing nothing meant leaving in limbo a section of the public that we felt to be in need of comprehensive medical services coverage that they could afford. To do nothing would also mean that we leave on the table in Ottawa the federal contribution which is estimated to be \$17 million annually.

"Secondly, we could develop a plan specific to Manitoba's needs. Approximately 70 percent of the population of this province have some form of medical coverage through MMS, private insurers and social allowances medicare. Manitoba's greatest need was to provide a plan for the 30 percent without coverage. Those in the 70 percent who have only limited coverage and probably more who might be finding their present efforts to provide insurance increasingly difficult."

Then he ends up by saying: "Our third position was that we could join the compulsory federal plan, benefit by the federal contribution of some \$17 million annually and raise the other half by premiums. The province would pay the premium for those most in need. Thus joining the federal plan under its terms and conditions is the only practical choice if we are to provide insurance against the cost of medical services for the people of this province regardless of age or financial assistance. Thus to meet federal criteria it was our opinion that a compulsory plan be introduced."

So the government are on record. In fact, they pleaded a far better case than I can plead here today for joining the plan. In fact, they have gone on record as saying they have fought a fight; they lost their fight for a voluntary plan; we are going to join the national plan on July 1st and if we don't we are "leaving on the table in Ottawa \$17 million that we might just as well have."

So what are they saying now? They say that we've had some second thoughts about it, we think we will leave the \$17 million on the table. -- (Interjection) -- What's \$17 million they say. Well that isn't much I suppose out of \$377 million that they are spending now. But it's still a lot of money; \$17 million is only a third of what the provincial revenue tax is now producing annually, isn't it? And then further, on March 17, 1967 from the propaganda department, again it says: "Prepaid insurance program slated for July 1st." They are going to go right ahead with it. It's government policy and this is it; explaining again. So here are three statements from the government that it is their intention to proceed.

Now in consideration of the intention of the government to take over the Manitoba Medical Services plan, to take over the operation of MMS on July 1st, they have met that criteria. They have met the one criteria by doing this. I don't know whether the government has announced in the House that they are going to take over the operation of MMS on July 1st but the papers suggest that this is a fact - this was one of the criteria set out that it must be a Crown corporation or one operated by the government. So what in the world, Mr. Speaker, are we waiting for?

I certainly hope that the government will before we adjourn for good in this House, enlighten the people of the province on what their intention is to look after the 30 percent of the people that are not now presently covered, because Mr. Roblin said on so many occasions that "it must be assumed - it must be assumed that the only reason that the 30 percent are not covered is because they can't afford to be covered." He said that in three publications here. And I think it's a fair assumption; it's a fair assumption that if they haven't got coverage in this day and age that they just haven't got the money to pay the premiums or the cost of Medicare. So

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd.) what are we going to do for these people?

Mr. Speaker, I'm just going to end up by thanking the 15 or 16 members that are still present with me, on the government side, and thank them for their kind attention, and sorry to have to interrupt their coffee and sleep and thank the Honourable Member the Leader of the NDP for bringing them back into the House. It must have been quite a jolt to their system but I guess they'll get over it. There were only ten here when we moved to adjourn the House. So I want to thank them for their kind attention, Mr. Speaker, and hope that we will now hear from the government, hear their views on Medicare and probably an explanation as to why there were only ten people here to listen to me when we moved to adjourn.

MR. LYON: Do you really want an explanation?

MR. SHOEMAKER: Do I want an explanation as to why there were only ten here? Well I wouldn't mind . . . would be having a Big Four conference some place on national -- you think he will? Oh well, I've got a fairly thick hide and if he wants a fairly good -- if he can explain to the satisfaction of all members here as to why there were only 10 members in the House, one that will satisfy everybody in the province -- (Interjection) -- ten out of thirty were only present.

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

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I was going to adjourn and I'll be closing the debate, so if the Member wants to speak . . .

MR. DOUGLAS M. STANES (St. James): I'd like to adjourn the debate. I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Brandon, that debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Gladstone. The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, in taking part in this debate I will not be long. I will ask the members of the House to support this resolution that was proposed to the Legislature by my colleague the Honourable Member for Gladstone. I think it's a very good resolution and one that could be supported by all members of the House, because all the Honourable Member for Gladstone is asking is that the Law Amendments Committee of this Legislature be instructed to undertake and take a look at our sales tax bill and how it affects many people in our Province of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, I also appeal to you and to your judgment and to the other members of this House, in this Assembly, for the little man in this province; for the people who cannot afford in many instances to pay the sales tax. And the area that the honourable member was mostly concerned and we are concerned on this side, is such things as clothes and used clothing, soaps and cleaning supplies, detergents, service charges. I feel that this tax is very oppressive and it also discourages development. This is the area that my honourable member was concerned and I think that he certainly is not asking for too much to have the bill go to Law Amendments, be reviewed, and see in what areas that this tax could be removed.

Mr. Speaker, I see no reason why the members of this House would be unable to support this bill, because just a few days ago the Provincial Treasurer told us that the sales tax netted to Manitoba some million dollars more than was budgeted for and was expected, so I see no better time than now to have the government review the sales tax and see where we could remove the sales tax in many areas that I mentioned. I can see no reason why we have to have sales tax on school supplies, clothing, and if you recall last year we proposed many amendments to this bill which were turned down, and in view of the fact that we did receive much more revenue than was expected, I think the whole matter should be reviewed at this time.

Mr. Speaker, there are many families in this city who receive small wages. One may say that they are living almost in poverty because the families in the CPR and Notre Dame area, according to the Social Service audit, out of some 3,000 families over 2,000 of these people are receiving less than \$3,000 salary. These people have families to support, and certainly this figure is a poverty figure.

Mr. Speaker, we can also look at the dry cleaning. I cannot see why the tax should not be removed from dry cleaning or shoe repairs. I feel that this tax is very unjust and really is a burden on large families.

I would like to also at this time mention that in the resolution we have that this tax also discourages development, and in particular I am concerned -- I will just touch briefly on it

(MR. PATRICK cont'd.) because I intend to introduce a resolution in this House - on housing and the sales tax on housing, so I will be able to make my remarks on housing at that time, but I do feel this is one of the richest countries in the world and we are unable to shelter many of our people in a proper fashion.

Mr. Speaker, today out of the total, payments on the average house runs anywhere between \$180.00 and \$200.00 per month. This is on a mortgage of \$18,000 to \$18,500 on an average sale house for sale of \$20,000 to \$21,000. I'd say in Winnipeg there are no homes that sell for less than approximately \$21,000. There are very few people in this province who can afford to pay \$200 monthly rent. Now surely, I think that the Committee of the House could look and review the 5 percent sales tax and how it affects the housing in this province. I feel that a large proportion of houses, at least according to the statistics, at least five out of 13 last year and five out of seven this year, are built with government finance or CMHC mortgages. In 1966, the average borrower had an income of \$7,300. The average family income in Canada is about \$5,500; in Winnipeg it's less than that, Mr. Speaker. So there's very few people that can qualify for a CMHC mortgage in Winnipeg. This clearly indicates the CMHC loans at the present time are for people above the average income of the people in the City of Winnipeg. So for this reason, and for the other reasons that I have mentioned, I feel that the tax should be reviewed; this resolution should go to Law Amendments where, if we could have interested parties and people make presentations to us, I'm sure all we would do is improve this legislation for many of our people in the province.

These are just a few of the remarks I wanted to make. I also just want to point out that where in the City of Winnipeg we're told that there are at least 5,000 homes that are not fit to be living in, our construction figures in respect to single and multiple dwellings in the last five years have been continually declining. For instance, in 1964 we had 2,182 starts; in 1965 we had 1,849 -- I'm referring to single dwellings, Mr. Speaker -- in 1966 we had only 1,435 starts; and last year 1,298. This is a clear indication that there are continually less houses built and the situation is getting much worse in respect to rentals. They have been greatly increased and many people in our province just cannot afford to own a house.

The greatest increase, as far as the construction costs were concerned, was the five percent sales tax provincially and the 12 percent sales tax federally. I said before that I was against the 12 percent and the five percent sales tax on accommodation. I think it is completely wrong because for years many politicians, provincial, federal and municipal, have always said that we attribute our high standard of living in this country due to the fact that we have such a high percentage of home ownership. Well this is completely changed, Mr. Speaker. We are becoming a nation of renters and not homeowners anymore. And even in the area of renting we are reaching the stage where we just cannot afford to pay because the people aren't making that kind of money in our city.

In many areas where the homes used to rent for \$65.00 and \$75.00 in the areas that were not as properly built up as in older areas, in a matter of a year and a half, or a year, these same houses are renting in the neighbourhood of \$100.00 to \$125.00 a month. This clearly indicates the drastic situation that we have in the way of accommodation and homes in this city, and of course many other cities, but I'm concerned mostly of Manitoba. So I feel that there should be consideration given of removing the five percent sales tax, not only to the school supplies and cleaning supplies, dry cleaning, shoe repairs and many of the other areas, but also on lumber materials for housing.

So, Mr. Speaker, with those few remarks, I do intend to bring a resolution on housing within the next couple of days and I do support the resolution. I hope all the members of the House will see fit to support it so that it may go to the Law Amendments Committee and receive proper attention there.

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

MR. EARL DAWSON (Hamiota): I move, seconded by the Member for Portage la Prairie, that the debate be adjourned.

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

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

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, this resolution, as of course we know, is asking the government to consider the advisability of establishing the office of an independent Auditor-General, and the whereases have spelled it out pretty well, because of the constant increase in the costs of government and because of the constant increase in taxes. I think this resolution is very timely at this time that it asks for an independent look at the expenditures of the vast sums of money that are being spent presently in Manitoba. If I recall, about 18 years ago the budget of the province was I believe \$22 million; this year we are called upon to vote in total - this is both provincial and federal amounts - \$377 million, so while the argument may have been valid some years ago that there may not have been a need for a watchdog on spending of tax dollars, I don't think that argument is valid today.

I could quote quite a number of cases that would bear some looking into to see whether or not government dollars were spent wisely, but I will just take the time of the House to quote one particular case that I believe should bear scrutiny of an independent auditor, and this is in the purchasing of land in connection with the Portage Diversion. I think members of this House will remember the method in which the government purchased the land known as the Bain Estate. To recount briefly for members what happened at that time, there was a farm consisting of 219 acres of the Portage water tower which formed part of the Bain Estate and it was put on the market through a real estate agent and was listed for sale at \$32,000. This included about 140 acres of arable land and approximately 70 acres that were not productive in any manner. The 70 acres consisted of swamp and extremely sandy soil that would not support any type of crop.

As I said, the land was put on -- or the whole farm with buildings was put on the market through a real estate agent for \$32,000. There was one serious offer made to purchase by the Campbell Soup Company, and upon analysis, and bearing in mind the use that they would make of the land, they made an offer of \$29,000. This offer was not taken at the time and a few months later - a very few months later - the government entered the picture to purchase the land which would be used mainly for the inlet from the Assiniboine River into the diversion and also for part of the channel itself. We find that this land was purchased by government purchasers who did not check on the land values apparently, or if they did they ignored them, and the government went ahead and paid a total of \$75,000 for this property.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it will be recalled in debates at the time that this was all documented but the government did not see fit to do anything about it. If anybody wishes to challenge my figures, I have copies of the Order for Return here and the cost paid, and I believe I tabled the documents in 1963 showing what the land was listed at by a real estate agent in Portage la Prairie.

Now, my point in bringing this old subject up is this, that in other jurisdictions where there is an Auditor-General - and I'm thinking of the UK now, United Kingdom - there had been instances there where it was found that, in particular war contractors, people who made war material, had been found to have been overcharging the government and through the action of the Auditor-General a recovery of funds was made. I believe the same thing has happened in the United States, where it was found that unwise purchases had been made and upon investigation it was found that they were, shall we say, unconscionable transactions, the government was able to recover moneys that were paid out in that manner.

I heard the question here asked in the House a few days ago, was it true that in the Information Branch, a newly furnished office, that a number of chairs cost \$500.00 - and I think it was three chairs. Well, Mr. Speaker, \$500.00 is not very much money, but is this the method that all departments can make purchases? Is there not a more organized method of buying, that when you're buying chairs that there's standard types of chairs, that there must be standard prices. Does every department go out and pay what they feel they should pay to furnish an office, or is this done through a proper buying office that must in turn bear scrutiny by a person such as an Auditor-General?

In closing my few remarks, Mr. Chairman, I'd just like to point out that the Province of Manitoba is not that affluent, despite what the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce keeps telling us, that how good things here are and we must talk more optimistically. I'd just like to quote to him what some of the average income figures are in the province. Now, this is from a 1966 news release, the Federal Government, and it's with respect to average incomes

(MR. JOHNSTON cont'd) . . . across the country and lists the average income of taxpayers in 88 Canadian cities. Winnipeg places 49th in this list with an average income of \$4,594, and because other cities like St. James, St. Boniface and Transcona are not mentioned, I would presume that figure refers to the Greater Winnipeg area. Brandon is mentioned as placing 77th out of 88 cities and the average income there was \$4,238; Portage la Prairie - a figure of which I am certainly not proud - is listed as 88th out of 88 Canadian cities with an average income of \$3,775.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when we're handling figures or sums of money that is now before us for this year, namely \$377 million, I think it's high time that an Auditor-General was appointed to be a watchdog over the way the tax dollar is spent, and especially - especially in view of the fact that the tax dollars that the citizens of Manitoba have to pay come from lower than average incomes.

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

MR. R. O. LISSAMAN (Brandon): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. James, that the debate be adjourned.

MR. SPEAKER: Moved by the Honourable Member for Brandon. . .

MR. SAUL MILLER (Seven Oaks): Mr. Speaker, if you don't mind, I would like to speak if the honourable member doesn't object.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member is prepared to proceed, is he?

MR. MILLER: I thank you, Mr. Speaker, there's one item or one matter that I would like to bring to the attention of the House in regard to the Auditor-General and I think that properly under this resolution that it could be introduced.

One of the features of the government in their tendering policies is that they do not let it be known to any unsuccessful bidder the prices, or the other prices that were quoted to the government. They could send out a tender for some equipment or some materials, they ask for a half a dozen tenders, they get the tenders, contracts are let. The unsuccessful bidder is completely in the dark. He hasn't a clue - he doesn't know whether he's a dollar out or \$10,000 out. He doesn't know whether the material supplied is as it was called for in the tender, whether someone who received the contract may have perhaps quoted or not the identical merchandise but what they call an equivalent substitute, and he really has no idea from one month to the next and from one bid to the next whether in fact he is, I say close, whether he's far from being competitive, whether what he is bidding on is perhaps not the right material, whether perhaps he should be bidding on an equivalent and perhaps cheaper material or product. Any attempt on the part of the bidder to get information from the government is denied, and it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that this cannot but develop into a very serious problem for the government, because what inevitably must happen is this. Many firms will lose complete interest in bidding; many will feel that having bid a half a dozen times on certain items and not having received the contracts, not knowing as I say whether or no they are close or they are reasonably close and perhaps next time around might, by sharpening the pencil, be considered; not knowing any of these things, they inevitably are let feel that (a) either they are being ignored; or (b) that they somehow are missing the boat, in which case they completely, as I say, lose interest in the matter.

Now, I think this is a disservice to the taxpayers. I'm not suggesting for a moment that the government and the departments concerned do other than give the final contract to the lowest bidder; they probably do. On the other hand, it seems to me an Auditor-General looking at this type of tendering procedure could very well challenge and question it. A similar procedure to what is being done in Manitoba was the method used in the federal jurisdiction, and I believe it was after the Glassco - I think it was the Glassco Report or the Glassco Commission - they changed that and today on any federal contract, whether it be for hundred of thousands of dollars or just a few hundred dollars, anyone who tenders can receive the information from the government as to the price, the name of the firm that won the tender, the price submitted by the winning tender. This is made available so that the unsuccessful bidders can look at it, can evaluate to see whether or no they were in line, whether perhaps they inadvertently quoted incorrectly, and are in a position next time around to sharpen their pencils or to go after the business with far more effect and with far more sincerity and enthusiasm than they might otherwise be able to.

So it seems to me this is a function that the Auditor-General could very very easily perform, because certainly an Auditor-General would be concerned that the department of the

(MR. MILLER cont'd) . . . government, or the purchasing department of the government should not discourage bidders. The whole concept of the bidding and the whole idea of asking for public bids is to prevent any one individual or company to secure an advantage, and in that way to prevent other potential sellers to get into the market, and if you're kept in the blind, it's inevitable that bidders are going to be discouraged. Other jurisdictions, as I say, have eliminated this type of thing. Without throwing any discredit or casting any doubts on any purchaser or any purchasing department, it seems to me that this sort of blind bidding must encourage a wheeling and dealing sort of thing where people try to get the information through the back door and I don't think this should be necessary. I think that any time a bid is made on a public tender, this should become available to all other firms who bid, and for that matter or anyone else of the public who's interested.

Now it's true nobody else is usually interested except other people in the same business, but by not being able to do this, as I say they don't know whether they're too high; they don't know if the lowest bid was indeed -- or the lowest tender was indeed accepted; they only have to take the word or the hope that this was so. They don't even know really, and no one knows, whether the equal specifications are properly evaluated, because as I say the government can call for a tender for a certain material or a certain piece of equipment and equal quality is accepted. But there's a big difference between a name product and an equal quality, and there's a big difference in the price very often, so that the bidder, if he knew what the price finally went for, if he knew finally whether indeed the government got the item, the trade name that they tendered for or whether they got an equal substitution, would go a long way to encouraging bidding, to encouraging tendering, and in the long run must accrue to the savings that the government would benefit by in getting the best possible price, because if the tendering system is to have any meaning it must encourage competition; it must encourage people to compete against each other for prices; and in the final analysis, I think it makes possible or eliminates any possibility that anything but -- everything is aboveboard, that the public is being served by encouraging the correct price, the fairest price, and a price that cannot be questioned by anyone because of the silence on the part of the government when it comes to these matters.

Now at this session of the House in order to ascertain certain prices I had to do this, I had to lay before the House an Order for Return. I didn't want to; I did it in order to see whether indeed I could get the information as an MLA. I felt that although it seems that firms can't, I was wondering whether I would have that right. Well, apparently after a few days of delay the government decided to release the information and I was given this information. I don't think it's necessary and I don't think it's right that I, or any other MLA, should have to use this method to elicit what is public information. It seems to me, and I'm convinced that if we're going to have a tendering system in Manitoba that means anything and is going to be of any value, then surely any firm that wishes to do business with the government and has honestly tendered on merchandise or material or on a job, should be entitled to find out the price that the winning bidder was paid for that merchandise or for that service. Then and only then will we have a fair tendering service; then and only then will we be encouraging people to bid and to tender; and then and only then are we going to really effect any economy and any savings that may be possible.

That's all I have to say on this particular point of it and I think in view of that, if there was any doubt in my mind up to now, I'm convinced that Manitoba certainly needs an Auditor-General if for no other reason than this sort of person, that sort of office would perhaps move this government to alter their present tendering system and the secrecy that they insist - they seem to insist - on cloaking all their prices, all their quotations, and a secrecy that I don't think does the government any good; it casts doubt upon them, and certainly discourages people from entering into lively competition which is what we want if we're going to get the best prices for anything that the Province of Manitoba buys.

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Speaker, with the permission of the Honourable the Member for Brandon, I would like to just enter this debate briefly because of the contribution which has been made by the Honourable the Member for Seven Oaks, because I think it would not be wise to allow perhaps his misunderstanding of certain procedures that are followed to go perhaps without some comment from me.

I believe that aside altogether from the advisability or otherwise of an Auditor-General, that the Honourable the Member for Seven Oaks is under a misunderstanding with regard to the tendering procedure that is followed by the Government of Manitoba and the effect that there

(MR. McLEAN cont'd)... might be in that regard by an Auditor-General. I would like to point out that we have a far more effective means of dealing with the matter of tendering than would be provided by an Auditor-General - and I'm not now specifically debating the question of an Auditor-General - because of the fact that the Comptroller-General under our present law, and under his present appointment, conducts a pre-audit of our payments, so that if there was anything irregular about a tender by the government, the tendering person would never be paid because the Comptroller-General would not approve of it, and if he didn't approve of it he couldn't be paid.

In other words, in order that an account may be paid under our system, the Comptroller-General must be satisfied that in accordance with the provisions of The Public Purchase Act that tenders have been solicited and that the contract has been awarded to the lowest bidder, subject only to requirements -- subject only to the satisfying of requirements if it were thought advisable to award it to some person who had tendered more than the lowest tender. All of these matters are most keenly checked by the Comptroller-General under our present system, and I wanted to make that point and have it recorded at this point in the debate, Mr. Speaker, because, as I say, it would be perhaps not doing a service to allow any misunderstanding to arise in this regard.

I am aware of the matter to which the Honourable the Member for Seven Oaks is addressing himself and that is, in my opinion, the subject matter of another debate and a question that is a fair question to ask, but there can be no, in my opinion, there can be no wheeling and dealing; there can be no under the cover dealing under our present arrangements because of the necessity of this pre-audit which is a continuously conducted operation by the Comptroller-General under our present arrangements.

An Auditor-General, if we were to have one, simply examines things after they have happened and he expresses his opinion as to whether a proper procedure was followed or whether a better one could have been followed, and perhaps the type of case cited by the Honourable the Member for Portage la Prairie might be one in which -- would be the type of case in which an Auditor-General might very well express some opinions in regard to the matter under consideration. It would not, in my opinion, be applicable in the normal day-to-day purchasing that is conducted by the Government of Manitoba.

I make one further comment, again only for the purpose of the record, of indicating that the present arrangement, far from discouraging bidding as suggested by the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks, is quite the contrary and our problem is not to get people to bid; it's sorting out the very numerous, the great interest we have in people bidding and we believe that the present system - and I have to trespass a little bit off the main subject of this resolution - we have good reason to believe that our present system is favoured by those who wish to do business with the Government of Manitoba. I wanted to record this at this time, fully recognizing the problem which is on the mind of the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks, but to indicate that I think he would not find any assistance in regard to his problem from the appointment of an Auditor-General.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Portage.

MR. JOHNSTON: I wonder if the Honourable Minister would permit a question? Does he consider the Auditor-General in Ottawa is serving a useful purpose?

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Speaker, I have not studied that subject and I have no opinion that I would be prepared to express in that regard, and after all that would touch upon the matter which is before the House and I'll be prepared to make my decision on that when the time comes.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. MILLER: I wonder if the Minister might permit a question?

MR. McLEAN: Yes.

MR. MILLER: I believe - I wanted to check - I believe he said that the Auditor-General does a pre-audit and would catch any irregularities.

MR. McLEAN: I said the Comptroller-General.

MR. MILLER: The Comptroller-General has a pre-audit. On the other hand, the Auditor-General would only check for proper procedures or recommend better procedures. Now, isn't this really what this side of the House is saying, that we're questioning the procedures? Now you quoted The Public Service Act. Isn't that the kind of procedure that the Auditor-General could challenge or question and make recommendations on which the Comptroller-General won't?

MR. McLEAN: Yes, although I would hardly expect that an Auditor-General would be expressing opinions on matter of policy that would be followed because matters of policy are decided by government and submitted in the form of legislation to the Legislature or to Parliament.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion on the adjournment 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 in amendment thereto. The Honourable the Minister of Education.

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, I adjourned this debate for my colleague the Minister of Public Works.

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Speaker, as the Honourable the Minister of Education has indicated, he was good enough to adjourn this debate in order that I might make a small contribution to it. This, I must hasten to say, does not indicate that I know very much about television, and indeed there's one member of this Chamber, Your Honour, that would find it very difficult to imagine my being able to say anything on that exciting and interesting subject.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion this Legislature, and indeed all Legislative Assemblies and the Parliament, are well served by the news media, that is the newspapers, radio and television. We have in this House a place for the people who work with each one of these and what is said and what takes place here is reported in the press. It's reported by radio and it is reported on the television in the way of news and programs of one sort and another, and I think that one could say, and I'm sure that all members would agree, that we are well served in this regard. Indeed, everything we do, everything we say, almost everything we think about is reported in great detail by all of the various news presentations, so that there's no shortage of news to the people of Manitoba about what takes place here in the Legislature.

The same is true outside the Legislature, that is to say as political parties and as individual members of the Legislature we have ready access to all of these same people throughout the entire year, and certainly of course more particularly during the time we are in session. Many opportunities are presented for us to make our comments, to make our views known, make statements, and indeed there are times when I suppose we're asked to do so when we would - some of at least - would rather avoid doing so if we could in a gracious way avoid it. And so not only during the session of the Legislature is this news distribution available, but at all times of the year. And so indeed we have almost instant news now of everything that is taking place and everything that is planned and everything that we would wish to say in any way, shape or form to the people of the Province of Manitoba. -- (Interjection) -- Well, I would hardly agree with the "managed" news because there's been a lot of news that I would like to have managed that I haven't been able to do, so I can't agree with the interjection of the Honourable the Member for Portage la Prairie.

Now we come, Mr. Speaker, to the proposal, and I have said what I've said in order to indicate what I think is an important distinction between the way in which this system works now and the proposal presented by the resolution of the Honourable the Member for Inkster and assisted by his colleague the Member for Kildonan, in which they propose that we make arrangements to enable live television and broadcasting to emanate from the Legislature, and of course by permitting the representatives of these various media to install and operate their equipment and facilities here in the Chamber. And so we have to examine this proposal, not in the light of the availability of news, because I think we can take it that the news is already readily available to the people of the Province, but in the light of the proposal to allow the mechanical devices that are associated with radio and television to be installed here in the Legislative Chamber.

Now that is a proposition, Mr. Speaker, which requires some careful examination, and I'm confident that the Honourable Member for Inkster would expect it to have some careful examination and discussion. And in thinking about this, I want to state one premise which I think we as Members of the Legislature, quite irrespective of our interest in news about what we are doing, we must never forget that the business of the Legislature is to be a Legislature. That is, this is not an entertainment forum; this is not a mere debating forum; this is the place where the public business of the province of Manitoba is conducted; and so our first obligation is the obligation of the government presenting measures which it thinks are needed in the interest of the province and for the members to debate these measures, to vote on them, and in other

(MR. McLEAN cont'd)... words to conduct the business of the Province of Manitoba. And that's our main job. Nothing else - these other things we are interested in of course - but if we didn't have anything else, we would still be accomplishing our purpose of conducting the business of the Province of Manitoba.

Now let us assume - let us assume that these mechanical means of carrying my voice and the voice of other members to the people at large were installed here, and television to show my picture at the same time, let us assume that that was here. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that we would find that our functions, whether we acknowledged it or not, would alter from that of conducting the business of Manitoba to that of entertaining, or trying to entertain the people of the province, and one can imagine the impact which that situation would have on the conduct of the business of this House, transforming it from the primary interest in conducting the business of government to something quite different.

Now, first of all, obviously there would not be continuous broadcasting nor would there be continuous television. Anybody that would suggest that would be off his rocker, if I might use an expression. So, Mr. Speaker, there could only be two things that would be done - either there would be a set time during our proceedings when the radio and the television would be operating, or alternatively, the radio and television people would record the entire proceedings and then edit and reproduce those parts which they thought were important.

Now let's take the first case where there was a set time. Imagine the jockeying that would be going on. Mr. Speaker. It's well known that the Honourable the Member for St. John's and myself are the two most handsome chaps in this Chamber and obviously we would want to be on that camera or on that radio microphone during the time that -- (Interjection) -- I reject that suggestion, Mr. Speaker - during the time that the radio and the television was on. In other words, instead of us considering what was needful in the interests of the Government of Manitoba, we would at least for that period of time be considering who could get the most time on the radio or on television because that would be a form in which we would think that we might achieve some advantage. We would have the radio and the television people, in effect, dictating to this House the manner in which we conducted our business.

If, on the other hand, everything were recorded - and I'm rather doubtful that this would be done because that would be quite expensive - and then edited, we would be at the mercy of those who edit the news, and that again would of necessity - or I shouldn't say of necessity, but would very likely be not a judgment which could be made by someone - and this is no criticism of those who would be doing it - they after all are not fixed with the responsibility of presenting legislation or debating measures in this House or voting on measures in this House, nor indeed of having all of the information that is necessary and important and they would not necessarily understand or appreciate those things which would be of the most importance. But even if they did, it would obviously confer upon some of us - those selected by the people who did the editing - an advantage that was not being conferred upon all of the members, and here we are all equal, and ought to be equal, because here our job is to conduct the business of this Chamber, and as long as there are no external forces which prevent or encourage, as the case may be, our contribution, then we have an equal opportunity of making our contribution.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I submit most strongly that this would interfere with the proceedings of this Chamber and that it would not be in the public interest for us to have such an arrangement. And I can adopt that position, Mr. Speaker, because, as I have said at the beginning, there is such frequent and full coverage in all respects of our proceedings here and in a way which I believe is in the public interest, and indeed individually we may go on radio, as I do myself, or on television, or we can write newspaper columns concerning the proceedings of the Legislature. We as members have that opportunity as well as of course having the advantage of the people who devote their lives to the presentation of the work of this Chamber.

Mr. Speaker, I am firmly convinced that we would unalterably regret the interference that would take place in the work of this Chamber if the principles espoused by the resolution were adopted, and it is therefore with some regret that I am unable to support the resolution and the amendment which has been proposed.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I don't really know what to say at the offset of my few remarks after listening to the distinguished Minister of Public Works in his rejection of the proposition proposed in respect of television. You know, I think the people of Manitoba and possibly Canada missed something this afternoon in not having the television cameras directed toward my honourable friend as he rejected this proposition, because it seemed to me ...

MR. McLEAN: I didn't have my make-up on.

MR. PAULLEY: No, I would say -- my honourable friend says he didn't have his make-up on and I don't think that he really requires make-up. I'm happy when I see and hear my honourable friend make such an interesting contribution to the debates in this House and I only wish that he would do it more, and I only wish of course, Mr. Speaker, that other Manitobans would be able to share, with those of us who are present in the Legislature, contributions such as he just made.

Of course I don't agree with my honourable friend and his reasoning for the rejection, but one of the things that he did say that I agree most heartily with is the fact that in this Assembly we are here charged with the responsibility of the conduct of the business of the Legislature and of the Government of Manitoba, and I think he suggested that if the cameras were aglow for certain periods of the time when debates are undertaken in the House, then we would have a reasonable attendance in the House. I only wish, Mr. Speaker, that the television cameras had been here about an hour ago to see how much consideration was being given to the conduct of government while the Honourable Member from Gladstone was speaking on the very important matter of Medicare. Ten members of government out of thirty-one were interested in the affairs of state that the Minister of Public Affairs just referred to a moment ago.

But again I say that my honourable friend's contribution was most interesting. I particularly liked the way he started out by giving credit to the present news media and our TV stations that we have here, and say to us that here these people are giving on-the-spot news, instant news, and fulfilling all of the facilities, all of the needed requirements to give to the news media instant documentation of what is going on in this House. My honourable friend the Minister, however, neglected to say that apparently his own Department of Industry and Commerce haven't got as much reliance on the contributions being made by the members of the Fourth Estate, because we found out the other day of course that the Department of Industry and Commerce apparently are making provision to conduct TV coverage of a nature satisfactory to the government. They are doing it in radio and other media as well, and yet here my honourable friend the Minister of Public Works today says we don't need anything more because the members of the Fourth Estate are covering this at the present time. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, a bit of a conflict in direction by the Honourable Minister of Public Works as opposed to that of the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce. -- (Interjection) -- Instant news? Yes, I think we should have instant news. I think possibly we would have, we would have better coverage inside of this House, and certainly if not better coverage we certainly would have better attendance.

My honourable friend said that this House is not an entertainment forum, and if I heard him correctly, not a debating forum; and he has a fear - he has a fear that if the facilities were provided in the House for news coverage by TV media and radio within this House that it might get into the position of being a debating forum. I wonder if my honourable friend had the privilege so many Canadians did not so long ago to have on their television screens, live and instant, the deliberations at the Constitution Conference when representatives of all the provinces and the federal authorities got together to deliberate on the matter of the Constitution. Should this have been conducted just in the conference chamber or did we gain something, Mr. Speaker, as the result of the widespread coverage given to that conference. And in saying this I'm not suggesting, I'm not suggesting of necessity that there is a parallel between the Constitutional Conference and what goes on in this House, but if anything can be done to improve the debates in this House, if anything can be done to improve the attendance within the Chamber itself during the consideration of the affairs of Manitoba, I think would be to the good, because we certainly did not have this afternoon.

My honourable friend the Attorney-General says it's a phony argument. I say that if what I am suggesting is a phony argument, the proposition of my honourable friend the Minister of Public Works was far more phony because of the fact that he suggested we would all be trying to get around a microphone, camera or a radio microphone.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, would my honourable friend permit a question then?

MR. PAULLEY: Why certainly.

MR. LYON: If my honourable friend is so certain that his thesis about attendance in the House relating to the conduct of business is such a certain one, why is it that the House of Commons, the mother of parliaments in Britain, conducts practically all of its business with something like a third of the people present and never, never has had enough seats for all the

(MR. LYON cont'd)... Members who do sit, and that is the mother of parliaments.

MR. PAULLEY: Well, I believe in motherhood but I also believe that sometime the offspring of the mother does not have to follow in the ways of the mother, and if my honourable friend the Attorney-General can justify, if my honourable friend the Attorney-General in his capacity as House Leader of this Assembly can justify the fact that his party who controls government in Manitoba had less than one-third of their members present this afternoon when I called for a motion to cease business, then I say that he'd better go over to the mother of parliaments because he's not looking after the affairs of Manitoba. And I don't think that my honourable friend himself, as leader of the House, was in here -- and now I'm getting a little chirping from my honourable friend Churchill Industries at The Pas, and I'm sure that he knows that we don't listen too much to the little chirping and chiding that we get from his quarter. -- (Interjection) -- It's all right, Mr. Speaker, I don't need your defence.

MR. SPEAKER: I knew it would happen. I wonder if the Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party would continue on with his most interesting remarks.

MR. PAULLEY: Oh certainly, Mr. Speaker, and I thank you for coming to my defence, and when you do, it is sincerely appreciated. But when one of those on the other side of the House comes to attempt to defend the indefensible, is the time that it calls for rebuttal from this side of the House because their conduct this afternoon was indefensible, and even my capable and learned friend the Leader of the House, the Attorney-General, could not defend, even by endeavouring to refer questions pertaining to the mother of parliaments, as a defence.

HON. J. B. CARROLL (Minister of Welfare) (The Pas):Red Herring?

MR. PAULLEY: It was a Mackerel. But anyway, apart from that...

MR. LYON: Carry on your way, we'll carry on ours.

MR. PAULLEY: Yes, my honourable friend says I'll carry on my way and he'll carry on his. I think the way we are carrying on on this side of the House would be far more acceptable to the people of Manitoba if they had the privilege and opportunity through the media of TV and radio of knowing how they are carrying on, and that's the purpose of this resolution.

It's not new - it's not new, the coverage, live coverage of areas of assembly such as the United Nations Assembly. The Speech from the Throne here is covered by radio and TV inside of this Chamber - I presume by special permission, Mr. Speaker, of yourself - in order to give to all of the people of Manitoba an opportunity to see the opening of the House and to hear the proposals of the government opposite for the well-being of Manitoba. Wouldn't it be well for the people of Manitoba to see the interest that they take after the opening day when there is no TV coverage? But it's nothing that's new. In Saskatchewan they have had this for a number of years.

My honourable friend the Minister of Public Works raises the question about everybody wanting to gallop before the cameras in order that they may have the advantage of being heard and seen, but this is arranged between the Whips in the Province of Saskatchewan. There is an allocation of time, divided between the parties in the Province of Saskatchewan in the ratio of their membership within the House. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, the government would really have an advantage over opposition because they have a majority and therefore they would have more time. I doubt if they could use it as effectively as those on this side of the House. Possibly that's the fear of my honourable friend the Member for Dauphin, although he did say, and I guess I have to agree with him at least to a degree that my colleague from St. John's and the Honourable Member for Dauphin are on a par as being among the better looking ones - I have to say better rather than best - better looking members of the House.

But despite the rejection of my honourable friend the Minister of Public Works, I do recommend this measure to the House. I don't think that it's a matter of great concern; it's a matter that's worthy of a trial. My honourable friend the Minister of Education - the Minister of Education is using the media of TV to educate the students in many of our classrooms and areas in the field of education. The basic proposition that we have before us is the education of the people of Manitoba as to the conduct of the government and this Assembly. So on the basis of what happened today I can understand the rejection of the Honourable -- (Interjection) -- Pardon?

MR. LYON: It's happened again and every...

MR. PAULLEY: Yes, my honourable friend, Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend the Attorney-General says that it's going to happen again, when 30 members of government duly elected to carry on the affairs of state will find that two-thirds of them are out of the Chamber,

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd)...and the people will wonder why it is the affairs of Manitoba are not being properly looked after. And what an admission, Mr. Speaker, of my honourable friend the Attorney-General, to turn around and say that as far as they are concerned, because of the fact that division bells have to ring to bring them back reluctantly into this House to put their hands up or stand up for a vote, that this is going to happen again. What a travesty on democracy to have the House Leader of a responsible government to suggest that they only require one-third of their membership to conduct the affairs of state. And my honourable friend here from The Pas interjected just now to say that it's irresponsibility on my part to call for a division or the adjournment of the House.

MR. CARROLL: Right.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, that was the only media, the only motion that I could put to get the reluctant members of the Conservative Party back into this House to take part in the affairs of Manitoba.

My honourable friend the Minister of Public Works suggests that the TV media would do it. Well, Mr. Speaker, if we can do it through the media of TV it wouldn't be necessary for the likes of myself or others of this House to move for the adjournment of the House to empty the coffee room and the corridors in order that the Conservatives would come back into the House to conduct the affairs of Manitoba. -- (Interjection) -- For this reason..

MR. LYON: Frivolous irresponsibility.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I just wonder if this discussion hasn't gone far enough. I know the Leader of the New Democratic Party needs no assistance from me, but I would appeal to the House as a whole in order to get on with the business of the House that we come back to the resolution we're discussing.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder now whether you haven't come to the defence of those opposite.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. What can I say?

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, may I assure you, Sir, may I assure you that I am quite used to my honourable friends opposite, and may I assure you too that I'll cease my remarks at this stage, not because of interjections of varying natures but because of the fact that I think it would be good for Manitoba to have an opportunity through a camera, to see the ineptitude of the government that we have in Manitoba at the present time. And despite the rejection by the Honourable the Minister of Public Works, I highly commend the proposition contained in this resolution to the honourable members in the backbench, because if they did have an opportunity of having the air waves reflected back to their constituency possibly they would stand up and have a better opportunity, or take the opportunity of participating in the debates so that they can show the people back home that here, by your ballot, am I; here, by your ballot and through the media of the TV, I show you that I'm on the job. If that's the only way we can get that information back to the people back home, I even suggest that the members in the backbench of the Conservative ranks should accept this proposition, then they may be able to achieve, at least to some degree, news reports of their doings and not those of the Information Services which only cover the gentlemen in the front row, coupled with those of the Ministerial benches in the second row.

MR. WALLY MCKENZIE (Roblin): Mr. Speaker, while I would like to enter into the debate at this moment with that challenge that was shot across by the Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party, I would move that the debate be adjourned, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Matthews.

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

MR. SPEAKER: It's almost 5:30 and I'm prepared to call it 5:30, by leave of the House, and return at 8:00 this evening.