

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Friday, May 10, 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

Before we proceed, I'd like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery, where we have 26 students of Grade 7 standing of the Edmund Partridge School. These students are under the direction of Mrs. Dyck. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

I am very happy to inform the honourable members that we have some more students from the United States with us this afternoon. Amongst them we have ten students of Senior grade from the Maxbass High School of Maxbass, North Dakota. These students are under the direction of Mr. R. J. Fee.

We also have with us today, 36 students from the Grygla School in Minnesoda. These are Grade 8 standing students. They're under the direction of Mr. Rusten.

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

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN, Q. C. (Provincial Secretary) (Dauphin): ... to inform the members that at 4:30 this afternoon, the Manitoba Government Employees Association and representatives of the government will be announcing a new salary agreement, which has been reached. In accordance with our arrangement, the details - that is, arrangement with the MGEA - the details will be made public at that time, and I just wish at this time to inform the members that that announcement will be made at 4:30.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party)(Radisson): Mr. Speaker, I thank the Honourable the Provincial Secretary for his announcement. May I ask the Attorney-General an allied matter, a related - and maybe the Provincial Secretary although I do believe it's the Attorney-General - what is the situation in respect of negotiations with the employees of the Manitoba Liquor Commission?

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q. C. (Attorney-General) (Fort Garry): The last word I had on that situation, and it's not recent, was that negotiations were proceeding.

MR. PAULLEY: May I ask a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker? Is there a time limit, or can negotiations go on indefinitely? Is the government holding up negotiations? The employees are quite concerned.

MR. LYON: As and when we receive a recommendation from the Liquor Control Commission and the bargaining unit for them, we'll be in a position to tell you. We take no active part in the negotiations.

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

MR. SIDNEY GREEN (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Minister of Public Works? Is it correct that the Winnipeg Police are being instructed to clear the Memorial Park of young people after the hour of 12 o'clock midnight?

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Speaker, the Winnipeg Police are not receiving any instructions from us. I can't speak of any other instructions.

MR. SAUL M. CHERNIACK, Q. C. (St. John's): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I may address a question to the Honourable the Acting Attorney-General and the Minister of Public Utilities, who I believe is responsible for the Licence Suspension Appeal Board. I'm wondering that in view of the Licence Suspension Appeal Board, under what circumstances did the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council find it advisable on April 29th last, to consider and to reinstate a driver's licence for a man whose licence had been suspended for 90 days by court order. What circumstances would have required such a treatment?

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I can't answer for any particular situation but I can give my honourable friend a generic type of situation where this occurs. The Licence Suspension Appeal Board is authorized to deal only with certain licence suspensions; that is, those arising from impaired driving and so on. Other suspensions are provided under the Highway Traffic Act over which the Licence Suspension Appeal Board has no authority, but in which a person

(MR. LYON cont'd) can make application for remission under the regular remission provisions. In those cases the practice generally, as I am aware of it, is that an application will be made to the Remission Board; the Remission Board will make then a recommendation on the matter, and if it's favourable and if it's agreed to, it's then presented to the Cabinet and an Order-in-Council is passed, as my honourable friend has indicated, from time to time.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well, I'm just wondering, Mr. Speaker, if I may ask a supplementary question then, does the Remission Board, which I believe, I assume consists of members of Cabinet, is it? or civil servants - senior civil servants - do they have the opportunity to hear this matter in the way that it is heard by the Suspension Appeal Board to consider the factors in the same manner, or is it a documentary consideration that's given to it? And how does the Cabinet itself then deal with it? Does the Cabinet investigate the circumstances and deal with it?

MR. LYON: . . . the Remission Board, Mr. Speaker, I really question whether this is a matter for the Orders of the Day, in explaining the duties of the Board that is age-old in government service, but the Remission Board is really an ad hoc board that is established to assist in recommendations to Cabinet on cases of remission. The membership of it consists of, as my honourable friend has indicated, senior civil servants from the Department of the Attorney-General, Department of Mines and Resources - they alternate from time to time. Also the RCMP usually have a member sitting on the board as well. Their investigation, to the best of my knowledge, is mostly documentary although they do utilize the staff of the Chief Inspector of the Liquor Control Commission occasionally to make investigations for them, to provide reports, in addition to police reports, and seeking out advice or recommendations from Magistrates or Justices of the Peace who dealt with the cases in the original instances.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well, Mr. Speaker, then may I, one more supplementary question, my last one to the Honourable the Attorney-General. Can anyone apply for this and what is the procedure involved in making the application?

MR. LYON: There's no point in applying unless you're seeking a remedy from some offence over which the province has jurisdiction.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q.C. (Selkirk): May I ask the Honourable the Attorney-General a question arising out of the questions asked by the Honourable Member for St. John's? Is the Remission Board set up under the provisions of the Treasury Act?

MR. LYON: I will have to take that as notice. My recollection was that it's always been an ad hoc board but I'd have to take that as notice to give a definitive answer.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I addressed my question, if you will recall, to the Acting Attorney-General because he is the one who sponsored this. I'd like to ask a question of him as the Minister of Public Utilities, dealing with the Licence Suspension Appeal Board, whether its powers are statutory, and if the limitations described by the Attorney-General are statutory, would he take under consideration the advisability of extending the power so that matters of this type could be dealt with in an orderly way by the Suspension Appeal Board rather than in a roundabout way through this Remission Board, if I could just request that of him.

MR. SPEAKER: I'm just wondering whether or not that could be dealt with at this particular time. However, the Minister is at liberty if he feels he would like to answer that question.

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Speaker, . . . under consideration. I think the distinction would have to be made that certain matters arise as a result of Criminal Code offences, and I doubt very much that we have any authority as to pass legislation here or to confer by legislation authority on a provincial body. The License Suspension Appeal Board is established by statute to deal with matters which are within the competence of the Legislature in all respects.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the Minister of Agriculture.

HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Minister of Agriculture and Conservation)(Rockwood-Iberville): . . . permission, I would like to contribute to the honourable members a modest pamphlet dealing with some of the experimental work that is being done in the Wilson Creek experimental watershed area. I know the Honourable Member for Gladstone will have some interest in this matter. This is just a brief description of some of the work that's being done there. It's a co-operative effort by both the Federal Department of Agriculture and our Department of Agriculture, the Water and Conservation Branches, Highway Departments; it lists there the

(MR. ENNS cont'd) committee that's set up that is dealing with this matter, and I've asked the Clerk of the House to distribute these.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I note that in Votes and Proceedings No. 43 that has just come to our desk, that there are notices of motion for the introduction of a couple of Acts for next Monday. My question would be to the Honourable the Leader of the House, I understand from him the other day there are certain other pieces of legislation to come from the government. When might we expect from him notices of motion of the introduction of such legislation, and how much more will be introduced at this session?

MR. LYON: . . . honourable friend asking about private Acts over which we have no jurisdiction as a government. The House has jurisdiction over these matters.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, if I might repeat my question, if the Honourable the Attorney-General will listen to me now.

MR. LYON: . . . that's why I couldn't listen to the Leader.

MR. PAULLEY: . . . Chastise the pair of them. My question directed to the Honourable the House Leader, Mr. Speaker, was to the effect that Votes and Proceedings deposited on our desks today, indicated that for Monday next there is notice of motion dealing with two pieces of legislation. My question of the Honourable Minister deals with government legislation. He had suggested a few days ago that there was additional legislation forthcoming from the government. My question is: when would we have Notices of Motion of the introduction of such legislation, and how much more is there that the government intends to produce for this session?

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I have nothing useful that I can add from the statement that I made, I believe, on the debate on the resolution to change the hours of sitting. I will double check, however, with the Legislative Counsel today and see if I can inform the House by Monday as to the final figure. My recollection is that the vast majority of government legislation is either in or has been given notice of. There are a handful of Bills that do not fall in that category, however.

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

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Honourable the First Minister. On April 1st I had an Order for Return No. 29, with respect to the travels outside the Province of Manitoba of the Cabinet Ministers. Could I expect the Return to be tabled this session?

HON. WALTER WEIR (Premier) (Minnedosa): Mr. Speaker, I expect to be able to table the Return before the end of the session.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well, Mr. Speaker, maybe I'll get a - hopefully I'll get a similar answer dealing with Order No. 31, which I brought in on April 10th asking for information regarding the Hedlin-Menzies Report on transition in the north. I wonder whether we could hope to receive that in the next few days.

MR. WEIR: I hope to be able to present that very shortly.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Education) (Gimli): . . . a Return to an Order of the House No. 44, dated February, 1967 on the motion of the Honourable Member for Rhineland. -- (Interjection) --

A MEMBER: It took a year's research.

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

MR. SAMUEL USKIW (Brokenhead): . . . this particular resolution has been debated for a great length of time and no doubt the mover of the motion would probably appreciate if it would get to the point of a vote on the question. However, it is an important resolution and we have had the other day, a new amendment which I think is worthy of consideration. I had seconded the motion on the basis of courtesy to the Honourable Member from Rhineland, not necessarily that I was in agreement with the proposal as it is on the Order Paper, but in studying it carefully I find that it is a very ambiguous amendment and can be interpreted in many ways. I find that I could interpret that amendment to be a good amendment if I ignore the fact that during the estimates on agriculture, that the Honourable Member from Rhineland made some specific references to what his interpretation of inland storage for wheat was. My interpretation could be much different than that of the Honourable Member from Rhineland.

Inland storage, Mr. Speaker, could be storage on the farm for example, it doesn't have

(MR. USKIW cont'd) to be storage that the government would build or that the Wheat Board would create. It could be in my opinion, interpreted as storage right on the farm, and for this reason I feel I could support the amendment, that consideration could in fact be given to ask the Wheat Board to provide storage payment to farmers that are caught in a situation whereby they can't deliver sufficient quantities of grain during the course of a crop year, and this procedure, Mr. Chairman, would probably enable the farmers to meet their financial commitments. On the other hand, I could also recommend to the House consideration that - the Wheat Board, that is, should give consideration or the government, to the idea of in fact purchasing the grain, although not moving it off the farm. This again could be interpreted as inland storage under the control or jurisdiction and control of the Canadian Wheat Board. This isn't a new idea; it's been done in other countries and during periods of slow movement of grain, I am sure that consideration could well be given to this particular idea, and it is in this way, Mr. Speaker, that I intend to support the amendment before us this afternoon.

Usually one is not surprised when we see motions concerning the problems of wheat surpluses as they are called today at a time when wheat sales are low. Quite often before governments tend to act on problems of this nature, sometimes the surpluses disappear and the first thing we know that resolutions of this nature disappear as well. So it is hoped, Mr. Chairman, that the House gives due consideration to proposals such as this so that we may have action before we arrive at the time where action is not even necessary, that these are usually short term problems and if they're going to be dealt with at all they ought to be dealt with very quickly.

If we look at the situation today, Mr. Chairman, we find that we lost approximately 20 cents a bushel in the returns on wheat; and in addition to that, Mr. Chairman, if you recognize that we have substantial carry-over of wheat from last year, that if a farmer is going to borrow money against a bushel of wheat, if he's going to borrow from the money market at eight percent that the price of that bushel of wheat will in fact be reduced by another 14 cents a bushel just by the interest factor on the loan. So, Mr. Chairman, it is an important problem. We have a loss of 20 cents a bushel in the market place and now we will suffer a loss of approximately 14 cents a bushel for every bushel that we have to borrow money against to enable the farmers to keep on their operations. I recommend to the House that we give this amendment some consideration and possibly urge the Federal Government and the Wheat Board to take a good look at the question as a short term problem, recognizing that in the long run we will likely have to increase our production of this very important agricultural commodity.

This is pretty well all I have to say on it, Mr. Speaker. There may be others that will add to it, but this is simply my interpretation of what could be implied as "inland storage" and how we would recommend that we either have legislation or programs to accommodate the situation.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members. For the benefit of the honourable members that were not in the House when the question was put, I would refer them to Page 5. We're dealing with the adjourned debate of the Honourable Member for Virden and the amendment thereto; that is the vote is being taken on the amendment.

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

YEAS: Messrs. Campbell, Cherniack, Clement, Dawson, Desjardins, Dow, Fox, Froese, Green, Guttormson, Harris, Hillhouse, Johnston, Kawchuk, Miller, Patrick, Paulley, Petursson, Shoemaker, Tanchak, 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, Spivak, Stanes, Steen, Watt, Weir, Witney and Mesdames Forbes and Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 22; Nays, 29.

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

MR. DOUGLAS CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, as the last speaker mentioned, this resolution has received a great deal of attention and I think there isn't any apology necessary for the attention that has been paid to such an important matter. I have the feeling that the question of selling the grain crops of Manitoba, particularly the wheat crop, is perhaps the most important single item that we could be considering so far as the farmers of Manitoba are

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd) concerned, and so even though I know how unpopular a person is who speaks at any length at this time of the session and under these conditions, I still think an attempt should be made to rescue the resolution that my honourable friend from Virden has placed on the Order Paper. As my honourable friend the Minister of Agriculture has said, he deserves credit for bringing this important matter to the attention of the House and the fact that he got his resolution on so early is sure an example to other members that if they want to have a resolution well discussed in this House the thing to do is get the resolution in good and early for this one has had much more consideration than the ones at the tail end of the list are going to receive.

But I am still so far from satisfied with the original resolution, Mr. Speaker, that I simply must make one more attempt to get the kind of consideration that I think this urgent and important matter deserves; and if we can't get it then I for one simply can not support the original resolution. Because let me repeat, Mr. Speaker, in spite of the good intentions of the mover of the resolution, in spite of the fact that the subject is a most important one, the resolution simply is not practical and why should we pass in this House impractical resolutions.

I pay no attention at all because I don't think it's tremendously important to the fact that there's any implied criticism of the Wheat Board. That doesn't matter particularly, I'm not above criticizing civil servants if they deserve it and I don't think that's of consequence even though I don't think that they deserve it in this case. But I certainly do object to the fact that the proposal that is recommended here simply will not work, it is impractical, I think we simply hurt ourselves in passing resolutions hoping for consideration when the burden of those resolutions is so illogical as this one.

Now I want to compliment the Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne for what he said the other day. The Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne made what I consider is a really useful contribution to this debate. True, he did what a lot of the rest of us do at times. He used someone else's words, but at least, at least the words that he used came from very informed sources, and my honourable friend read them on to the record here and I think they're a most useful contribution to this debate. I will not take time to repeat them although they are well worthy of repetition. Honourable members who wish to can find most of them on Page 1463 of Hansard where my honourable friend from Souris-Lansdowne quotes at length what Mr. Runciman, President of the United Grain Growers said at a meeting in Saskatchewan, and that is certainly well worth anybody taking time to re-read. Then on the next page he makes brief reference to what Mr. Bill Parker of the Manitoba Pool Elevators said and Mr. Charles Gibbings of the Saskatchewan Pool. These are worthwhile remarks; these are the opinions of people who are vitally interested in this question and who really know what they're talking about. I have copies of both of those speeches. My honourable friend read just from the Country Guide report of those speeches but they were good reports and they were concise and to the point. I have the full copy of both of those speeches and I would be glad to make a copy available to any one of the honourable members who wishes to read the full text -- and they're worthwhile too. I think these speeches should be read by members of this House.

But I think there's a better thing than that, Mr. Speaker. I'm going to suggest that now we ask Mr. Runciman and Mr. Parker to come and meet with the Agricultural Committee and see what they say to us about this situation. It will be better for us to talk to them than to read what they said. I'm going to make a deal with my honourable friend, the mover of the resolution and the Honourable the Member for Souris-Lansdowne. I'm not generally a betting man, I want a sure thing if I ever bet, but I think I've got one here. I'll make this deal with the two honourable gentlemen. If either one of Mr. Runciman or Mr. Parker, either one -- if they want to go to the trouble of asking Mr. Gibbings to come too, I'll include him -- if any one, if any one of them advises us to pass my honourable friend's resolution, I'll buy a good dinner for my two honourable friends and myself -- (Interjection) -- not for the House -- oh, that's too big; that's too big; that's too much. This is just a poor man's bet. But if either one of them recommends that we pass that resolution then I'll buy a dinner for my two honourable friends. Not because they aren't just as interested as anybody in this House in what's being done; they are every bit as interested. They both head huge organizations that, together with Mr. Gibbings who was quoted, market much more than half of the grain crops of Canada; they both are tremendously interested and tremendously knowledgeable; and yet I'm willing to say that I'm sure, and I haven't talked to them on this matter, but I'm willing to say that I'm sure that neither one of them would want this House to pass this resolution, simply because it isn't practical. So why

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd.) not have them come over and meet with the Agricultural Committee. It hasn't met yet. It can be constituted in minutes. All we need is a morning. I can't guarantee that these gentlemen will come. I'm sure that if they're invited they will go to great length in order to come. All we need is a morning. We talk the situation over with them. It can't help but be useful to the members of the committee. I'm sure that out of that we can get a better resolution than the one that's before us.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to once again ask my honourable friends on the government side, don't turn down sensible amendments just because they come from this side of the House; let's deal with a matter that is so important, so vital to the welfare of agriculture in this province, let's deal with it in a statesmanlike manner, let's get the best answer we can.

I asked my honourable friend from Gladstone, asked about getting the Canadian Wheat Board representatives here. Well, maybe there was a feeling on the part of the government that the Canadian Wheat Board people were after all Federal civil servants and certainly civil servants -- maybe they felt that they shouldn't put them in the position of coming here and questioning them -- I don't know the thinking of the government -- at least they turned that suggestion down. Now I'm suggesting that we ask these two gentlemen who were quoted by my honourable friend for Souris-Lansdowne and who most appropriately read into the record some things that they have had to say on this matter. So I'm going to move, Mr. Speaker, seconded by the Honourable the Member for Selkirk, that all the words after the word "Board" in the first line of the resolution be struck out and the following be substituted therefor: "Markets wheat, oats and barley on behalf of the Manitoba farmers; and

Whereas second only to the farmers themselves grain handling organizations are vitally interested in the whole question of grain marketing and payments to the farmers of returns from sales of these products; and

Whereas United Grain Growers and Manitoba Pool Elevators are farmer-owned organizations principally engaged in grain handling;

Therefore Be It Resolved that the Committee on Agriculture be instructed to invite Mr. W. J. Parker of Manitoba Pool Elevators, and Mr. Mac Runciman of the United Grain Growers to meet with it to discuss the marketing of Manitoba's grain crops, the function of the Canadian Wheat Board therein and the times of payment by the Canadian Wheat Board to farmers from the pools it operates on their behalf. "

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, before I take my seat that I want to correct what the Honourable Minister of Agriculture stated in his address a few days ago when he said that the Committee on Agriculture could at any time call people before them to get representations from them. This, Mr. Speaker, as you know is incorrect. I know my honourable friend didn't intend to make an incorrect statement. After all he hasn't been here as long as some of the rest of us. But the fact is that the Committees, the standing committees of this House, can investigate only those subjects that are referred to them by this House and once they are referred to them of course they have great powers in the method of even compelling witnesses if they wish so to do, and sending for papers and documents and all such things. But, being standing committees of the House they are restricted in their operation to the things that are referred from this House. Therefore the resolution reads the way it is of the Committee being instructed to invite these people to come and make representations to us.

Mr. Speaker, in all seriousness and earnestness I suggest to the House that this would be a worthwhile move and would result in some action that would be much more beneficial than passing the resolution in its original form.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. J. DOUGLAS WATT (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne, that the debate be adjourned - unless any other member wishes to speak.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate of the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Inkster and the proposed motion of the Leader of the Opposition in amendment thereto and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface in further amendment thereto. Order, please.

Having reference to the sub-amendment of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface and to the amendment of the Honourable Member of the Opposition as appended to the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Inkster in the matter of the establishment of one

(MR. SPEAKER cont'd.) municipal government in Greater Winnipeg.

Reviewing the detail and in particular items of reference pertaining to the subject before the House, I feel that the honourable members might be placed in a peculiar situation in determining their course of action in their attitude toward what in my opinion are two separate approaches to the main motion.

For the edification of the House reference was also made to Beauchesne's Fourth Edition, Citation 201, from which I quote sub-paragraph 3: "Since the purpose of a sub-amendment is to alter the amendment, it should not enlarge upon the scope of the amendment but it should deal with matters that are not covered by the amendment. If it is intended to bring up matters foreign to the amendment the Member should wait until the amendment is disposed of and move a new amendment." Everything considered I must rule the amendment out of order at this time. I do this having in mind that the Honourable Member for St. Boniface may act as he sees fit when the House has determined and registered its opinion on the amendment yet to be dealt with.

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

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, on the amendment and what I have to say has no direct bearing on the resolution that has been proposed by the Member for Inkster. It seems to me that one can deal solely with the proposition proposed by the Leader of the Opposition as a distinct proposition, one which deals with the question of referendum in certain areas of responsibility and it's on that matter that I just briefly want to express my personal opinion. I want it clear that I'm expressing my own personal opinion on this matter because the question as to whether or not this House should refer matters to the ratepayers or voters has been one that has been considered in this House on a number of occasions.

I think though that it would be proper for me to relate the present amendment to the original introduction of the bill setting up the Metropolitan Corporation. I took the stand at that particular time that we have a responsibility in this House as members of this House to make up our minds respecting what the municipal corporation should be in Manitoba. Under the British North America Act, as I understand that document, the responsibility of the municipality rests with the provincial authority. We are that provincial authority. We create municipalities; we change the boundaries of municipalities and do all of those other acts that are necessary for the conduct within the Province of Manitoba the operation of our municipalities.

There is a referendum that takes place in Manitoba every three or four or five years respecting the members of this House that pass their judgment insofar as municipal government is concerned and I accept that responsibility, Mr. Speaker. I may not do everything that is right as a representative of my constituency but the constituency has the right to reject me whenever it so desires. I feel that it is my responsibility as a member of this House to make up my mind as to what should prevail without the reference by way of referenda to the ratepayer. There are certain avenues of human endeavour that I would suggest that it may be advisable to have the opinions of the individual taxpayer or voter or resident of a municipality expressed and allow them the privilege of expressing them. I think offhand of the question of Sunday sports, the questions of liquor outlets and other allied matters. But I think insofar as the government structure in Manitoba, this is our responsibility as members of this House to make up our minds. I think that if I recall correctly we did have a number of propositions in the House in the past requesting referenda of matters like this and on each and every occasion I've opposed, as I can recall, the reference to the local ratepayers. Not that I'm opposed to them expressing their opinions and I'm sure, I'm sure that as the debate goes on, not necessarily inside of this House but outside it as well, on the whole proposition of one large city or amalgamated city, that there will be debate, that all of the members of this House, particularly those in the Greater Winnipeg area, will be placed in a position where they will have representations made to them. And I'm prepared to accept them, I'm prepared to accept my responsibility. I've been criticized over and over again by many people because of the fact that this Assembly passed the Metropolitan Act in 1960 or 1962, I'm not just sure which year, but whichever it was. But I've stood firm insofar as my own position is concerned. I accept my responsibility. I cannot support the proposition of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition because I think that it would be a setting aside of our responsibilities as members of this House and I'm prepared to make up my mind and to arrive at my conclusions, or the conclusions as to what I think is best, on the basis of evidences presented to me in this House.

So I say, Mr. Speaker, I cannot accept the amendment proposed by the Leader of the

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.) Opposition. I am speaking as a member of this House, the representative of the constituency of Radisson and not at the present time as Leader of my Party expressing a firm Party decision. There may be differences of opinion within my Party and I respect those differences of opinion if they are there. But I think by and large we have accepted the general principle of responsible government and I think that as a member of a responsible government it is up to me to make the decision and to accept the responsibility for the creation or disbanding of our municipalities here in this Assembly and not by way of referenda, which we don't have to approve of in any case. The responsibility is ours. I accept it.

HON. DONALD W. CRAIK (Minister of Mines and Natural Resources) (St. Vital):
 . . . at this time. If not, I would move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre, that debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER:

MR. DOUGLAS M. STANES (St. James): Mr. Speaker, I adjourned the debate for the Honourable the Minister of Health.

HON. CHARLES H. WITNEY (Minister of Health) (Flin Flon): Mr. Speaker, when we deal with this resolution we are really dealing with two matters of concern that have occurred over the time since The Federal Medical Care Act was passed in Ottawa and that has been the question of costs and that has been also the question as to whether or not there would be any change.

When the Federal Medical Care Act was passed and when it was first introduced to the provinces in 1965 by the Prime Minister, many of the provinces at that time indicated that they would be joining the plan in one form or another. And then as the months went by and as the year began to go by concerns began to be expressed about the cost of the Federal Medical Care Plan and I think it was significant to note that the plan was delayed by a year. It was supposed to have come into operation by July 1, 1967, and it came into operation -- it was then delayed for a year to come into operation by July 1st, 1968. And when you speculate as to why that change was made, I think one of the significant factors at that time was a concern that had been expressed by the Federal Government as to just what it was going to cost. And then of course I think back to the meeting of the Premiers that took place in Halifax and while not all of the Premiers of Canada were there at that time, emanating from that meeting again came an expression of cost with respect to the Federal Medical Care Act and what it would cost the provinces. And as I've mentioned that while not all the provinces were at that meeting, not all premiers were represented, some of the larger provinces were represented, and those men at that time called for a meeting with the Federal Government to consider the matter.

And then of course this question of cost began to arise within the Federal Government itself and as I mentioned the other day, and perhaps you were not here, Mr. Speaker, when we were dealing with the estimates of the Department of Health, I mentioned at that time the expressions of opinion that came publicly from Cabinet Ministers of the Federal Government which showed a disagreement or difference of opinion with respect to what the eventual costs would be. And this question of cost has been subject to many wide variations. When you are dealing with a matter of insurance for the costs of medical services alone, you can have people who are on this side who say that the costs will not rise substantially and you can have people on this side who say that the costs will rise substantially and the people who are on this side -- and the people who are on this side are the people that you cannot say are irresponsible people, they are people who express their viewpoint with equal force and with equal vigor, which leaves at the time that we are considering this resolution a doubt still in the minds of many people as to what the eventual cost of the cost of insurance for medical services is going to be, not particularly for this year, not particularly for the next year, but for years ahead; and you could also find a great difference of opinion as to what the escalation of those costs are going to be. I think, Mr. Speaker, that it is expressed by the fact that under the election campaign that's going right now, we have the leader of one party, the Conservative Party who was saying that after the election he would call the provinces together and the Honourable Member for St. Boniface advised us the other day that the Prime Minister advised him that after the election the provinces would be called together to consider the Federal medical care scheme. So for what reasons are they being called together? Obviously they are going to be called together, if they are to be called together, because of this concern about the cost of insurance against the costs of medical illness.

(MR. WITNEY cont'd.)

Now the other factor, Mr. Speaker, is the factor of change: Would there be any change to the Federal medical care legislation? As I pointed out, there was one significant change made, the Act was deferred for a period of one year from July 1st, 1967 to July 1st, 1968 and even after that change you'll perhaps recall all of the speculation that took place in the news media about whether or not there would be a further change and that further change or deferment was generally tied in with the question of what would be the cost eventually and in years ahead of the Federal Medical Care Act.

At the time that we passed Bill 68 in this House and the time that the Federal medical care legislation went through for July 1, 1968, it appeared at that time, Mr. Speaker, that it was going to be in effect by July 1, 1968, and, Mr. Speaker, we passed our legislation on that basis. But I would like to point out to you that it was after that, that again there was doubt and that that doubt exists even today by the statement of the two major leaders, of the Leader of the Conservatives and the Leader of the Liberals, that there might be a change. For what other reason . . .

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): The Minister stated the other day and again today that I stated that Mr. Trudeau told me that he would call the provinces together. What I clearly stated, that Mr. Trudeau said that this will definitely come in at this time, that it was the law of the land, and I wish the Minister would explain this and say this, and that he would be ready to discuss this at any time with the provinces and that it might be possible that a change could be brought at any later date. This is not what the Minister is saying right now.

MR. WITNEY: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for St. Boniface says that "he's going to be willing to discuss it with the provinces." For what purpose would he be willing to discuss it with the province? Only because the provinces are saying that there ought to be a change, that the provinces are concerned about the Federal Medical Care Act; and if they were not saying that, then why would the man say that he was prepared to discuss with them. There would only be a reason for it.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that there have been two other significant events that have taken place recently, with the interpretation of the present legislation in Ottawa. Now I understand, I haven't heard the news myself, but I understand that the British Columbia government have made application to join the Federal government plan by July 1, 1968, and it is our interpretation of that plan that if they do, that that plan then -- if they are accepted, that there has been a different interpretation of the Act than the interpretation that most of the provinces have. And the second province that already has its application in is the Province of Saskatchewan, and the Province of Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker, has recently introduced a deterrent. Now all along when the question of deterrents and co-insurance were being considered in this question, we were referred to the terminology of universality and the terminology of universality as it is reflected in the Hospital Act where deterrents are not accepted. And while the Federal Government did say they would not rule out entirely deterrents, the deterrents were such that they could not significantly alter the terms of universality.

Now is the new qualifications in Saskatchewan, or are the new qualifications in Saskatchewan going to be considered as deterrents that will not alter that conception of universality, or are they going to be considered as altering the terms of universality and not be accepted? I'd like to suggest that even in the resolution this question of change or the possibility of it is reflected even here because the resolution in the second whereas says that Whereas the Federal Government has indicated its intention -- "has indicated its intention." It doesn't say, "has stated it would proceed." It is stating "indicated its intention." And I suppose that the accusation that might be made is that I'm again making a play on words. But nevertheless, nevertheless, I would suggest to you that indicating its intention, indicates that the resolution itself is questioning whether or not there is going to be a change.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that this matter must be clarified as to what is actually going to happen on July 1, 1968. What is going to be the interpretation of the Act? Is it going to be interpreted, if it's still there, such that the B. C. plan is in operation, a plan that's based on need? Is it going to be interpreted so that the deterrent factors in Saskatchewan are going to be accepted? These matters must be clarified.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I move that the resolution be amended by deleting everything after the word "and" in the fourth line, and adding

"Whereas all provinces have expressed concern as to the cost of the Federal plan for

(MR. WITNEY cont'd.) medical care insurance; and

"Whereas the provinces have expressed the desire for a conference with the Federal Government to discuss the national medical insurance plan; and

"Whereas original estimates and escalation of costs of the Federal medical insurance plan have been subject to wide variation; and

"Whereas there is a public need for an economically sound medical insurance plan for Canadian people,

"Therefore Be It Resolved that this House request that the Federal Government convene a conference of the provinces at the earliest possible date for further discussion and deliberation on the costs of the national medical insurance plan and its ability to effectively meet the needs of the people of the various regions of Canada."

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): . . . suggest that you might consider the resolution on Page 16 in the name of my colleague the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, Resolution No. 35, which is already on the Order Paper and calls for exactly that type of conference. I believe that the proposed amendment would therefore be out of order on the grounds of anticipation.

MR. SPEAKER: I didn't get the seconder of the Honourable Minister. Thank you very much. I'll take this matter under advisement and will report when it appears on the Order Paper again.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, while you have that under advisement, it would be in order for me to speak on the main motion . . . on that, Mr. Speaker, if it is in order for me to speak at this time on the main motion, I would desire to do so.

MR. SPEAKER: I must compliment the Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party for really picking out a tiddler for us today. It would seem that -- at least I'm advised that it would probably be the wisest thing to do if the honourable gentleman would withhold his speech until such time as the matter to do with the amendment has been determined, whether or not it will be in order at that time.

MR. PAULLEY: I appreciate, Mr. Speaker, the situation that you are in. I would love to have been able to reply to my honourable friend this afternoon and take part in the debate immediately, but I don't know if this problem has arisen before. It might be one that I would forego the privilege of replying to my friend until such time as you consider the amendment, and I would suggest, Your Honour, that you might be able to delve into the books in respect of similar situations for the future.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes. It was a question as to whether the Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party wished to speak to the main motion or to the amendment, and of course a decision is pending on the amendment. It is not acceptable to the House.

MR. PAULLEY: It is the question that I want to speak to, Mr. Speaker, not the amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder if the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party would bear with the Chair on this particular occasion and I will endeavour to see to it that it doesn't happen again.

MR. PAULLEY: . . . be cleared up for the future, and may I just suggest, on a point of order, that it is a peculiar situation, because while you have the amendment under advisement, we haven't really any other proposition before the House than the main motion, but I'm prepared to defer to your request for consideration and not proceed at this time.

MR. SPEAKER: We acknowledge that consideration.

MR. CAMPBELL: I'm sure you won't need advice on it at all because it is so simple, but surely my honourable friend the Leader of the New Democratic Party knows that when you have withheld your decision, that decision is going to be either that there is an amendment before us or there isn't. If you could have made that decision immediately you'd have done it, but while you consider, while you are still thinking that it might be possible that it can be allowed, you are simply saying now, if you allow my honourable friend to speak, that you're going to rule it out of order.

MR. SPEAKER: May I consider the matter closed for the time being?

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker . . . a question to the mover of the amendment prior to the closing of the whole matter. On the proposed amendment, could he supply to our group, and I presume the other groups in the House as well, a copy of his amendment, as we may not otherwise have it.

MR. SPEAKER: Shall the House proceed?

MR. CAMPBELL: . . . solution but it might do all right.

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

MR. RODNEY S. CLEMENT (Birtle-Russell): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the honourable members from the government for the kind reception. I know they are feeling awfully sorry that there's a possibility they won't have to listen to too many more of these addresses. However, the resolution that we are discussing today I think, Mr. Speaker, is perhaps one of the most important that has come before this Legislature this year. It is one that is in the eyes and the minds of every single person, man, woman and child in Manitoba. This five percent sales tax has become a very, very controversial topic, in fact so controversial I'm sure the Honourable Member from Wolseley refused to come out in the country to run. He would have heard a great deal about it.

Now in the resolution there are six different Whereases, and on each one of these Whereases I'm sure a very lengthy address could be prepared. "Whereas taxes should not be an oppressive burden on individuals." Now this is generally accepted that it shouldn't be. "Whereas taxes should not discourage development." "Whereas the sales tax has now been in effect for some months in Manitoba," and "Whereas in certain cases such as used clothing, work clothing, soaps, cleaning supplies, school supplies, labour and service charges and other necessities, the tax is oppressive on the average wage earner." Now this, there is no doubt about it, it is oppressive and in many cases creates a hardship. Why a woman should have to pay five percent sales tax on soap to keep clean, keep her clothes washed, is beyond me. Why we should have to pay it on school supplies, and now there are certain conditions where labour should have to pay the tax. This is right, but many they should not have to.

The next Whereas, "Whereas in some of its applications the sales tax can discourage development, and Whereas it would be in the interests of Manitoba to periodically review the effect of taxes" - this I believe is only a reasonable and fair request.

So the final part of the resolution "Therefore Be It Resolved that the Law Amendments Committee of the House be instructed to undertake during this session a review of the sales tax and its effects and make recommendations to the House." Well now, the Law Amendments Committee, I would think, would be well qualified. This tax has only been in effect for a few months. It's been talked about and it's been very, very controversial and I don't hesitate for one minute, Mr. Speaker, to suggest that there are certain cases of unfairness, hardships, and somewhere people should have permission and the right to come before a committee of this Legislature to present their briefs and their beefs, if I may use the word, Mr. Attorney-General.

MR. LYON: No bouquets, though.

MR. CLEMENT: Well, I don't know where the bouquets would come from. But for instance in the agriculture part of it; in one of the cards that were sent out about agriculture it explicitly said that grain storage would not be taxable. However, the Provincial Treasurer and I have had several discussions and I'm sure one of his - not salesmen - one of his officers have been to see a farmer in our locality who feels very very hostile about it, and I can see no reason why a steel granary should not be tax free. Farm hoists are taxable. Why should a farm hoist not be tax free? Fuel filters. A farmer goes to get a battery for his tractor, he has to pay a sales tax on it. And of course there's the old business, you can buy plow shears but you have to pay the sales tax on the nuts and bolts.

Well now, if you buy an engine for a grain loader you can get the engine by filling out a certificate and signing it. Now why should this not be possible - and I'm sure that it is possible and it would be extremely practical for a farmer who was buying a farm hoist for his grain truck to be able to sign a certificate to the effect that it's on a grain truck. What else is it going to be used for? There's a few other commodities on the farm that they use trucks for but they're all to do with agriculture.

I would like to also point out that, in regards to a municipality, the Municipality of Russell are contemplating buying a \$40,000 grader which means a \$2,000.00 tax. Now this is just taxing one form of government by another form of government, and quite frankly I think it's something that should be checked once every year or once every two years, and as far as I know this winter the Law Amendments Committee has only, to the best of my knowledge, not met more than two or three times. We had a week last week where every morning was free, and I'm sure that if people were advised that the Law Amendments Committee were going to conduct hearings on the sales tax that we would be able to fill the room to capacity.

The sales tax with regard to automobiles: - it's quite feasible, and it has happened, where

May 10, 1968

(MR. CLEMENT cont'd) an automobile is purchased for \$4,000, the five percent sales tax is \$200.00; that same car is perhaps resold within three or four months for \$3,000; another \$150.00 sales tax is collected, and three or four months later it's resold once again for \$2,500 and another \$125.00 would be collected, making a total of \$475.00 that could be collected on one year on one automobile. This I think is most unfair. The Saskatchewan form of sales tax, once the car is paid for, is bought, the sales tax is finished and never again is sales tax collected on it.

I think that this sales tax is just so important that well, it's caused so much controversy, so much talk, that the Honourable the Member for Wolseley, the ex-First Minister, I don't think there's a shadow of a world of a doubt that this is one of the main reasons why he has abdicated his position as First Minister and wants to go into further fields of politics. And I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that at his nomination the other night he said he would see to it the tax burden would not become so oppressive as to burden the small businessman. Well, Mr. Speaker, if there's any man living that's ever brought on a sales tax or other taxes that have affected small business, agriculture, and everybody else is concerned, it's this the Former First Minister, and I would hope to goodness that the people, the constituency that he's representing will remind him of this and if he does get elected that at least he will not carry on with the same sort of tax ideas, and if the Conservative Government did become the Government of Canada the chances are he would be the Minister of Finance, and God help the country if that happens.

Mr. Speaker, without any further ado, I feel that this is an excellent resolution and I would sincerely request the government to go along with this resolution and let us have a reappraisal of some of the problems of the five percent sales tax.

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

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): If no one else wishes to speak, why I'll close the debate, feeling certain that it will be unanimous when the vote comes. Since I moved the resolution some weeks ago, I took the opportunity of writing to the Taxation Division in the Treasury Building over there, to get their comments on certain items that are taxed and then to inquire of them of certain exemptions, because I found it rather difficult to get any intelligent answers from across the floor, and then I thought that I should get something on record.

The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell, I believe, mentioned the subject of grain storage, and he said that he thought that under certain conditions, materials that were used to build grain storage were exempt; in other conditions they were taxable; and you can find this similarity completely through the Bill on so many different items. For instance, if you buy a new farm tractor, or garden tractor I suppose, or any farm implement that requires calcium chloride in the tires, and surely you find them in all tractors in this day and age, then calcium chloride is exempt because you have bought the tractor equipped with the calcium chloride, but yet if you require additional calcium chloride to put in the tractor tires, or you buy a new tractor tire and require calcium chloride to put in it, then it's taxable. So on the one hand you've got it exempt and on the other hand it's taxable.

On lumber and material that is required for the construction - and Mr. Speaker, I'm reading now from the letter that I have from the Assistant Deputy Minister of Taxation - I didn't know they had one, but they do have one; one at least. I asked him 19 different questions and he answered each and every one of them. I'm asking now about Item No. 7.

A MEMBER: Don't get him fired now.

MR. SHOEMAKER: I don't intend -- he's a very cooperative man and I hope the government will not see fit to relieve him of his great responsibility. He states that "Lumber and materials required . . ." -- (Interjection) -- Oh, you are? Well, it's because of my helpers on all sides, I guess, not because I'm not speaking, I don't think.

A MEMBER: Oh, you have your ups and downs.

MR. SHOEMAKER: But I will try and accommodate my honourable friend and seek cooperation from my deskmates. Now: "Lumber and materials required for the construction of livestock feeders is exempt from Revenue Tax when the purchaser certifies, at the time of sales, that these materials are to be used exclusively in the business of farming. Revenue tax would be applicable to the purchase price of the lumber or other materials where the livestock feeders form an integral part of a barn or other farm buildings."

Well, isn't that a stupid kind of a regulation? That is, if you build a self feeder and have it a foot away from the barn it's completely tax exempt, but if you drive a nail into it to hold it

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd) against the barn and it forms part of the barn, then it's all taxable because it's attached to it. And then my guess is, too, that you could go into the lumber yard and order a couple of thousand feet of lumber and say, "I'm going to use it to build a couple of chicken feeders," and some of the fellows wouldn't know that it wouldn't take 2,000 feet to build them, so you'd get it tax exempt and then you could take the lumber home and build some granaries out of it, and no doubt this is going on all the time but it's a silly thing to start with. And my honourable friend the Member for Souris-Lansdowne said, speaking from his seat - I don't suppose it got onto Hansard - but when I was speaking the other day about the tax on building materials that it worked a hardship on the farmers, he said, "I quit buying it." He quit buying it because of the tax. Well that's bad for the whole economy if he and other people like him quit buying it.

Now on question No. 8; I asked him whether or not paint, paint required to paint the barn or the chicken house, was taxable. Yes it is. Paint is taxable under The Revenue Tax Act when used exclusively for farm buildings. So isn't the farmer, then, discouraged from keeping his buildings painted? I think that's a terrible thing. Surely to goodness, in this day and age a farmer would like to paint some of his outbuildings and keep them looking nice and preserved.

Water pressure systems are regarded as subject to the application of Revenue Tax. Now I was told that on the introduction of the Bill, by someone, that a water pressure system in the house was taxable but if you bought one for the barn it wasn't. I'm still not clear on this, whether you buy one for the barn. Farm horses, cattle and the like are taxable at an auction sale, I believe, but if a neighbour, if one neighbour sells a horse to his next door neighbour, then that's an individual sale and it's not taxable. I asked him specifically about revenue tax on fruit jars because my honourable friend the auctioneer from Carillon said that if there was a teaspoon of honey left in the bottom of a fruit jar it wasn't taxable. Now that's a fact. If there is any food at all in a fruit jar then the whole thing is exempt, but if it's absolutely clean at an auction sale, then it's taxable; and certainly all of what I'm saying points up the fact that the tax needs to be reviewed annually. Just needs to be reviewed, and that's all we're asking. Let's have a new look at it.

Where - and this one has caused me some concern as it no doubt has caused you, Mr. Speaker - where a church group, the Lions Club, the Kiwanis, the Rotary Club or any other service club in the province - the Knights of Columbus, my friend says; certainly, them too - if they put on a banquet, or at their regular dinners, they can serve members of their club a meal costing \$1.99 tax free, but if it's over \$2.00 then they have to charge, and if you invite a guest in, if you take the strictest interpretation of the Act, if you bring a guest in who is not a member and the meal is \$2.25, then you're supposed to pay a tax on that meal; or if there's a half a dozen guests there, then you would have to pay the Revenue Tax on the meals of the non-members - that's what it says here.

So all of these things, as I've said, just points up the need to have a review. When the Revenue Bill was introduced last year and passed after about one month of debate, and we in this group insisted that it be referred, after second reading, to Law Amendments, and the government turned us down on that one, both of the daily papers thought that it should be, a bill as important as this one and one that indeed results in \$50 million of revenue - because that's what it is going to produce this year, it produces \$50 million in revenue - surely then there's nothing wrong with having a look at it once a year to iron out some of the, well, the most difficult sections to interpret, and make certain amendments. So this is all we're asking my honourable friends to do, is just let's have a look at it; let's review it once a year; and I hope my honourable friend the Member for Souris-Lansdowne, who apparently has quit buying certain things because of the tax, will at least vote with us on this one, and Mr. Speaker, I seek the co-operation and support of every member of the House.

MR. SPEAKER put the question.

MR. SPEAKER: It's rather difficult but I think the nays have it.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Did I hear you correctly?

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the Members.

For the benefit of the honourable members who were out of the House, may I direct their attention to Page 5, as discussing the adjourned debate of the Honourable Member for Gladstone.

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

YEAS: Messrs. Campbell, Cherniack, Clement, Dawson, Desjardins, Dow, Doern, Fox, Froese, Green, Guttormson, Harris, Hillhouse, Johnston, Kawchuk, Miller, Molgat, Patrick,

(Standing Vote cont'd) Paulley, Petursson, Shoemaker, Uskiw, Vielfaure.

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

MR. CLERK: Yeas 23; Nays 29.

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

MR. R. O. LISSAMAN (Brandon): Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Hamiota, in proposing this resolution to the House made several points during his discussion of the subject. He made the point that an Auditor-General would confirm money spent, being spent for the purpose for which it was intended to be spent; the Auditor-General would point out instances of bad judgment; he would assure reliability of a pre-audit. He suggested that there might be some hurry in this connection, that time was limited, and that it would improve the budget forecast, that it would reassure the public on the Manitoba Development Fund procedures, and would save money.

Now the Comptroller-General at present confirms that money is spent as authorized, and I think that members would agree that pretty generally public auditors, for municipalities and so on, usually this is a normal procedure and one would expect that the procedure would be used here. On the matter of bad judgment he covered the point of an army officer receiving a pension, and I failed to get the point in this particular thing. He also touched upon the case of an election cost including phoning of police, money for police at the polls and then found that the Election Act prohibited this. Well, the Comptroller-General does now check in instances like this, and if it's found to be a case of bad judgment it is returned to the department for its reconsideration.

In the matter of reliability of audit, haste, that it might be a daily hurried process, I'd like to suggest to him that this should not be the case. The Comptroller-General has 40 which do pre-audit work so that it is not too likely that anyone is over-loaded and hasty procedures are used.

In the matter of post-audit procedures, the Comptroller-General department checks inventories; he checks the purchasing procedures; naturally checks the accounting; checks pay-rolls in the field; and so there is again no particular advantage to a change in the role to that of Auditor-General in that particular instance.

Now as to budgets, I would suggest that the Comptroller-General or Auditor-General would probably have little or nothing to do with the matter of a budget; this is determined on government policies and figures from the various departments.

Now, as to the point that it would reassure the public on the operation of the Manitoba Development Fund, Manitoba Development Fund has its own auditor. It has its responsibilities. It's within the powers of the company, and it operates as a separate Crown corporation and, quite understandably, with its own auditing procedures.

I question very much whether the many things that the Honourable Member for Hamiota claimed, that the role of a Comptroller-General would assure, I question whether this carries as much value as he suggests, but because in the expenditure of public money procedures must not only be careful, they must also display to the general public and to the casual observer that these precautions are taken as ever day procedures, and it is important that there be no doubt in the minds of the public but what the expenditures and operations of the government are most carefully scrutinized, therefore Mr. Speaker, I wish to amend the resolution, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. James, that the resolution be amended by striking out everything after the third "whereas" and substituting therefor the following:

"Whereas it has been suggested that an independent Auditor-General could prove of benefit in providing savings to the taxpayer, and

"Whereas the office of Comptroller-General in Manitoba has had, and has at present, the same degree of independence as have the Auditors-General, Comptrollers-General and provincial auditors in the federal and provincial jurisdictions throughout Canada, and

"Whereas the government is reviewing its administrative and financial management practices at the present time with a view to ensuring maximum efficiency in government services,

"Therefore Be It Resolved that, as a part of that review, the present functions of the

(MR. LISSAMAN cont'd) Comptroller-General be examined to discover to what extent, if any, procedures could be changed to permit further efficiency without disturbing the present independent control of the expenditures and revenues of the Consolidated Fund of Manitoba, and to what extent, if any, the reporting requirements of the Comptroller-General should be changed."

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I think the motion is in order.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. MOLGAT: . . . Mr. Chairman, what is it that you're substituting?

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the motion of the Honourable Member for Hamiota. Do you wish me to read the motion through, the amendment?

I'll proceed again to read the motion. (Mr. Deputy Speaker read the motion as on Page 1872.) Are you ready for the question?

MR. GREEN: I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Wellington, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Member for Inkster, and the proposed motion in amendment thereto by the Member for Kildonan. The Member for Hamiota.

MR. EARL DAWSON (Hamiota): Mr. Speaker, the motion as presented by the Honourable Member for Inkster has some merit, as I pointed out earlier, and now that it has been amended, that we certainly can reconsider the position that we took earlier. I am not going to take the time of the House to rehash the various presentations that were made in behalf of this amendment. I will simply offer another amendment that reads as follows, moved by myself, seconded by the Member for La Verendrye. It reads:

That the amendment be amended by inserting after the word "operate" in the second paragraph in the first line thereof, the following words: "subject to the approval of Mr. Speaker as to times and locations."

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. John's, 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 Emerson, and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Burrows in amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOUGLAS WATT (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I think it's probably the first time that anybody's ever received applause for getting up to talk about the weather, but I should say that when I adjourned this debate at the last sitting of Private Members' day that I thought it was not a very good time to talk about the weather, because at that time the Legislative Assembly was emanating volumes of gloom and what have you, and the weather was going along with the opposition and the weather was dry and it was dusty, the forecast was going along with the weather and the opposition - the forecast was also dry - and I thought to myself it was a bad time to speak and I'd wait to see if there wasn't some change. And so today, Mr. Speaker, I'm very happy to get up and say a few words on weather and weather forecasting, because the picture really has changed. I think probably we have had enough moisture over the province in the last few days to have completely washed out the gloom that has been dispelled through the province by the Members opposite here, and it simply has put the farmers in a very nice state of affairs and there's a lot of happy people out in the western part of the province and there's particularly one in here.

Now, in speaking on weather forecasting and weather control, Mr. Speaker, I know that there are not too many people that know much about weather. We all talk about weather and, as the old saying goes, nobody does anything about it. But I want to say to you, Mr. Speaker, that probably I know a little bit more about weather than most of the honourable members, or I should, because at one time I happened to be a director on a corporation which had been formed to do something about weather. As you will recall, oh back in 1965 I think it was, that I presented a Private Members' Bill to the House which had the intent of dissolving a corporation known as Weather Modification, of which I myself was a director. Back in 1953, a group of farmers in the southwest area, oh in an area about 100 miles wide - it extended from

(MR. WATT cont'd) approximately Carberry to the Saskatchewan boundary and from the United States boundary about 60 miles north - met in different places in the southwest and they decided that they should employ somebody that knew something about weather, or thought they did, and that we would try to forecast for the farmers in that area their weather, and at the same time we would attempt to increase rainfall. Now I know this is going to bring a lot of smiles from a lot of the fellows around here; no doubt it will. But I want to tell you that we successfully organized a corporation and we successfully collected, on a voluntary basis, enough money to employ the Denver Water Resources Corporation to come into our province and to forecast weather for us, and to, if possible, increase rain.

They started to operate in the year of 1953 and it started to rain, and I want to say to the honourable members here that rain it did. And it rained through 1953; it rained through 1954; and it rained through 1955 until we had water running out of our ears, and I want to say to you honourable members that we were threatened with suit from the people across in Saskatchewan and from the people down in North Dakota, and when we said, "We are not operating in your area," the reply that we got was that we were splashing water into North Dakota and into Saskatchewan.

At the same time as this operation went on, Mr. Speaker, we were getting forecasts, the type of forecast that has been a request in this resolution. I think that I should say something to members of the House, Mr. Speaker, in respect of the people that we were paying to increase rainfall and to bring us daily weather forecasts to the individual areas, and we find it here in the Country Guide. And I have a copy here of the Country Guide with the forecast prepared by Irving P. Krik and Associates - Dr. Irving Krik actually. At the time that we employed Dr. Irving Krik, his association - and I believe it still exists - was really known as the Denver Water Resources Association. Dr. Irving Krik I think has been recognized all over the world as probably an outstanding authority as a meteorologist in weather forecasting. Some years ago, prior to 1953, an article appeared in the Readers Digest giving an outline of his work in that field and telling how he had been employed, or he actually had been drafted into the war services of the Allies and was to a great extent responsible for forecasting of D-Day, and I think it was partly for this reason that the farmers in the Boissevain, Deloraine, Reston, Virden, areas to the southwest of Manitoba, at that time believed that we could get a useful service from Dr. Irving Krik and his corporation.

And so, on a voluntary basis, we set the rates that would be charged to the individual farmers for this service at \$5.00 per quarter section. We covered an area of approximately 32,000 quarter sections of land, and I think that we collected in the first and second years about 25 percent of that area at \$5.00. But Mr. Speaker, in spite of the fact that we had spoken from platforms, that we had advertised in the press, we had Dr. Irving Krik and his Associates come from Denver, it was impossible for us to get more than 25 percent. Off the top of my head I'd say it was about 25 percent, and I'm sorry to say that I really did partly postpone or adjourn this debate hoping that I could have got some information from some of the members that belonged to that corporation, but apparently the records have been destroyed.

But we knew at that time that, could we have interested all of the farmers in the whole area involved, that it might have cost them about \$1.00 per quarter section, but as the years went on, and as it rained too much, and as farmers outside of the area blamed us for drowning out their crops, the farmers within the area started to fall off and collections became almost impossible. In spite of the fact that at that time that we advocated, and I believed in the forecast, insofar as it was really costing us no money and that some of us were working actually for nothing as far as collections were concerned, I never was really convinced, Mr. Speaker, that the use of cloud-seeding with silver iodide ever really did increase the rainfall, nor was I ever convinced that it did not increase it. I still don't know, but I was satisfied at that time that if ever we had an opportunity for a forecasting system that actually forecast the weather, for what it was worth, to areas confined to a size of probably a municipality -- at Reston where I lived, we received the daily forecast for the next day. At Melita they received the same thing. At Boissevain they received the same thing. The forecast was given to us by the Corporation, headed by Dr. Krik, and he worked closely and was closely associated with the meteorological branches in Canada both in Manitoba and in Ottawa. A meteorologist was stationed full-time in Brandon, and I believed at that time that if ever we could have got a forecasting system that was confined to small areas and that gave us the forecast from day to day as near as they could forecast it, we had the opportunity then.

(MR. WATT cont'd)

But the farmers turned it down, Mr. Speaker, and those of us who worked on that project finally gave up. I might mention to you that some of the largest and well-known farmers in that area were dedicated at that time to continue that service, not convinced of course that there was anything really practical in cloud-seeding, but that eventually we might get a forecasting system out of it that would be of some advantage to the farmers. I can recall to you, and many of you here will recall the late Elwood Downie, probably one of the largest farmers that ever farmed in that southwest area, who worked untiringly to keep that project going, but eventually we gave up because we could not convince enough farmers that the type of forecasting that we were getting was worth a dollar a quarter section of land, or practically nothing. And I have to say to you and to the honourable members, Mr. Speaker, that I never really was convinced myself that the forecasts that we received from Dr. Irving Krik's Corporation really was any more effective, or any closer to being right, than the forecasts that we were getting through the radio and through the press from our own services.

However, I did believe that with the experience and with the name that Dr. Irving Krik had created for himself all over the world, that it was an association that we might well have kept for the price that it was costing us, but it went by the boards, Mr. Speaker. In spite of our efforts, the farmers could not be convinced that, apart from the rain-making program that went along with it, the forecast was worth what they were paying for it. Now I say to you today, and I do not say this with any intention of trying to discredit the forecast that Dr. Irving Krik publishes in the Country Guide, but I'm very happy to say that so far in the month of May he's completely wrong, that he has forecast dry weather for the prairie provinces for the month of May, and I am happy to say that he is completely wrong thus far and that we have ample moisture in the meantime to seed our crops and to germinate, start what looks as if it could be a very good year. And so I say, Mr. Speaker, that I am not going to support this resolution because I cannot see myself voting to put the Minister of Agriculture and this government in a position where the people would be phoning us and saying, "You don't know how to forecast. You said it was going to be dry tomorrow and it's raining." And we are perfectly aware that this is what can happen. I am sorry I have not made notes on this. I should be referring to a speech that Dr. Irving Krik made in Brandon in 1953, at which time he told us that the weather in this particular part of the North American Continent, with the hot air coming in from the south and with the cold air coming down from the north, the constituency of my honourable friend over here, that there was a clash approximately in this area, and that it was very difficult to forecast. And so, Mr. Speaker, I do not want to put my honourable friend - I'm sorry he's not in his seat over there - the Minister of Agriculture in a position where he, among his other many responsibilities, would be responsible to the farmers for whether the sun was going to shine tomorrow or whether it was going to rain.

I think that maybe that's about all I have to say on this subject at the present, Mr. Speaker.

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

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

..... continued on next page

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Hamiota.

MR. EARL DAWSON (Hamiota): I'd like to say a few words on this resolution. It had not been my intention to speak but I thought that if there could be some leadership offered on this, it could...

MR. LYON: in the speech of the Honourable the Member from Arthur there had been some agreement expressed that we would try to get into Bills around 4:30 if that was possible, and if that agreement still prevails I wonder if we could perhaps prevail upon my honourable friend the Member from Hamiota to adjourn the debate rather than speak on it.

MR. DAWSON: Mr. Speaker, I could continue next time.

MR. SPEAKER: from Hamiota would he take it upon himself to adjourn the debate with a seconder?

MR. DAWSON: Mr. Speaker, I move the debate be adjourned, seconded by the Member for La Verendrye.

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

MR. LYON: agreement we should move over to Page 18 of the Order Paper to the private bills and the public bills that appear there. There has been a request that Bill No. 85 be called first, if the honourable members would agree to permit the honourable Member from Birtle-Russell to speak to it.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 85. The Honourable Member for Russell.

MR. RODNEY S. CLEMENT (Birtle-Russell): Mr. Speaker, the explanation of the Bill is quite simple. Oh pardon me. Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Gladstone that Bill No. 85 an Act respecting the Town of Russell be now read a second time.

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

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Provincial Treasurer)(Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, if you will go back to the head of the list now and the second reading of private bill No. 64.

MR. SPEAKER: Second reading private bill No. 64. The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MRS. CAROLYNE MORRISON (Pembina) presented Bill No. 64 An Act for the Relief of Jacob A. Johnson and Donelda M. Johnson for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MRS. MORRISON: This Bill, Mr. Speaker, does give quite a clear understanding of the events that happened on November 28th, 1963 when Mr. and Mrs. Jacob Johnson of Bangalore, India, but who at that time were visiting in Manitoba, were passengers on a Greyhound Bus when it was in collision with a truck on Provincial Trunk Highway No. 10 near Grandview at which time Mrs. Johnson suffered severe injuries from which she apparently still suffers, and Mr. Johnson also had the misfortune to suffer considerable pain and discomfort for some time after the accident.

As the bill states, action for the recovery of damages was commenced within the time limit as required, but at the time, however, negotiations were being conducted between the solicitors for the petitioners and the defendant to settle the claim. As a result, the statement of claim was not served on the defendant within the time allowed for such service. Therefore the purpose of this bill, Mr. Speaker, is in the interests of justice to either enlarge or extend the time of service of the said statement of claim so that the petitioners will be allowed to apply to the Court of Queen's Bench for permission either to proceed with the action already commenced or to bring a new action in respect of the same matter.

I would earnestly hope Mr. Speaker, that members of this House would give this bill second reading so that it could go to Private Bills Committee where the solicitor for the petitioners could appear and give any further information that members of the House might wish to have. Thank you.

MR. DOUGLAS CAMPBELL (Lakeside): question of the sponsor of the Bill, I would like to ask the Honourable Member on whose part was the failure to file the statement of claim within the proper time?

MR. EVANS: if she speaks now, Mr. Speaker, and perhaps there may be other questions.

MRS. MORRISON:, Mr. Speaker.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition)(Ste. Rose): I wonder if there isn't an error in the Bill to begin with and whether we won't be compounding the problem. Unless my geography is incorrect the Bill refers to a collision occurring on Provincial Trunk Highway No. 10

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd.)... approximately 1 mile west of the village of Grandview in the Province of Manitoba. If my memory serves me right, and I haven't checked my provincial map, Provincial Highway No. 5 is the one that goes through Grandview. It's true that 5 and 10 are contiguous for a short distance between Dauphin and Ashville Corner, but I'm sure that beyond that it is not correct and we would need an amendment to the bill before it could do what the mover wishes it to do, if this is an important item in the matter.

Mr. Speaker, on all of these bills that come to us for special relief there is always a problem insofar as the Members of the House and I don't suppose there are any bills that really cause more personal difficulties for the members than these, because in each case I think the sentiment of the members leans towards giving relief to people who apparently have no other means of obtaining this relief. On the other hand, the problem it seems to me most frequently is one that someone else is at fault, that some individual who should have done something and who is paid to do something, and normally a solicitor, simply does not do the job that he is supposed to do. If it is a matter beyond their control, then I feel that this should be given consideration, but if it's simply a question of poor management or bad planning or bad office procedure, then I have grave doubts as to whether or not there shouldn't be some clause that the individual at fault be the one who supplies the relief. I would hope that we could get some clarification on this matter from either the mover of the resolution or at the committee stage. I'm prepared to let it go to committee but it seems to me that with these coming up every year that we ought to have some structure whereby if it's purely a case where it's impossible and through no fault of anyone, then possibly the House should consider them, but if it's some other individual's fault then let that individual be the one to be made responsible.

In other words, I'm prepared to have every amount of sympathy, Mr. Speaker, for unfortunate people who can't get relief, but if the purpose of these bills is to bail out lawyers who don't do their work, then I have another view on the subject.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Speaker, the only thing that I have in mind is the fact as to whether your prayer for relief is sufficiently wide, because actually what you are asking the Court to do is, notwithstanding the provisions of Rule 23 of the Court of Queen's Bench Act, extend the time for serving the statement of claim. The statement of claim has been issued. Mind you it does refer to the court extending the time but it says notwithstanding any provision of the Highway Traffic Act or the Limitations of Actions Act, and notwithstanding that more than one year has elapsed since the occurrence of the hereinbefore mentioned collision; I think it should recite the fact "and notwithstanding Rule 23" or whatever it is, "of Court of Queen's Bench Act", so that you are going to get the relief you are asking for.

MR. LYON: for the sake of the record that I have seen this Bill. I have my own personal views on these bills in general and my personal view is that they should not be passed. My own attitude, however, on this one, speaking as the Member from Fort Garry is that I'm prepared to see it go to Committee to hear any explanation that can be made to support it.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate second reading, Bill No. 76. The Honourable Member for St. James.

MR. LYON:.... if no one else wishes to speak on the matter.

MR. SPEAKER: Second reading private bills.

MR. JAMES COWAN Q.C. (Winnipeg Centre) presented Bill No. 77 an Act to incorporate Home and Research Centre for Retarded for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. COWAN: Mr. Speaker, this bill is for the purpose of having this company incorporated to build a home in Metropolitan Winnipeg to care for about 16 adult retardates. It will be a permanent home for these unfortunate people. It will be the first of its type in Western Canada and the costs of operating it will be shared by the guardians and the parents of the retardates in the home. The home and grounds will be designed for residential environment and there will be an effort made to make the home life as fine as possible for the retardates.

The centre will have a research centre within it and research will be carried on for the mentally retarded. The latest advancements in residential care will be provided and physical activity will be combined with their learning ability. The home will be so located that it will be as convenient as possible for the retardates to attend public facilities and carry on daily

(MR. COWAN cont'd.)... activities, go to concerts and so on. The home is being paid for and sponsored by those that are interested in having these particular retardates in the home and there will be no cost to the public.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for St. John's.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I have no doubt that this is a worthwhile endeavour which should be encouraged and supported. Of course as I read it, it's one designed to take care of a special group of people who have the financial capacity to provide the facilities which are planned by the applicants and by all means they should have a right to do so. I would like to get clarification from the mover of this motion when he closes debate as to just why it is necessary to have a special Act of the Legislature to establish this home and why it could not be incorporated under The Companies Act and looked after under the sections and regulations dealing with The Companies Act. I have not looked at the bill to any extent and I'm not sure that it has any peculiar powers that go beyond what the Provincial Secretary may grant and yet, of course, we do have an opportunity here to give our approval to it, and as I say, we should do so.

I realize that there may be a question involved as to trading in shares, because the proposed - well the Board of Directors will have complete control over the ownership of the shares and a private company does have that, but it may well be that this company will not be operated for profit and therefore should not be on the basis of a private company under the terms of The Companies Act. Possibly we could have clarification either on the closing of debate or in committee; but I rise only to indicate support.

HON. CHARLES H. WITNEY (Minister of Health)(Flin Flon): ... recall that we passed a Bill similar to this one last year in the Legislature but this one has a different title to it. This one refers to "Research". Within the Bill itself, the bill makes - it is subject to the Mental Health Act and the Public Health Act and any other Act of the Legislature and I have had it checked with the psychiatrists and the Department of Health to see whether they had any particular points to raise on it.

The only one that I raise is this question of Research and when the Bill goes to committee, I would want to have some clarification as to what Research means, who would be doing it and where the money would come from.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Honourable Member introducing the Bill could tell us whether there is any concessions in the way of tax under this legislation for such a home.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Speaker, one question to the mover, and that is this. Along the lines of the questioning by the Honourable Member for St. John's, why was it that you incorporated a company with share capital when actually I think the company should be without share capital.

MR. COWAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I think one of the reasons for the Company to be incorporated is that they wish to have unrestricted rights to repurchase and resell their shares as mentioned by the Honourable Member for St. John's. Another I think might be the fact that it provides that if the company is discontinued that the capital stock of the company shall be donated to Her Majesty the Queen in the right of the Province of Manitoba or its assets after all debts and liabilities have been paid shall be distributed to other charitable organizations in Canada. And then another reason might be that since they are incorporating the Foundation that will provide a good deal of the funds for operating the centre that they wish also to have a similar incorporation for the Company that owns the home, instead of having it incorporated by Letters Patent.

The property will pay regular taxes. I've forgotten the question of the Honourable Member for Selkirk. - Why the share capital? Well I think it is to insure that each of the parties contribute a certain amount towards the initial cost. I think we'll be able to get more information on that question though when the bill goes to committee.

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

MR. LYON:.... order at this stage concerning the committee disposition of these bills. Would it be agreeable to the House if these bills were committed to Law Amendments Committee in view of the time of the year in order that they could be dealt with by that Committee when it next sits?

MR. MOLGAT: As far as I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, I think we would prefer that

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd.)... procedure and get all of the Bills in the one place.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well that suits me all right, Mr. Speaker. It does occur to me that you could have two committees sitting concurrently if you did have it in that way, but I'm quite prepared to let it go.

MR. LYON: We can accept the fact then that all of the Bills presently waiting for Committee hearing would go to Law Amendments and would be dealt with in that committee. Thank you.

MR. COWAN presented Bill No. 78 an Act to incorporate Home and Research Centre for Retarded Foundation for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. COWAN: This is to provide a Foundation to finance the Home. It is anticipated that there will be quite large contributions at the beginning and if the money is put in this Foundation it could be held for years and used for work in connection with the Home and also used to help pay the cost in respect of some retardates who may not have parents or guardians who are able to pay the cost to look after such retardates.

It is necessary that this company be incorporated by the Legislature because the company wishes that the rule against perpetuities and the rules against accumulations shall not apply to gifts, donations, devises or bequests to the Foundation.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for St. John's.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I listened to what the Honourable the Minister of Health said and I think that what he said applied to this bill more than to the one we have already dealt with.

I think that it is highly commendable that people involve themselves in the establishment of trusts of this type for study and for treatment, but I must express a certain amount of concern of the multiplicity of health research funds that exist in the communities of this continent. It's not something that's peculiar to Winnipeg, Manitoba or Canada; it's something that's happening everywhere, that interest groups are involving themselves in particular studies along special lines - and this has been very important for all of these special interests because you can only raise the funds and provide the research services if you find people who have a special interest in them and therefore it's highly commendable that they should have done so - but to continue a perpetuation to me, raises the question of duplication in fund-raising; duplication of certain research that may be unco-ordinated; a possibility of an imbalance in effort, and in expenditure of both effort and money, on behalf of one or another health problem.

Therefore, I feel strongly that somebody has to take hold of this entire problem in the health field, and I speak now - and I call it a problem - I speak of all the associations we know of that are raising funds for their special groups, starting from the Red Cross which is very general, and coming to the more specialized fields. When I say that somebody ought to be doing it, one would think that it's the United Way that ought to be doing it, and yet the United Way has not yet been able to bring in under its umbrella all these types of organizations. The Community Chest prior to the United Way were unable to do so at all and we had multiplicity of campaigns. With the creation of the United Way some other organizations have come in with the former members of Community Chest, but the United Way still has competition from special vested interest groups, all of whom are well dedicated, all of whom are properly motivated, but who create certain problems in the minds of people and who sometimes demand support that are out of proportion to the contribution they make to society.

So that again I support the Bill; it should be passed; I'm sure that it should be passed after it reaches the Committee stage; but in the end, some day somehow there has to be a much better arrangement made, and if it can't be done by the community through an organization such as United Way, then the government is going to have to play a role in seeing to it that research is on a co-ordinated basis and one which is done for the greatest benefit for the greatest number of people. So I use the opportunity to speak on this Bill to state what has been bothering me for many years, not in connection with this particular problem but in the general field of voluntary contributions, both in funds and energy, on behalf of various of the health problems of society.

MR. COWAN: Mr. Speaker, this particular Bill is for an organization that doesn't intend to make an appeal for funds, but that the parents or guardians of the retardates themselves will put up all the funds that are required.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I had -- (Interjection) -- I thought he was just replying to a question. Would the honourable member permit a question then, if I'm otherwise out of order. This just has to do with the matter of publication of books and periodicals. Would those periodicals or books confine themselves just to the subject matter of the research of this type?

MR. COWAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, this would be to contribute towards research, to contribute pamphlets, to contribute articles, to contribute information or knowledge that they may have gained that will be of use in helping other retardates. -- (Interjection) -- Well, they might publish some pamphlets telling of their work and what they have found out in connection with their research.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 83. The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. COWAN presented Bill No. 83, An Act to incorporate Westminster United Church Foundation, for second reading.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned Debate on Second Readings. Bill No. 59. The Honourable the Member for Inkster.

MR. PAULLEY: On behalf of the honourable member, could we have this matter stand?

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed? -- Order please.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, if it's not too late, the honourable member instructed me that he had looked at the Bill, he was satisfied not to speak on it and would have been ready to permit it to go. We're now speaking of the St. Boniface Charter Bill, No. 59?

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 59.

MR. CHERNIACK: I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, I was not aware of it.

MR. SPEAKER: It's the wish that this stand in the name of the Honourable Member for Inkster? -- (Interjection) --

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, my colleague from St. John's was indicating -- and I appreciate the interjection of my Honourable Member for Kildonan -- but our colleague from Inkster has looked at the Bill and we're prepared to allow it to go to second reading to process the Bill.

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

MR. SPEAKER: I realize the hour is getting a little late, but I would appreciate the assistance of the House for the remainder of the day. Bill No. 55. The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. SAUL MILLER (Seven Oaks): Mr. Speaker, the mood of the House is to move things along and I hope I won't detain them too long on this. On Bill 55, the Winnipeg Charter amendment, again we have a request by a city to raise its interest on unpaid taxes from one-half percent per month to three-quarters percent per month, and as I mentioned earlier I don't object to this, I think it's essential, but I object certainly to the fact that every city and every municipality has to come before this House for this certain amendment. I would urge the Minister of Municipal Affairs to do this in the logical and sensible way and have it made permissive within The Municipal Act and then we wouldn't have to spend hours on this sort of Bill, because this is just the beginning. I think there are two or three requests this year; next year I can see it really becoming a request from many municipalities.

Now the need for it is very definite. In the City of Winnipeg the tax arrears amounted to \$3 million last year. Of the \$3 million, it's interesting, however, that 25 percent are from owner-occupied homes, 75 percent are from commercial or multiple dwellings, that is rented premises and so on. In other words, \$2,300,000 are commercial, and this indicates certainly that people are using the low interest rate of six percent, which is all that the city can at this stage charge, they're using it to finance a business operation, or if they're in the real estate business, a real estate operation. And certainly this mustn't be encouraged, because when a city has a tax arrears of \$3 million as Winnipeg has, obviously they have to go to the bank to borrow money to continue their operations and the interest they pay is more than the six percent that these people would be paying, and of course the extra interest has to be borne by all the other taxpayers in the municipality because it's simply an added cost to the running of the city itself.

So I think that we have to go along with this increase from one-half to three-quarters percent in order to try to curb the abuses to which some of the ratepayers are putting it. On

(MR. MILLER cont'd.) the other hand, I think we have to be very careful to make sure we are not going to put an additional burden on people who are not paying their taxes because they haven't got the money - and I'm talking about the smaller percentage of people who are in arrears, or who may be in arrears not because they are using the tax moneys to finance a private business operation but simply because they haven't got the taxes to pay - and if we increase, if we allow this increase to affect them, in other words if we go from six percent per year to nine percent per year on these people, then we're penalizing the wrong groups.

Now I don't think really this is the city's intention. So when it goes to Law Amendments, I'm hopeful that the City of Winnipeg, or perhaps the Minister, might consider bringing in an amendment whereby we can protect owner-occupied residencies who perhaps on the signing of a statutory declaration may make it possible whereby they will be exempted perhaps from the first \$300.00 of taxation, some minimum base on which the extra interest would not be charged. They can apply for this exemption, and on that basis the people who can least afford it and who are in arrears because of lack of funds, shouldn't be penalized because of the actions of some people who are using the low interest rates levied by the city as a means of financing their operations and getting a better rate of interest than they would have to pay at the banks.

With those few words, Mr. Speaker, I would go along with having this sent to Law Amendments and hopeful that the Minister or the City of Winnipeg may bring in the necessary amendment.

MR. PAULLEY: . . once again to the House what I think is a very important matter. My former colleague who represented Inkster Constituency, the late Morris Gray, on many occasions drew to the attention of the House the inadvisability of the necessity of the City of Winnipeg, our capital city, of having to apply to this Assembly for amendments to its charter year by year, and the government has promised over a long period of years, all too long, that consideration was going to be given to, first of all, the question of the possibility of home rule for our capital city - my honourable friend is shaking his brain, that's the Honourable the Attorney-General - but first of all, this was going to be considered; and secondly, the government has promised for 10 years, this government of action, has promised for 10 years a Cities Act. -- (Interjection) -- Now I don't know whether my honourable friend says that I am right when I say this is a government of inaction, or whether he's suggesting that I'm right because I refer to the fact that they have promised. Now of course lack of action, so possibly he's right on both counts.

MR. LYON: . . . home rule was impossible - a Cities Bill.

MR. PAULLEY: The Attorney-General shouldn't talk about anything being impossible unless it is described as an adjective pertaining to my honourable friend directly. But - (Interjection) -- I don't want to get into too many arguments with my honourable friend the Leader of the House. I know that he's had a hard row to hoe this week and things haven't been too well for the government, so I excuse him at a quarter past five on a Friday afternoon.

MR. SPEAKER: and I appeal to the Honourable the Attorney-General to possibly address his remarks to the Chair.

MR. PAULLEY: It would be a good idea too, Mr. Speaker, and I'm glad that you come to the - no, I won't go on because I got into difficulty once before on that. But, Mr. Speaker, as I've said, I'm using this opportunity of drawing to the attention of the House the fact that the government has not fulfilled one of the promises that it made years ago when my former colleague, Mr. Gray, was in this House; namely, the production of a City Charter.

Just a moment ago we passed amendments to the City of St. Boniface Charter, and now we're dealing with suggested changes insofar as our capital City of Winnipeg is concerned. Now my honourable friend the Attorney-General says that we can't give home rule to Winnipeg. All right, but we did have to give authority in this House to amendments to the St. Boniface Charter, and I'm sure that we're going to have to carry on this process with the other municipalities and other cities as well because there's a number of them. -- (Interjection) -- Always will my honourable friend. And I've received my answer, Mr. Speaker, if my honourable friend the House Leader and the Attorney-General by his interjection is now speaking for the government, he has rejected the idea of a uniform city charter because he says we

MR. LYON: Just home rule, that's all. You can't have it; it's a fallacy.

MR. PAULLEY: I do understand the rules of procedure, Mr. Speaker; if my honourable friend wants to interject, he should rise in his place and pose a question. I wonder,

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.) Mr. Speaker, if you could interpret the mumblings of my honourable friend the Attorney-General because I can't, and I'll sit down until you've interpreted him or the Honourable the Attorney-General stands and states his case.

MR. LYON: If my honourable friend is finished, I'll be glad to speak, Mr. Speaker.

MR. PAULLEY: . . . interjection of my honourable friend the Attorney-General.

MR. LYON: The interjection, Mr. Speaker, was quite simple; I hope that it's comprehensible to my honourable friend though. It is that home rule, that mythical element that he talks about, is, under law, impossible because of course the municipalities are, as he is wont to say, creatures of the province; and they are. So how he can on one hand advocate home rule and then on the other hand say that the municipalities should receive certain benefits and so on from the province is of course really a non sequitur, but a Cities Bill, as my honourable friend the Minister will tell him, is coming in. So all I'm trying to tell my honourable friend - I wasn't really aware that he was listening - was that home rule is a legal impossibility. It might be desirable but it's not possible.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, the profound statements that the Honourable the Attorney-General just made is that his statement was a simple one, and I'm sure that coming from such an honourable gentleman most of his statements are simple, but I reject his contention that it's not possible for the City of Winnipeg, our capital city, to have home rule. It can have home rule under conditions laid down by this Assembly. It shouldn't be necessary for any amendment to the City of Winnipeg -- (Interjection) -- my honourable friend wants to make another speech.

MR. LYON: Carry on.

MR. PAULLEY: Oh, he's listening and it hurts. -- (Interjection) -- I beg your pardon?

MR. SPEAKER: While the Honourable Leader of the Opposition -- the New Democratic Party is having that drink, I'd like to tell him that I'm tired too, so let's try and get along for a few minutes.

MR. PAULLEY: I agree with you that I am the leader of the effective opposition in this House, Mr. Speaker, and I appreciate that very very much.

I do want to use this Bill of amendment to the city charter of the City of Winnipeg to direct to the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs, the House Leader or the First Minister, what has happened to the proposition of uniformity of a city charter, or, as I expressed earlier, home rule for the City of Winnipeg under certain legislation as to their rights agreed to by this Assembly. I appreciate that there has to be control, and I agree that there should be control by this Assembly as to how far the city should go under a home rule charter, but I think that could be laid down by this Assembly. But my point, Mr. Speaker, is that here we have had this afternoon to give consideration to two charters, the charter of the City of St. Boniface and also to the City of Winnipeg, and the chances are that once this is passed we are going to have to amend the charter of the City of West Kildonan, East Kildonan, Transcona, St. Vital and others, and St. James - St. James-Assiniboia possibly after a few weeks, I don't know what - Brandon and others, and this is what we are going to have to do.

Now my honourable friend the House Leader, the Attorney-General, is wont to get up off of his chair and suggest to us that we are using too much time in this House in the consideration of matters that possibly could be resolved otherwise, and I suggest that if we did have a more or less uniform city charter, that instead of dealing with the individual cities these matters could be handled without too much debate insofar as the individual cities are concerned.

So I would like to hear from the Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs - I have more faith in her than I have in the House leader - but I would like to hear from the Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs that, while we are dealing I appreciate with a private members' Bill, I think it is opportune for her to make some comment in respect of the proposition for a cities charter, even if she may agree with my errant friend from Fort Garry that home rule is impossible for the City of Winnipeg.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I just have two or three points that I would like to mention. One has already been brought forward by the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks and has to do with increasing the interest rate on unpaid taxes from one-half to three-quarters of one percent. Mr. Speaker, it would be my opinion that if we give the City of Winnipeg this right that other municipalities and other cities should have the same privilege. I don't mean to approve of it at all; actually I'm not in favour of it.

(MR. FROESE cont'd.)

The second point has to do with having the trustees of the Sinking Fund be under 70 years of age. I would like to have the reason for this, because when we have members of the House of Commons that can be 75, I can see no reason why we should have the limitation of 70 for the trustees of the Sinking Fund. I think some of our elder or senior citizens of this province are probably better qualified for this purpose than some of the younger ones are, and I would like to know the reason for this provision in Section 21.

The third matter has to do with having an actuarial valuation every three years of the Police Pension Fund, and starting with having one in 1969. What is the reason for having a valuation made every three years?

HON. THELMA FORBES (Minister of Urban Development and Municipal Affairs) (Cypress): I'll take it on estimate time. This Bill is being introduced by the Honourable Member from Winnipeg Centre; he'll reply.

MR. COWAN: Mr. Speaker,

MR. LYON: debate on this mythical concept of home rule which is casually thrown about by my honourable friend from Transcona, or wherever it is, about home rule. There is no such thing as home rule any more than there is — there can't be home rule in the sense that you can have a charter laid out for a city that would never be touched, and that's what he's talking about or that's what he's implying by home rule. So I merely say in the brief 30 seconds, that this is a passel of nonsense. It's claptrap that's been talked about before, and as long as it's recognized by everybody as being claptrap, then we can get on with the business.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that not too long ago we dealt with what is the type of permission that's given to cities to enact legislation along certain lines. It's an optional thing. My friend the Attorney-General argued strenuously that any municipality should have the right to prohibit parking, all night parking. They said that's a permissive thing, they can pass it if they like. That is exactly the type of thing my honourable leader was talking about, but the House Leader being so tired could not quite grasp it.

MR. COWAN: Mr. Speaker, the Member for Seven Oaks says he'd like to see the first \$300 exempt. Well, I think we would all like to help the person who has low income that owns their own home, but still that wouldn't do it because you find that some of these people that are very well off own quite a few houses, and having the first \$300 exempt would give them some more money to finance business and buying some more houses and . . .

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, I said — owner occupied homes.

MR. COWAN: But couldn't it help some that are also in business as well as some that aren't in business and help quite a lot of the citizens of Winnipeg so that perhaps the increased penalty wouldn't be so effective.

The Sinking Fund trustees have to be under 70, I suppose that's because on the whole people under 70 are more active and more able to carry on the job of being a trustee.

In regard to home rule, I would certainly think that the Honourable Member for Radisson should on every occasion give Winnipeg the home rule that it wishes, and he doesn't do it on every occasion, but perhaps this year he will have a chance to demonstrate that he gives to Winnipeg the home rule that it wishes because there are three bills this year.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. FROESE: What about the third point, the actuarial valuation?

MR. COWAN: They want to make sure that the fund is up-to-date and always in good actuarial standing, and as interest rates go up and down they can make variations accordingly.

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

MR. LYON: I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer, that the House do now adjourn.

MR. SPEAKER: presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House adjourned until 9:30 Monday morning.