

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Tuesday, April 26, 1966

Opening Prayer by Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions.

Reading and Receiving Petitions.

Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees.

Notices of Motion.

Introduction of Bills. The Honourable the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): . . . Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, if I may . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: I forgot to call the Orders. Orders of the Day.

MR. MOLGAT: I'd like to address a question to the First Minister. Could he advise the House as to the procedure regarding Bill No. 41, which is presently in the Law Amendments Committee? What are the intentions with regard to the bill?

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier and Provincial Treasurer) (Wolseley): I'm consulting with my colleagues on that one. And while I'm on my feet, I should say the Honourable Leader has asked on several occasions about Orders. We expect to have all those Orders ready before the House rises, and I might say that if they are not ready following our discussions in the Rules Committee this Session, we'll send them out just the same.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I want to thank the First Minister for that statement. I think that is a very proper course to take and I appreciate that we will get the information we asked for.

HON. MAITLAND B. STEINKOPF Q. C. (Provincial Secretary & Minister of Public Utilities) (River Heights): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I'd like to file a Return to an Order No. 45, on the motion of the Honourable Member for St. George; and also an Order for Return No. 49, on the motion of the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

HON. WALTER WEIR (Minister of Public Works) (Minnedosa): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I'd like to lay on the Table, Returns to Orders of the House No. 10, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Portage; No. 14, in the name of the Honourable Member for Portage; No. 19, in the name of the Honourable Member for Emerson; No. 24, in the name of the Honourable Member for Gladstone; No. 33, in the name of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia; No. 47, in the name of the Honourable Member for St. George; No. 55, in the name of the Honourable Member for St. John's; and No. 60, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Portage.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I'd like to ask a subsequent question of the First Minister. What did he say regarding Bill 41? What was the course?

MR. ROBLIN: I'm in consultation with my colleagues on that bill.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party) (Radisson): Madam Speaker, may I ask a supplemental question to that of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition respecting Bill 41 of my honourable friend. Will the amendments which were in Law Amendments Committee, that is the Bill 41, amendments to The Election Act, be brought into effect prior to the next general election in Manitoba.

MR. ROBLIN: That depends on when the next general election will be, Madam Speaker.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to direct a question to the Honourable the First Minister and/or the Minister of Education. I wonder if either gentlemen might give me any information so that I could give the information to my residents of Windsor and Niakwa Park. My question is, when will the First Minister be replying to a brief and letters from the Citizens Committee of Windsor and Niakwa Park respecting the building of a so-called French-option school in Windsor Park, St. Boniface?

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Chairman, I have been in correspondence with these people with respect to their brief and some of the letters they have written to me. I have not replied to all of them and I shall not be replying in the immediate future. These are matters that will receive some further study before I am able to do so.

MR. PAULLEY: . . . my honourable friend think about a month is time enough to study a letter?

MR. ROBLIN: It may even take longer.

MR. PAULLEY: It's understandable, Madam Speaker, . . . my honourable friend, I'd like to address a question to the Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs. I see that he

(MR. PAULLEY, cont'd) . . . is not in his seat. I therefore will address the question to the Honourable the First Minister. While discussing the Metropolitan Act the other day, the question arose as to further consultations with the Young Women's Christian Association respecting a grant, and I ask my honourable friend whether the meeting, as indicated by the Minister of Municipal Affairs, has been held and if so, have the results of the meeting been satisfactory to the Young Women's Christian Association?

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Chairman, I can't answer for the YWCA - they must do that. But I understand, although I have not spoken to my colleague about this, that the meeting did take place and I've heard of no difficulties arising from it, so I trust that all is well.

MR. PAULLEY: A subsequent question, Madam Speaker. Can the Honourable the First Minister indicate whether a firm proposition was submitted to the Association?

MR. ROBLIN: I can't give any further information than what I have already done, Madam Chairman.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Madam Speaker, before the Orders are proceeded with, I'd like to address a question to the Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs, but since he is not in his seat perhaps his colleague the Minister of Public Utilities could answer this. The other day we passed Bill 118, an Act respecting the City of Portage la Prairie, and an amendment was passed to it holding the Municipal Council liable for the actions and the over-expenditures, which I take it was in order, but on checking the statutes last year we passed a bill - Bill No. 93, an Act to validate By-law 3739 of the City of Brandon - and no similar measure was taken on that one, and I was wondering what is the significance of this.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Chairman, I'll have to take my honourable friend's question as notice. It sounds rather involved.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

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

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, as we were ending our morning session, I was on my feet to speak on this resolution. I can agree with a great deal that has been said by the honourable the member who introduced the resolution. There's no question about it that regardless of what we may be, either professionally or business or whatever our activities are, in the final analysis we are consumers, and it is very important that there be proper consumer protection. The House has taken some steps over past years. My colleague the Member for Selkirk was one of those who many years ago proposed such things as changes in consumer credit and so on, and over the years the House has moved in this direction.

At the moment, the consumer protection matters are mainly in the hands of volunteer organizations such as, oh, the Credit Bureau, the Better Business Bureau and so on, and I do not question in any way the work that they do. I think by and large they are doing a very useful service in this field. I do believe, though, that there is a possibility of co-ordinating the efforts of the various bodies involved, and possibly getting a better service for all the people of the Province of Manitoba. I don't think that the government effort should be to take over the volunteer organizations, but rather to work with them and co-ordinate their efforts.

The resolution before us recommends a Department of Consumer Affairs. Madam Speaker, it seems to me that one of the dangers that faces us in this House is the proliferation of departments. As I reckoned them the other day, I think we're up to 17 now, which means 17 potential cabinet ministers, and as I recall - the debate was not too long ago - the Leader of the NDP himself was saying the same thing, that he doubted the need of further departments, that it seemed that the government had gone a long ways already in establishing departments.

I noted this morning in the comments of the Honourable the Member for St. John's, that he said that while he might prefer a department, that he was prepared to consider another alternative to this. I think, in the long run, what the members of the House are concerned about is that the functions be performed and that they be performed in the best way possible, and I think that at this stage this can be done by the establishment of a branch, and that the responsibilities for co-ordination and for further government action where there is no volunteer action at the moment, could be properly handled by a branch without the necessity of setting up a department with a full-time Minister.

(MR. MOLGAT, cont'd) . . .

So Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Member for Gladstone, that the motion be amended by deleting the words "Department of Consumer Affairs" in the last line thereof, and substituting therefor the following words: "Branch of Consumer Affairs in the Department of the Provincial Secretary."

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, on a question of order, is not the question before the House the amendment as proposed by the Honourable Member from Selkirk, and not the main motion?

MADAM SPEAKER: The question before the House is the main motion. Are you ready for the question?

MR. PAULLEY: I'm sorry, Madam Speaker.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I'm just going to make a very few comments on this because this is a subject which the government is very much interested in indeed. We have been giving some consideration to this whole question of trying to find some better way of helping the ordinary citizen who may find himself in difficulties in the labyrinth of credit dealings that now are part of our urbanized society, and we have been wondering just how best to approach this matter.

Our view at the present time is that we might very well be advised to establish something like the Citizen's Advice Bureau, either directly ourselves or in co-operation with some outside organization. You will recall, Madam Speaker, that during the Great War in Great Britain there were organizations sponsored by municipalities. I think there were 87 towns in Great Britain that had what is called a Citizens Advice Bureau, and if you lost your ration card or if you were bombed out or if you ran into a hundred and one of the different trials that beset the ordinary person in those days, you knew that you could go to the Citizens Advice Bureau in wherever you were located, and get some help, and it seems to us that something along the same lines might very well be worked as an assistant in the field of credit. It might even be expanded to other complexities of life that ordinary citizens have to deal with.

Our view, however, was that this matter probably could be handled more economically and certainly more in touch with the realities of commercial life through some other agency than a department of government or a bureau as has been suggested. Our thought was that a suitable arrangement might well be worked out with some of the people who are in the business now, to provide a public service which would at least be partially supported by public funds, but supported in part as well by private funds, because it would, I think, be a matter of extreme interest to the credit granting industry to place their industry on a better footing from a public relations standpoint and to ensure to the general public whom they serve and we serve, that the thing was being done properly.

Now, unfortunately, I'm not in a position at the moment to say that we can undertake to do this in the terms outlined in either the resolution or in the amendment. They are asking for the government to undertake this matter as a straight operation of the state. Our feeling is that while that might very well turn out to be the course to follow, we have not yet finalized our studies sufficiently to be certain that we would be willing to accept this resolution or the amendment in the terms in which they stand. So unfortunately we're not going to be able to support either, but I don't want the House to interpret that as being a lack of interest in the question, or an indication that we don't think that something should be done along this line to provide some form of information to the general public in dealing with the complex matter of credit.

I shall not speak at length, I have outlined our position very briefly. We are sympathetic to the goal. We are studying and have fairly close to completion our views as to how the matter should be tackled, but we would ask the House not to tie us to the two particular suggestions that are put before us now. We will vote against them, but we intend to take this whole issue very seriously.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, would the Honourable First Minister permit a question? Is he aware that the resolution, also the amendment, goes far beyond the question of consumer credit. It has to do with the whole question of consumer protection. All matters of consumer, not simply consumer credit.

MR. ROBLIN: I think I indicated that I was considering matters more than consumer credit in this idea.

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Madam Speaker, I am happy that the First Minister entered into debate even at this late stage. He is probably aware of the fact that we've had a number of opportunities to discuss this whole problem, not only this year but in previous years. He may not have been aware, as was indicated by the Honourable the Leader of the Official Opposition, that the proposal that we made in this Resolution was a much larger one involving all aspects of consumer purchasing, and the original thought that there should be a department was based on the fact that the consumer is the largest entity of society which is not at all organized nor equipped to handle the sophisticated selling methods that are now used, and that of course does not apply to consumer credit alone.

The Minister was anxious to make the point that they do not lack interest, and I'm certain that the government does not lack interest, but I would invite the Honourable the First Minister to read the report of the Consumer Credit Committee, which I think completed its deliberations some time in January, and then review the legislation which was brought forth from that date until now, and although I don't excuse the government of lack of interest, I would like him to form his own conclusion as to the recommendations made and the actions which followed it.

Now Madam Speaker, it is our belief that this matter is so important and the interests of the community are so widespread in this field, that it is deserving of a department to service it, but I indicated earlier that we would be happy to settle for a branch of a department, or indeed I think this morning I said an officer in charge of a department, and I have no doubt that that will come and I believe it will come fairly soon. I think that the Honourable the Provincial Secretary indicated almost as much this morning and on previous occasions, that he sees that this is the tendency in which this government will eventually go. I'm glad that the Honourable the Leader of the Official Opposition accepted my suggestion which I made this morning, that we would accept the idea of a branch of a department, and I'm glad that he took the initiative of presenting the amendment so that we could offer the government this lesser, less costly and less elaborate scheme.

I would point out to the House, Madam Speaker, that Nova Scotia has already passed its legislation involving consumer protection - and not only credit protection - and that in the Act there is also provision for an office of the government to be established for the protection of consumers in the Province of Nova Scotia.

I would also point out, Madam Speaker, that the Tribune report of April 23rd, last Saturday, has a headline stating: "Ontario Sets up a New Bureau" and the story is datelined from Toronto and reads in part only, as follows: "Attorney-General Arthur Wishart today announced the establishment of a Consumer Protection Bureau and his intention to give it broad powers by legislation to wipe out consumer frauds, especially by door-to-door salesmen." I might indicate we already have enacted some legislation along the lines of protection for consumer frauds and door-to-door salesmen, but we have not yet reached the stage which Ontario reached in the setting up of a government bureau. We have benefitted from the fact that Ontario started its investigations before we did, and indeed we had the benefit of an elaborate, bound book giving the report of the Consumer Protection or Consumer Credit Committee of Ontario in which a bureau or a department of government was recommended, and now we find that the Attorney-General of Ontario has announced it in the House. He states further - I'm reading from the news item: "Mr. Wishart said that while the government plans to establish the Bureau immediately, the legislation to be administered contains new principles that business people will want to study."

Well, we are ahead of them in this respect because we have already had the opportunity of discussing it with business and with consumers, but nevertheless Mr. Wishart, in the way that has already been indicated by our government, wants to do some more study on the question of the principles. However, there is no more study required in Ontario before a department of government is established - and I mean department with a small "d" because it says a Consumer Protection Bureau. This, then, means that if we would pass either the resolution or the amended resolution today, we would be the third province in Canada, as far as I can tell, that will recognize the need for government to enter into this field, and of course if we delay longer, as has been suggested by the spokesman for the government, we may no longer have an opportunity to be the third. We may be fourth, fifth, sixth, I don't know; but this problem is not peculiar to Manitoba; its studies are not limited to Manitoba, and it will be brought into effect elsewhere as well as in Manitoba eventually. All we can do is suggest, prod, suggest and keep on suggesting, and eventually we know it will be there.

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd)

I am hoping that something will happen about this before the next session. The Honourable the First Minister has already, may I say, stated his intentions in such terms that we can forecast the result. --(Interjection)-- Of Course -- well, but still we would know the result today of our resolution, and I think it's unfortunate, and yet it may well be that since the government doesn't need this Legislature's instruction or authority to set up an office within a department today, then I would think that even if they should see fit to vote against the amendment, they can still carry out the intent of the amendment by proceeding to set up an office within the Department of the Provincial Secretary. So although they may vote against the motion and the amendment, I'm hoping still that before we meet again in Session there will be a department -- again, I want to correct the word "department". There will be at least a branch or an office established by government. I assure you that if the next government will be a New Democratic Government, there will be before the next Session. I'm beginning to guess that this might even apply to the Liberals, although their chances I know are poor. Nevertheless, Madam Speaker, in spite of what has been said by the Honourable the First Minister, I feel that the Resolution itself is a good one, a correct one, and one which deserves support. The amendment by the Honourable Leader of the Official Opposition is a compromise which I think, too, is better than a whole loaf, and I would urge support of that.

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

MR. MOLGAT: Yeas and Nays, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the Members. The question before the House, the motion of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition.

A standing vote was taken the result being as follows:

YEAS: Messrs. Barkman, Campbell, Cherniack, Desjardins, Froese, Guttormson, Harris, Johnston, Molgat, Paulley, Shoemaker and Wright.

NAYS: Messrs. Alexander, Baizley, Beard, Bilton, Bjornson, Cowan, Evans, Hamilton, Harrison, Hutton, Jeannotte, Johnson, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McDonald, McGregor, McKellar, Martin, Mills, Moeller, Roblin, Seaborn, Shewman, Stanes, Steinkopf, Watt, Weir, and Mrs. Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 12; Nays, 29.

MADAM SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost. The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the Member for Elmwood.

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

MR. PAULLEY: Yeas and Nays, please, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the members. The question before the House is the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the Member for Elmwood.

A standing vote was taken, the result being as follows:

YEAS: Messrs. Cherniack, Guttormson, Harris, Johnston, Molgat, Paulley, Shoemaker, and Wright.

NAYS: Messrs. Alexander, Baizley, Barkman, Beard, Bilton, Bjornson, Campbell, Cowan, Desjardins, Evans, Froese, Hamilton, Harrison, Hutton, Jeannotte, Johnson, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McDonald, McGregor, McKellar, Martin, Mills, Moeller, Roblin, Seaborn, Shewman, Stanes, Steinkopf, Watt, Weir and Mrs. Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 8; Nays, 33.

MADAM SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost. The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Seven Oaks and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable the Minister of Health. The Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I read with interest what the Honourable the Minister of Health had to say some time ago when dealing with the resolution which was proposed by my friend and colleague the Member for Seven Oaks, and the amendment that he proposes is really incomprehensible when one considers what is apparently going to be suggested insofar as a Medicare scheme for Canadians. The Medicare scheme as suggested by the federal authority is one which emanates from the recommendations of the Royal Commission on Health Services. That Royal Commission recognized the impracticability of a voluntary system of Medicare for Canada. The recommendations contained in the proposal of the federal authority is that a province should, in the first year of the adoption of the scheme, have approximately 90 percent of the inhabitants of the said province enrolled for a Medicare scheme, and then, following that year, the amount should increase to 95 percent.

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd)

The Honourable the Minister of Health - and I am sorry he is not with us today while dealing with this important matter - but the Honourable Minister indicated in his remarks dealing with this question that he was going to endeavour to have the federal authority reduce the requirements percentage-wise of the enrollment in a health scheme, and he was going to approach Ottawa accordingly. I think, Madam Speaker, if this were to be the attitude of all provincial governments, then Canadians would not have what they have long strived for, namely a universal comprehensive Medicare scheme. So much for the Minister of Health, who stated that in his opinion volunteer associations would be sufficient, and as I say, he was going to endeavour to have the requirement lessened at the Federal level.

Then, the other day on April 15, Madam Speaker, we heard what the position of the Liberal Party in Manitoba is in respect of Medicare, because the Leader of the Liberal Party took part in the debate, and I have before me the Hansard of April 15, Page 1848, and I would like to make a few quotes from the speech of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition, which indicates to me that he is somewhat of the same opinion as the Minister of Health, that we should continue to muddle along with a voluntary scheme in respect of Medicare. I quote from the speech of the Leader of the Official Opposition: "But I would want to make every effort first to see if we can have a voluntary plan work, and this is why I hope that the Minister having enunciated that policy would be in a position to give us more details than what he has given so far." My honourable friend a little later on goes on to say that "obviously those that need the coverage most are usually the ones that are not covered now." What actually, Madam Speaker, my honourable friend is saying, that he wants to make a voluntary plan work, and then a little later on says that it's obvious that those who need the coverage most are usually the ones that are not covered now.

Well Madam Speaker, we have had a voluntary scheme here in the Province of Manitoba for some considerable years, and it hasn't worked. The Leader of the Opposition admits that it hasn't worked. And yet, after having said that, he still joins with the Honourable the Minister of Health in suggesting that a voluntary plan should be followed. In fairness I will say, Madam Speaker, to the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition, that eventually he did say, "but that if a voluntary scheme does not work then maybe we'd better have a compulsory one."

My friend the Leader of the Opposition on this same page, 1848, states in regard to the relationship between the doctor and the patient: "I think that there will be some difficulties if our doctors were to become civil servants." I wonder, Madam Speaker, whether or not my friend is aware of the considerable number of doctors who, in effect, are civil servants today. What about the doctors that are in charge of our mental institutions? Are they not in effect civil servants? What about our doctors that are associated with health units? What about our doctors that are associated with the Sanatorium, and other departments; the Department of Health? We have a considerable list of doctors that are in the civil service, Madam Speaker. And I suggest, I suggest that the mere fact that they are members of the civil service in effect does not detract from their abilities and the method, the way they perform their duties.

My honourable friend the Member for Ste. Rose goes on in his oration to say, "I think there would be difficulties in holding many of them. I'm told that the experience in some areas has been that the quality of health care has fallen when this has happened." Madam Speaker, I suggest this is nonsense. I suggest that if a doctor is qualified, whether he is working under a prepaid Medicare scheme of a universal nature such as in Great Britain, in the Province of Saskatchewan, in Scandinavia or anywhere else, he does not lessen his efforts on behalf of humanity simply because he is working under schemes like that. And I suggest that to say so, I suggest that to say so is a reflection on the integrity of the medical profession.

Then my honourable friend goes on, on the same page, to say, "We have found for example in the case of the hospital plan, that while there is universal coverage in the Province of Manitoba, the facts are that not all the people can get hospital coverage, because they can't get into hospitals on many occasions." Well I would suggest, Madam Speaker, if this is the psychology of the Liberal Party in the Province of Manitoba, then I ask why was it that just prior to the election in 1958 they joined the national hospital scheme and we had, as a result of their activities at that time, the hospital plan in the Province of Manitoba. Indeed, of course, it's universal right across Canada at the present time.

It is not my purpose this afternoon, Madam Speaker, to delay the House longer on this important issue. Many speeches have been made; many documents have been written insofar as Medicare services are concerned. I have raised on a number of occasions in this House

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd)... that under our voluntary scheme there are thousands, indeed tens of thousands of people who are not receiving Medicare in the Province of Manitoba. I have raised the question of where many people, whose sole income is \$75.00 a month, are not covered under Medicare. Many of our Old Age Pensioners who are in receipt of old age pensions, which are universal at 70 now, at 69 now, still are not covered by a Medicare scheme.

So I say, Madam Speaker, it is time for us to adopt the suggestion of the Honourable the Member for Seven Oaks. The day of the voluntary scheme as visualized by the Minister of Health, the day of the application of Medicare as practised by the present government of Manitoba, should be finished with, and it should be a right of every man, woman and child, without a means test, in the Province of Manitoba, to be entitled to the fruits and benefits of the advances which have been made in medical science. It is true, Madam Speaker, it is true that if a comprehensive, universal Medicare scheme was brought into effect in Manitoba or in Canada tomorrow, we would be faced with a period of trial so far as the health professions are concerned, because there are so many people in Canada, in Manitoba, who are in need of medical services, who are being deprived of those medical services today, that it would create a burden insofar as the work load is concerned on our professions. I think, Madam Speaker, this is an indication sufficiently enough to indicate the need. And when I speak of need in this, I'm not speaking of a need in respect of financial ability, I'm speaking of need in reference to the requirement of being able to obtain, as a right, medical services.

MR. DOUGLAS L. CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Madam Speaker, I'll dispense with the time-honoured phrase this time, but I really wasn't going to speak on this until I heard my honourable friend the Leader of the NDP Party saying why was it that the government of the day entered into the hospital insurance scheme in 1958. Well I can tell him very quickly. It was because the Federal Government went into the program at that time, and this is one of the things about the combination that we have in Canada, that if the Federal Government institutes a program of this kind and insists on using taxpayers' money that originates in the province of Manitoba that would be applicable to other parts of the country in some one of their programs, if Manitoba doesn't go in then they're still being taxed for their share of the program and they don't participate in the program. This, I think, contains a lesson for us in Manitoba in more ways than one; that is, if the Federal Government is going to continue to dominate the situation by proposing programs that the province can hardly afford to take part in and can hardly afford to not take part in, it poses quite a problem to Manitoba. This is one of the difficulties of the shared programs that we have today, and it's one that has been growing rather than diminishing, and I have never hesitated to say that I think there was a good bit of political jockeying between the premier of one of the provinces of Canada at that time and the Minister of Health of the Federal Government at that time, which resulted in each one of them pushing the situation along, point by point and step by step, to where Canada had a hospital insurance program, perhaps before it was ready for it.

However, that made the decision for Manitoba as far as I was concerned, and while I can assure you that we went into it with misgivings as to the cost, misgivings that have been abundantly justified in light of experience, yet it seems to me that federal programs of this kind make it very very difficult for the province to escape implication in them.

Now if that has any indication of what I think of some present programs that are in the making, I'm expressing a personal opinion alone, but I have not greatly changed my opinion since that time.

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Education)(Gimli): I did not intend to get into this debate, but one statement made by the Leader of the NDP was a little sweeping in nature. First of all, I can certainly agree with the Member from Lakeside, these all-inclusive, comprehensive schemes initiated by the Federal authorities, as they have been in the past, certainly I think with the rapid increase in costs that accompany them, unless the continuing resources are coming from the Federal authorities to shore up those programs, they become extremely costly to the provinces and I can't help thinking, in the course of time are bound to a degree to become partial programs in the course of time. It's eight years now since the hospital scheme was brought in. Mental Health, TB still has not been tackled. In addition to that, capital grants towards hospital costs have not gone up. I suspect that any increase in capital support from the Federal authorities would create more beds, and every time you build a bed it's \$7,000 a year in your premiums, so the escalators are there. I think in humanitarian terms that universal hospitalization has been a wonderful thing for our people, but I do think that in future programs of this kind, in health and health fields, we should certainly be looking

(MR. JOHNSON cont'd) at the problems that they will entail, and I think the kind of arrangement suggested by the Minister in initiating a universal program in our province is very worthy.

But when the Leader of the NDP makes the statement that there is such a - I forget the words he used - such a tremendous hiatus in unmet medical needs that people are not getting essential health services - is that -- I gather he meant, well, I don't know if that will stand the test of real close examination. I think that across this province, in my experience, essential health services are available to the people. The medical profession has traditionally met need both in the field and in the communities and through the teaching wings of our hospitals where the very best in health services is offered. And these are being enhanced and of course will be enhanced the more universally available our medical services become. But I simply don't believe that there's that amount of unmet needs as stated by the Honourable Member for Radisson.

While I don't go so far as my predecessor member from Gimli, who said, "Let us not deliver the last bastion of humanitarian endeavour, the medical profession, into the jaws of the voracious socialistic monster" - a Churchillian phrase - nonetheless I think that the resolution that is before us is timely at this time. I think we all believe in seeing the health and hospital needs of our people met. The responsibility of introducing these schemes is weighing heavier on the provinces. We've had the experience of hospitalization and I think the gradual introduction which I believe the Minister of Health has outlined in his resolution here, is in the public interest at this time.

MR. J. M. FROESE (Rhineland): Madam Speaker, I'd better not start off the way the other members did that did not intend to speak on it. I had intended to say a few words because I hadn't spoken on the resolution so far this year, and this is a resolution that has been brought in by the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks I think on a number of occasions, and while we differ on various matters, and I suppose we differ in principle on this item, I respect him for what he does because these are his beliefs and this is the way he thinks it should be in order to help the people of this province.

Now in my opinion this is something that I have not supported and I don't intend to support, that is to have a compulsory medical scheme operated by the government which would be another monopoly for this province. I think we have sufficient monopolies already in existence that were set up through legislation here in Manitoba. We have the various Crown agencies that provide services; we have other commissions such as the Hospital Commission and the Hog Commission, the newly-formed Vegetable Commission; we have all sorts of organizations of this type which become monopolistic and monopolies, because of their nature and because of the legislation which is passed in setting these commissions up. I prefer to have a voluntary scheme in effect such as they have in Alberta. This scheme has worked very well. In fact, more than 85 percent of the people there subscribe to the plan. Under their plan they have been able to provide services at low cost, and they at the same time had competition. They had a large number of insurance companies which were involved and to which people could subscribe, and in this way the plan remained competitive.

Now with the Federal Government coming in with the national scheme, we find ourselves in a position where the provinces will be forced more or less to join if they want to take advantage of the financial contributions that are being made available by the Federal Government, and you might find that some of the provinces held out for some time. I understood Manitoba held out too for a voluntary plan, but when it came to a certain amount of financing, when it came to fourteen bucks, the Minister and the government capitulated and compromised on their principles. I think this is cheap, in my opinion, and I certainly cannot subscribe to the plan which is a comprehensive, universal plan to which everyone will have to subscribe. I think we are going too far in this way, and I would like to see that if the government wanted to set up a plan, let them do so, but let it be voluntary. I think we have had the MMS operating in Manitoba for a good number of years. The plan has worked satisfactorily and those that wished to subscribe to it could do so. Those that felt that they did not like to, or would not, they had the right to refuse, and I think this is a better situation and this is one that we should follow here in this province. I definitely am opposed to a compulsory plan of this type and also one which sets up a monopoly right across the country.

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

MR. PAULLEY: Yeas and Nays, please, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the members. The question before the House, the proposed motion in amendment thereto by the Honourable the Minister of Health.

(MADAM SPEAKER cont'd).

A standing vote was taken, the result being as follows:

YEAS: Messrs. Alexander, Barkman, Beard, Bilton, Bjornson, Campbell, Carroll, Cowan, Desjardins, Evans, Groves, Guttormson, Hamilton, Harrison, Jeannotte, Johnson, Johnston, Klym, Lissaman, McDonald, McGregor, McKellar, Martin, Mills, Moeller, Molgat, Patrick, Roblin, Seaborn, Shewman, Shoemaker, Stanes, Steinkopf, Watt, Weir and Mrs. Morrison.

NAYS: Messrs. Cherniack, Froese, Harris, Paulley and Wright.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 36; Nays, 5.

MADAM SPEAKER: I declare the motion carried. The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks, as amended. Are you ready for the question?

MR. ARTHUR E. WRIGHT (Seven Oaks): Madam Speaker, I'd like to say a few words to close the debate. Before I start, Madam Speaker, I would like to thank you for allowing my resolution to be discussed. You had us worried about it for awhile. I believe, Madam Speaker, it is the custom to thank the various honourable members who spoke to this resolution. I didn't have this difficulty with my resolution in regard to ambulance care, because I want to remind this House that not one member spoke to that resolution. This was very discouraging because the government had at that time, or were anticipating a report on the survey of the ambulance situation in Manitoba. It seemed as though there was very little interest in matter of health by this government.

I think the government have been doing some very fancy skating around the whole issue of health. This was obvious when we saw how the report of the Committee on Dental Services was handled. I've already mentioned the ambulance resolution. This is somewhat different, Madam Speaker, from the enthusiasm that was displayed by this government when they spoke to the Royal Commission on Health Services, because at that time I thought they did a pretty good job in setting out the case for Manitoba. The Premier, in speaking to that, set out the fact that some 350,000 Manitobans were not covered by any plan, and while much had been made of the Social Allowances Act, it was pointed out then that only the indigent are taken care, and this is a point we have been trying to make from time to time, that if you are indigent in Manitoba you are looked after, but there are many many people who are yet indigent and who find the cost of medical insurance too exorbitant. The Premier recognized that when he said the balance of the citizens, approximately 350,000, have as yet no coverage, and these individuals have the same needs and requirements as those covered in the above plan.

I think the big issue, the big difference between us, Madam Speaker, is this argument about the voluntary plan and the compulsory plan. We fail to see how they can achieve the requirements of the Federal Government to meet this 90 percent within a year by the voluntary plan. Now I submit that we have good care in Manitoba right now if you can afford to pay for it. I think we would be letting our doctors and hospitals down if we didn't say a good word about the high standards of care in Manitoba. But the trouble is that far too few people are able to get this kind of care.

I think now that the Federal Government has made itself known - and this has taken them since 1919 by the way - they have now stated that they're prepared to support any provincial government who can meet the full requirements. This has now called upon our Manitoba Government to stand up and be counted, and I can understand they're quite uneasy about this because what they should do is to come out and meet these requirements, and I don't think they're going to be able to do it by the half-baked attitude that they are adopting towards this offer by the Federal Government. The Honourable Member for Lakeside pointed out the difficulties of provincial governments. When they have attractive offers made to them by the Federal Government, he said they are having difficulty in making up their mind. Well, what happened in Saskatchewan when they didn't have this sort of offer? They didn't hesitate to invoke a plan that helped their residents.

I think we have been stressing far too much the importance of the payment of fees; who is going to pay the medical fees. My honourable colleague from St. John's brought this out when he spoke to the amendment. I don't think it makes much difference to the doctors who pays the fees. I think what we're interested in is the enlargement of the whole concept of medical care, and I think while this government has been procrastinating, that through the evolution of things we are already passing the concept of comprehensive medical care, and I think the next step will be preventive medical services to our people. This is already on the horizon.

(MR. WRIGHT cont'd).

The government as yet has not announced who the agent will be. I understand that the Manitoba Medical Service, a non-profit organization, are anxious to become the agent for the government, but I haven't seen any announcement about whether or not the government intends to ask them to take it over, because they do have considerable experience. I think that while we have been waiting - and we could certainly see the writing on the wall - that we should have been training more personnel, because this naturally is going to involve more people.

What about costs, Madam Speaker? I would like to read something to the House about the cost of the plan. Far too many people are inclined to forget that the medical services that we enjoy today is costing money, and I read from The Packing House Workers Magazine from July 1964: "The annual cost of the proposed Medicare Plan would be 4 billion, 481 million dollars by the year 1971. This represents \$198.00 per person, and if we do not get this plan, then we will still have to pay \$178.00 a person just to continue the present inadequate system of health services without any improvements to what it is today."

So the increased cost to provide the complete Medicare Plan would be \$20.00 per person. Too many people are inclined to throw up their hands in horror about the cost of the plan when they fail to recognize the amount that is being paid today. It goes on to say: "The cost of health services sounds like a lot of money, but in 1963 Canadians spent \$746 million for cigarettes and tobacco, and \$973 million for alcoholic beverages." Stewart Chase, the economist, said that if we can produce a thing we can afford it, and I submit, as I've said before, that we can produce a better system of medical care for our people. As I said, as time went on the picture is changing. You take the cost of drugs today. The Hall Commission recommended, mentioned drugs - include prescribed drugs but the patient would pay the first \$1.00 on each prescription. I can remember the cry that went up under the British Health Scheme, Madam Speaker, when they told us that there were 143 million prescriptions issued in one year and this sounded terrible, but when one deducted the population of the British Isles into that, it came to about 3 prescriptions per year. So we must not be fooled by these large figures.

The Hall Commission recommended a compulsory plan over that of a voluntary plan because it said it would be less costly to administer and would certainly become universal. You'd have everybody in the scheme.

I remember in the municipal field, Madam Speaker, when we were trying to sell the idea of the Manitoba Hospital Services plan, and how people were so upset about the idea of it becoming compulsory. Well, it's compulsory now. I think we can look back and think that this was worthwhile. We don't frown upon compulsory education or compulsory vaccination when it's for the common good. I think this government at the impending election will have to answer some of these questions, and I was discouraged to find that the Honourable Minister of Health used up 12 lines in Hansard in replying at the introduction of my resolution. I thought he would have displayed more enthusiasm for the plan that they were about to unveil - which by the way, Madam Speaker, they still have not unveiled. There are a lot of things we would like to know.

The Honourable Minister says that they have agreed to and will be able to meet the requirements of the national plan. If this is the case, why doesn't he tell us more about it? We don't believe that you can acquire the kind or the amount of protection or the number of people necessary to ensure the success of the plan, and still have it on a basis like this. I would have hoped that the Honourable Minister would have told us whether or not they were going to ask the MMS to administer the plan, because July 1st isn't very far away, especially when there is talk of an election. There wouldn't be much time for the government to get down to business and see that this plan can be put into effect.

The Honourable Member for Rhineland spoke about monopolies, Madam Speaker, and I've already mentioned the beneficial types of public ownership that we enjoy here - our Manitoba Telephone System, our Manitoba Hydro, which are monopolies; our Manitoba Hospital Services Plan is compulsory, and yet I think these things do much to contribute to whatever reasonable standard of living we enjoy in Manitoba.

The honourable member likes to raise the question of the Alberta plan. It just happens that I have a comparison between the Alberta plan and the Saskatchewan plan. I would like to read it to the House but I don't intend to do it at this late date; but I can give you some of the figures here. The cost in Alberta. It says, assuming full coverage at maximum allowable rate the total cost to the people of Alberta would be \$55 million or \$41 per capita; and in Saskatchewan its \$21 million or about \$23 per capita. I'd like him to explain that. The benefits in Alberta - they are similar to Saskatchewan except (1) You have to have a 12-month waiting

(MR. WRIGHT cont'd) period for psychotherapy. (2) There is a 24-month waiting period for annual health examination. (3) Pysiotherapy is not covered. (4) Current MSI contracts limit X-Ray and Lab to \$50 per person per year. But in Saskatchewan there is virtually all physicians services which are not provided under other public programs and physiotherapy is included. So I say there is really very little to be compared between the two. In Alberta the residence requirements are that you have to have 12 of the previous 24 months whereas in Saskatchewan you are covered after three months.

I could go on, Madam Speaker, and talk about the alternatives for doctors and that, but I don't think I wish to do that at this stage. But I want to point out that the plan in Alberta is not to be compared with a compulsory plan of Saskatchewan.

I have another comparison here - Alberta's Medical Care Plan, comments by the Hon. A. E. Leighton, who was a former Minister of Health in Saskatchewan. He said "it is not easy -- I'm quoting Mr. Leighton now - "It is not easy to estimate how many people will be helped by the Alberta plan, but it will be a minority of the population. Approximately 400,000 people or 30 percent of the residents have taxable incomes of \$500 or less and may therefore be eligible for subsidies if they have resided in the province for at least 12 months in the past two years. The subsidies which may be available for these people are very limited indeed. A married couple with a total income of only \$180 per month would still have to pay up to \$95 a year, even with the subsidy. A couple with children would pay up to \$87 a year. This coverage excludes drugs, dentistry, eye care and many other items. A large number of the people who qualify for the subsidy may well find that they cannot afford to take advantage of it. This is what we have been saying all along, Madam Speaker, and the Hall Commission emphasizes that fact, that these voluntary plans are not to be compared with the type of plan that we recommend. Many organizations, one can pick up the paper any day of the week now and find out where a certain woman's group or a federation of labour or agricultural associations have gone on record as favoring a comprehensive universal plan of health care, and yet one wonders why the government is so reluctant to go along with this. It's like trying to hold back the tide. I would suggest, Madam Speaker, that they had better make up their mind pretty soon, about what they are going to do about this scheme for Manitoba and get this unveiling so it will take place before the election.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? Those in favor please say Aye; those opposed please say Nay -- I'll have to ask for that vote over again please. It's the adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Seven Oaks, as amended.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Logan and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable the Member for Springfield. The Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I won't be long in dealing with this matter which I consider to be one of the more important matters to come before the House. That is the question of the effects of automation and cybernation on the well-being of Manitobans, indeed, on the well-being of all who are engaged in industry.

I think the Honourable Member for Brandon said the Bogeyman. I want to assure my honourable friend there's no Bogeyman insofar as the possible effects of automation are concerned. As a matter of fact I refer my honourable friend to a debate that took place here the other day where one of his colleagues the Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne and the Leader of the Opposition were engaged in an exchange because of the effects of automation on the pipeline in the Province of Manitoba, whereas as a result of automation and the use of electrical energy rather than diesel energy there was a displacement of some, I believe, 125 workers with a detrimental effect on the town of Glenboro. So I use that, Madam Speaker, as an illustration of what can happen to our small towns and villages in Manitoba.

It happened, Madam Speaker, to many of our small towns because of the automation in our railroads, Neepawa, Rivers, Gladstone, one could go on listing many places which used to be a railway divisional point, now due to dieselization and other mechanical advances in the railroad industry, employment is not as widespread as it used to be.

But my main purpose, Madam Speaker, in taking the adjournment of this debate was to deal very briefly with the amendment as proposed by the Honourable Member for Springfield. This honourable gentleman, Madam Speaker, I presume, was acting for the government and he states in his amendment: "whereas the Speech from the Throne indicated that a new Youth and

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) Manpower Agency will be established, the duties of which will include co-ordination and development of governmental studies and programs relating to technological change." And then adding on: "This government should continue to study and co-ordinate along with labour and management representatives measures that will ease the social and economic effects of technological change." Now I don't know whether my honourable friend the Member for Springfield was around when the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer compiled his budget speech, because if he was I'm sure that the Member for Springfield could not - and I repeat, could not have come to the conclusion that the establishment of a Youth and Manpower Agency would have any relationship at all to dealing with the question of automation, cybernation or technological change at all.

I want to read, Madam Speaker, from the budget speech of the Provincial Treasurer on Page 26 wherein reference is made to a Youth and Manpower Agency and what it is to do, and I quote: "A second innovation for development is a Youth and Manpower Agency. Here emphasis is on the opportunity for training our people to meet the needs of expanding potential of our economy. The functions of the agency are "staff" rather than "line" operations. It will endeavour to maximize the use of all our training facilities by co-ordinating the services now available. It will blueprint our youth and manpower problems and needs and aims of proposing new policies to be implemented by the operating department and agencies. It will assess program results. It will also associate youth in particular as well as labour, management, agriculture and the community in general with the evolution of policies and programs for the development of our human resource potential."

I respectfully suggest, Madam Speaker, that there is no relationship at all in the announcement of the government in its Youth and Manpower Agency insofar as the problem that was posed originally in the resolution that was introduced by my colleague from Logan. And while, Madam Speaker, I presume that the amendment to the resolution will be carried by the overwhelming majority of the government, I am not satisfied that the Government of Manitoba is yet aware of the problems of automation and cybernation and they have not taken any more than feeble steps in meeting the problems which might be faced. We are convinced that through automation and cybernation there can be and there will be a great future for men and women of this country of ours but only, only if the benefits of automation and cybernation are directed for the benefits of the people instead of benefits for individuals.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Logan as amended. The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. LEMUEL HARRIS (Logan): Madam Speaker, I am going to be very short. When I'm speaking to this motion of automation, and I look back into time and I see the various governments in the world that were confronted with things that they knew nothing at all about, so they had to go out and plan. I heard the Member from Springfield talking about the wheel there the other day. Yes, the wheel came into Europe and is supposed to have pushed our civilization ahead, but to give him some thought, there was no wheel here in the Americas - why we had one of the finest civilizations down in South America you ever seen in your life. They had longer roads than the Romans and all the various buildings that went. So when you talk about these things you can see what planning will do.

Now here in Canada we talk about automation, we see the effects of automation coming in - but no we want to close our eyes and go to sleep and let these indecisions drown us. Now I say, Madam Speaker, in various parts of Canada they are starting to wake up. I have talked to you people before on this, but I will repeat it again, "Recommendations of the Honourable L. R. Peterson, Q. C. Minister of Labour, Province of British Columbia in the matter of the disputes between the Oil, Chemical and Atomic Workers International Union." It goes on to say how many companies were involved in this - there were about seven - but to go down - Job Security. In view of the interest and concern by the parties on the impact of manpower and conditions of employment resulting from technological changes and automation it is recommended that the parties utilize the best advantage of the company and the employees, all the scientific improvements and establish a committee to be known as the Committee on Automation consisting of equal representation by employer and union. Pending the implementation of recommendations made by the above committee on automation or the expiration of this agreement, whichever shall first occur, the following provision shall apply: (a) the company shall notify the union six months in advance of intent to institute change in working methods or facilities which will involve the discharge or layoff of any person who was employed by the company on the

(MR. HARRIS cont'd)..... 31st of August 1965; (b) the company in co-operation with the government agrees to participate in every possible training and retraining of any employee; (c) any employee who is discharged or laid off because of technological change or automation shall be entitled to severance pay equivalent to one week's pay for each year of service in the employ of the company to a maximum of 26 weeks. Now it shows that there's things being done in Canada, but as I see in this Chamber and as I see how things go on, we here in Manitoba don't want to have no change; we still want to stay in the same old way. My father was here 60 years ago and his father was here before him and they ploughed with a wooden plough, and I can go on in the same old way. Well surely if we are to go on, we have to change with the world. How many times did we hear in the last war, "Too little and too late." Is the same thing going to happen to us in Manitoba? It's up to us to wake up. I know that this thing has gone down the road but surely - surely we can go ahead and we can work things out in our own minds, not say push it down the road; let somebody else think it out for ourselves.

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

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

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, unfortunately my colleague from Elmwood is unable to be present. We're prepared to allow this matter to go to a vote.

MR. HARRIS: In the absence of the Honourable Member for Elmwood, I would like to speak in his place. Madam Speaker, I would like to say a few words on this amendment. I would like to thank the Minister of Welfare for his kind words about

MADAM SPEAKER:the wrong resolution.

MR. HARRIS: I beg your pardon.

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

MR. PAULLEY: Yeas and Nays, please, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the members. The question before the House, the adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Elmwood. Those in favour of the motion please rise.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, would you kindly read the motion?

MADAM SPEAKER: BE IT RESOLVED that the minimum wage in Manitoba be established at the figure of \$1.50 per hour and that such minimum wage apply equally regardless of geographical location or sex.

A standing vote was taken, the results being as follows:

YEAS: Messrs. Cherniack, Harris, Paulley and Wright.

NAYS: Messrs. Alexander, Baizley, Barkman, Beard, Bilton, Bjornson, Campbell, Carroll, Cowan, Desjardins, Evans, Groves, Guttormson, Hamilton, Harrison, Hutton, Jeannotte, Johnson, Johnston, Klym, Lissaman, McDonald, McGregor, Martin, Mills, Moeller, Molgat, Patrick, Roblin, Seaborn, Shoemaker, Stanes, Steinkopf, Tanchak, Watt, Weir and Mrs. Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 4; Nays, 37.

MADAM SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost. The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Logan and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable the Minister of Welfare. The Honourable the Member for Elmwood.

MR. HARRIS: Madam Speaker, in the absence of the Honourable Member for Elmwood, I would like to speak in his place. I apologize for jumping up too soon the last time. I guess I want to get out of here like the rest of them, I suppose.

Madam Speaker, I would like to say a few words on this amendment. I would like to thank the Minister of Welfare for his kind words about my speech moving the resolution. I only wish he had listened to it a little more closely. I told him in that speech that the United Way institutions that he had been talking about will only hold about 220 children, the cost of which is partially paid by the government. The Minister wants us to be content with that. I want to thank the United Way agencies that operate four day nurseries in our community. I am glad to see that there are some people in our community who are conscious of the need for proper care for children. The Minister shouldn't think that if there was a need for day nurseries that a lot of working mothers would get out and ask that they be established. All the articles that I have read on this subject show that working mothers are afraid of complaining about care available to their children, because if they complain it would mean to others that they are willing to let their children have improper care.

(MR. HARRIS cont'd.)

The Minister suggests in his speech that if neighbours or relatives could be found to care for children, then that was all right. Well, I say that we need to have available centres which are properly supervised, which guarantee proper care. Just listen to this quotation taken from a recent magazine article: "In Winnipeg, the Community Welfare Planning Council's study on day care services for children of working mothers found Bobby M. staying with his grandparents while his divorced mother took a business course so that she could earn their living. Bobby's grandmother was emotionally disturbed and Bobby developed an eating problem. Both his eating habits and his health deteriorated. A social worker decided Bobby should be in a day nursery. Both his eating habits and his health then improved. Bobby and his mother moved out of his grandmother's home. Bobby's eating problem was completely eradicated. It was only through the counselling efforts of the day nursery case worker that Mrs. M. and her son were able to resolve their conflict."

In another place the same article quotes a Toronto social worker as saying: "I would really like to know how many factory accidents are caused because women workers are worried about their children. I know of at least five women who have had nervous breakdowns. You see, all women who leave their children in private homes go to work so worried that the children are not getting the food and the special care that they are paying for, and of all the women in factories I have talked to, I have never found more than four at any one time who have been able to put their children in day nurseries. The care provided by friends and relatives is not always adequate."

I could go on and quote from reports by the International Labour Organization, national welfare study groups, magazine articles, comments by welfare workers and many other resources. All of them indicate a crying need for such a service such as could be provided by day nurseries at this time. In this Session, however, I don't think that would be appreciated. All the information that I have found, the Minister could also find. His speeches here suggest that he hasn't looked into this problem at all. His amendment suggests that he doesn't even know the problem exists. My motion doesn't ask for much; it asks for the bare minimum - a mere drop in the bucket. This government won't even accept that. Well, I'll tell you, I really am disgusted.

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

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce) (Fort Rouge): Yeas and Nays please, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the members. The question before the House, the proposed motion in amendment thereto by the Honourable the Minister of Welfare.

A standing vote was taken, the results being as follows:

YEAS: Messrs. Alexander, Beard, Bilton, Carroll, Cowan, Evans, Groves, Hamilton, Harrison, Hutton, Jeannotte, Johnson, Klym, Lissaman, McDonald, McGregor, McKellar, Martin, Moeller, Roblin, Seaborn, Shewman, Stanes, Steinkopf, Watt, Weir and Mrs. Morrison.

NAYS: Messrs. Barkman, Campbell, Cherniack, Desjardins, Guttormson, Harris, Johnston, Molgat, Patrick, Paulley, Shoemaker, Tanchak and Wright.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 27; Nays, 13.

MADAM SPEAKER: I declare the motion carried.

The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Logan, as amended. Those in favour of the motion

MR. HARRIS: Madam Speaker, to finish this off on the main motion, I have something here that really plugs the hole right up, in a sense of speaking. The problem of Winnipeg's neglected children. Mothers worry about them. What can they do? Help may be coming. When? Thousands of Winnipeg children are being neglected every day. It is not that their mothers don't care. They worry about it but they are the sole support of their family, because of death, divorce or desertion, and the only alternative to going out to work, is the humiliating choice of going on welfare. And a lot of these people they've got too much pride to do that.

Four years ago the Community Welfare Planning Council made a study of the situation. It found that in Winnipeg alone 6,000 children needed better care; about 1,400 of them were under school age, some of them were babies. Licensed day nurseries in the city do not admit infants and are able to take care of less than 200 of these 1,400 pre-schoolers. Relatives, friends and women in unlicensed private homes take care of most of the surplus, but the care they provide often is far from adequate. One woman, for example, looks after no less than ten

(MR. HARRIS cont'd.) babies and collects a fee for doing so. Some of these neglected children actually don't know how to play. One three year old had never seen a picture book until she was placed in a good day care home. And what of the thousands of children, too young to fend for themselves properly, who return home from school to an empty house because mother has to go out to work?

"Last fall at the request of the Welfare Council, the Family Bureau began a program to show what could be done. The idea was to find proper care for fatherless children whose mothers had to go out to work. But in practice the program also helped the children who had a parent at home, who however, was unable to look after them adequately because of physical or emotional problems. So far the bureau has found day care for six young children after considerable exploratory work by Miss Frederica C. J. Van de Werve a social worker handling the new program. The daytime foster homes all meet high standards. The youngsters get constant understanding care by emotionally mature women. You have to do more than just place children. There is a teaching job to be done both with day care mothers and with young mothers who apply for help, she said. Since counselling takes up so much time, whether or not mothers decide to use the day care service, Miss Van de Werve finds that 20 children from 15 or 20 families is about all one social worker can look after."

This lady has been trained in this work and as you can see by this report there is very little being done here. We have a population of approximately 500,000 people here in Winnipeg. And the people that are looking after these children and the people that are doing the work, it's just a mere pin prick, you might say, and we have asked this government to go ahead and see what can be done to these children because they are going to be the citizens of tomorrow. And if we don't look after them today, you are going to have to look after them tomorrow because they won't have the necessary training.

So I say, Madam Speaker, this government should turn around and examine all these things that are brought up by the opposition because we're not here spouting off hay all the time. There are some people over here that can use their noodle a little bit too, and I think that they should be listened to. I think, Madam Speaker, at this time, I don't want to hold the proceedings up too much, I think I have covered the field pretty well. Thank you very much.

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

. continued on next page

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition. The Honourable the Member for St. George.

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): Madam Speaker, I'm at a loss to understand why the government is reluctant to equalize rates on electric power in northern Manitoba. People in northern Manitoba because of the location, are forced to use more electricity; the evenings are shorter; the winters are longer and consequently over-all these people have to use a lot more electric power over the course of a year. And why the Minister of Welfare who represents a northern seat or the Member for Thompson -- or Churchill, I should say, would support this present discrimination, I can't understand. It seems that it's time we made the rates equal on the basis of all Manitobans. It has been argued that people of southern Manitoba are in isolated areas and we don't discriminate against these people, and for the same reason, I think the people of northern Manitoba who are strong users of power should be treated on an equal basis.

I was rather surprised when this matter was debated last to hear the Leader of the NDP say that they wouldn't support it because this resolution a year ago, they did support -- the NDP did support this resolution and why they've had a change of heart in the meantime, I don't know. In view of the fact that there is a tax on electricity and the fact they need to use it oftener and more of it, I think it's imperative that we give the northern people equalization of power rates, and I would urge the House to consider this resolution favourably.

MADAM SPEAKER put the question.

MR. KEITH ALEXANDER (Roblin): Madam Speaker, I find that I can't support the resolution as it's worded. I'd like to point out to the members that the present cost of supplying electricity to those areas in the north which are supplied by diesel units represents a subsidy to the system of \$221,600 for this current year, based on current rates, and I think it has already been pointed out that the policy of the Hydro and of the government has been to try and lower these rates over the years as much as is practicable, and I think this is the policy, in view of these figures, that should be continued.

So therefore, Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Virden, that the resolution be amended by striking out all the words after the first "whereas" and that the following words be substituted therefor: "The supply of electric service to virtually all towns and villages in northern Manitoba has previously been, or is currently being undertaken by Manitoba Hydro; AND WHEREAS in those northern communities where Manitoba Hydro is providing electric service by means of diesel electric generators, the cost of such generation is greatly in excess of the cost of generation on the balance of Manitoba Hydro's system; and whereas notwithstanding that much higher cost of generating electricity by means of diesel electric generators, Manitoba Hydro have progressively reduced the rates applicable for service provided by this means; THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this House commend the policy of Manitoba Hydro in bringing the benefits of electric service to the communities in northern Manitoba that cannot be supplied from its transmission network, and that this House commend the actions of Manitoba Hydro in progressively reducing their rates for service in those areas supplied by means of diesel electric generation, and that this House recommend to Manitoba Hydro that a continuous policy of reducing rates for service in areas served by diesel electric generation toward the rates for service on our southern rural system.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. STEINKOPF: Madam Speaker, this question is not new before the House and I don't think that we will hear the end of it until some time next year, late in -- not next year, 1968 -- when the transmission line will be built to The Pas and the announced plan of taking the last step to reduce the rates in that area so that they will be the same as they are in the southern rural system.

The question is resolving itself into a rather simple one. Whether or not the government should make a direct subsidy to the Manitoba Hydro or whether the Hydro should increase the amount of subsidy that the Hydro is now paying for the power that it is supplying through its generating station -- diesel generating station in northern Manitoba.

As the Honourable Member for Roblin has just said, the amount of that subsidy in the books of the Hydro or the Power Commission, is \$221,000. This is a substantial amount and is being borne by the customers of Hydro that reside in the southern parts of the province. I think if you were to ask the customers if they were to object to them carrying the load and paying this subsidy, I am pretty sure that if it were possible to question them, that they would say that they don't object and that they wouldn't mind paying the subsidy. But the subsidy over the

(MR. STEINKOPF cont'd)... years has increased because of the fact that the rates have been lowered each time it was possible to lower them and very substantially since the time that the Power Commission took the system over from the Town of The Pas, and the people I think, in the northern areas have appreciated the fact that there has been a consistent plan of rate reduction. Their final plan is now to equate the rates gradually. There has just been another reduction that's just recently been put into effect that brings the rates reasonably close to the southern rural rate and the announced plan to take that final step on December 1st, 1968, certainly has been welcomed by the people in the north. I think they would like to see it a little sooner but in the interests of running a good power operation for all of Manitoba, the Directors, the people who have the responsibility for running the affairs of the Hydro have decided that this was as far as they could go at this time.

They have plans afoot to invest hundreds of thousands of dollars more in the north, maybe to the extent of millions, in conjunction with the recently announced policy of the Federal Government in connection with their community development on Indian Reservations and a large part of this planned development is to bring power to almost every community - every Indian reservation in northern Manitoba. I think the intensity of the drive to bring this electrification to all of the Indian Reservations will rival the drive that was put on by the Manitoba Government of earlier days in the electrification program they had for rural Manitoba which was very successful and which did so much to bring the rest of rural Manitoba on a par with the amenities that we have here in the City. Therefore, I strongly support the amendment to the resolution that has just been put forward.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. GUTTORMSON: Madam Speaker, I was just looking at the journals - I want to make a correction on something I said a few minutes ago with regard to remarks made by the Leader of the NDP. The Member for Brokenhead voted with us last year but the Leader of the NDP and the rest of his group voted against the sub-amendment which was proposed and I want to make that clear, that I didn't misrepresent his stand last year.

MR. FROESE: Madam Speaker, I wasn't sure whether I had spoken on the main motion before so now that we have an amendment before us, I'm quite in order to get up and make a few remarks.

It has been pointed out that the Manitoba Hydro, or the government is subsidizing the Hydro electric power being used in northern Manitoba. Well, Madam Speaker, I don't think there is anything wrong with this because in so many other cases we subsidize people where you have isolation. I know when it comes to the teachers salaries they get extra pay for being isolated and certainly when we have a utility such as this, I think it should be operating at the same cost for all of us so that no one would have to pay more than the next person just because he's living in a different locality. I would support the resolution that we should have uniform rates for all people across this province even though it meant subsidizing in some instances.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, before the question is put, I would like to say a few words on the amendment that has been proposed by the government. This is the same amendment, Madam Speaker, as was proposed in past years when I've introduced this resolution. I think it's now the third time that the government has amended it in this way. They've chosen different numbers on different occasions but the result is the same, they amend the resolution simply patting themselves on the back for what they have accomplished supposedly in the reduction of rates, but we still end up with the same situation that the people in northern Manitoba are paying more for their electric power than the people in the balance of the province.

Madam Speaker, the government says that the reason that nothing can be done about it is that this would involve a subsidy and they say that they are already subsidizing the northern system in any case and that they cannot go any further.

Well, Madam Speaker, the point really is that because of the policy established, there is a subsidy in any case in the southern balance of the system, because one need only look at a map of Manitoba to consider where our generating power is and it is obvious that by establishing one rate for all of the southern block, when you consider that the power is produced only in certain centres, basically the Winnipeg River system, the steam plant at Selkirk, the steam plant at Brandon, and Grand Rapids. What have we done in that southern system? We have said we will pool all of the costs of distribution. We will not assess the people in the constituency of Roblin - the member for which constituency we have just heard moving an amendment. We won't tell the people in Roblin up here, well we're going to charge you for the distribution

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd)... system to serve Roblin. We haven't said to them because you happen to be living there and the power is produced here and we have to transport it from there to there then the cost of the transportation system is going to be charged to you. If we were to follow the principle the government establishes there would be a base cost for power at each plant, then you would charge people across the province that base cost plus whatever it cost to transport it to them because the whole of the transportation system is part of the cost.

But long ago, Mr. Chairman, or Madam Speaker, this matter was resolved in Manitoba, it was resolved that all of the people who are on the southern system would have one basic rate depending on the category in which they fell. If they were on the farm rate then it was the same farm rate if they lived in Beausejour, or right next to the power plants or close to them or if they lived in Roblin or if they lived in Swan River or Mafeking. This was established as a matter of policy. They were not charged for the distribution system.

Well then, let's go to the northern area. I agree that the costs are higher in the northern area. I agree that the power is produced in a different way. But it's the same thing, Mr. Chairman, to say that it costs more to deliver power to Swan River than it does to deliver it to Beausejour, and the same principle applies - and I think that the time is far past. I've said this in the House several times now - the answer that I get particularly from the Minister from The Pas is why didn't you do it when? That's the regular answer each year. Mr. Speaker, I'm not interested in the days in which I was not responsible for the policy that was followed. What I'm concerned about is the situation today. I've been concerned about the situation for the residents in the north now for some years and I've introduced this resolution for some years, because I think that they are being charged a higher rate which they should not be charged, their costs are already higher and this is one service that could be given to them on the same principle of equalization as we give to the bulk of the province. I don't believe that an argument can be made that this is something that is beyond the capacity of the system to cover it. If we were dealing with a very large block of power in the north, if this meant 10 percent or 20 or 40 percent of the total productive capacity of our system, one could say well, this is going to affect completely the rates in the balance of the province. But that is not the case, Mr. Chairman, because the figures that we have - the latest that we have from Hydro indicate that the total northern production of Manitoba Hydro as distinct from the balance of their system amounts to something like one-half of one percent of the total generated capacity. We're dealing here with a very very small proportion of the total - one-half of one percent. And to equalize the rate on that portion it seems to me is certainly not beyond the financial capacity of the system. You're not loading the balance of the system with an impossible cost.

It seems to me that in any case by their statement the government have accepted the principle because they say that they are reducing rates. Well, I say to them if you're able to start reducing them -- you're doing a subsidy now, why not establish as has been established in the balance - one plan, one system.

So, Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Member for Lakeside, that the amendment be further amended by adding the following words at the end thereof: "And be it further resolved that this House request the government of Manitoba to speed up the policy of reducing rates for service in northern areas to equalize them with the rates in the remainder of the province at the earliest possible opportunity and in any case no later than December 31st, 1966."

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. STEINKOPF: Mr. Chairman, I would like to just say a word. The statements just made by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition by themselves can't be refuted but if taken in the whole, taken as part of the business of trying to operate the Hydro, the Power Commission, on a profitable and an economic and at the same time a well-run basis, then one can see some of the flaws in his argument.

The statement that we are now subsidizing the power in the north -- I presume he means that - we are indirectly, that the Hydro, the Power Commission are doing the subsidy --(Interjection) -- Well, I think that he meant that it was being subsidized by the Manitoba Hydro. It's still the taxpayer -- it's still the customer that's doing it. I guess we're all in the same boat but we try to keep the government and the day to day operations of these utilities at arm's length. The amount of the subsidy is usually considered in the over-all statement - in the over-all profit and loss basis sheet of the Hydro and as the other income of Hydro increases, so can the amount of subsidy in another part of the system be increased - one balances the other. If that was not done, we would have a very illogical way of doing business because everyone would

(MR. STEDNKOPF cont'd)... then have a claim for his own generating plant no matter where he was located without any limit to the number of people who would have to be attached to that generating plant and you can see what chaos would result - what fantastic costs would be undertaken by the hydro system and of course this would then be an added burden to the great majority of the customers of Hydro because you would be having plants by the hundreds all over Manitoba in areas that are not now being serviced or as you've heard we've had a lot of requests during this Session for generating plants or power to be put into isolated camping locations where people have summer homes and the amount of power that they actually use doesn't even begin to justify the interest on the cost of taking the power into these areas. So one can't just segregate the problem of rates. One must take a look on the whole operation of the Hydro. The Hydro realize the importance of equating the rates in the north. And when we're talking about a very small area in the north; we're not talking about all of the north by any means; we're only talking about the areas that are now being serviced by diesel generating power. As they see the income, as they can project the profit and loss statement of the Hydro, so can they project the amount of subsidy that they can afford to take insofar as the north is concerned and they have stated that their projections show that within a short period they will be able to bring the rates down the last step so that they will be equated with those of the southern rural system.

So I think that the government has, and as this resolution states, done everything it can do to encourage Hydro within the bounds of good business to bring those rates down just as fast as they can. And they've done it in a period of the last three or four years, that is at a rate that even Hydro at the start didn't think that they could accomplish and only were they able to because the rest of the system projected and brought forward a larger profit than was anticipated.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

HON. J. B. CARROLL (Minister of Welfare) (The Pas): Mr. Chairman, maybe I should just say a word. You know I really think the reason why we get this resolution each year by the Opposition is that I think they are feeling very guilty about their performance in the years in which they had responsibility for extending Hydro.- (Interjection)-

Here we have the Leader of the Official Opposition who sat in this House from 1953 to '58 - and what was his concern at that time about power for northern Manitoba? How many extensions were made during those years in that part of Manitoba which lies north of the 53rd parallel? Well I think the answer's very simple. There was only one extension in all of that period of time and that was only because there was very substantial political pressure put on the government to try to get them to take over a utility at The Pas which of course was beginning to fail and which the resources of the community could no longer support. So we did finally get one extension of power in over 14 years of operation of the power utility by the then government; and of course there was certainly no cry at that time from the present Leader of the Opposition who has since become very concerned about services of this kind for northern Manitoba.

I also recall very carefully listening to the explanation or the negotiations that went on and the request of the people of The Pas to try to get some kind of a better rate once the utility was established at The Pas. That was the year 1957 - 1957. You weren't leader of the government at that time but I always recall that you say backbenchers have a responsibility for government policy and I'm inclined to agree with that, that they do, and if you thought your policy was wrong at that time I think you should have made it known. You should have come forward with some of your vision you now have with respect to power extension.

But I recall the rates were very high at that time. They had been twelve, eight and four and I think were reduced to something like ten, eight and four and of course the government would at that time give no assurance that the rate would be changed. So obviously they wanted full recovery from that system. Full recovery. Presumably that was the policy which was supported at that time by the Leader of the Opposition.

I would like to say that the policy changed completely when this government took over because we became active right away with the Federal Government, with Indian Affairs, to try to establish a policy of extending power service, not only to other northern communities - and this has happened each year in which the system has been in operation - we have had I think better than one extension a year on the average and we've arrived at the point now where there will be very substantial extensions in many of our very remote settlements. So I think there was a complete change of policy in the year 1958 with respect to power extension, and the conscience of my honourable friends are bothering them so much that they feel they must now swing full way and of course try to make amends for their negligence during the years in which they were in office.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, when my honourable friend the Minister of Welfare discusses people being bothered by their consciences, I am afraid that it applies not only on this side of the House but likely on the other because it seems difficult for my honourable friend to sit there and oppose the resolution that's before us. To use the term that is sometimes used in this House, "examine your consciences" - examine your consciences - and don't look at the past only in examining your consciences, look at the present. This resolution, this amendment to the amendment is dealing with the present. It's saying get along. If my honourable friend thinks the conscience of some other people should be bothering them, I guess that we offended my honourable friend so frequently and so long that probably we got our consciences under pretty good control.

But my honourable friend's conscience is bothering him now greatly by this situation because here's the Manitoba Hydro in a very different position to what it was years ago when my honourable friend is talking about it. Do you know, Mr. Chairman, that a few years before my honourable friend was talking about it, that the Manitoba Power Commission, as it was then, rather than the Manitoba Hydro, was actually fighting for its life here in the Province of Manitoba. Do you know that it actually went broke one time, if you take just the bare financial situation? Do you know that it took it a long time to come back, and about the time it was starting to come back well that it hit the tough years; the really tough years? The tough times that my honourable friend who is now the First Minister of this province, reminded us of when he said a few years ago, "Be careful this Commission may need a prop or two some day". That's how bad my honourable friend the First Minister remembered those times when he was saying that the Telephone System or the Hydro Power Commission might need a prop or two. People might take out their telephones, he was saying. This was because of the times it had gone through.

Does my honourable friend remember that the former administration that he's talking about - he gives them at least credit for having a conscience - but does he remember when he's talking about it that it was the former administration that reorganized the electrical industry in this province and put it in a position to make the forward strides that it's been able to make? Does he think it didn't take some courage to organize the industry at that time against a good deal of opposition? And it was from then on that it started to really go and it was at that time that we went up into my honourable friend's territory and at least gave them a start on good electrical service up there. But my honourable friend's conscience bothers him now because here's this mighty utility that really has developed, after the start that it got from the former administration, and having developed to where it now is a giant, then my honourable friend can be pardoned for having his conscience bother him, because here he sits as a representative of that area and apparently is not going to support the proposition that they get treated like the rest of the people of Manitoba.

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

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

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Call in the members. All those in favour please rise.

A counted standing vote was taken the result being as follows:

YEAS: Messrs. Barkman, Campbell, Desjardins, Froese, Johnston, Molgat, Patrick, Shoemaker and Tanchak.

NAYS: Messrs. Baizley, Beard, Bilton, Bjornson, Carroll, Cherniack, Evans, Groves, Hamilton, Harris, Harrison, Hutton, Jeannotte, Johnson, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McDonald, McGregor, McKellar, Martin, Mills, Moeller, Paulley, Seaborn, Shewman, Smellie, Stanes, Steinkopf, Watt, Weir and Mrs. Morrison.

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

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The motion is lost.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER put the question re the amendment, and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER put the question re the resolution as amended and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie, and the proposed motion in amendment of the Honourable Member for Assinibola. The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, when I first proposed this resolution, I would be the first to admit that it is not of prime importance to all of the people of Manitoba, but it is of prime importance to some thousands of people who are located from the border at North Dakota up to Lake Manitoba and perhaps even further north, because the people in this area from Portage south feel quite strongly that there should be, -- it's about time that there should be a direct connection to the trunk highways of the United States instead of having to go ten or twenty miles either way laterally across the province that is, east and west.

I mentioned before that there have been meetings held where representatives of Chambers of Commerce, representatives of Municipal Councils, MLA's of the area, have all met and at one particular meeting where there were about 400 people in attendance, people of all parties were unanimous that this action should be taken, so I do not intend to take the time of the House today in going over old points as to why this highway should be constructed at this time, but I would like to make two points: One is that I have in my hand here I believe it's a 1962 traffic count map that originated from the Department of Public Works, now the Department of Highways, and it shows that even at that time, leaving Portage la Prairie daily and heading south and east there were 3,097 vehicles. By the time they had got onto the highway that goes by the south port this had reduced down to 435 vehicles per day. Now that leaves a balance of approximately 2,665 vehicles of which a great many no doubt, turn into the south port because there are many armen and civilians who work there; but there are a great number of vehicles that daily make the trip to what is now a provincial road, but has a very poor road over to St. Claude and further on south. So I would urge on the members to support this resolution, because the usage in my opinion has already been established and if the road is upgraded to a highway it will be of major service to the south central section of Manitoba.

I had laid on my desk today an Order for Return that I had asked of the Minister of Highways and the Order asked in part the number of highway signs in the Province of Manitoba advertising highway construction and bearing the name Walter Weir. This Order is now in and I find that in addition to the \$10,414 worth of advertising spent on No. 1 highway between Portage and Winnipeg - I think it was worked out by a newspaper as \$212 per mile - in addition to this, there are 30 other signs scattered around the province at an additional cost of approximately \$14,000. So we have the Highways Department in a position where they think they are able to spend \$24,000 a year on highway signs. I would ask them to perhaps cut down on the propoganda and let's build the highways where they are needed. In my opinion this highway is needed. Thank you.

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

MR. CAMPBELL: The yeas and nays please, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the Members.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if you would kindly state the motion that is before the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion before the House is the amendment of the Honourable the Member for Assiniboia that construction be started in 1966.

A counted standing vote was taken the result being as follows:

YEAS: Messrs. Barkman, Campbell, Desjardins, Froese, Guttormson, Johnston, Molgat, Patrick, Shoemaker, Tanchak.

NAYS: Messrs. Beard, Bilton, Bjornson, Carroll, Cherniack, Evans, Groves, Hamilton, Harris, Harrison, Hutton, Jeannotte, Johnson, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McDonald, McGregor, McKellar, Martin, Mills, Moeller, Paulley, Seaborn, Shewman, Smellie, Stanes, Steinkopf, Watt, Weir and Mrs. Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 10; Nays, 31.

MR. SPEAKER: The amendment is lost.

The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie. Are you ready for the question? The Honourable the Minister of Highways.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, I think that I would like to say just a word or two on the motion that's before us. I'm happy that the Member for Portage clarified the situation a little when he spoke a few minutes ago, because my original thought as I read the resolution was that the impression was being left that there was no north-south road in south central Manitoba; and of course, the fact is that there are two roads and quite good roads, Highway 34 and Highway 13, 3 and 32 which do connect in this area. It's quite true that there's no provincial trunk highway straight through from Portage la Prairie south but the distance between those two arteries is

(MR. WEIR cont'd.) not all that great. We have areas in Manitoba where the distance between roads is greater than this I think.

It's also quite true, Mr. Speaker, that the roads in question themselves have not been brought up to the standard that we would like to see them in 1966. It's also a fact that there is a considerable expenditure of money listed in the Highway program of 1966 for Highway No. 13 and Highway No. 34. There is also the carry-over of expenditure from last year on Highway 32 down in my honourable friend's area, which represents a pretty good contribution of the tax dollar of 1966 in providing north-south arteries in the south central portion of the Province of Manitoba.

It's very difficult to be against the whereases in this resolution, Mr. Speaker, because I think it's true to say that it would be very desirable to have a first class highway in this area of Manitoba; but I think it shouldn't go unnoticed the fact that through all the years the area south of the airport in Portage la Prairie has never really received a great deal of benefit of the municipal interest of the area in the Municipality of Portage la Prairie. The roads were developed a little better further south in some of the other municipalities, but even though it was a main market road the municipality didn't in the earlier days under the old system place that much importance on this road, that they were prepared to contribute their 40 percent in the development of it. Since the provincial road program has come in -- and I'm the first to admit, I'm the first to admit, Mr. Speaker, that it's not a high class road -- but, Mr. Speaker, there's an awful lot better road there now than there was just about a year or so ago. It's true the expenditures aren't that great but there's a gravel road which connects Highway No. 2 and the airport south of Portage la Prairie and the road carries on down and there are other provincial roads in the area which do provide links. Admittedly, Mr. Speaker, not the kind of links that the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie is talking about -- and I recognize this fact.

He talks about the signs that are up and the fact that it wouldn't hurt the Highways Department to cut down a little on the propaganda and build this road. Well, Mr. Speaker, the best indication that I have had of the value of the signs which is pointing out really what it costs to build roads in the Province of Manitoba is the fact that the honourable member feels that a reduction in a \$40,000 figure or something of this nature would be of significant benefit in the construction of the type of a road that he is talking about between Portage la Prairie and Windygates. The fact is that it really wouldn't go very far. It would sure help maintain it once you got it there, but it wouldn't go very far as far as putting it there. This is a pretty good indication that a few signs of this nature might go a long way to improving the picture that the Honourable Member for Portage has of road construction costs.

So without any further comment, Mr. Speaker, I may say that I don't intend to support this motion at this time.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, it's always intriguing to hear discussions in the House in regard to road construction in our province. At the present time as you are well aware, we have two resolutions before us for our consideration, and also on many occasions during a Session, particularly when we are considering the estimates of the Department of Highways, members want to talk about roads in various areas within the province. Also this year, Mr. Speaker, we have had a number of Orders for Returns which have been submitted by members dealing with road counts or traffic counts which have been rejected by the Minister, and the government of course, basically because of the fact that it's privileged information and should only be the property of the government.

I must frankly confess, Mr. Chairman, that it's rather hard for one at times to assess the program that the government has insofar as priorities of road construction. I confess, Mr. Chairman, that dealing with the resolution that we have before us on the highway from Windygates to Portage la Prairie, I confess that I am not too well up on my Province of Manitoba because I really haven't looked up where Windygates is in the province. However it does seem to me that it must be a road of prime interest to the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie, otherwise the resolution would not be before us. I may say I voted against the request for construction to start in 1966 because I realized that the programs are planned in advance and this one apparently is not in the program -- as did the government previously to the present one, programs were laid out, at least the expenditures of money.

But I am not satisfied, Mr. Speaker, that the government is really operating on a planned program of highway construction in the province. It does seem to me that it's sort of a helter-skelter system without rhyme nor reason. I would like to suggest that we bring in a

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.) little reason in the planning of highway construction in the Province of Manitoba. I do not intend to ask for setting up a separate department or a separate agency of the Department of Highways, Mr. Speaker, but we have set up this Session, or had the propositions before us this Session, to set up some ten or twelve various committees, and I feel that it might be in order just to set up one more.

So I would like to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the government consider setting up a Committee of the House with representatives of all parties to consider road priorities based on a proper evaluation insofar as use and need of the roads are concerned. I think if the House would be prepared to accept my recommendation or my suggestion then we would be sure we would take road construction, highway rebuilding and the likes of that, we would take it out of the realm of politics, we'd be able to assess the need for roads in the respective areas.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Logan, that the motion be amended by striking out all words after the word "Manitoba" in the fourth line, and adding the following: "And whereas it is essential road construction be based on an orderly and progressive program, therefore be it resolved that the government give consideration to the advisability of setting up a Committee of the House to consider priorities of road construction based on a proper evaluation of use and need."

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER presented the motion.

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

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, just make a suggestion. I don't want to make a long speech. I would like to make a suggestion to the members of the government though. In view of all the different committees we'd have, I wonder if we can have the same people on this committee -- I understand that the Traffic Committee will sit tonight, so it might be an idea, they would just have a day or so to meet before the election so we could speed up things if the same committee would meet tonight on all these different matters before you call the election.

MR. GORDON W. BEARD (Churchill): Mr. Chairman, I might suggest to the Member for Radisson, if we appointed the Minister for life, probably that would satisfy him.

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

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, before the question is put, I'd just like to say that I regret that the amendment that has been proposed by the Leader of the NDP removes the operative part of the resolution presented by my colleague the Member for Portage la Prairie. This is unfortunate, in my opinion, because the particular piece of highway that my honourable friend the Member for Portage la Prairie was proposing is one that I think has some very definite benefits. I had the opportunity of travelling on the proposed route of the highway at the request of the municipalities of that area. They met in a delegation in the Village of St. Claude; we travelled up and down the proposed route and it did appear to me to be a sensible connection onto the American highway. We went down as far as the next town in the United States, met there with the mayor and some of the members of his council who were most enthusiastic about having this as an over-all connection. So I regret that the proposed amendment is going to remove the particular proposal that was in the first - in the main motion.

However, I gather from the statements made by the government that they were not going to accept our motion in any case, and that they were simply going to vote it down; so rather than simply have that situation, I think that the amendment proposed by the Leader of the NDP is worthy of consideration. It seems to me that this would bring out the facts and figures that we have been trying to get; it would get out in the public the information regarding traffic counts and the proposals of the government as to why they want to build a certain highway rather than another. At the moment all that the House gets are the sheets prepared by the Minister. They're deposited on our desks during the discussion of his estimates; there is really no opportunity for members of the House to determine if the priorities are right or wrong. We have attempted to get information on traffic counts, which certainly are one item that should be considered in establishing highways. The government has refused to give these to us. Then I think that we should consider having a Committee of the House, having the facts and figures brought before that committee, have the government make its proposals and back them up with their reasons for wanting to proceed that way.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. FROESE: Madam Speaker, I think the proposal put forward by the Leader of the New Democratic Party is quite an interesting one and might have merit. However, I would hasten at the same time to make a comment or two on what the Minister of Highways said here

(MR. FROESE cont'd.) . . . this afternoon, and that is that we have, or will have if it, once Highway 32 is completed, that we will have a fairly good road running north and south from the U.S. to Highway No. 1, which is at a point something like twelve miles east of Portage la Prairie. So that if this other thing should come about, the request contained in the main motion that we are also considering, this would be a second road running north and south just a little west of the City of Portage la Prairie.

I have no objection to having many more and good roads in southern Manitoba. I'm all for it. But I naturally am more for having Highway 32, 13 and part of No. 3 which constitutes the north-south road east of Portage, to having that completed first before we start a new one on the west side of Portage la Prairie.

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

MR. MOLGAT: Yeas and nays, please, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the members. The question before the House, the proposed motion of the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party.

A standing vote was taken, the result being as follows:

YEAS: Messrs. Barkman, Campbell, Cherniack, Desjardins, Guttormson, Harris, Johnston, Molgat, Patrick, Paulley, Shoemaker and Tanchak.

NAYS: Messrs. Beard, Bilton, Bjornson, Carroll, Cowan, Evans, Froese, Groves, Hamilton, Harrison, Hutton, Jeannotte, Johnson, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McDonald, McGregor, McKellar, Martin, Mills, Moeller, Seaborn, Shewman, Smellie, Stanes, Steinkopf, Watt, Weir and Mrs. Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 12; Nays, 30.

MADAM SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost.

The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Portage la Prairie. Are you ready for the question?

MR. JOHNSTON: Madam Speaker, I would like to speak at some length on this. Would you care to call it 5:30?

MR. EVANS: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Education, that the House do now adjourn.

MADAM SPEAKER: Before we place the motion, I would again ask the members to make sure that you keep our Orders of the Day for our sitting this evening.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House adjourned until 8:00 o'clock Tuesday evening.