

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Friday, April 26, 1968

MR. SPEAKER: May I introduce our guests for today in the gallery. We have 39 students of Grade 12 standing, from the Roblin Collegiate. These students are under the direction of Mr. Ritchie and Mrs. Carnochan. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Roblin. On behalf of all the honourable members of the Legislative Assembly, I welcome you all here today.

The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Virden, and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Gladstone in amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, if I may on the point of the business of the House, if I have leave to make a brief statement because I brought this up two days ago. It's with regard to Resolution No 22, the adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Member for Assiniboia and then adjourned in the name of the Honourable Member for Inkster. I had indicated then that the Minister of Public Utilities would like to have this resolution withdrawn so that the legislation could be proceeded with, and I suggested rather than do that that we would be agreeable to have it come forward today by leave of the House as the first item of business, and we would agree to deal with the resolution as it is without any further amendment or adjournment insofar as we are concerned, and if that were agreeable to the House in general, we could have a vote today.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, the Minister who has the responsibility for this matter, the Minister of Public Utilities, is not in his seat this afternoon, but he has advised me that he is prepared to see the order, the resolution, remain in its regular place on the Order Paper. If there is someone who wishes and I think on this side of the House - who wishes to speak to it, then he has no objection to its remaining on the Order Paper in its present place and being spoken to.

MR. SPEAKER: Do I understand we deal with this matter now or as it remains on the Order Paper? It remains on the Order Paper. We go in accordance with the Order Paper as set out, then, I call the Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne.

MR. DOUGLAS M. STANES (St. James): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the honourable member, I wonder if this matter could be allowed to stand.

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for St. James. The Honourable the Minister of Welfare.

MR. CARROLL: Mr. Speaker, I think that a consensus of opinion has developed in the House that recreation is a good thing. In 1968 and for some time in the future it will be taking up a considerably larger share of our time and our life than it has heretofore. I'm very happy that all people recognize the need for healthy recreation outlets and the efficient use of facilities within our community.

The Member for St. John's, the other day, proceeded to move up and down the front bench here trying to stimulate some activity, some response to his remarks. He called on urban members. I feel rather left out that he didn't see fit to mention me. I don't feel slighted, however, because I recognize that his interests are pretty well limited to the Metropolitan area and he pretty well confined his remarks...

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I object, if I may, to that statement.

MR. CARROLL: He pretty well confined his remarks to the problems of the Metropolitan area. I acknowledge that he made some gesture towards the rest of the province and presumably the fact that he was calling on urban members to speak, he was primarily -- his centre of interest primarily lay in this area.

I would like to say that -- and a great deal of emphasis was laid by him on the development of facilities as did the Member for Inkster, who suggested that of course the facilities seem to be the most important thing in the recreation field. I would like to point out that, in my opinion, the development of facilities is not the most important problem in the recreation field, and I'm happy on investigation to find out that other people agree with this point of view. Various meetings of recreation directors, the various conferences of community club leaders, have confirmed the point of view that there are more important problems than the development of facilities, and possibly the most important one being the mobilization of people for executive office, to accept leadership roles within their community clubs in the provision of recreation services, the development of the actual leaders, the people who will coordinate

(MR. CARROLL cont'd.) and plan services, the people who will actually take responsibility for the various recreation activities as well as people who will be participants in the various fields of recreation. And in saying this, it doesn't mean that there aren't shortages of facilities in the Province of Manitoba, but it does indicate that a more important problem is the under-utilization of many existing facilities within our province at the present time. It was generally for this reason that the government, in its Fitness and Recreation program established a few years ago, saw fit to lend emphasis to the encouragement of the development of leaders in the recreation field in the province, in helping people to prepare themselves for this important activity.

Since 1964 there have been over a thousand youths and playground leaders that have received training courses either at Gimli or at Cranberry Portage in recreation programs. There have been a number of leadership conferences, both involving recreation directors and other community club leaders in this field. There have been recreation workshops involving arts and crafts, drama and other leisure time activities. There have been many hundreds of athletic clinics and schools. There has been the development of a very large number of recreation commissions in the province. There are over 80 recreation commissions existing today under by-laws of municipalities where only 14 existed a short three years ago.

We all recognize that school facilities have been vastly improved in recent years, and under the unitary plan others are being developed at the present time. The Department of Education, their Physical Fitness Branch, the architects of the province and the school boards are considering the community needs for recreation in the designs of new school facilities and gymnasias and things of that kind. The Public School Act was amended last year, as you know, to make it possible for school boards to open up their schools for public use, and more and more schools are attempting to open their facilities for use on a 7-day-week basis so that the school isn't in darkness after the closing of school hours. It would be my hope that schools, the auditoriums, the gymnasium and other things, might be used more than the 25 hours a week that they're used in the actual academic training for students. I think it would be to the benefit of all if these could be open for 14-15 hours a day on a 7-day-week basis.

But a great deal more than just school facilities are needed for recreation programs. There are other community buildings; there are church halls, fraternal organizations with buildings and halls or museums, libraries, parks, playgrounds, even our elderly persons' housing projects have within them activity areas. They're of great benefit to the senior citizens of our province in providing for their recreation needs.

Now the Member for St. John's the other day was talking about the problems that he experienced as a member of City Council and his lack of success. I think he was indicating in getting more favorable consideration of views that he had with respect to the provision of recreation facilities, and of course this view seemed to be confirmed by the Member for Inkster who talked about the lack of facilities in the North End of Winnipeg. As a result of the comments that were made, I've seen fit to contact the Recreation Department of the City of Winnipeg. I have some very interesting figures. The amount that they're spending for pools, swimming pools in the City of Winnipeg, was \$27,000 in 1957 and I don't know whether that was when the Member for St. John's was on the school board or not -- (Interjection) -- 1957 -- but he'll be happy to know that that figure has been increased to \$289,600, so since he left there have obviously been very substantial increases.

MR. CHERNIACK: Might I inquire from the Minister, does that include payments on capital account?

MR. CARROLL: No, I really can't tell you that. That's the amount that's included in their budget and that was reported to me over the telephone, and frankly, I can't give you the detail of it at the present time.

The amount for parks seems to have gone down very slightly. The amount of \$425,000 had dropped from 449,000 in 1957, but we recognize that the Metro Government has taken over and has expanded for recreation purposes a good many of the parks in the Metropolitan Winnipeg area; Kildonan Park, Assiniboine Park, with their skating, tobogganing facilities, and things of that kind. The amount being spent for playground facilities in 1957 was \$237,000, and that figure has been increased in 1967 to \$945,590, a very substantial increase and presumably the North End will be getting its fair share. I noticed . . . pardon?

MR. GREEN: . . . any community centres in there.

MR. CARROLL: Yes, I'll give you that detail inasmuch as you haven't got it. In tot

(MR. CARROLL cont'd.) lots in 1957 in the north end there were two, and in 1967 it's been increased to eight, so there are eight tot lots in that part of the city. As far as community clubs are concerned, there's the Sinclair Park, Northwood and Norquay Park, three of them. Also, there's Luxton which is a new one. They have facilities; they've got a board; they haven't really, you know, developed the facilities but they do have an organization at work that will be providing service this year as well as Tyndall Park in the Rosser Are. These are some new extensions and additions in the north end, and I must confess I'm not as familiar with the geography of the north end of Winnipeg as I am with the geography of northern Manitoba, but I am also told that in the north end as well, there's Kelvin, Elmwood, East Elmwood and Chalmers, so we have a fairly substantial number of community clubs in the north end -- (Interjection) -- yes, the last were, I must confess -- (Interjection) -- All of them? Sinclair Park? Northwood?

MR. CHERNIACK: No, the list that was just ended - Kelvin and . . .

MR. CARROLL: The last four. Yes, the last four were east of the river; that's right. But he didn't say -- you said the north end. I'm assuming that the east of the river is part of the north end. It may not be.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I just want to ask the Minister. I mentioned the constituency of St. John and Burrows in which I said there were no community clubs. Do you have on your list that there are -- you mentioned Luxton is going to be starting, so that would mean that you confirmed that there is none in St. John's.

MR. CARROLL: I just wanted to mention one other . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder -- these interruptions of the Minister. I think he has the privilege of granting it and if it's not asked for and granted I would hope that no-one would take advantage of it.

MR. CARROLL: I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker. I should have taken my seat when the member got up. I didn't want to be discourteous to him.

The one other piece of information -- I can't tell you by constituency boundary where these community clubs are located, but I did want to indicate that there is also a new recreation director being appointed by the City of Winnipeg that would be working largely in the Lord Selkirk Park area this year, so this is another new development that has been fairly recent.

Now, when I came down to Winnipeg in 1958, I did have occasion to spend a little time in some of our recreation facilities in the Metropolitan area, and I am aware of the very severe limitations on at least skating and hockey facilities that there was at that time. The Winnipeg Arena was the only large arena with the exception of the Olympic, which has since disappeared, and of course the community clubs had very limited access to either of these facilities, as I understood it, and most of the hockey was played outdoors which enabled them to get in at best 2 1/2 months of hockey during a year. But since that time, since 1958, we've had the development of the old Exhibition Arena which I understand is in the north end, Sargent Park, Grant Park, St. Boniface Maginot, St. Boniface Bertrand, Fort Garry Centennial, St. James Civic Centre, River Heights, Transcona, West Kildonan, the Dutton Arena which is in the Ravenscourt School, plus the extension of artificial ice to the University Arena - and I don't know whether it was available in 1958 or not.

But not only do we have all of these new facilities - and I think they all have artificial ice but two, and one of them is having artificial ice added this year - with the addition of artificial ice it means that a normal two months outdoor hockey season is extended to about six months, and in addition to that you could maybe play a couple of games of hockey on natural ice before it's pretty badly cut up, and with the artificial ice, of course, you can have six games in an evening; you can have some in the morning; you can play hockey all day; and I think this is another extension in the use of facilities which is not indicated just by a look at the actual increase in facilities themselves. In addition to that, of course, many of these new facilities have cement floors on which they can play lacrosse and tennis and other recreational activities during other months of the year.

Now I did look as well at the facilities in the Metropolitan area with respect to swimming pools, and I find out that in 1958 there was Pritchard Pool, Sherbrook, and the Central Y that were enclosed, and there was Sargent Park outside and the Happyland in St. Boniface also an outdoor facility; and since that time we have the development of the magnificent Pan-Am Pool, the St. James Civic Centre, the St. Vital Y, the North End Y - and I presume that's in

(MR. CARROLL cont'd.) the north end - the East Kildonan Y, the St. James Y, the University Pool, the YWCA which is just being developed at the present time and will be coming into use soon, and I understand that the City of Winnipeg is also establishing another north end enclosed pool so that we have this additional facility as well.

And in the outdoor field there's Windsor Park, Provencher, Norwood Bowl, St. Vital Centennial, Fort Garry, Lions, Kildonan, Metro Park - that's one of the Metro Park facilities. In addition to that, of course, we have several other facilities that aren't really open to public use to the same extent. We have the Canoe Club, the Sun and Fun Club, Winter Club, Lipsett Hall, RCAF Station. I think we'll recognize that there's been a very substantial increase in recreational facilities in the Metropolitan area. In fact there are many millions of dollars worth of investment in recreation facilities in the last ten years.

Now there was some mention of course of the lack of facilities in rural Manitoba and I happen to be maybe a little more familiar with some of the rural areas than I am with some of the Metro areas, but I find that communities in the rural parts of the province are much more aggressive in the development of skating rinks and curling clubs than are their counterparts living in the Metropolitan area. We find that even the smallest towns make every effort they can to provide facilities for their people. Most of the communities, at least a great many of them, have arenas or have curling rinks and many of them have golf courses as well. There are just three or four communities I'd like to mention because I've been to them recently and I think it shows the kind of spirit of people when they're given a challenge to develop facilities. I was out to La Verendrye Constituency here a couple of years ago; they had a wonderful winter carnival out there. I don't know the size of La Broquerie - could the member inform me? I know he's not in his seat, but it's not a large community, and the development of that facility I know got the full participation of all of the people in that area and the pride of those people in that facility, and the kind of activities that went on there would be a credit to any metropolitan area and they've done it with a very minimal number of people. Maybe the honourable member could help me out on that.

MR. ALBERT VIELFAURE (La Verendrye): What was the question, please?

MR. CARROLL: How many people live in La Broquerie?

MR. VIELFAURE: About a thousand.

MR. CARROLL: About a thousand people. And here you have a closed-in arena with good hockey, good skating facility, a very proud community and a very active community pursuing this recreation pursuit.

I happened to go down to Miami . . .

MR. VIELFAURE: If I may interject, this includes the municipality; the town is not 1,000, as much as I'd like it to be. This includes the whole municipality and every part of the municipality was contributing.

MR. CARROLL: Very good. A wonderful example of the municipality, rural municipality and the community working together to develop these kinds of facilities.

I was down at Miami a couple of years ago, another very small community - I would think - the member's not in her seat, but I would think not over a thousand people, maybe a little less, who have not only a closed-in skating rink and curling rink, they have excellent shooting facilities and a tremendous ball club there that would rival, again, any of our large metropolitan areas.

I've been amazed that a community of about 500 people at Mafeking within the last few years, a community that has very limited economic resources, where the people there have developed an outdoor skating rink, a closed-in curling rink, a very small community did this by uniting together and combining their efforts and putting up a very excellent facility.

Camperville, one of our Metis communities, assisted by the Indian Reserve close by, a very small population again, maybe 1,200 people involved at the most, probably one of the - we call it one of the underdeveloped areas because there are very very limited economic resources, most people are fishermen, here again, making use of facilities that they got from MacDonald Airport. They have an excellent community hall, outdoor skating rink and facilities that they're certainly very proud of and I would like to commend them for at this stage.

Now in addition to this there have been a great many new educational facilities developed in Manitoba. I mention the Frontier Collegiate at Cranberry Portage. During the Easter holidays they just completed the training of 60 northern recreation leaders. It's a course

(MR. CARROLL cont'd.) that's somewhat similar to the Gimli course that's run during the Easter holidays to provide again for young people who are interested in learning more about recreation so they can go home and apply these kind of skills and this kind of learning in their community club activities or their school activities at home.

As I mentioned a moment ago, over 1,000 have been trained in this way in the last four years. In addition to that we have the vocational schools at Brandon, Winnipeg and The Pas, all of which are allowing their facilities to be used beyond the use required by the students themselves. I'd like to commend our universities, the University of Manitoba, Winnipeg and Brandon who have all seen fit to extend the use of their facilities for training programs, training projects for adult education and for other programs of public use.

We're all aware of the contribution of Pan American Games with the total community participation that was involved at that time and we in the metropolitan area here have been left a legacy not only of facilities, but of people who have benefitted from that wonderful activity. I just mention the activities: The Pan Am Pool, the Tartan Track, one of the finest in the world, the Velodrome with the potential soccer field in the centre, the improved tennis courts and ball diamond, the sailing facilities at Gimli, the gymnasium equipment and other things that were left as a result of that activity.

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, would the Honourable Minister permit a question?

MR. CARROLL: Yes.

MR. DESJARDINS: I'm at a loss to understand. I'd like to ask the Minister if he is supporting this resolution, because listening to his speech it seems that he can't. Are you supporting this resolution or are you against it?

MR. CARROLL: Well, I'm going to get to that but this was for the edification of members of the House who had some doubts as to the availability of recreation facilities in the metropolitan area, and if my friend had been here the other day listening to the debate he would have realized that some members of the New Democratic Party were most anxious to learn more of the facilities that might be available to people in whom they have a particular interest.

In addition to the Pan Am Games they've developed a spirit among our people and an interest for recreation that certainly wasn't here before. They've developed in addition to that a number of time-keepers and referees and executive personnel, all of whom will be interested in continuing this activity in the recreation field in the future. We recognize that facilities must be extended in accordance with the interest and the needs of the community and in accordance with the priorities established by the community itself, and also in accordance with their ability to pay for the new facilities and in accordance with their ability to operate these facilities once they have been developed.

Now I know the New Democratic Party doesn't agree that there should be a concern for these financial matters. They live in a euphoric state of financial unreality and I think the Treasurer the other day talked of financial hallucinations, "for financial hallucinations, take a little NDP". Well, I think the NDP is an escape from reality. I don't know whether it's a disease or a kind of political paranoia that is brought on by political frustrations, perhaps. -- (interjection) -- I suppose - oh, there he is - I suppose the cure for this disease or condition might be a term in office but somehow or other I doubt that the patient would survive. What I'm really afraid of is that they might take the province with them and this of course would be a tragedy, which of course goes to prove that sometimes the cure is worse than the disease, sometimes. I understand the member for St. Boniface has some comment.

MR. DESJARDINS: What's left of it after you finish with it. Why don't you get back on the resolution?

MR. CARROLL: I think maybe we're going to have to put up with the idiosyncrasies of the members of the New Democratic Party, their condition, their illness, or their if we want to call it, their financial irresponsibility. But if we do, we must expose it to public view, their posturing and their plea for lower taxes while they're demanding further expenditures to add to the existing tax burden of our municipalities and this is something that I think should be said.

There are many new facilities and many new opportunities for recreation in our province. We've mentioned the new schools and the new arenas, new libraries, the new pool.

A MEMBER: Are you responsible for those?

April 26, 1968

MR. CARROLL: I'd also like to mention the new parks, the new parks in the province, Birds Hill Park, we were responsible for Birds Hill Park, a wonderful recreation facility on our doorstep for the people of the metropolitan area, the people from all of Manitoba; the Assinippi Park, the Spruce Woods, the improvements in Grand Beach and in Winnipeg Beach, the improvements that have been made in the Whiteshell.

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder if I may interrupt the Honourable the Minister for just a moment. I can see the clouds gathering, but at the same time we have some guests that I'm sure you wouldn't want me to overlook. We have 60 students of Grade 12 standing from the Rivers High School. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Hamiota. On behalf of all the honourable members I welcome you all here today. I'm very sorry you were overlooked earlier. The Honourable the Minister of Welfare.

MR. CARROLL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think that one could also count among the new recreational facilities in the Province of Manitoba the new tourist resort areas that are being developed in northern Manitoba and in other parts. We also must recognize the private developments in this field, and there have been a great many.

I'd also like to mention the new ski resorts, the developments that have taken place at Falcon Lake and La Riviere and at Mount Agassiz. We should recognize the tremendous recreation potential that exists in the Floodway out here for all kinds of activities that were not possible before.

One other area of activity that I think should be mentioned, of recreation, are the Day Centres for the elderly. We have three of those in Manitoba and we're the first province in Canada to assist in the provision of recreation resources of this kind for older people. We have three centres operating here at the present time, we have the Sherbrook Centre, the Selkirk Avenue Centre and the Notre Dame Day Centre. We have of course many other resources as well in community clubs and ball parks and things of this kind that probably don't bear mentioning at this time.

I think I must recognize that there is a major lack of co-ordination in the use of existing facilities and in the development of new ones. Responsibility for recreation rests with the municipalities, rests with those at the local level, and recreation commissions have been recognized as one means by which the municipalities can coordinate the various activities taking place within a municipality and planning for new ones and we know that there are schools and churches and other clubs who are all a part of a well rounded recreation program.

Town planning becomes vital as well in the provision of space for new recreation developments. But I think the people should not consider recreation in its limited sense of sports and physical fitness programs only; we must look at the total man; we must look at libraries, the arts and crafts, and there's a very good art club in the City of Portage la Prairie. There are others in the Province of Manitoba. We must look at music; we must look at drama; we must look at tot lots and day centres for the aged; day nurseries, perhaps. I would think that in this stage in the evolution of government service the municipality is vital, in the development of programs, in the development of facilities and in co-ordinating the use of existing ones. The municipality is closest to the people and most sensitive to their interests and their needs and is vitally affected by the costs of such programs.

We would hope therefore that the spirit of this resolution that was introduced by the Member for St. James might prevail and that all municipalities might accept this challenge, as many have already done up to this date, so that the benefits may accrue to all of the citizens of the Province of Manitoba and I would wholeheartedly like to add my support to the resolution that is now before the House. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q. C. (Selkirk): Mr. Chairman, I listened to part of the Honourable Minister's speech and tirade and the only conclusion that I can come to is this: That he is opposed to this motion; and if his speech means anything, it certainly means to me that the municipalities of Manitoba have been doing more than their share towards creating recreational facilities. But I think that what the Honourable Minister has completely forgotten is the fact that what municipalities are interested in is a sharing of facilities between municipal corporations and school divisions. Now it may be true that some school divisions do allow their gymnastic facilities to be used by the public in general, but as I pointed out when I spoke on this motion originally, or on the amendment to it, I spoke of the situation where one municipal corporation may comprise the bulk of the population in a school division and the

(MR. HILLHOUSE cont'd.) other portion may be sparsely settled and what we wanted to have was some arrangement whereby that municipality which comprised the bulk of the population could enter into some kind of co-operative cost-sharing agreement with the school division respecting recreational facilities, because it would be unfair to shoulder that school division with the total cost of these recreation facilities when the use of these facilities would be perhaps made 90 percent by the people in that built-up area. That is the one thing that we wanted and I think that was the main point in the amendment which was defeated and I still feel that that is something that should be accomplished.

So I therefore wish to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lakeside, that the motion be amended by deleting all the words after the word "that" in line six and substituting therefore the following: "The Government of Manitoba give consideration to the advisability of taking such steps as are necessary and essential to co-ordinate, provide and to increase recreation facilities in Manitoba with particular attention to built-up areas."

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. STANES: I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Brandon, that the debate be adjourned.

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

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

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Speaker, can we have the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand.

MR. SPEAKER: May the honourable member have leave? Agreed? The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Brandon, and the amendment thereto standing in my name.

First of all, I'd like to say I appreciate the indulgence of the House in affording me the opportunity of giving the matter of this resolution the consideration it deserves.

After perusing carefully the amendment, may I say that I am prepared to allow the debate to continue and therefore rule the amendment in order.

Are you ready for the question? The Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

HON. DONALD W. CRAIK (Minister of Mines and Natural Resources)(St. Vital): Mr. Speaker, were you referring to No. 6? This amendment? I didn't quite catch all your remarks and I may be in error here but did you at one stage introduce a discussion on the Information Service there with regard to the amendment?

MR. SPEAKER: I was dealing with the amendment put forward by the Honourable the Member for Brandon which is before you -- standing in my name -- which was taken under advisement and I have now ruled on it. The matter is now open for debate or shall I put the question?

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

MR. SPEAKER: Now we deal with the main resolution. -- (Interjection) -- Thank you for your . . . I've got it.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for St. John's in amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for St. James.

MR. STANES: Mr. Speaker, it was my original intention to go into this matter in some detail in my opposition to this amendment. But after careful reconsideration and after reading the majority of the speeches made in this House I came to the conclusion there was very little that I could add to what's already been said and that anything I might say probably wouldn't change one single opinion.

Consequently, Mr. Speaker, I've decided to refrain from putting down in detail my thoughts in opposition to the amendment which is before us and hope perhaps that the time

April 26, 1968

(MR. STANES cont'd.) saved can be spent to a better use. I personally am firmly convinced that on this most important social subject that the opinions are most sincerely held by all. I disagree with the motion and cannot support the motion because I disagree with its universality, it's all things to all men and proven costs in many other areas. Whatever scheme we may provide I do contend we must provide a basic medical coverage for all wherever the need may be to a basic requirement of the people irrespective of the ability of the individual to pay for it. I have in mind of course, and I'm sure most of us have, a very important segment of our society; those people who because of inflation, because of age and very often illness find themselves in a very difficult economic position; that basic health must be provided to them irrespective of their ability to pay. Our senior citizens have contributed a great deal. Much that we have today is through their efforts and I would like to see that they are provided. I do not think that the means of providing that in the most efficient and economic method is through universal plans of a compulsory nature. Therefore I will oppose this amendment.

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

MR. BEN HANUSCHAK (Burrows); Mr. Speaker, as time goes by this whole question becomes increasingly important, increasingly urgent and calling for immediate action by this government. It wasn't very long ago, Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, April 24, when a story appeared in the Winnipeg Tribune headlined: "Doctors Want Full MMS Fee - Extra Bills Likely". Then the story goes on to describe the negotiations between the Manitoba Medical Society and the Manitoba Medical Association and it indicates that the doctors walked out.

According to the information presented in the House yesterday negotiations have not resumed and there is every indication, Mr. Speaker, that come July 1st there is going to be a substantial revision, and most likely an upward revision of fees. It's quite likely that this will create an additional burden upon the people of Manitoba. So when we talk about being reluctant to implement a Medicare program because it's too costly, the estimate on the basis of the negotiations underway indicates that if the doctors' demands were met the people of Manitoba will have to find an additional \$26.1 million in their pockets every year.

Now when we hear the criticism that governments ought not interfere in professional fees, when we hear criticism that a government operated Medicare scheme would increase the cost, surely, Mr. Speaker, it is the responsibility of the government to step in in a situation such as this and set up a plan whereby the consumer of the services offered by a doctor would have some say in the cost of them. After all, the services offered by the medical profession are extremely essential services, much the same as education. We don't negotiate the price that is paid for negotiation by the user of the educational services even though there is negotiations for salaries by the offerors of the education services. Teachers negotiate with school boards, and there's nothing wrong with that, and this should continue. But regardless of the negotiations at that level there is no one forced into a position where in order to obtain education services he may find that he individually, personally, would have to shell out an additional "X" number of dollars out of his pocket. In other words if there is an increase in the cost, the increase is spread over the entire community. Now insofar as education costs, this is a separate issue again because we have a thing or two to say about that as to what we mean by sharing education costs by the community. But the point is that the increase in the cost does not fall on any one individual consumer.

When these negotiations broke down, Mr. Speaker, it's reported here that Premier Walter Weir had an observer at the April 15th meeting. "However, Mr. Weir could not be reached for comment today on the latest development." I do not see the First Minister in his chair today either. Whether he is available for comment today or not I do not know, but I do hope that if he's not available for comment on this situation that the Minister of Health will take it upon himself to comment on this issue today. I think that the people of Manitoba deserve to know. The people of Manitoba deserve to know what is going to happen come July 1st. It's very strange, Mr. Speaker, that there have been a number of things happening and going on up until now which inevitably will affect the rates paid for medical services and the government did not take it upon itself to inform the people of what's going on, to fully inform the people of what's going on.

On March 1st of 1968 the Manitoba Medical Association sent quite a lengthy letter together with a number of enclosures addressed to all its members re billing to schedule. And in the opening paragraph this letter states that this billing to schedule should of course be

(MR. HANUSCHAK cont'd.): weighed in appropriate circumstances. What appropriate circumstances are I don't know. How a doctor is going to judge whom he is going to bill to schedule and whom he is not going to bill to schedule is beyond me. Is he going to make a decision on the basis of his job, on the kind of car he drives, the type of clothes he wears or home he lives in, I don't know. "But we believe that failure," and I'm continuing to read from this letter, "But we believe that failure to employ it in most cases will result in our losing the right to set a fair value on our own services, a right that ought to be denied to no one in a free society." And this I agree with, that this is a right that ought to be denied to no one in a free society. But I do not agree that any group unilaterally ought to have the right to set a price on its services, which is exactly what the doctors want to do. And this is exactly what the government is allowing the doctors to do by failing to implement a Medicare plan.

And strangely enough in the second paragraph in this same letter the writer of the letter -- it's written by one D. L. Kippen, M. D., President of the Manitoba Medical Association. In the second paragraph he goes on to say that "The profession should not have its economic base subject to the unilateral decisions of any free payment agency private or public." In other words what he's saying in his letter, if there's going to be any unilateral decisions made, let us make them. Let nobody else make them; we're going to make them. We don't want anybody else to tell us or to negotiate with us what the price for our services should be. We ought to retain that privilege to make that unilateral decision in setting what, in the doctors' opinion, will be a fair value for his services. Then -- and this, Mr. Speaker, I'm sure the government is aware of -- in the fourth paragraph the author of the letter said that, "Prior notification is important" -- that is before billing to schedule, and this is true. Prior notification is important because the contract, the Manitoba Medical Service contract, terms and conditions that describe this contract is dated July, 1967 -- I presume that this is the contract that is in effect today -- there is a provision in the contract, section -- and the Honourable Minister of Health no doubt has a copy of it in his office -- Section 3, subsection (a) and it reads as follows: "The corporation shall pay medical members at the rates from time to time enforced, provided that the medical member shall receive such payments as payment in full for the care and treatment rendered by him except (a) where there has been prior agreement between the medical member and the subscriber, the medical member may require the subscriber to pay the difference between the payments received on behalf of the subscriber and the total fee payable under the fee schedule of the Manitoba Medical Service then in effect" -- where there has been prior agreement. What does the medical association tell the doctors that they should do in order to create this prior agreement? Post a waiting room notice, post a waiting room notice, and together with this letter they enclose a copy of a notice and it reads as follows: "Important notice to MMS subscribers." And this is a photostat of it. Somewhere in the waiting room of a doctor's office you -- that is in the offices of those doctors who may choose to proceed according to the suggested proposal -- you'll find a notice such as this and it is headed, "Important Notice to MMS Subscribers. Manitoba Medical Service does not pay the doctors' fees in full, therefore it is necessary for us to submit accounts for the outstanding balance for certain services as outlined in your MMS subscriber's contract, Section 2, paragraph 3. Please feel free to discuss with us any questions regarding our services or fees." This notice, amid whatever else hangs on walls in doctors' offices, is to constitute a binding notice -- a binding notice to create a contractual relationship under this contract between the doctor and the patient. The patient comes in to see a doctor and he's expected to read everything that appears on the walls around him, and if he doesn't, no doubt I suppose the medical association would say, "Well it's not our fault that you didn't read the notice. It was there. It was there, typewritten on a sheet of paper. You should have read it." This is the type of situation that this government is allowing to develop and the instructions going to the doctors from this organization are to proceed in that manner. And then in the closing paragraph the President says, "Remember that your patients are entitled to prior notice" -- that is posting this notice on the wall -- "and reasonable explanation." What is meant by reasonable explanation I don't know. I suppose just a, you know, passing reference to the fact that this is what may happen and that he may be billed according to schedule.

Now the government knew that this was happening; the government knows if this is allowed to continue that the cost of medical services in Manitoba is going to increase tremendously, that the cost may conceivably increase up to approximately, or close to 10 percent of the provincial budget. What is the provincial budget? \$330 million or something for this

(MR. HANUSCHAK cont'd.) year? \$29 million if the doctors get their way isn't that far off from \$33 million. This is the type of thing that the government is allowing to happen; and in the same breath the government says that we cannot institute a Medicare plan, it's too costly, it's too expensive and so forth.

Now I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that there is need for the institution of a Medicare plan in Manitoba immediately and this is the reason why the Honourable Member for St. John's introduced the amendment that he did. The resolution as it originally stood makes the introduction of Medicare in Manitoba contingent on what happens in Ottawa. If I just may refresh your memory, Mr. Speaker, on the obligate proportion of the resolution: "Be It Resolved that this House request the Manitoba Government to join the national plan effective July 1st, 1968." This means the type of national plan that may be in existence as of July 1st, 1968. At the present time who knows what sort of a national plan there will be in effect on July 1st of 1968. -- (Interjection) -- That's true. That's true.

Our amendment asks to consider the advisability of introducing forthwith a health plan in accordance with the principles recommended by the Hall Commission. These have been spelled out and have been recited over and over again, time and time again, from coast to coast in Canada. The Hall Commission is quite clear as to what type of plan it proposes, and this is the type of Medicare Plan that we wish to see instituted for the people of Manitoba. And this is the reason why, Mr. Speaker, it is absolutely imperative that the people of Manitoba hear from this government today what is their position going to be come July 1, 1968. And that is only two months away, Mr. Speaker, two months away, and commencing as of that date the people of Manitoba are likely to be faced with paying a considerable amount of money more for their medical services than they are now; and to add insult to injury in most cases this excess amount, this increased amount, will have to be borne by those least able, least capable of paying.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): I wonder if my honourable friend would permit a question, because I was following him pretty closely there. Can he tell the House the total number of dollars that the people collectively paid, that is subscribers of MMS, paid collectively to doctors in the last year over and above the fee they received from MMS?

MR. HANUSCHAK: That is on the billing to schedule? How much they paid? I don't think any doctor would tell me that, nor you.

MR. SPEAKER: Order -- order, please. The Honourable Minister of Education.

MR. HANUSCHAK: The right is there, but I'm sure it's not being exercised.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, this is what worries all of us in Manitoba, is the kind of talking I've heard this afternoon. A member of the House picks up a newspaper article -- down with the doctors, throw them all out, they're all a bunch of . . . -- (Interjection) -- Well, this is the implication that I got sitting here. -- (Interjection) -- They're getting an unconscionable amount of money from the people. Is that what you insinuated? I think it is --

MR. PAULLEY: Are you preaching for a call?

MR. JOHNSON: I hope not.

MR. PAULLEY: I hope not, too.

MR. JOHNSON: . . . if my honourable member just keeps his seat. It makes me think of the famous words that my predecessor from Gimli once said in this House: "Let us not deliver the last bastion of humanitarian endeavour, the medical profession, into the jaws of the voracious socialistic monster". I think these are words that are coming back to haunt me. At one time I thought they were too tough, and I practiced in rural Manitoba and I have some knowledge of what hard work medical practice is. I have some knowledge that doctors are just as dedicated as any other group in society and anxious to render service and render good service for reasonable fees and this will be the end result of any negotiation with that great profession, who as recently as 1942 -- and maybe they made a mistake back in '42, when they started MMS as an instrument to provide prepaid premiums for those people in Manitoba who wanted to underline their care costs. No governments of the land were prepared to do it. The doctors did it. And many of us took 40 percent of our fee schedules gladly so that there was a fee and a premium available that people could afford to pay for a comprehensive service. And in Manitoba through that instrument of MMS we developed the most comprehensive care scheme on the North American continent under that system. But doctors have been under the cloud for years.

(MR. JOHNSON cont'd.)

I remember sitting in school when our professor of medicine said: "Get out to rural Manitoba before it's too late. Practice private medicine. See what you can do by yourself. Get out and see how well you can accomplish your task because pretty soon there'll be state medicine in this land." We've been living under the threat of this since the cows came home. And I became interested in this, and I became interested in Medicare for the needy in my own area and in this House; and this government's the only government in connection with a social allowances' program that ever brought in the most comprehensive Medicare scheme of its kind in North America. I think they stole the word "Medicare" from us.

MR. PAULLEY: Oh, poppycock.

MR. JOHNSON: Because Medicare to us and social allowances includes doctors, drugs, optometrical care and glasses and dentures and teeth and dental care. That's under the Social Allowances Act today for around 21,000 people. -- (Interjection) -- That's the literal interpretation of my honourable friend. I challenge him to show me people in this province today who haven't got access to the best in medical and health services anywhere in the continent in North America.

MR. PAULLEY: I accept your challenge.

MR. JOHNSON: And your schemes aren't going to cure it all overnight because you're going to pour more dough through the taxpayers' pockets.

MR. PAULLEY: Fiddlesticks.

MR. JOHNSON: A new deal? I stood up here and voted for this compulsory bill on the same basis that the Member for Lakeside brought in universal hospitalization. They put the dough on the table and they said, "fellows, take it or leave it." And I have to admit that universal hospitalization has been -- well it's the greatest social measure ever adopted in Canada or ever will be -- and costs -- we're experiencing that right now and experiencing more of it. But we've only started we find in hospitalization. We opened the front door, now we'll spend the next 20 years patching up the back door with the facilities that that leads to. But this is good for our people. Medicare and prepaid medicine is a good thing for the people. Those that need it especially. -- (Interjection) -- However, a form of prepaid care. But I'm not altogether a donkey; I went to England and saw Medicare operating there. I used to hear great speeches from this side of the House from the then CCF Party, and travelled and saw these facilities. It's a different ball game over there and one that our people don't want any part of.

MR. PAULLEY: Oh, fiddlesticks.

MR. JOHNSON: No fiddlesticks to it at all. I went into the hospitals ...

MR. PAULLEY: You know it's fiddlesticks.

MR. JOHNSON: I went to the teaching hospitals and I saw conditions under which our people wouldn't work. I'm not degrading the British Health Scheme, I just say under those conditions and the facilities I saw, our people wouldn't have any part of it. I just thought to myself as I stood in the hospital that Florence Nightingale worked in, in St. Thomas' across the bridge in Westminster, Westminster Bridge, 500 people lined up at 7 and 8 in the morning to get their medicine -- I thought oh by golly John...

MR. PAULLEY: At least they got it.

MR. JOHNSON: If we were back in Winnipeg and that ever happened, there would be a way - a war - and so there should be.

MR. PAULLEY: That's right...

MR. JOHNSON: But he knows all about it. Let me finish. I went to Norway where they always used to quote me. I said maybe that fits the western Manitoba, the same kind of terrain, maybe from my ancestry, maybe the same kind of people - I'll go and look at that place. I never heard of a Norwegian Doctor. There's state medicine all right but no Doctor practiced - you never, they don't export them. They're all at home. It's a state supported scheme. You graduate, you work for the state, you don't leave anywhere. It's a good scheme in many ways, but the little fellow said to me, you know we're so busy paying our social services we can't take a trip from here to Matlock - we have to walk. This is the kind of problem - the rich get richer in Scandinavia, the poor get poorer, and never get a chance to break out. I wasn't impressed with that social scheme. This is my own personal opinion, Mr. Speaker, I made a report on it when I came back to this House. Nobody listened to me but it's in the records if anyone wants to look. I read the Hall Report.

MR. PAULLEY: What.

MR. JOHNSON: The Hall Commission Report. We presented one in 1962 you should read again.

MR. PAULLEY: Oh, I did and I was disgusted.

MR. JOHNSON: We presented one to the Royal Commission that made them think. The Hall Report doesn't mention one thing about the number of calls a day, the 784 practicing Doctors in Manitoba see every day, a friend, a neighbour, a relative, a fellow MLA or someone like that and you pass him off, you give him a prescription; you give him a pill; you give him, you may even treat him; you may sew him up; you may deliver his baby. I would say there are five to eight of these calls a day per Doctor. Charged at the full rates under Medicare, add that to your cost across this nation and you'll get some idea of the escalation in the basic program as proposed by the Federal authorities. However, the cruncher was when this game of cat and mouse started last fall - after we'd passed this bill the Minister has recited. Nobody down there in the inner junta -- of course my honourable friend's in the inner junta over there - I'm not; I'm in the outer junta of that great party -- and different Ministers said different things. I remember our former Premier writing to the Prime Minister of the day and saying "Are you with it or agin it", and I don't think he ever got an answer that I recall.

MR. PAULLEY: They're both wishy washy.

MR. JOHNSON: Wishy washy - go wishy washy yourself. No wishy washy - no laundry boy in Gimli today.

MR. PAULLEY: That's right.

MR. JOHNSON: I just want to say that we went into this pretty thoroughly, they're still not certain down there and the Minister has said he had to make his decisions here in Manitoba. We're still not certain.

MR. DESJARDINS: That's for sure.

MR. JOHNSON: Certainly, because along come some civil servant marching across Canada saying the Federal Government is pulling out of Indian Health Services. I know when I was Minister of Health and Welfare in this province, I tried to urge the Federal Minister to share in Mental Health and TB, they couldn't afford that. They can't afford Indian Health Services but by golly they want to put a billion dollar program in this country. I don't know, it doesn't make sense to me. I'm just a little fellow from the country but that don't make sense to me, that this nation knows where it's going when it does this sort of nonsense.

MR. DESJARDINS: Why did you vote for it last year?

MR. JOHNSON: But I say this, that's the disaster down there. I'm so delighted that the new Prime Minister is of such -- well he sees it; what else could he do but go back to the people? He's got to replace that disaster as quickly as possible and I think he will. -- (Interjection) -- No, I didn't say that.

MR. DESJARDINS: You will admit there is a disaster?

MR. JOHNSON: My delicate cultured friend from St. Boniface.

A MEMBER: The way to go George.

MR. JOHNSON: My delicate cultured friend ...

MR. DESJARDINS: Watch out, Duff's around here today for a change.

MR. JOHNSON: My delicate cultured friend, he uses terrible words in this House, such words as gutless and spineless. -- (Interjection) -- I know it relates to your vocation and these things come so readily...

MR. DESJARDINS: Yes, we correct your mistakes for a long time.

MR. JOHNSON: When I hear this, when my vocation comes back to me and I think of such words as M. D., I think of such words as ideas of grandeur, hallucinating that maybe he may be over on this side some day.

MR. DESJARDINS: You're taking that drug now.

MR. JOHNSON: When things like that come to my mind, all of which make me believe that when he sees all this live, living, throbbing material on this side of the House, it's got to be frustrating to him. However...

MR. DESJARDINS: ... stay down, that's all.

MR. PAULLEY: You will admit there is a disaster in the provision of Medicare services in Canada.

MR. JOHNSON: In Ottawa.

MR. PAULLEY: In Canada.

MR. JOHNSON: Well, I think Canadians are seriously looking at it.

MR. PAULLEY: That's right.

MR. JOHNSON: And I think the people in this House reflect the thinking of the people.

MR. PAULLEY: No.

MR. JOHNSON: Well, you found out. You come down to Gimli, I'll take the member, the delicate cultured member from St. Boniface . . .

MR. PAULLEY: I bet you on medicare we could beat you in Gimli.

MR. JOHNSON: . . . and yourself, come on down, come on down.

MR. PAULLEY: We'll beat you on medicare alone.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Order please. I'm sure the Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party knows better than this.

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, you heard the challenge. I hope that's marked in Hansard. Let's underline it.

MR. PAULLEY: On Medicare alone we would beat you in Gimli.

MR. JOHNSON: Well my folks know a little more about life than you think they do.

MR. PAULLEY: Yes, living we want for your people, not death.

MR. JOHNSON: But you fellows would like to tell everybody how much they should earn; you'd like to set all the wage scales; you would like to do all these things for the people. But it isn't a perfect world; that's the way it is. People don't necessarily want all these things. Even us fellows can change our minds and attitudes. -- (Interjection) -- But you watch - I'm not worried about you.

MR. PAULLEY: No, of course not, but you will be.

MR. JOHNSON: I know that the medical men of this province have traditionally met the needs of the people and they will continue to meet the needs of the people, medical scheme or no medical scheme, and I have every faith that they will continue to support a measure which meets with such universal acclaim and satisfaction from the people concerned. But don't let me hear anymore of that -- some of that guff that they're against all these measures. The Doctor, a good Doctor is worth his hire, certainly, and he's not asking to be, to subsidize to any extent.

I'm one of those who personally believe that within our resources and our ability to do so, we should do what we can to assist those in the lower income group. When we say people have no resources, such as the people on social allowances, they have no money to buy it, then we give them a Medicare card and that's what we have done in this province.

MR. PAULLEY: They have to crawl to the government.

MR. JOHNSON: But if my honourable friend thinks that he can pay all the Doctors for all the services that they'll render on a long day and every day from now and forever more, that's pie in the sky.

A MEMBER: You better go back to your scriptures.

MR. JOHNSON: However, you take me on in Gimli my friend and I'd be delighted.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I just want to end by saying that the NDP have still not answered the question proffered by the Minister of Health who wondered what they meant by this amendment. To me, this is the all-inclusive amendment demanding all those services recommended, and I think that I can't add much more to what he has said in a very able address. -- (Interjection) -- He said plenty. I think we have to do what we can in this province, but I reject this particular amendment at this time.

MR. DESJARDINS: I just want to ask a question. I would like to ask the Minister a question please. What year did he make his survey on socialized medicare in England and Sweden? Would he mind -- (Interjection) -- I beg your pardon?

MR. JOHNSON: I think it was 1961. I was just over for three weeks. . .

MR. DESJARDINS: Well would the Honourable Minister tell me why he voted in favour of Bill 68 last year then if he had made this survey?

MR. JOHNSON: It was an ultimatum, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DESJARDINS: What's changed? What's changed? -- (Interjection) -- Just a minute, we'll come to you after. What's changed?

MR. JOHNSON: We don't know what we're going to get.

MR. DESJARDINS: You don't know - you don't know. You're changing for Walter Weir, that's all. You're costing the people a lot of money -- (Interjection) -- That's not what George said. That's not what George said.

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder if the honourable gentlemen have forgotten an important rule, that they must address the Chair rather than across the floor. Are we ready for the question on the amendment?

MR. PAULLEY: May I, through you, address a question then to the Honourable the Minister of Education who has just taken his seat?

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

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I asked you -- you suggested that we should direct our questions through you. I just did that, whether the Honourable Minister of Education would permit a question.

MR. JOHNSON: By all means, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you very much. The Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party. Let's not carry it too far.

MR. PAULLEY: The Honourable the House Leader suggested that they knew what their policy was in respect of this. I wonder whether the Honourable Minister of Education, who has disassociated himself with the question of health in Manitoba due to his present portfolio, what is the direction now of the government, because I note tonight, in the Winnipeg Tribune I believe it is, that there is a new approach insofar as the continuation or otherwise of MMS; namely, that the Government of Manitoba considered taking over MMS.

So I would like to ask my honourable friend, or through him the House Leader, what is the position of the Government of Manitoba as to the future of MMS? My honourable friend doesn't know, Mr. Speaker, this is quite -- (Interjection) -- I've asked my question. My honourable friend in answer to me rubbed his hands and I guess they don't know what the First Minister...

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, I made an address. Let him read it tomorrow.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I didn't ask for the address, I asked a question as to what is the future of MMS, which is of course associated with Medicare, in respect of the situation of government as contained in tonight's paper, and it's a perfectly proper question of my honourable friend.

MR. JOHNSON: I haven't seen the paper.

MR. PAULLEY: He has no answer.

MR. JOHNSON: I haven't seen the paper.

MR. PAULLEY: And I say this is typical of ...

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. In the crossfire, the Honourable the Minister of Education said that he had not seen the newspaper you are referring to.

MR. PAULLEY: Well, Mr. Speaker, can I take it that the government doesn't know which direction their First Minister is travelling?

MR. LYON: We just don't want to confuse your theoretical argument with any facts.

MR. PAULLEY: It's not theoretical, and I suggest to the House Leader that he'd better take other consultations on this matter with his Leader. At least we know where we're going.

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

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

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I ask for a recorded vote.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members please.

For the benefit of the honourable members that were not in the House during the earlier discussion, I would refer them to Page 5 and we're dealing with the amendment to the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, that is the adjourned debate.

A STANDING VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

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

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

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 10; nays, 40.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the amendment lost. Are you ready for the question on the

(MR. SPEAKER cont'd)...main motion? The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, we are now once again arrived at the main motion which is before us, the purport of which is that the Manitoba Government immediately indicate that it will enter the scheme which is now - to use the euphemism that is used by Liberal Cabinet Ministers - the law of the land, that is, that there is a statute whereby the Province of Manitoba can participate in a scheme which will provide this comprehensive type of health coverage. And I think it's significant to note, Mr. Speaker, on the last vote that indeed there was not a clear understanding of the position of parties in this House, otherwise I don't think the division bells would have rung as loudly and for the great length of time that they did ring, because of course the government position was not in trouble. They on this issue, in any event, on the issue that was put by the amendment, have been supported by the Liberal Party.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I'm on my feet again in this debate principally because I wanted to make some remarks with respect to what the Minister of Education said. I thank him for doing me the courtesy of coming back to hear these few remarks and I hope I won't detain him too long.

The Minister of Education hit at least a personal sore spot with me. He suggested that we in this Party were attempting to regulate everything relating to human conduct, that we were going to suggest how much people should earn, that we were going to suggest what they should do and when they should do it. And he says this, Mr. Speaker, apparently, because we are in favour of the citizens of this community providing a fund whereby if a person is sick he will then be able to go to a doctor, the doctor will treat that person and payment will be made out of the fund.

Now how the Minister of Education can logically jump to the conclusion, or what mental gymnastics he undergoes to arrive at the conclusion that we therefore say we are regulating the price of that person's commodities and regulating everything else there is about that person's conduct, is beyond me, and I hope some day he'll explain it to me. Because this is, Mr. Speaker, a popular criticism of the things that this party stands for, that we are out to regulate. The other parties, apparently they believe in the freedom of people to set their rates of wages, the freedom of the people to do what they like to do, but this party seeks to take away that freedom.

Now what is in fact the case, Mr. Speaker? We, in this party, moved last year that people do have the free and unfettered right to set their wages, and by the way with regards to the Medicare scheme we agreed that the person will have a free and unfettered right to either work or not work under this scheme as it is in the Province of Saskatchewan. What would happen, according to our submission and according to our presentation, is that when a patient walks into a doctor's office the doctor would be entitled to know whether he was going to get paid from the scheme. If he agreed to work for that patient as a member of the scheme, he performed the services and he got paid; if he didn't wish to work, he didn't have to work. And that is exactly the type of scheme which is in effect in the Province of Saskatchewan.

Now in view of the fact, Mr. Speaker, that the scheme that we propose retains that freedom - and I suggest that it does - why then are the medical profession against it? Mr. Speaker, I suggest they are against it for the very reason that was mentioned by the Minister of Education, that the medical profession is a devoted profession, is interested in looking after the needs of people in this community, and the Association knows that if such a scheme is presented the doctors will work under it just as they have worked under it in the Province of Saskatchewan, and they will work under it willingly because the doctors know that they will be able to make a reasonable arrangement with the Province of Manitoba and its representatives regarding the payment of their fees. And if that is the case, then where is this compulsion the Minister of Education speaks of?

Well, Mr. Speaker, though we have continually suggested that there be no compulsion, that people do have a right to set the rates that they are willing to work for - and by the way people also have the right to accept or reject that rate - where then is the compulsion? Well I suggest that the Minister look at those parties who he says do not compel the setting of rates and let's see what actually happens. In the Province of Saskatchewan, the Saskatchewan government enacted a medical care scheme which enabled the doctor to either serve or not to serve. What happened? The doctors withdrew their services. This is a euphemism for the word "strike."

MR. SPEAKER; I wonder if the honourable gentleman is not basing his argument .

(MR. SPEAKER cont'd)... somewhat with the amendment that has already been dealt with rather than the main motion. That has been discussed and dealt with, I'm sure he will agree. It is a little difficult for me to follow.

MR. GREEN: If I may, Mr. Speaker, the main motion suggests that we get into the national scheme which is to be in effect on July 1, 1968, which is the type of scheme that I am talking about, and I am expressing, Mr. Speaker, with great respect, reasons why this scheme does not offer any type of compulsion such as has been indicated by the Minister of education.

And I want to go back to what happened in the Province of Saskatchewan. The Saskatchewan government enacted that type of scheme, and what happened, Mr. Speaker, was the doctors withdrew their services. What did the government of Saskatchewan do, this government that the Minister of Education says had a philosophy which directs people as to what to do. They didn't say to the doctors you have to behave in one way or another; no, the doctors withdrew their services and the government of Saskatchewan negotiated with them. They didn't enact legislation saying that you'll stop this withdrawal of services, that you will go to work or go to jail. That's not what the Saskatchewan socialist government did, that's what the Saskatchewan Liberal government did. They did it last year when other employees, employees who do not make \$22,000 a year, employees who make in the neighborhood of between \$5,000 and \$8,000 a year, the employees of the power company, the other employees who work for the Saskatchewan government, when they said that they would withdraw their services, that Liberal non-Socialist government said no, we are going to put you in jail or put you to work. They enacted legislation directing people what to do, not the Socialist government of Saskatchewan.

And what happened with the railway workers? These people weren't making \$22,000 a year. They withdrew their services; they said we won't work under our present working conditions. And was it a New Democratic Party in government at Ottawa that said go to work or go to jail? No, it was a democrat freedom-loving Liberal government that said go to work or go to jail. And what legislation do you now have on your books, this Conservative government which says that it doesn't direct people what to do, that it lets people set the price for their services. How is it that, under this Conservative government, judges in Manitoba have issued injunctions to people who made \$2.75 an hour, not \$22,000 a year, and wanted to go from one job to another job, and the employer went down to the courthouse and got an injunction which said go to work or go to jail. It wasn't a Socialist government, it was the government of which this Minister of Education is a member that has laws which permit that to happen. You tell me, under even the British Labour government's national health plan, as to whether a doctor had to work for a patient if he didn't want to. He didn't have to, and that plan, Mr. Speaker, with the greatest of respect to what the Honourable Minister of Education said - I don't know what circumstances were like when they brought in that plan but that plan was an improvement - and if 500 people had to line up to get their medical care, that was better than those 500 people laying home in bed sick because they couldn't afford to get it. But that's what happened before this national health plan.

And what about the present legislation in the Province of Manitoba, which the honourable member says that people can't -- that the Socialist government would set wages, would set rates of pay, but the present legislation, which you the Minister of Education are a member of the government which is administering it, says that once wages are fixed for a year you cannot stop working for those wages in concert in any event. --(Interjection) -- Yes, in concert. Well if we believe in collective bargaining, if we believe that people have to engage in collective bargaining in order to have a position of strength from which to improve their wages, it's your legislation that says that wages have to remain the same during the collective agreement. The company can do anything they want with regard to prices. Why don't you have prices remain the same during the collective agreement? The worker gets an increase in wages, it stays the same; the company raises its prices and the increase in wages is withered away. It's not a Socialist government that legislated that, it's your government.

And what about in the Province of British Columbia? That's a right-wing government, a government of which the member for Rhineland -- a Social Credit government which doesn't believe in taking away human freedom, but that's the government that is enacting legislation that says it is going to have a board say what wages you are going to work under and what wages you are going to pay. That's not what the New Democratic Party has stood for; it's the other governments in this country that have stood for this type of legislation, and all the time

(MR. GREEN cont'd.)... mouthing that we are the ones who want to regulate things. They regulate everything except the wages of those who are powerful enough to influence the government. They don't regulate the wages of doctors; no, because the doctors are powerful enough. They don't regulate the wages of lawyers. They don't regulate the wages of lawyers because the lawyers are powerful enough to set their wages. They don't regulate the wages, they don't regulate the prices that are charged by the International Nickel Company ...

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I wonder if these remarks that the honourable gentleman is making are conducive to what is before the House for discussion. I hesitate to interrupt him from time to time but I realize that at times he does leave the subject, and I wonder if he will make an endeavour to stay with it.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'll come right back to the subject. I'll stop by saying that the Minister of Education attributed this type of conduct to us; I am merely putting the blame where it lies, not to the members of this Party but to the government who is in power now for enacting this type of legislation. I don't think that I have to stand here and accept from him that I want to regulate people's conduct and people's wages without answering, and certainly that's not what the government of Saskatchewan did in 1962 when the doctors went on strike.

MR. SPEAKER: ... the honourable gentleman and myself are agreed on what the honourable Minister had to say, I certainly didn't read into his words what the honourable gentleman has just said by any means.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, if the Honourable Minister would get up and say that that's not what he said, then I will say that I have wasted the last ten minutes.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, would the honourable member permit a question?

MR. GREEN: Yes.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, is he not prepared, after two years in this House, to accept the fact that the majority of this House does not adopt his Marxian philosophy?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I suggest what the honourable member has just said is repetition of what the Honourable the Minister of Education said before. What my particular philosophy is is irrelevant to the question that we are now discussing. I am talking about the people of the Province of Manitoba putting into a piggy-bank, so to speak, enough money so that when the Honourable the Attorney-General gets sick, he can go to a doctor and all of us will be responsible for his treatment. If that's Marxian, then I'm a Marxist.

MR. LYON: ... would then have to set class against class every time he speaks in order to bring this philosophy out?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Education got up and said that the New Democratic Party is interested in regulating what people should work for, regulating the price of what they should get; and I am demonstrating to him that that's what his government does insofar as the lower income groups in this community, insofar as they are concerned, and if he will tell me that he didn't say that, that I misunderstood him, then that's fine.

MR. SPEAKER: I'm sure the honourable member realizes that I am only trying to keep the debate within the limits and scope of the material before us, and I would like him to assist me to do that if he will.

MR. GREEN: I am talking, Mr. Speaker, in terms of a simple pragmatic program for the provision of health services to the people in the Province of Manitoba. I'm not talking about it in terms of any philosophy which this government has not already adopted with regard to other programs which they provide. If the Minister of Education can see that, can see that we are not discussing this from a philosophical point of view, we are discussing it from a pragmatic point of view, then he wouldn't bring in references to what he suggested we are trying to do and I would ask him to leave those references alone.

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

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lakeside, that the debate be adjourned.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder before we move on if I may speak to the House on something that developed a little earlier, and I would refer you to Page 4. You will recall we dealt with the amendment to the main motion of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition, and whilst I indicated at that time I felt it was in order, or I said that it was in order, I inadvertently picked up a piece of paper amongst my many ones which I quoted as a ruling, which I'd have

(MR. SPEAKER cont'd.)... been well advised to have let stay where it was. As a consequence, I would ask leave of the House if I may strike from the Hansard that part that is to do with that matter that I read that had no consequence with the question whatsoever. --Agreed. I am very grateful to the honourable members.

The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Gladstone. The Honourable Member ...

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I believe you didn't put the question on the motion to adjourn.

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourn? --(Interjection)-- yes. I'm sure the Honourable Member for Lakeside will appreciate my mind was full of the very important thing that I wanted to get cleared up and I apologize to the Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. CAMPBELL..... a lot of the rest of the members are at times.

MR. SPEAKER: I mustn't be there too often.

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

... continued on next page.

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

MR. JOHN P. TANCHAK (Emerson): Mr. Speaker, we have had a very lengthy and healthy debate last year on Bill No. 56, by which the present government for the first time in Manitoba imposed a sales tax on the people of our fair province. Some of the members opposite when this resolution was introduced by my friend, my colleague, seemed to think that debating the Bill at this time would simply be a waste of time. I do not agree with it. It may be a waste of time as far as this government is concerned, I do not know, but we hope that the government has a bit of conscience left and may be persuaded to do something worthwhile to relieve the burden of oppression on the people of Manitoba imposed by this government. But I can assure the members opposite that the housewife, the poor people, the pensioners, and some industries, will not agree with them, with some of these members who have said that it's a waste of time, they will not agree with them that this is a waste of time debating it at the present time.

Now if we look at the resolution, the preamble is made up of four paragraphs. The first one says, "Whereas taxes should not be an oppressive burden on individuals." I would like to say that although taxes are necessary to provide the services for the people of Manitoba, I definitely say that some of the tax imposed last year is definitely an oppressive burden on many of the poorer people, especially when the sales tax applies to the essentials, the essentials of life. Therefore, it does become an oppressive burden. If these taxes were applied to non-essentials of life, such as luxuries and so on, I would say it wouldn't be such a burden.

Now the second one, the second paragraph, "Whereas the federal" - I keep losing the page - "Whereas taxes should not discourage development." In many instances taxes do discourage development, because as I mentioned previously, there were some industries that were ready to start business in Manitoba but it was the tax, and especially the tax on building material, that persuaded them not to develop in the Province of Manitoba. In fact, they told me that they do not think that it will pay. It's also an oppressive burden on people, especially the poorer people who would like to improve their residences, and many people in this past year due to both of these sales taxes on building material - you had the existing tax, but this one just capped it - they decided that they cannot afford it. True, some of the people who have greater income go ahead and make improvements, develop the community, they improve their homes and so on, but it is the poor people, the people on fixed incomes who definitely have to look twice at what they can afford.

Now when we come to the next one, "Whereas in certain cases such as used clothing." Why should there be a sales tax on used clothing? The original purchaser had already paid a sales tax on it. And who buys the used clothing? I'm sure that the members will agree that the people who buy the used clothing are not the people with means. They are the people, the poorer people who cannot afford new clothing; they go and buy used clothing. Why should used clothing be taxed a second time when there was a full sales tax paid the first time?

School supplies. Many of our school supplies are being taxed now, especially exercise books and so on, and again I come back - people with means, people who are a little wealthier or earn more can probably afford the luxury of sales tax, but again the burden falls on those larger families, families with lower incomes. They can barely afford to pay the price of these school supplies, then there is the added burden of the sales tax.

What about sales tax on service charges? The same thing applies there; the same thing applies to even dry cleaning. Maybe some of these poorer people would be able to say, well we can afford the fees charged for the service of dry cleaning, but when it comes to that extra few cents - naturally you say it's only a few cents - but those few cents to the poor people mean an awful lot and those services and many other services should not be charged with the sales tax.

What about soaps, cleaning compounds, and so on? This, I would say, is the most vicious tax. To me, it's a penalty on cleanliness - a penalty on cleanliness. The people have to use these soaps, they have to use cleaning compounds, and here this government taxes these cleaning compounds, soaps and so on, and it is a penalty on cleanliness because a lot of the poorer class of people probably would be able to afford more of these materials if there was no sales tax.

And then we can go on and on and prove that a lot of these taxes are really creating an oppressive burden on the people with fixed incomes, on the poorer class of people, people

(MR. TANCHAK cont'd)...whose wages are lower.

So what is wrong, after we have had this sales tax in operation for a year, what is wrong in bringing it before the Law Amendments Committee to take a second look at it? I'm not saying completely throw the Bill out, or completely do away with sales tax, but review some of these articles that could be excluded or exempt from the sales tax, some of these articles that really and truly create a hardship on the people of the Province of Manitoba. Let us take a second look at it in Law Amendments, and after a year's experience maybe some of the sales tax could be juggled, maybe we could increase the sales tax and I'd be all for it; increasing the sales tax on luxuries and dropping the sales tax completely from some of these essential goods. If we increase the sales tax by one percent on luxuries, I would say that in my opinion it would be better to increase this sales tax by one percent on the luxurious items than to have them create this oppressive burden on the necessities of life.

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

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Carillon that the debate be adjourned.

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

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

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Speaker, in rising to support this resolution, I want to outline the purpose of it. We on this side of the House have introduced this resolution with the express purpose to provide a measure of protection for the public funds. We feel that every effort should be made to eliminate waste, extravagance and human error.

Let's go on and look at the what has gone on in other countries with respect to the Auditor-General. The oldest Auditor-General is that of England. It was established there in 1866 where the office is appointed by Letters Patent and he is responsible to the House of Commons. He enjoys the independent statute similar to that of a high court judge. He cannot be removed from office except on an Address of both Houses of Parliament.

He conducts the audit of all government accounts and one of his responsibilities is to check for waste and weaknesses of systems. Some members of this House may remember the case that arose in England following the last war, at Critchley Downs which was designed for airport construction. After a lot of investigation the Auditor-General discovered that there were improper practices and the government had to make a lot of changes to rectify the situation. Others may recall that the airlines in that country were investigated and found to be operating ineffectively and following a number of recommendations, substantial changes were made and savings accrued from it.

On the Canadian scene, under the revised statutes of Canada, two offices are established. The Comptroller of the Treasury, which is appointed by the Government-in-Council and who's counterpart we have in Manitoba. They also have the Auditor-General which is also appointed by Government-in-Council. He holds his office during his good behaviour until he is 65 years old and is removal only by the Governor-General on address of the Senate and the House of Commons. The Auditor-General has access to all government files, documents and records. His terms of reference are far broader than those of a Comptroller-General. It's his responsibility to check all moneys that have been spent and fully accounted for; check to see that money's spent for purposes which they were appropriated for by parliament. This is also done, I submit, by the Comptroller-General in Manitoba.

Each year the Auditor-General reports to the House on all matters he believes are important and over the years, members who have read the reports in newspapers and the Auditor-General's report in Ottawa, will recall of many instances where there have been examples of waste in the House of Commons. In 1962, I recall stories of the Auditor-General saying, quoting the Auditor-General saying. "Money wasted", and showed a number of specific cases.

There's another example of the RCA Officers house which was originally planned for \$34,900, and when it was finally built, the cost was around 70-odd thousand dollars. Another case that was brought to light was that of a government wharf which the government had sold and after the sale had taken place, the government proceeded to repair it at government expense.

And everybody I'm sure remembers the famous case at Petawawa where the horses were on the payroll. And the samples go on and on; it would take too long a time to cite them all during this debate.

It is true that our Comptroller-General does some of the things that the Auditor-General

(MR. GUTTORMSON cont'd)... does but he does not do all the things that an Auditor-General should do. In business today it is an accepted practice to have an Internal Auditor and an External Auditor and this is the suggestion that we are making in the resolution, Mr. Speaker. They should have an External Auditor in the terms of an Auditor-General, who would check the workings of government, the workings of various branches, crown corporations and the boards appointed by government. It would not be an additional expense, Mr. Speaker, when one considers the waste and extravagance that he would uncover during his investigations. It would amount to a tremendous saving and in this day and age when people are being taxed beyond their means.

I suggest that we should make every effort to institute some program whereby we can eliminate waste and extravagance in an effort to reduce taxes and I suggest that this House should pass this resolution which has been introduced by the Member for Hamiota.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. JOHNSTON: I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Gladstone that the debate be adjourned.

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

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

MR. FOX: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, there's been some considerable debate on this resolution and in essence some of the members have been saying that we on this, from our group want to create some kind of a cost and that we are also indicating that something should be compulsory. Well, Mr. Speaker, the situation is that we are not interested in forcing anything on this House; what we are interested in is providing a service so that the public can more generally get to appreciate the operations of this House. Now, we are not indicating that this has to be done; all we would like to have done is that the same privileges be extended to another means of communication as has been extended to the Fourth Estate at the present time. The press and the radio reporters do occupy seats up above, so does TV; but TV is not a complete communication system unless it also has the transmittal of the picture to go along with it.

Mr. Speaker, the simple proposition of our resolution, although it's been misunderstood, has been that we give them the same privilege of entering this House and doing their job at their own discretion, at their own cost, as they see fit and when and if they see fit. Now the reporters in this Chamber, Mr. Speaker, do not continually take every word down that is said, Hansard does that and they can always refer to it. But there are occasions when they do like to take excerpts and use them immediately and quite often a member of this Chamber will say something and five minutes later he'll be asked to come out and say it on radio. The press in the meantime is able to get on the telephone and write in their communication and have it in the paper that evening, quite often. But the TV system, Mr. Speaker, has a different problem, that they can communicate the spoken word but they cannot communicate the picture without having the equipment in the Chamber - and this is all that we require and this is the only thing that we are asking. We are not saying that it should be compulsory but that they should have the same privilege.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would move an amendment through the resolution which will make it that much more easier for the other members to agree that we only want it to be permissive. I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Brokenhead that the resolution be amended by eliminating the period in the last line thereof and by adding after the word "large" in the said last line the following: By permitting the representatives of these media to install and operate such equipment and facilities as would enable these media to provide such coverage as they in their discretion deem advisable.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. JOHNSON: I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Health that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Emerson, and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Burrows in amendment thereto. The Honourable the Minister of Agriculture.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I see that the mover of the amendment to this resolution is not in his place. However, I'll take a few moments to unburden myself of a remark or two in this particular... I am aware, of course that the mover of the resolution, the Honourable Member from Emerson is there and I'll direct my remarks to the main motion as well.

(MR. ENNS cont'd)

At first reading, Mr. Speaker, I was tempted to interpret the resolution in a way that perhaps the mover didn't expect, that is, was he in effect asking the government to expand their public Information Services Branch. I'm sure my colleague the Minister of Industry and Commerce might have thought that might have been a good idea. I could envisage the kind of situation developing where in the case of agriculture you would have the weather coming out this way: And now we have your friendly Minister of Agriculture telling the farmers whether it's going to rain or snow that particular day; or I suppose in the case of Tourism and Recreation you would have the friendly Minister of Tourism and Recreation advises the beach-goers as to what kind of weather you'd be having in the next few days. I don't really think that is what the Honourable the Member from Emerson had in mind when he was asking for this type of expansion of government service, but I believe, you know, you could read that interpretation into it.

I would have to at the first, say that I know what the honourable member is after in the amendment, that is more detailed weather as it refers to agriculture particularly. The Honourable Member from Burrows who is now in his seat expanded that by adding or deleting any specific reference to agriculture and including, you know, better weather information period right across the board. Now, of course, those of us who farm, we sometimes feel that the exclusion is the other way around. We get a little annoyed when after waiting for three or four weeks for some very badly needed rain and the first few drops begin to come and it happens to be on a weekend and the news media is concerned about somebody's spoiled weekend and the fact that somebody's golf game may be disrupted somewhat. But I'm treating this facetiously in this way and I really shouldn't.

I think No. 1, we have to recognize that weather forecasting as such is not such an accurate science as all of us perhaps would like to see it to be. I think while I certainly concur with the importance of accurate weather information in terms of the farming enterprises that our farmers are engaged in and how important the information can be to the successful operation of the various operations on the farms, I'm afraid that it's going to be sometime before the kind of specific information that the specific farmer wants - and that's really what we're talking about - because up until that time, I think that the individual farmer will continue to moisten his finger and hold it up in the air or watch the way the poplar leaves are turning on the trees or sense the direction of the wind and its strength to decide whether or not his alfalfa is due for cutting on this particular day or not. Or as he gets up in the morning and checks the dew on his grass, whether or not that's going to forecast rain or if he sees that sliver of cloud on the setting sun, to forecast the omens weatherwise for the coming day. And I don't really think that this House or this government should take away these perogatives from the farmers in exercising their prognostications, which I would have to say - which I would have to say are so many and so often as accurate, if not more accurate, than some of the weather forecasting that we're getting.

More specifically, I would have to say I really don't see the purpose of the resolution in the sense that information is now not being given. I think we may well debate the kind of information that's being given or its reliability, but any time we drive in our cars we hear weather forecasts practically on the hour every hour throughout the day; we have extensive weather mapping illustrated in our press, in our weekend press, particularly in our farm press, indicating the fronts moving in and allowing us to draw conclusions thereof. Certainly the TV coverage on weather - twice a day, usually at prime time - is again a very full coverage illustrating the whole width and breadth of Canada and allowing us to judge what weather fronts are moving in or what the situation can be expected to be within the next day or two.

The particular reason here for my having some reservations about supporting this amendment, this resolution, is that I'm not that sure whether or not - with having said the foregoing about questioning some of the reliability of weather forecasting - whether or not I as a government spokesman would want to necessarily associate myself with any given weather forecast at any given time. I think it begs a big question in this particular area, because certainly as in all other cases the government would very quickly become responsible for the misinformation or for the wrong information with regard to weather, and as sure as the Good Lord made little green apples, somebody would be pounding my desk saying but I cut my alfalfa or I cut my wheat on this particular day, you said it wasn't going to rain, or at least your agency or an agency that you support said it wasn't going to rain. And now it has rained, Mr. Minister, what are you going to do about it?

(MR. ENNS cont'd)

I think this is a question that, you know, we see more and more of government involvement in our daily lives. We like to think on this side of course that it's no more than is necessary or to the public good. I do question though whether in this particular instance this would be adding to that good in any way.

I would have to say this one thing further. The news media, whether it's the radio or the TV or the press, they're in the public service field and I am not sure whether the farm organizations have made every attempt necessary in telling them or sitting down with them and discussing what kind of specific arrangements they might need. I'm sure for instance, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Lionel Moore from the CBC farm broadcasts would be only too happy to sit down with the Manitoba Farm Bureau or the Farmers Union and discuss with them what extra kind of weather information they would like to see, whether it's a matter of timing - it could well be that during the particular seasons of the agricultural activity here in Manitoba, during seeding time or harvest time, it may serve the farmers' interest if simply the scheduling or the timing of weather forecasts were made at different hours, in keeping with the hours that farmers generally keep during those seasons, or indeed any other aspect of this.

It's not known to me whether or not sufficient effort has been made on the part of the farm organizations to approach their news media in this specific regard. It leads me to comment on one thing that I deplore somewhat, that for some reason we have - and perhaps it's partly our fault - we have encouraged in far too many instances I think, and this holds particularly true in the farm sector, to come first-hand to government to clarify or seek aid and assistance in a particular field without first seeking out the kind of arrangements that can be arrived at with the private sector in this instance.

I know that, without having particularly contacted these stations, but whether you talk about the radio station at Portage or at Brandon or at Dauphin, that these stations are there to serve the community, and farmers are certainly part of the community, and that if within these stations any organized attempt was made to sit down with the radio stations, I am sure that they would provide for them all, what after all we could provide or assist in providing.

I don't think the suggestion in the resolution is that the Province of Manitoba should begin to get into the business of actually creating the weather forecasting itself; I take that to be understood. Great and large amounts of money are being spent in this direction, not only by Canada but by governments throughout the world. I think a good portion of our space program is directed towards, or at least ancillary benefits are being sought weatherwise in this regard, and all we are really talking about is disseminating or further distributing the information that we have on weather to our community or to our farmers.

I'm convinced that if the farm organizations of this province were to seek an audience of the radio broadcasters or the TV people or the press, they will be only too pleased to sit down with them and help work out with them programs that would be of specific interest to them. After all, if the press and the media sees fit to publish the rising of the sun and the setting of the sun or the moon for that matter daily because of apparent sufficient interest in it, I'm sure, I'm sure Mr. Speaker, that they would also be only too happy to publish whatever additional kind of weather information the farmers of this province seem to require. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. TANCHAK: I understand I'll not be closing the debate, I'm speaking to the amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: You're speaking to the amendment, yes.

MR. TANCHAK: Just a few comments, Mr. Speaker, on the few words by the Minister. I can assure him that it wasn't my intention to extend the Information Services, or the News Information Services of the present government - definitely no - and I did not expect the government to get involved in forecasting weather. That wasn't my intention at all; my intention was to improve the present facilities, and the intention also was that specific times should be set aside for the farmers so that the farmer would know exactly when to look for this information. I'll come to that later.

The Honourable Minister says that weather forecasting is not so very accurate. I agree with him, but I also say that if it is at least 50 percent accurate at the present time, even then it would help the farmers, even if it was 50 percent accurate. He says that the farmer has his own ways, moisten his finger - and I've seen them do it - and test the weather or look at the

(MR. TANCHAK cont'd)...dew on the grass in the morning or watch the clouds and so on. And I have also heard this, that some old-timers say that they'll rely on some forecasting of our native Indians. Like the Indian says it's going to be a tough winter. Why? Because the white men have heap big woodpile. So I don't think we can depend on this kind of forecasting.

I am sure that with the huge great strides in the meteorological studies at the present time that at any time we may come to the point where at least these forecasts will be at least 75 percent accurate, and I would like our province to be ready when this time does come that they would be more accurate and really to the greater benefit of the farmers. I don't think that the government would be blamed too much if the government wasn't really directly involved in it and forecast the weather. I don't think the government would be too much blamed. There's no danger there because our farmers are all reasonable men, and they know that at the present time nobody can definitely say what's going to happen because changes can come up very very fast. And that's all I'll have to say on the Minister's remarks.

Now I'll come back to the mover of the amendment, and here is where I would say that I disagree with the amendment and I intend to oppose it. I would say that that seems to be the policy of the New Democratic Party, because I presume that the mover of this amendment had caucus with it with the rest of the members - and if he didn't he should have - and it seems to me that it is contrary to the enunciations made by the New Democratic Party in regard to the farming industry and I intend to oppose it. I think the original resolution was reasonable and the amendment to me just simply does not make too much sense because I am sure that the honourable member knew what was intended here.

He says, why not for the benefit of everybody? In my speech - and he admitted it that I did say that the whole community could benefit from weather forecasting as I indicated in my speech - but the intention was to help the farmer plan his program to improve himself financially. Even if it improved it 10 percent financially, then it would help. Now how would it help? You all know, most of the people - some are farmers and some are suitcase farmers and some pretend to be farmers - most of them know how it would help. If the farmer knows it's going to rain, he's not going to start harvesting or cutting down his grain at the particular day or hour or cut down his hay.

But we come back to the resolution, and here is where I disagree with the New Democratic Party. Evidently the member from Burrows does not believe in all these whereases because he says delete them. What is wrong with the first one, "Whereas the business of farming is highly dependent on the vagaries of weather." He says that's right. If that is right, why delete it? Evidently the New Democratic Party does not agree that the business of farming is highly dependent on the vagaries of weather because they had deleted it - they had deleted it - they don't agree with that.

Another whereas which the New Democratic Party deleted is "Whereas the weather plays an important role in the successful operation of a farm". The NDP party does not agree with that because they deleted that. That was deleted. And "Whereas orderly planning of daily farm operations is essential to a farmer," they don't believe in that; delete it. Orderly planning of daily farm operations is not essential to the farmer according to the NDP party because they delete it. I don't know where they stand on that.

Then it continues, "Therefore be it resolved" - and then delete "therefore" - that's their privilege - delete "the news media". Why delete the news media? I am sure that the news media will be just too happy because these are the kind of news that everybody in Manitoba would like to hear, because everybody, as I said before, is interested in them and nobody prevents the rest of the community or the industry from listening in to these broadcasts. The original intention of this, as the Minister has said - and it doesn't exclude the rest of our society - it doesn't exclude them at all because the resolution says "detailed local and regional, daily and long-range weather information primarily" - now that one word does not exclude the rest of the people in Manitoba - "primarily for the benefit of agriculture". Primarily for the benefit of agriculture, and I think agriculture deserves this little bit of service.

So I completely disagree with the amendment because the resolution in the first place was a more sensible one. It was all-inclusive and it did heed to what the farmers have been asking; they have been asking for this. I haven't heard any briefs presented by other people in the Province of Manitoba asking for better weather information, but this would give them better weather information.

It is essential to the farmer that he has regional - the Honourable Minister said you could

(MR. TANCHAK cont'd)... turn the radio on and listen to weather forecasting, but we want the regional. I would like to have regional weather forecasting. I would like to have for a certain area, say northeastern Manitoba, at a certain time - even if there is a warning that an hour or an hour and a half from now you'll be struck by a hail storm, it's coming, because those things develop - and at certain times in the day set aside for that we could have it - regional forecasting. That's why I said primarily for the benefit of the farmer, and for the life of me I cannot see why the New Democratic Party would delete any reference to the farmer when the original resolution included all of Manitoba but primarily - but it included them - primarily for the farmer, and I think the farmer ought to have that little bit of consideration in this House.

MR. SPEAKER; The Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

MR. SAMUEL USKIW (Brokenhead): Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to participate in this debate at all but seemingly it appears that one has to educate some members of the House with respect to the fact that farmers are people, and the amendment as presented by the Honourable Member for Burrows refers to all the people of Manitoba when he says that they ought to receive proper weather forecasting information.

Now I'm wondering whether the Honourable Minister of Emerson is trying to imply that farmers are something other than people, other than people, because really our amendment is all-inclusive. It doesn't discriminate against any group of people or any individual, and I don't see that we have to have specific weather bulletins for one group or the other. I think those people that want to go camping are interested in what the weather is going to be. I think the people in the construction industry want to know what the weather is going to be. I think the people that are going on trips want to know what the weather is going to be. And I know, as a farmer, that I do want to know what the weather is going to be, but I don't know that we have to categorize ourselves as having been farmers in this area or whether we are people that are going on trips or whether we are building homes or what have you. I think we all want to know what the weather picture is and it's a matter of having more or better weather forecasting for the whole Province of Manitoba.

I think that's the real question. I don't think anyone is trying to suggest that farmers ought not to have the necessary information such as has been suggested by the Honourable Member for Emerson. I don't see how he could interpret that type of idea into our amendment, because, Mr. Speaker, the very idea of the member for Emerson suggesting that we as a political party are not concerned with the needs of agriculture insofar as weather forecasting is ridiculous, because we recognize farmers as being part and parcel of the community and that they are not any different than any other community in whether or not they want to receive proper weather information.

So, Mr. Chairman, I have very little patience with this type of propaganda. This type of propaganda, another example of an individual or a political party trying to suggest that another party is not interested in one segment of our economy. So, Mr. Speaker, I certainly want to take my honourable friend the Minister from Emerson to task on his position -- the member rather.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. WATT: Mr. Speaker, if no one else wishes to speak, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Springfield, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Portage and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Wellington in amendment thereto, standing in my name. I refer to something I'm about to say. It's necessary that I burden the House with this in order that posterity may be satisfied, so I hope you will bear with me if I go through these notes as to the ruling in this connection.

I appreciate the indulgence in the House in affording me the opportunity of giving the matter of this resolution the consideration it deserves. After perusing carefully the amendment, may I say that I am cognizant of the fact that the House and Committee of Supply approved of the estimates which included expenditures of the Information Branch referred to in this resolution. At the same time, I realize the estimates of the department concerned are not finalized in that they have not yet had concurrence. In spite of the unusual situation that has developed, I am prepared to allow debate to continue. At the same time, I commend the contents of Citation 148, Beauchesne Fourth Edition, to the honourable members, which I would like to quote in part when I say, "It is irregular to reflect upon, argue against, or in any manner call in

(MR. SPEAKER cont'd)... question in debate past Acts or proceedings of the House." Having said this, I feel confident the co-operation of all the members will be forthcoming in dealing with the matter under review.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, do I then gather that your ruling is that the amendment is in order?

MR. SPEAKER: That is what I was about to say and put the question, unless there is any speakers. Are you ready for the question?

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, might I ask - possibly I was out of the House at that particular time - might I ask whether or not the Honourable the Member for Wellington was participating in the debate, had moved the amendment, or what...

MR. SPEAKER: He simply moved the amendment.

MR. PAULLEY: Pardon?

MR. SPEAKER: He simply moved the amendment.

MR. PAULLEY: And now it is open?

MR. SPEAKER: It is open for discussion - or debate I should say.

MR. PAULLEY: Then, Mr. Speaker, I would beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains, that the debate be adjourned.

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

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

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I don't want to delay this matter but I understood that - I was going to adjourn it but that would be a delay unless it was indicated that somebody from the government side wishes to speak, and if that's the case then it wouldn't be delayed by my not speaking at this time.

MR. LYON: ... to speak, but he's not present at the moment so I encourage my honourable friend to carry on.

MR. GREEN: If that's the case, Mr. Speaker, then I'll proceed.

Mr. Speaker, we've looked at the resolution with regards to a breathalyzer and the members of this Party are certainly in agreement with the members of the Liberal Party in feeling that something must be done with regard to the drastic situation in connection with highway traffic accidents associated with the drinking of alcohol. Quite often the situation arises that when there is a particularly critical situation that rash remedies are looked for, and what we are concerned with is that the cure not be worse than the disease, as it was put earlier today in another debate. We think that the breathalyzer is a proper and effective instrument for the control of drinking driving.

The resolution that has been put by the Member for Assiniboia simply states that there be legislation - and I'm paraphrasing - enabling the law enforcement agencies to require drivers, who are believed on reasonable and probable grounds to be under the influence of alcohol, to submit to a breathalyzer test. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is pretty general and we think that it's sufficiently general so that when precise legislation comes up then we could deal with the question as to whether the legislation would or would not affect fundamental civil rights which we feel are just as important to all of the citizens of our community. And to just indicate the type of thing that we fear, I would like to refer to the federal legislation which makes it a criminal offence to fail to breathe into a breathalyzer test - the piece of mechanical equipment.

This is the type of legislation, Mr. Speaker, that we are very concerned with. I don't wish to register a definite objection, but this is the type of legislation that we are very concerned with. We feel that the historical civil rights of the citizen, which enables him to refuse to affect either his person or his mind to a law enforcement officer, is still something which should be treasured by this society.

On the other hand, we think that it is a proper part of a province's licensing powers to require what is reasonable from persons who are asking for that privilege, because, Mr. Speaker, the use of the public highway by an individual in a motor vehicle which is capable of doing immense damage and also is capable of causing grievous bodily injury or death to other individuals is a privilege for which the person must apply to the law enforcement officers for a licence, and we think that the law enforcement officers in granting a licence are entitled to require certain conditions of the person who seeks it. This is not at all unusual and it applies I suppose to every single licensing authority set up either by provincial or municipal governments. A person who wants to operate an ice cream stand, I suppose has to get a licence and has to

(MR. GREEN cont'd)...comply with certain health requirements in order to see to it that that licence is not affected.

And so, Mr. Speaker, we see within the resolution, the broadly framed resolution that was put by the Honourable Member for Assiniboia, the possibility of the implementation of legislation such as we would favour, that is, legislation which would make the obtaining of a driver's licence conditional upon a person stating that he would submit to a breathalyzer test under certain circumstances. The circumstances have to be studied, but we think that the principle is good and it should go forward based on that principle so that legislation will be forthcoming.

For instance, Mr. Speaker, a person applying for a driver's licence would have to make a statement to the effect that he will willingly, upon the happening of certain circumstances, submit to a breathalyzer test, and failing same, that his licence would be suspended for a certain period of time or until he has done something which would satisfy the licensing authorities that it should be renewed, and I, Mr. Speaker, for one don't think 24 hours is sufficient. I know that some say that some provinces have 24 hours suspension or something of that nature; I think that once a person undertakes to do it and doesn't do it, that a lengthy suspension of the licence is certainly in order. I don't say this because I suggest that he is trying to avoid an offence, although he may very well be doing so for that reason, that is refusing to breathe into the test, I'm suggesting a lengthy suspension because he has broken his undertaking with regard to the holding of that driver's licence.

So we, Mr. Speaker, we recognize the need, we recognize the urgency, and perhaps a little more than some others we recognize the difficulties. We know that the Minister has come under severe criticism as a result of some soul-searching. Mr. Speaker, the criticism is positive, I'm sure, and yet I wish to be generous to the Minister in saying that the soul-searching is also positive. It's not a simple matter; it is a serious problem but that doesn't mean there is a simple solution. We think that the resolution that is put by the Honourable Member for Assiniboia will permit the latitude that would enable the kind of solution that we are suggesting, which would have the double effect of reducing the mayhem on the highways while at the same time protecting the civil rights of the citizens. It's a tough thing to do both things at once. We think that at least we should try and we hope that it's possible. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Speaker, we dealt with this subject matter at great length, a week ago today I believe it was, and I don't intend to take up any time of the House now because it was certainly thoroughly debated a week ago and I was certainly on record at that time. However, in reviewing some books and literature in the legislative library today, I came across the Throne Speech from Saskatchewan as registered in Votes and Proceedings No. 1, and it's interesting to note there that the Saskatchewan government on February 15th said, "My government is greatly concerned over the proven relationship between drinking drivers and traffic accidents. Accordingly, it is my government's intention to introduce legislation which will complement the amendments to the Criminal Code in this field presently under consideration by the Parliament of Canada".

Now, this is what I said a month or six weeks ago, that there was a relationship between the drinking driver and accidents generally and, in particular, fatal accidents. We have plenty of records to support that fact. All insurance companies have records to support those facts. The Throne Speech, as read in the Saskatchewan House on February 15th last, says that the Saskatchewan government is concerned over the proven relationship between drinking drivers and traffic accidents. So if the Saskatchewan government has statistics to show that there is in fact a relationship and the Throne Speech there, as read by the Lieutenant-Governor, says that the government is concerned about that relationship, then I say that it is high time that this government made the same observation and enacted similar legislation.

I have before me, just to summarize, and this is all I'm going to say, Mr. Speaker, that the accidents in Manitoba last year, while the fatal accidents were down by two, that is there were 202 deaths in our province last year, the overall accidents were up substantially and in Metro Winnipeg alone the percentage of fatal accidents were up 20 percent. Now, Mr. Speaker, I understood the Minister of Public Utilities to state a week or so ago that it was his intention to vote with us on this resolution today and that this would once and for all put him on record as supporting the resolution, and so I look forward at this time to having unanimous support of

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd)... the resolution.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, one of the main reasons for the use of breathalyzers stem from the danger of motorists on highways...

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, is my honourable friend closing debate?

MR. PATRICK: Yes, I am.

MR. LYON: Well, there's somebody else who wishes to speak.

MR. PATRICK: Well, Mr. Speaker called the question.

MR. LYON: In which case, I would like to move, seconded by the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer, that the debate be adjourned.

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

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

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain, that

Whereas Condominium legislation would assist low income families to own their own dwellings, and

Whereas Municipal, Provincial and Federal governments are dedicated to the principle that all individual citizens should have the right to own real property and that these rights are inherent in a free society, and

Whereas home ownership has become much more difficult in the last few years due to escalating construction costs, land values, high interest rates, and increasing taxation, and

Whereas Condominium accommodation provides an equity investment for the occupier, a flexible investment opportunity for the builders, and would create greater activity in the construction industry in this province, and

Whereas during the 1966-67 session of the Manitoba Legislature a resolution was proposed by the Hon. Member for Assiniboia on the subject of condominium legislation, and

Whereas this resolution was amended by the Minister of Urban Development and Municipal Affairs, referring the subject of condominium legislation to the Law Reform Committee for further study, and

Whereas to date the government has failed to reveal the results of this study and has failed to indicate that it will bring in condominium legislation,

Therefore Be It Resolved that an Act be passed at this session to facilitate the division of buildings into separately owned units, with a certificate of title to issue for each unit, and that each unit may be transferred, leased, mortgaged or otherwise dealt with in the same manner and form as any land held under the Real Property Act.

And Be It Further Resolved that each unit in a condominium constitute a "Homestead" for the purpose of the Dower Act.

MR. SPEAKER: I feel I must tell the Honourable Member for Assiniboia that I have considered the substance of the resolution in reference to our Rule 27/60, and the fact that the Throne Speech makes reference to condominium legislation, I must rule the resolution out of order.

MR. PAULLEY: With all due respect, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that due to the fact that there has been legislation introduced, we might be on firmer ground.

MR. LYON: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I believe my honourable friend is making reference to the fact that legislation in this regard has already been introduced pursuant to the Throne Speech which would further undergird Your Honour's ruling.

MR. SPEAKER: Has the legislation been tabled?

MR. PAULLEY: Yes, it has been introduced.

MR. SPEAKER: Has the honourable member had the privilege of seeing the legislation?

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I haven't seen any bill or legislation.

MR. SPEAKER: I consider my position correct and I have ruled it out of order. The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Elmwood. The Honourable Member for Dufferin.

MR. WILLIAM HOMER HAMILTON (Dufferin): Mr. Speaker, I know we are all aware of the importance of this matter to the citizens of Canada and I don't think it's to be treated lightly, but great consideration has been given to the constitution, the Canadian Constitution, reinforced by the two great conferences we had not too long ago, the Conference of Tomorrow in Toronto

(MR. HAMILTON cont'd)... last fall and the Federal-Provincial Conference held in Ottawa last February, at which all these matters were thoroughly discussed. I was quite pleased with our Premier's contribution to the debate at that conference and I think he is to be commended highly for the high tone in which he spoke on behalf of the citizens of Canada and of Manitoba. In fact, it was a lot higher than some of the debates I had the privilege of listening to.

Now we have many ethnic groups in Canada who have contributed to the building of this great country and their voices have been heard thoroughly in my opinion in the B & B commission. I think everything has been done up to date that could be done in bringing this to fruition. Agreement has been reached to study and negotiate these important matters that divide Canada and I don't think it's time, at this time, for narrow and parochial advantage, and I'm quite sure as I stand here this afternoon that the new Prime Minister Stanfield will take this under consideration after the 26th of June. So therefore, Mr. Speaker, I'm opposed to any study at the present time based on the provincial level and I'm sure that a committee at this time would be very redundant, so therefore I'm opposed to it.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. John's, that debate be adjourned.

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

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

MR. PAULLEY: I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if we can have this matter stand?

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I wonder, due to the hour and because of our new rule which marks "stand" against people, if there might be some agreement, rather than hobble certain people who might not be ready to speak right now, or may be absent, that we could call it 5:30 and adjourn.

MR. PAULLEY: Do I take it from my honourable friend that it will not be considered as a Standing for my honourable friend the Member for Wellington if that is ...

MR. LYON: I think we should be generous enough to...

MR. PAULLEY: I appreciate the gesture of my honourable friend.

MR. LYON: I think we should make that retroactive to include the Honourable Member from ...

Mr. Speaker, I would move, seconded by the Honourable Provincial Treasurer, that the House do now adjourn.

MR. PAULLEY: How mellow can you get?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, Order please. Before I put the motion, I would like to remind the House that we go on daylight saving time on Sunday morning at 2 a. m.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House adjourned until 2:30 Monday afternoon.