

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
2:30 o'clock, Thursday, May 23, 1968

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions
Reading and Receiving Petitions
Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees
Notices of Motion
Introduction of Bills

I'd like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery where we have 22 students of Grade 4 standing, from Rockwood School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Pearson. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce.

We also have with us today 54 students of Grade 8 standing, from the Beliveau Junior High School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Bernard and Mr. Parker. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party.

Also with us today, 34 Grade 8 students of the Edmund Partridge School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Braun. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

On behalf of all the Honourable Members of the Legislative Assembly I welcome you all here today.

Orders of the Day. The Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

HON. DONALD W. CRAIK (Minister of Mines and Natural Resources) (St. Vital): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to lay on the table Return to an Order for an address No. 2, dated March 18, 1968, on the motion of the Honourable Member from Ethelbert Plains.

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

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q. C. (St. John's): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Honourable the First Minister, may I appeal to his deputy to see what could be done to obtain a Return for the Order which I requested on April 10th, No. 31, dealing with a report on the Hedlin-Menzies Report on Transition in the North.

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q. C. (Attorney-General) (Fort Garry): I'll ask the First Minister about that this afternoon.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debates on second readings. Bill No. 84. The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. DOUGLAS CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that the honourable member would have no objection to someone proceeding with this Bill. Might I ask what Bill is it?

MR. LYON: Incorporation of the Town of Thompson. Bill No. 84.

MR. CAMPBELL: I think that we wouldn't want to hold it up. Certainly if anyone else wishes to proceed okay, and if the honourable member isn't back by the time we finish the rest of it let us deal with it.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill 108. The Honourable Member for St. James.

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

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Education) (Gimli): Mr. Speaker, my remarks will be brief here. I don't think I can support this measure, Bill 108 -- and I believe in the second section there that deals with the request from the Winnipeg School Division that teachers' aides be allowed to have the same disciplinary powers as the teaching staff. At the present time there are no such aides at the moment. I think it is something we could consider in the coming year but personally I don't see why or how there would not be a teacher in the building at any one time during the day when these teachers' aides are -- if and when they are hired they could always turn to the teacher in the school for advice re discipline.

The first section of course is asking for the right to extend bursary monies to teachers to assist them in upgrading and I feel that if this is a good measure it's one that should be given in a general provision. I'm not prepared to support such a provision at this time as I believe the department's bursary loan and other programs in assistance to teachers in training and

(MR. JOHNSON cont'd.) upgrading at this time is quite generous and if we're going to hold the line in some areas in the field of education maybe this is where we should start. In other words, if it's going to be a general provision for divisions to give bursary monies then it's something we should be looking at as a general measure in the department.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister would permit a question. In relation to both aspects. Firstly in regard to the 8,000 limitation which apparently now exists on the Winnipeg School Division, do I assume correctly from what the Minister said that this limitation of 8,000 applies to all other school divisions and that they may spend up to that amount?

MR. JOHNSON: This is a special provision, Mr. Speaker. It's been in the Act for some time and only applies to the Winnipeg School Division.

MR. CHERNIACK: What is the permissible amount now payable by others?

MR. JOHNSON: Well the school divisions to my knowledge are not paying bursary monies to teachers as far as we know.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well then the next question if I may, Mr. Speaker, is: what are the rights that teachers now have to impose discipline which are denied to the teachers aides?

MR. JOHNSON: Well under the general provisions of The Public Schools Act teachers are given the right to give -- I haven't got the specific wording -- but they're allowed to, I guess on the advice, the policy of the board and the principal, the amount of -- carry out punishment such as the strappings and so on -- I don't know if too much of that is going on these days. But they are allowed to give -- I haven't got the wording in front of me, I'd be happy to look it up. I just read it not too long ago. I'm sorry I haven't got the exact description of it but it boils down to giving punishment. I don't think it's necessary especially when there are no teachers aides at the moment. But should they come into being I think that we can examine this during the year, but it also seemed to me in a practical measure that there's bound to be a qualified teacher in a school, surely, in which these teachers' aides are operating. I think it's the teacher that should give that punishment. The teacher's aide should refer that matter to a person who has the power to carry out the necessary discipline.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, my question was very similar to that of the Honourable Member for St. John's. Do the teachers have full power to impose discipline? And I see under this particular Bill here that the aides would only have similar powers. Their powers would not be extended beyond what the teachers have, am I right?

MR. JOHNSON: No, I would gather that -- In answering the Honourable Member from Rhineland, I would gather that this Bill is asking that the teachers' aides be given the same powers as teachers with respect to discipline. Those powers are spelled out in the Act and they're limited powers, of course, but I would not be prepared to see this and I don't think it's necessary.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, we have some reservations as far as this Bill is concerned but we're prepared to let it go into committee so we can hear presentations on it.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? Those in favour please say Aye. Those opposed say Nay. In my opinion the Nays have it.

Bill No. 86. The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. Did you declare the Bill lost?

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? Those in favour please say aye. Those opposed say nay. In my opinion the Bill is lost.

Bill No. 86. The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, this Bill was first read yesterday; I believe it was approximately midnight, and I believe that all of the members in the House were not at that time in their most receptive mood to hear any comments on the subject and it was for that reason that I felt that it should be adjourned so that it could be considered in a more favourable atmosphere.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make it immediately plain that I am not going to oppose this bill going to second reading and that I will favour the bill when it finally reaches the House on third reading. But I think, Mr. Speaker, that if this bill is of significant importance for what it does not say -- and what it does not say, Mr. Speaker, is that the idea of co-ordinating the services

(MR. GREEN cont'd.) of various municipalities in Greater Winnipeg is so obvious that even if a suggestion that a matter of this kind should be delayed for one day is looked upon as being some kind of obstruction.

Now what is the situation with regard to this Bill, Mr. Speaker? We have two municipalities in Greater Winnipeg whose municipal councils have decided that they should form one municipality or one city and they then say with pride that -- I believe it was mentioned by the Honourable Member for St. James, and some day it may be the Honourable Member for St. James-Assiniboia, I don't know -- but they say with pride that it's going to be the second largest city in the Province of Manitoba. They didn't come to the Legislature and ask -- oh, well there are two members sitting for that particular constituency -- they didn't say to the Province of Manitoba that we would like you to have a commission to study this; they didn't say that we would like you to refer it to a boundaries commission; they didn't say we would like a referendum taken on the subject; they didn't say that it needs study. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, they didn't say it, and what is significant is that nobody else said it either. There wasn't a single voice raised to suggest that this is a very complicated, difficult social and economic problem that will require years of study, years of procrastination and years of doubt as to whether it's a good idea. It was such a good idea that it was read on the dying days of the Session, at 12:00 o'clock midnight, and there was some surprise that debate would be adjourned on the subject.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I ask the promoters of this Bill and I ask the members of this Legislature to remember this Bill when they are considering just as simple an idea, just as obviously right an idea as the co-ordination of services in Greater Winnipeg as a whole. Because if there are any doubts, Mr. Speaker, that if the twelve remaining municipalities -- after this one is amalgamated, there will then be twelve I take it, or eleven; I hope I'm right on the numbers, but it will be either eleven or twelve -- that if the municipal councils all came and said we are asking for a Bill to co-ordinate the services, is there any doubt that the same thing wouldn't have happened with that kind of legislation? That it could even be read on the last day of the Session. It would be so obvious that anybody who moved adjournment would be looked upon as possibly delaying the Bill and there'd be distinct surprise if anybody suggested that you had to study it. But that's exactly what's occurred with Greater Winnipeg. Not only was there one study, but my recollection is, and the Member for St. John's would know better than I, that there were three studies. And not only were there three studies but then it was referred to a boundaries commission; and then there were reviews and then there were suggestions that we should have referendums; and then there were suggestions that we should have cost studies and I want the people who are making those kind of recommendations to remember this Bill. Remember that all that was needed was in effect the consent of two municipalities, who, Mr. Speaker, I believe are consenting to the right type of thing for all of the wrong reasons. Because it appears to me that this Bill is meant to put St. James-Assiniboia into a stronger municipal position when it comes to the question of discussing what's going to happen to Greater Winnipeg as a whole. They will probably and I know the -- what I've heard from members of those councils before, they will probably take a greater stand against co-ordinating all services than they would have if there were two cities rather than one. And for that reason, Mr. Speaker, they probably think that they are staving off a greater co-ordination of services.

Well, Mr. Speaker, they're not because I say that this Bill is a precedent and the way which the Legislature has reacted to this Bill is a precedent. All that is necessary, apparently, to co-ordinate services in more than one municipality in Greater Winnipeg is to get the consent of the municipal councils. Well, Mr. Speaker, it's probably the last group of people -- probably the last group of people that should be asked to decide whether this should be done. And yet it apparently is the only impediment to it being done. Because I suggest that if the eleven municipalities came here and suggested that we consent to this idea the idea would be so obvious that nobody would even delay the Bill, nobody would have the temerity to suggest that debate be adjourned because somebody -- I think that the Member for St. James indicated that he had already told the people to be here at Law Amendments Committee today. He had already told those people to be at Law Amendments Committee today, so certain was he that nobody would even adjourn this debate on this kind of a proposition. That's how obvious it was to him that this kind of thing should be passed.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if we recognize that the only thing that prevents this kind of thing is the consent of the municipal councils; and if we also recognize that there is no special reason

(MR. GREEN cont'd.) why they would know more about co-ordination of services than the members of this Legislature; and in fact that they are probably the last ones to be able to express an objective decision on this question, then I say that following the precedence of this Bill, remember this Bill and don't give those kind of arguments against the co-ordination of all municipal services that have been raised in the past but are now rendered irrelevant by the way in which we behaved when this Bill came to the House.

Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to object to the Bill. I think that the reason that it is being presented is the wrong reason. I think that the kind of thing that it suggests is a good thing. I'm going to support it and I'm going to ask the members of this Legislature to look to it as a precedence when they are talking about doing this on a bigger scale and having a better situation for all of Greater Winnipeg than we have at the present time. -- (Interjection) -- Mr. Speaker, I think -- my honourable friend from St. John's also indicates to me that the preamble -- I remember it -- refers to this Bill as being in the public interest and I think that that's a very key phrase. Not merely in the interests of St. James and Assiniboia but in the public interest. Remember that preamble when we are talking about Greater Winnipeg as a whole, "the public interest."

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. SAUL MILLER (Seven Oaks): Mr. Speaker, I join with the Member for Inkster in stating that I think this Bill should go forward. It represents the decision by the councils of both St. James and Assiniboia and I differ from my colleague, that I think I am prepared to accept their thinking on this. I think they reflect the people who put them into office. I think they can be as objective as any member in this House, including the Member for Inkster. I think they're as honest as any member of this House and I think they face up to their responsibilities as often, as sincerely as any member of this House.

There's a few questions I have to ask on this and the first one is the reference to the Boundaries Commission. I find it a somewhat odd clause where it says "that it is not the intention of the councils of the City of St. James or Assiniboia to interfere in any way whatsoever with the work being carried on by the Boundaries Commission." Now whether it is not their intention or not they may be interfering, we really don't know this. So that this clause in here I think is a somewhat misleading one; it's a fatuous statement; it's a sop towards recognizing that this government did establish a Boundaries Commission, this government appointed the Commission to study the boundaries within Greater Winnipeg, Metropolitan Winnipeg, and this paragraph here is simply sort of a sop towards this recognition. But in fact for this House to say and to go along with a statement that says that it's not the intention of Assiniboia and St. James -- and I don't know what their intention really is -- but it's not their intention to interfere in any way. How can we agree to a statement like that when in fact we don't know whether this will interfere with the work of the Boundaries Commission.

I'm wondering whether the Member for St. James can tell us whether the Boundary Commission was in any way consulted; were they notified; were their opinions in any way solicited; and if they were solicited did they have any opinion to state; and in the final analysis, does it really matter what the Boundary Commission has to say on this subject? I really don't know. But I think before we pass this Bill in this present form this third paragraph really is asking this House to agree to a statement which says it is not the intention of two councils outside of this Chamber to interfere with another body which is also not in this Chamber and we in a sense by passing it with this wording are acquiescing to an intent of which we're not aware and to which we're not privy, I think for the sake of good legislation it should be cleared up.

There's a reference to the disbanding of the Regional Library which now consists of Assiniboia and Charleswood. The library in Assiniboia would become part of the St. James Library system, they'd combine, and Charleswood is to be cut adrift into a separate Charleswood municipal library -- what was part of a regional library now becomes a municipal library. Mr. Speaker, I am wondering what effect this will have on the operations of libraries in Charleswood. They're a smaller community; I think they're too small a community to have a decent library on their own -- that's probably one of the reasons why they went into a regional library in the first place because it required the combined population of Assiniboia and Charleswood to be able to come up with a proper library facility. Now by cutting Charleswood off -- although it's true there will be a division of books and I suppose some method will be found to divide the books that now exist in the library and pack it off to the newly created Charleswood municipal library -- nonetheless I am concerned that the Charleswood municipal library may not be a viable

(MR. MILLER cont'd.)... institution if they have to rely entirely on whatever their own one mill will yield on their assessment. I can't remember offhand what that may be, but it's obviously a small amount because they're not an area with a very high actual assessment.

So I'm concerned with this aspect of it and I'd like some - perhaps comments either from the Member from St. James, or at Law Amendments, as to whether this problem I pose is indeed a valid problem and how the people in Charleswood feel about it. Because I think whenever these amalgamations are achieved, we have to look at not just the benefit to the two parties involved but what effect it may have on the other areas which perhaps co-operated through joint efforts in the past, and if they're cut adrift what effect it might have on them.

There's one other item I'd like to refer to. I don't see it anywhere in this Bill and perhaps I've just missed it. What is the effect of this amalgamation on the employees of both Assiniboia and St. James -- and I'm thinking particularly of the employees of the municipalities who can and do through a certificate of permanency acquire the necessary permanency so they opt out of the Unemployment Insurance Plan of Canada because it's considered that in their positions they have security of tenure and they're not likely to lose their positions except through some misdemeanour. So they do not participate in the Unemployment Insurance Scheme any longer; they have job security. Is there anything in this Bill, and if not what is the position of the employees who up until now had the job security and the security of tenure -- are they in danger of losing their job, because possibly there's some positions which may become unnecessary, some positions which by joint unity between these two areas may no longer be necessary. I think this certainly is something we should look at and carefully consider before this Bill is passed; because I don't think any individuals, any employees, whether they be of, maybe five, six years' standing, or in many cases of 30 and 35 years standing, whether they should be in any way jeopardized through an amalgamation of this type.

And a general comment stemming from this Bill. I think that, as I said earlier, if the people in these areas want this type of amalgamation I certainly feel it should be done. I don't think it sets any precedent whatsoever in Greater Winnipeg except for a similar type of amalgamation, and there may be similar type of amalgamation. Nor do I think it follows automatically as day follows night as has been suggested, that if this amalgamation is good and proper and is right and makes sense that therefore complete amalgamation would make even more sense. This doesn't follow at all. This is a play on words. It might make sense to amalgamate St. James and Assiniboia and it may make no sense at all to amalgamate other areas and certainly it doesn't mean it follows that all should now be amalgamated under one government.

Insofar as the old concept of services being provided throughout the Metropolitan area, we have a Metropolitan government who has undertaken just that. This is their responsibility, this is what they were charged to do, this is what they are trying to do, and perhaps if they had better support from this government, and perhaps they might have achieved more and in greater harmony than has been achieved up to now within Greater Winnipeg. But to suggest that if we pass this we are establishing a precedence and if we pass this we are then saying that from here in any arguments against total amalgamation cannot be made is I think completely untenable and I think has no relation or no bearing at all with the Bill that we're actually discussing today.

So, Mr. Speaker, with those questions that I pose and as I say I hope the member for St. James can answer them. If not, perhaps when we go to Law Amendments these questions will be posed again and representatives from the two municipalities and Charleswood would be there, we could answer them.

There's one point I would like to bring up. I notice, and I'm very pleased, that in this amalgamation the obvious has been done, there's been no attempt to break up school divisions. It's obvious what they've done here is take the existing Assiniboia School Division No. 2, the existing St. James School Division and the two become part of a co-terminus municipal boundary. This is essential in all amalgamations because one of the difficulties facing all municipalities and Metropolitan Winnipeg is the question of schooling, education costs, and in any amalgamations it's absolutely essential that the school divisions must if possible be co-terminus; where it cannot be co-terminus no municipality should find itself in a position where it is part of one municipality and yet its school division is separate from the municipality and part of adjoining municipalities. And of course this brings up the whole question of the problem - as I feel it is a problem, and many people do - of treating the school divisions separately from the municipalities. This opens up the whole question really of if there's amalgamation on the municipal level can there, is it feasible to be and is it good that there shall be one school division

(MR. MILLER cont'd.)... for all the 500,000 residents of Greater Winnipeg.

And that issue -- that's another debate, and I'll gladly debate that one, but I think that this is a pitfall that St. James - Assiniboia have avoided and I want to congratulate him on that score.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I had intended to speak on the bill last night if it had not been adjourned by someone else. I feel this is too important matter to just let go by without any comment at all. The Bill to me is one that should definitely have been referred to the people to decide on. I think any matters of this type should be decided on by referendum and not by the councils alone. Just a few weeks ago we passed a bill whereby deals could be made within municipalities and utilities and so on, but these will have to be referred to the people within a given community and I think this is a much much larger deal, certainly therefore this should have been referred to the people in a referendum. Because who is losing out and who is gaining? The Bill contains no schedules as to the encumbrances or indebtedness of these municipalities. What are the present mill rates of the two municipalities and how much do they differ. No rewards will be required because they are amalgamating as such in total.

But, Mr. Speaker, I think we should know what the encumbrances are and who is losing and to what extent; and not only on the municipal basis but also on the school divisions. Surely there must be debt in connection with both divisions. Let's hear from the people presenting the bill, what the case is. I think this should also have been presented to the people in the community and if it has I'd certainly be interested to hear from the Honourable Member for St. James who is sponsoring the Bill to that effect.

Then too, as has already been pointed out, the government sure does not place too much emphasis or weight on the Boundaries Commission, if any; otherwise they would not allow this Bill to come forward at this particular time when the matter of the Greater Winnipeg area has been referred to the Boundaries Commission just recently. You would think that a Bill like this would definitely be deferred until such time as a report would have come in, if they did place any weight on the Boundaries Commission's decisions or recommendations.

So, Mr. Chairman, I oppose the Bill on principle, that this should have been referred to the people concerned and if they choose to do so I certainly will have no objection whatever then, but I think it should be up to the people themselves, to decide on an important issue like this which will be lasting for a long time to come no doubt.

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

MR. STANES: Mr. Speaker, I will attempt to answer the questions. Those I cannot answer maybe they can be more fully answered in committee. Before doing so I would like to apologize to you, Sir, and through you to the members, for any indication of undue haste last evening. There's a reason behind that but of course the two councils, the two school boards and others were very anxious to be in Law Amendments and with such a large number of people it's very difficult to assemble those people and to fit into their private affairs at a moment's notice. I was asked for a good guess -- I gave one, at 9:30 this morning. I did not guarantee anything, I didn't anticipate anything, I was hoping so. I really mentioned the thing last evening just to indicate that they were attempting to be here. Incidentally, I managed to get them this morning and stop all but about two from coming.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the members for their contribution. Most mentioned the question of the Boundaries Commission. The intent behind those two councils - and it is not new, it's been discussed around St. James - Assiniboia for some years. I was in a few when I was on St. James council. Some of them were ad hoc meetings, some were semi-official meetings, but always with the intent, can we provide better services and lower cost to our people by reuniting ourselves. Remember it was one unit in 1920. And with this in mind, finally there were meetings - it was the matter of the last municipal election which brought it to a head - and they came to the conclusion that they can serve their public better by uniting. Realizing the Boundaries Commission or some other commission, of what is done, somebody has to look at Greater Winnipeg and see whether the total unit can serve the people of Greater Winnipeg better in some other form, and is more likely with a Boundaries Commission, but not knowing when the Boundaries Commission, at the time this Bill was written, would be into Winnipeg and looking at Winnipeg, they decided that it would be better to go ahead with what they had agreed to, serve the people the best they can but always bearing in mind that the greater whole may change the combination of those two units. That is the only reason as far as I know

(MR. STANES cont'd.)... for the inclusion of that clause in the resolution part of the Bill. I think it's a wise move and I think it also recognizes that St. James and Assiniboia are very much an integral part of Greater Winnipeg.

The question of the dying days. I mentioned in my introduction of the Bill, Mr. Speaker, that the meetings of the two councils was concluded about the end of February, then their own counsel, their lawyer, had to get all the facts together, go over the whole thing again. It was completed as far as I know - I had the last draft bill about six weeks ago. Everyone was attempting to get it in as early as possible this Session. There was no attempt whatsoever to bring it in in the last dying days of this Session. It's unfortunate; I think it's a very important matter. I think it's an important matter not only because it will serve the two communities better but I think it's going to be a very very interesting experience, whatever we do in Greater Winnipeg is going to be of great value in the future of Greater Winnipeg when you amalgamate two units together.

The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks, Mr. Speaker, mentioned the library. I was concerned about that and I understand the two councils were not in favour of continuing the regional library but wish to control one library for St. James-Assiniboia. As members of the Law Amendments were informed a week or so back St. James has been administering the total libraries at the moment. I've checked into the situation as far as Charleswood is concerned. I understand that there will be an agreement between St. James and Charleswood. May already be in fact, may be presented in Law Amendments. Concerning Charleswood. Charleswood if anything will be in a better financial position. Any membership in the library of Charleswood will be interchangeable in St. James-Assiniboia, and a lot of the administration will still be continued by the St. James librarian. So as far as I can see Charleswood library will be if anything in a better position not a worse position.

He also mentioned the question of employees. I understand that this question of the employees has been continued almost to finality and there are agreements now to insure that there is complete job security and there is a phasing out of various things over a long period. This thing has been gone into in considerable detail in every department and I'm sure if that question were asked in Law Amendments a complete answer will be quite at hand.

And the last question I think raised, Mr. Speaker, was from the Honourable Member from Rhineland. He mentioned first the referendum. I might add this is reuniting. There was no referendum when it was separated and I see no reason why there should be referendum on reuniting it. It's very difficult to members here to not understand the amount of publicity this has had through our local newspapers. The Honourable Member for Rhineland mentioned the financial situation. I have in my hand here a document which was put together by the two treasurers and it is dated the 31st of January. It is marked "confidential." This was released when the agreement in principle was released and that has been published in the newspapers. It contains the financial statement of both units and the likely situation when they are united. This has been in daily papers and also several times in local newspapers.

That, Mr. Speaker, I think answers all the questions. But there is one other thing I would like to mention that I heard over the lunch hour but I've been unable to check it out. But I will do so at the earliest possible moment. Is there general agreement between the two councils to reduce the size of the council. The idea is a sliding scale finishing with a permanent council of twelve. The intention is to reduce that twelve to ten. I think this is an excellent idea. It will reduce its way all the way down finally to a final of ten not twelve as on Page 2.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE Q. C. (Selkirk): I wonder if the honourable member would permit a question, Mr. Speaker. Is this the answer of the City of St. James and the Municipality of Assiniboia to the proposal for one big city?

MR. STANES: I'm afraid, Mr. Speaker, he'll have to ask that question to St. James. I can't answer for them.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, could the honourable member table that financial statement so that we could scrutinize it.

MR. STANES: I'd be very pleased to.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 112. The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. EDWARD I. DOW (Turtle Mountain): Mr. Speaker, in adjourning this Bill last night in regards to the gift to the Brandon General Hospital I did so on the basis that some time ago it was documented -- a year or two ago it was documented as to the reason of this extension of

(MR. DOW cont'd.) . . . the Brandon General Hospital through extended care. I will not take the time of the House to rehash the reasoning for this, but there are one or two questions in my mind that the sponsor of the Bill may be able to give the answer -- is that the Brandon General Hospital is still a private company running a public hospital and on this basis I feel that the grant of \$1 million to other than public property is somewhat large for the opinions of councils to take and say we are just going to do this. We have a law in Manitoba that says that money by-laws must be voted on and until we change that law, Mr. Speaker, I object to these type of bills coming in, that we as legislators take away from the law and say we'll give these municipalities the privileges of imposing this sum of money, a million dollars in effect, spread over four municipalities, and charging to the taxpayer on a basis of debenture sales for the next twenty years. I know the reason behind the extended care hospital in Brandon; I know the type of work it does but there's a principle involved as far as I'm concerned.

I'm not going to oppose the Bill but I would hope that those municipalities that are interested and are going to have to pay this will be able to answer the question: do the rate-payers of these communities absolutely know that they are going to give this type of a grant.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, there is a number of matters stemming from this Bill which I would like to take up. Dealing with the question of the hospital itself. Brandon would be required to pay I think \$790,920, close to \$800,000, and that would be in the form of a grant is what it's called. Now the question is this and it's a question that I posed with regard to the Metro Bill a couple of days ago and which I still haven't been answered.

The formula whereby the province and the Federal Government participate in construction of hospitals is based on a total cost of \$5,000 per bed. This goes back many years obviously because the cost of a bed today is closer to \$30,000 and not \$5,000. Under that formula the authorized cost per bed is \$5,000. The Provincial Government putting up \$2,000, the Federal Government putting up \$2,000 and the balance of 20 percent, the \$1,000 to be paid by either the charitable organization or the municipality - in this case Brandon I assume. Is this being circumvented because this is an actual dollar amount. Does this amount of \$790,920 represent the 20 percent in relation to the 80 percent being picked up by the Federal and Provincial Governments, or is this simply an amount which the Manitoba Hospital Commission has decided they would like to see Brandon and the communities around Brandon pay towards the hospital? Because it is essential, surely, that the municipalities should not find themselves paying more than the Provincial and Federal Governments. It's because of the unrealistic level of the formula which is still based on the cost of \$5,000 a bed, because that is so unrealistic, whereas in fact the beds cost at least \$25,000 more, the municipalities although only supposedly paying 20 percent could in fact in dollars be picking up far more than the province or the Federal Government through their participation. I would like that clarified. I think it's essential that it be clarified.

In dealing with the concept here of getting permission to enter into this without ratepayer approval, I don't quite feel the same way about it as the Member for Turtle Mountain. On the other hand, I do feel -- I remember quite well some of the heated discussions that took place with regard to another bill which was introduced on behalf of Brandon where they asked for the city to be able to go into the fields of recreation and parking facilities on a local improvement basis. And what I am wondering is this. They seem to be departing in this particular Bill from the very principle they espoused earlier in the week or last week. If the concept of local improvement is valid, if, as it has been argued, that it is proper that recreation should be treated on a local improvement basis -- in other words if one part of the town wants their recreation -- let them vote for it, let them decide for themselves and let the charge be upon them. If the downtown area requires parking, not just for the people who live downtown but for all of the City of Brandon, if parking is needed - the Brandon people argued that again it should be a local improvement and let the people in the downtown area pay for it; although if the service is going to serve everyone it shouldn't be borne -- the cost shouldn't be spread over the entire community. And yet here they come in with a Bill and they say give us permission to pay close to \$800,000 without any sort of approval either through a district vote or a general city vote - because this is what we want.

Mr. Speaker, I think they've got to be consistent. Surely they wanted parking and surely they wanted recreation and surely they wanted this general hospital and I am sure they did want it. But if the principle embodied in Bill 112 that we're dealing with, that they be given the right

(MR. MILLER cont'd.) to levy this amount and raise this amount of money without ratepayer approval, if we agree in principle with this Bill then surely we should agree, and they should be prepared to ask this Legislature to give them the same right, to provide the necessary downtown parking, the necessary recreation in the Town of Brandon without ratepayer approval. We were told in committee that ratepayers in the past turned down requests for recreation and so therefore the only way to do it was on a local improvement basis. Are they fearful that the ratepayers are going to turn down this particular by-law for a hospital and are they circumventing that by coming to this Legislature to free them of the need to go to the ratepayers? I'm one of those who believes that for essential services of this kind or of recreation or something that a community needs there should be no need to go to the ratepayers for everything you do. But surely Brandon should be consistent because what they're doing is playing on both sides of the fence here; they're riding two horses. On the one hand they're claiming that they cannot on their own through council decision build the facilities required for parking and recreation because the ratepayers might not agree; on the other hand they say we want to build a hospital but never mind whether the ratepayers agree or not, we want to do it anyways, give us the authority. I suggest to them that they be consistent and they should ask, on a matter of principle, for the same approach to all these problems because whether it's a hospital, whether it's the hospital for the sick or recreation for the well or the healthy, they're both essential to a community. And simply to say well a hospital is somehow a privileged institution is I think putting the emphasis in the wrong place. We need hospitals but perhaps if we had more recreational facilities we mightn't need quite as many hospital beds. I think the two are very necessary to any community.

So I would like to hear the Member for Brandon explain the difference in his philosophy from one afternoon in the Law Amendments Committee to his position that he's going to take on this one because I think the positions are completely contradictory.

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

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I would agree with the sentiments expressed by the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain. I do not want to go over all what was already said in connection with that, but it seems to me ever since the Metro Act was passed in 1960 where the powers were given to Metro to pass money by-laws without the approval of the voters or without having a referendum; and then too since last year when the Provincial Finance Board was given the power to do likewise, to provide all the capital for the building of schools without the approval of the electors, that we find more and more of these requests coming through to the Legislature through the various Bills. I certainly do not like the idea one bit. We know that the way the hospitals and hospital improvements are financed that 20 percent has to be brought up by the local area and this is the way they intend to provide for the 20 percent under this Bill by allocating a certain portion to the various municipalities and the city, and while I have no objection to having improvements made to hospitals or hospital facilities I do not subscribe to the idea of not having the voters approve of the money by-law that is needed under these circumstances. Therefore I certainly cannot subscribe to the principle as laid down in the Bill.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon.

MR. R. O. LISSAMAN (Brandon): Mr. Speaker, some of the questions I may not have answers to at my fingertips but they will no doubt be available in committee. The Member for Turtle Mountain referred to this being a private company. Well in actual practice and true sense of the word I think that this is not literally so. Well it is literally but not in the broader sense. Certainly there are members of a corporation and almost anybody can become a member by contributing. It's literally for all general purposes a community hospital.

The Member for Seven Oaks rather attempts to confuse the issue, at least he does for me, in assuming that these are both City of Brandon bills. He discussed as much during his time the bill from the City of Brandon as this one which originated with the Brandon General Hospital and in there while they asked this by-law should be valid and binding on the municipality without assent of the ratepayers, what those municipalities choose to do in this regard will be up to them. Some of them may feel that they must put this to the ratepayers and this is quite a possibility.

The capital involved is the local share, the 20 percent plus the interest of the given years and some working capital. And where the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks feels that I am a bit confused in my philosophy, I would like to say that probably both philosophies are

(MR. LISSAMAN cont'd.) Illustrated right in this Bill because in the Rural Municipality of Whitehead there is a split area, because if he reads the Bill he'll see that you might say this is the local area principle because they say, "And all the rateable land in the Rural Municipality of Whitehead excepting that portion included in the Souris hospital district." And now I would suppose that to be in keeping with his reasoning we should spread the cost over those people in addition.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge the members to support this Bill on second reading. I think it's good for the general area surrounding Brandon. There has been voluntary entrance into the scheme by the municipalities concerned and I think this in itself should recommend it to the House.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Is it the wish of the House we go back to Bill 54? Bill 54. The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Bill 84, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill 84, yes.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I believe in this Bill it's a very simple issue at stake. It's whether or not a private enterprise or a company should have a say in the domestic affairs of a municipality and this indirectly relates to the sovereign right of the Province of Manitoba also. I believe very strongly that there should be no call to go to an outside group such as a company for consent with respect to the boundaries of a municipality and for that reason I feel that all members who take their duties seriously in this House should not be a party to voting in a bill of this nature that gives away part of the elected responsibilities of councillors, members of the Legislature and the like.

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

MR. GORDON W. BEARD (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, I'll be closing it on second reading. I'm sorry I couldn't grasp the real feeling behind the member for Portage la Prairie's thoughts on this but we'll get back at it I suppose in Law Amendments.

To review some of it and take a little time I would like to go over some of the thoughts that I have in mind in respect to this amendment, and I would hope that members opposite would pay attention to it, because it is one of the growing problems that we have in the development of northern Manitoba. The development of Manitoba is both integrate and individual and I suppose if I want to expand for a minute -- this is why I always come back to the thoughts that I really would like to see a different approach in respect to the expansion of Northern Affairs Departments to deal with these things.

I don't think, Mr. Speaker, that you can expand southern programs, apply them exactly as they are in the south and transplant them to northern development areas. We must accept the fact that they're new areas, they're new concepts and I think they're new approaches and if we can use the - if I may say, the "mistakes" that we made in southern Manitoba, or take advantage of those mistakes that we see that we made in southern Manitoba through development years and use them to help the development in northern Manitoba, then I think that we're doing ourselves a service.

The history as I say of course really reaches back to the original agreement which was signed by the Honourable Member for Lakeside's government on December 3, 1956. I think that was a real red letter day for Manitoba. The agreement of course, had to carry through, not only from then but in principle through not only the incorporation of the Town of Thompson but as long as the development area was to carry on, and I think that we must live by the principles that were considered at the time the agreement was made in 1956, because at that time no person lived there, Mr. Speaker. If you could just realize that in 1956 nobody lived there, there was nothing -- and this I think was brought about through the International Nickel Company's document a while ago where they showed a picture of the area of Thompson before 1956 up to last year, and you could see barren land. So in any agreement they must anticipate and try and anticipate, and at first I believe they anticipated a 6,000 population, and then when the local administrator moved in and they started to look at it, they said, this isn't right we should anticipate at least an 8,000 population. Then I saw an independent report by the Arthur B. Little Company when they were developing the Plaza and they said, this should be considered a town of 17,000. They anticipate this is 1975 or '8 and here we are today with a town of 16,000. So this has grown in astronomical growth and usually is used in publications as one of the fastest growing communities in Canada. So I think that first of all you've got to keep that

(MR. BEARD cont'd.) in mind.

Now, we incorporated the Town of Thompson in April 27, 1966; and I think we were all in agreement with the fact that this was to be incorporated at this time. The incorporation was good and it brought about to the people self-government in every respect, self-government. Today in second reading we asked that you consider the amendment -- which I might state at this time and I think this is very important -- that this amendment was supported by resolution given to the government by the Local Government District of Mystery Lake and the Mayor and Council of the Town of Thompson, and the International Nickel Company are in agreement with it. So you have the three groups of people representative of all the area in agreement with this amendment. If we're discussing the pros and cons of it then we are doing it in this House despite the fact that each and every one of the people that are involved in the Thompson-Mystery Lake area are in agreement with what they've asked us to do. So I would ask, Mr. Speaker, that you keep this in mind when we're considering this, this is what everybody has asked - everybody.

Let us review again the new area, this area that we're involved in is part and parcel of a portion of the land adjacent to the incorporated area of the Town of Thompson, and it is owned, the surface rights and the mineral rights are owned by the International Nickel Company, and in agreement with the local Town Council and the Administrator of the LGD, they have agreed to develop this area to accommodate an additional 7,000 people, and in accommodating these 7,000 people the International Nickel Company have continued on with the obligation that they took on when they first made the agreement in 1956 and then again when it was incorporated in 1966. And now in 1968 they have said, all right we will develop an area and add it on to the Town of Thompson that will utilize the services that are available already to the Town of Thompson, in fact they're enlarging the water treatment plant, the sewer treatment plant at But if you could consider this for a minute, Mr. Speaker, that it's an orderly development, it's a package, it's like adding a subdivision on, and as they add this subdivision on they are handing it over to the Town of Thompson for \$1.00. This is a fully serviced subdivision. At which time the local Town of Thompson, the Mayor and Council and the people of Thompson will derive value from the sale of this property to private enterprise, fully serviced. I am told, led to believe, that the Town of Thompson will in effect gain three-quarters of a million dollars from the sale of this property to private enterprise, which will go into the Town of Thompson, become part of their budget. So this is not costing the taxpayer anything but it is giving the Town of Thompson another three-quarters of a million dollars to their budget. It is also giving them a new assessment, a new assessment on three-quarters of a million dollars' worth of property.

I think that you must agree that the Local Government District of Mystery Lake, the Town of Thompson and the mining company has in effect, Mr. Speaker, always come down to grips with the problems of the growth of Thompson. They've negotiated their own problems, they've been negotiated in good faith -- in good faith they've negotiated, and the principle behind it has always been that it would not be a mine-owned town, that this would be a town owned by the people, governed by the people. You say in respect to housing - yes, there is a shortage. But, Mr. Speaker, we listen every day, there's a shortage of homes everywhere, and I think that the shortage of houses in Thompson is not that they want urban renewal for replacement of old homes, they want new homes. The International Nickel Company is big enough, it's ugly enough and it doesn't need me to stand up for them, but I would point out that one other time I suggested to you that probably the Minister of Industry and Commerce got his summit conference from the idea of International Nickel Company gathering together the heads of the finance and investment people in pretty well all of North America. They flew them up from all over the States in the hope of showing them that there was a future in northern Manitoba, that they were here to stay for many years and that they in effect, Mr. Speaker, required 17 to 18 millions of dollars for housing for northern Manitoba.

I think that you must keep in mind that in this amendment, as in the original one, that the town can, could have in the past and can in future always initiate amendments to the boundaries from time to time. They can either do it through negotiation with the surrounding local government districts, the various mining companies that may be involved or through direct application to this Legislature, just the same as any other community. This amendment allows for the extension of the school district along with the municipal boundaries of the town. And if I'm not mistaken this is one of the things that the Member for Seven Oaks brought

(MR. BEARD cont'd.) up when he was talking about the St. James-Assiniboia boundary. He said he was pleased that they were going to be carried along the same.

I cannot understand the Member for Logan stating that he wouldn't support this amendment, this extension, because the extension really doesn't cost the people of the Town of Thompson one cent, not one cent. It introduces the new taxation area, it introduces new capital funds to the Town of Thompson of almost three-quarters of a million dollars for re-investment in the community itself; it's good for the people of Thompson; it's good for northern development and certainly I think it's good for all of Manitoba. The town means that it's developed and it's developed on a planned program. I think the mineral areas must be carefully considered that surround the Town of Thompson, Mr. Speaker, because I know you live in a farming area and I know you're concerned about the expropriation of farm areas and the misuse of good farm land. But you must consider when you're going up north that you consider what that type of area is like. The deep drilling that is involved to see whether there's mineral resources at a thousand foot level below or above. If it's below the thousand foot level then you can have construction on top of the ground; if it's above the thousand foot level then perhaps it should go to open pit mining. So they've got these things to consider when you are extending the boundaries of a town.

The Member for Logan said that he felt that he was against it because the government was being able to curtail the expansion of towns in the north. But, Mr. Speaker, the government owns pretty well part and parcel of all those properties in three-quarters of this province. I just don't know how far I'm out on it but either through local government districts or through unorganized territories the government are the people that own this property and the government are the ones that suffer through no development of this area. So I would say let's get along and encourage as much development as possible.

I am sorry I didn't grasp what the Leader of the Opposition was stating last night but he asked -- more or less I think -- that if this town was in balance or this incorporation was in balance with other incorporated townsites he had agreed to the original incorporation and he agreed to the amendment which extends the boundaries at no cost to any taxpayer I'm sure. I don't think that this curtails -- in my mind anyway -- what the Town of Thompson or the Council could do. Because I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that if I felt that we were putting something over on the Town of Thompson then I wouldn't be submitting a Bill like this, because I intend to live there for quite some time. In all probability my days are numbered in here, such as everybody else's, except the Member for Lakeside who just seems to have an automatic vote of confidence in his seat, but the rest of us suffer once in a while I think. I think it's good and I hope that the questions that come up at Law Amendments we can answer and if it's the wishes we'll make sure that people from the Town of Thompson or their lawyers or whoever it may be will be in attendance to answer some of the questions and make sure that we aren't trying to put something over on them. I hope so; because I want to live there. Thank you.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Would the honourable member permit a question? It is my understanding from what you've said that the boundaries of the Town of Thompson cannot be altered or changed without the consent of the Company and the Government of Manitoba. Is that right?

MR. BEARD: Yes. I had also mentioned last night that I indicated, I'm sorry, that I would be moving an amendment to this during the committee in consent of the town - expressed by a resolution of the council of the town and the consent of the resident administrator of the local government district.

MR. HILLHOUSE: That is the point that I wanted to make. Would you agree to an amendment allowing for the changing the boundaries of the town on the petition of the council and with the consent of the company and government because that's what the agreement provides.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party)(Radisson): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question for purposes of clarification? What is it that the amendment is going to be in this . . . May I ask again is it going to take away in the provision within the bill requiring the direct consent of the company to any changes in the boundary?

MR. BEARD: Well can I read it again then, Mr. Speaker. The important part of it is the boundaries of the town and the school district may be altered or amended from time to time by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council with consent of the company -- it should be: "and

(MR. BEARD cont'd.) with the consent of the town expressed by resolution of the council of the town and the consent of the resident administrator." It involves, if I might enlarge on it, the four. But when you speak of Company then you must speak of not only International Nickel Company but whatever company may have properties in that area. I hope I've answered. . . .

MR. PAULLEY: No you haven't.

MR. BEARD: If the member had in his mind that he thought that the mining company could stop this then it is my understanding that, as in any other community, a resolution can be passed by the council and sent directly to this Legislature.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, if I may ask a question of the honourable member. Does he really believe or subscribe to the principle as outlined in Subsection (2) of Section 1 - subjecting or subordinating the Crown to the company?

MR. BEARD: I don't understand the question.

MR. FROESE: Subsection (2) of Section 1 as it is proposed in the Bill subjects or subordinates the Crown to the company. Do you really believe and subscribe to this principle?

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

Order, please. For the benefit of the honourable members that were absent when the matter was being discussed, we are dealing with Bill No. 84 on Page 9.

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

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

NAYS: Messrs. Cherniack, Doern, Fox, Froese, Green, Hanuschak, Kawchuk, Miller, Paulley, Petursson and Uskiw.

MR. CLERK: Yeas 40; Nays 11.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate - second readings. Bill No. 76. The Honourable Member for St. James.

MR. STANES: Mr. Speaker, I adjourned this debate because I believed as expressed at other times during this Session that this type of legislation should be referred to the Special Committee on Professional Organizations, whatever the correct name is. I know the Honourable Member for Selkirk in proposing this Bill suggested that the special committee can only consider those things which are statutes and cannot consider those things like bills I understand. From my information that is not correct. If it were correct what has happened then to the several bills in the last session that at second reading were referred to a special committee?

Since I adjourned this debate, Mr. Speaker, there have been a number of debates pro and con on this subject and I think it is not worth the time of the House to repeat them again. But I believe that this matter and other matters like it should be referred to a special committee. I think the special committee which has been reconstituted should get to work in principle and should see the functions that the Honourable Member from St. John's and others and myself intended it to do in the first place. This is the reason I oppose the Bill at this stage.

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

Again for the benefit of the honourable members that may not be in the House, we're dealing with Bill No. 76 on Page 22.

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

YEAS: Messrs. Baizley, Barkman, Beard, Bjornson, Campbell, Carroll, Cherniack, Clement, Cowan, Craik, Desjardins, Dow, Doern, Einarson, Enns, Evans, Fox, Froese, Green, Guttormson, Hamilton, Hanuschak, Hillhouse, Jeannotte, Johnson, Johnston, Kawchuk, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McGregor, McKellar, McKenzie, McLean, Masniuk, Miller, Patrick, Paulley, Petursson, Roblin, Shoemaker, Spivak, Stanes, Steen, Uskiw, Vielfaure, Watt, Weir, Witney and Mesdames Forbes and Morrison.

NAYS: Nil.

MR. SPEAKER: I can assure you it was a very revealing experience to me.

MR. CLERK: Yeas 51; nays nil.

MR. SPEAKER: I must declare the motion carried.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Speaker, my faith in democracy has been fully restored.

MR. DESJARDINS: What do you mean? I voted for it because you scared me.

MR. SPEAKER: I'm going to have the echo changed. That's for sure.

Second reading Private Bills. No. 82. The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. JAMES COWAN, Q. C. (Winnipeg Centre) presented Bill No. 82, The Winnipeg General Hospital Act, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. COWAN: Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this Bill is to amend and consolidate the Act of Incorporation of the Winnipeg General Hospital and the various amendments that have been made to that Act during the years. The Winnipeg General Hospital is one of the oldest institutions in this province and it was originally incorporated in 1875. The Royal Assent was given on May 14, 1875, just 93 years ago, and I thought it might be of interest to see what the Lieutenant-Governor had to say that day about two or three things that would be of interest to members of this House. If I have leave I would just like to read two and a half sentences from his closing address to the legislators: "I have most cheerfully assented to the measures you have adopted for the holding of elections, the introduction of the ballot, the dealing with controverted elections and the better securing the independence of the Legislature in the framing of which Act you have wisely been guided by the legislation of the Parliament of the Dominion and of the other provinces and whereby you have endeavoured to perfect a system of election which will I trust secure a large measure of purity in the exercise of the franchise as well as free and unbiased expression of the voice of the electoral college." And then he goes on with another sentence which the Honourable Member for Churchill would likely be interested in: "I regard the results of the Session that is about to close as a hopeful augury for the future and I believe that this province is destined to grow rapidly in importance and become an influential center of progress, intelligence and moral and material advancement thus exerting a wide influence on the happy issue of the great problem of how to turn to the best advantage the vast stretch of habitable territory which the Dominion of Canada is entrusted with in the northwest of the Queen's possessions in British America." And then he ends with this phrase: "I feel assured that on your return to your homes you will do all in your power to promote a spirit of pride in and contentment with our free institutions and of harmony and forbearance amongst all classes of our mixed population." And I thought it was of interest to note that - there is the estimates here for the year ending December 31, 1873. The estimates totalled a little bit less than \$70,000. The estimates for the Department of Education were \$7,000 and the Legislative Assembly \$9,750. There's also here part of a brief to the Federal Government asking for more money and in it the Counsel say...

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please. I must be consistent. I appreciate the honourable gentleman's remarks and if it's the wish of the House that he continue...

MR. COWAN: I'll just be a minute. "In spite of every precaution and degree of parsimony unworthy of government the public chest is exhausted." As a result the Federal Government complained to them about being so extravagant with their expenditures but they did give them \$25,000 which was to include an amount to buy seed grain because of the poor crop the previous year. It is of some interest to me too because of the fact that...

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I think we should get back to the Bill.

MR. COWAN: My namesake, my grandfather was a member of that Legislature representing a place well-known in this Legislature, the constituency of High Bluff.

There have been some 15 amending Acts to the Act that replaced the very first one and there are two section ones and two section twos and two section threes in the Act and it has been recommended on various occasions that the Act should be consolidated so now we have this consolidation, this new Act, before this Legislature.

The Manitoba Hospital Commission recently recommended that the Hospital Board be reduced in size and that will be one of the things that this Act will do if this Bill is passed. The qualifications for membership are changed. At present under the Act in order to be a member of the Winnipeg General Hospital you must make a subscription of \$500.00 on some one occasion or an annual subscription of \$25.00. It is felt that these qualifications are somewhat out of date because of the introduction of hospital insurance. The proposed Bill makes all of

(MR. COWAN cont'd.) the present trustees members of the hospital other than the trustees that are appointed by other bodies. The existing legislation does not specifically define the objects of the hospital. It is thought that the objects should be more particularly defined to show that the purpose of the hospital is not merely the operation of a hospital but extends also to research and education, particularly in view of the hospital's connection with the University of Manitoba. The purpose of a new section in this Act is to consolidate the existing provisions and deal specifically with some of the powers not specifically spelled out in the past. There might be some ambiguity with regards to the tax exemption that is now in the present Act and it is proposed to make it clear that the hospital is liable for local improvement taxes.

With regard to the Board, presently the Board consists of the Mayor of the City of Winnipeg and three members of the Winnipeg City Council. The Bill proposes that there will be one representative of the City of Winnipeg. The City of Winnipeg have objected to this and the hospital board are agreeable that the City of Winnipeg shall be represented by the Mayor and one other person elected by council. This amendment will be presented in committee and is agreeable to both the city and the hospital board so that the city will have two representatives on the Board of Trustees. At present the three members of the Board of Governors of the University of Manitoba are representatives on the board. It is proposed to increase this to four because of the close relationship between the university and the hospital. At present the Act provides that there will be one member of the Union of Manitoba Municipalities on the Board and it's intended to drop this person. It now provides two appointed members of the honorary medical staff and it intends to reduce this to one; 18 members from the general membership of the hospital and this is reduced to a varying number which may vary between nine and fifteen, with the result that the number on the Board will be 22 as the maximum or 16 as the minimum plus two that might be added by Metro Corporation, which they are entitled to add if they make a grant to the Winnipeg General Hospital. Because Metro may be represented on the board that is one of the reasons that the representation of the City of Winnipeg is being reduced.

Various things that were in the Act have been dropped. They will be covered by by-laws and one of the reasons is that all by-laws require the approval of the Minister under The Hospitals Act so that there remains government control over the hospital. By allowing some of these matters to be decided by by-law it allows for greater flexibility such as the holding of meetings and so on.

The draft bill with one minor exception has been approved by the Manitoba Hospital Commission; that exception is with regard to Section 5 subsection (2) which is a broad section with regard to the ancillary powers. The Hospital Commission thought they should be specified and the members should wish them to be specified. I have them drawn up here and they cover about five pages but it is not suggested that these five pages should be inserted in the Act in place of Section 5 subsection (2).

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

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, if not for the sickness of the existing structure or the constitution of the General Hospital I would be inclined to urge members to vote against this Bill on principle, but because even this is an improvement over what now exists I have to endorse it. That's of course not the only reason that I do so and I'll come to that.

I had the honour of being a member of the Board of Trustees of this hospital, appointed as such by the City of Winnipeg when I was an alderman in the city and I found -- my Honourable Leader says that that was a long time ago but not so long that I don't remember how this Board operated. And regardless of how it operated or how it was constituted and the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre has indicated that it had a membership which gave the vote rights to certain people on the base of their contribution, we should look at what the present Act deals with and not deal with the past except to agree that 1875 was a long time ago. Therefore the desire expressed in the preamble that the corporate status of the hospital be clarified and amended is certainly one that I endorse.

The powers of the General Hospital are of course very extensive. They have the power to acquire land, to build plant, to carry on the services of a hospital including the research aspect as indicated by the honourable member, the right to appoint, reject, suspend or remove all or any of the medical staff - and this of course is the largest, I believe it is the largest hospital in Manitoba which serves the public of Manitoba and not of any one particular

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd.) segment or indeed of the City of Winnipeg itself. And I can understand why it was felt not necessary that the City of Winnipeg have representation on the board of the hospital because the hospital is not strictly a City of Winnipeg hospital, and I might say that I had the feeling, which I acquired with good reason whilst I was a member of the board, that in my representative capacity I was not too welcome as a member of the board because the City of Winnipeg, even at the time that I was on, was no longer making any real financial contribution to the hospital compared with times prior to that when the city was involved in the financial requirements of the hospital.

But let us look at the constitution of the board as in the Bill proposed to us, and let us consider how we ought to look at this type of structure. "Twelve members or such other number not less than nine or more than fifteen, as may be fixed by bylaw." Bylaw of whom? Of the Board of Trustees. These twelve who make up more than half of the total number will be elected in such manner and to serve for such term as may be prescribed by bylaw. This is the majority of the board who, as a majority, will have a right to determine who shall follow in the office held by the board and who shall be selected in that majority grouping of between nine and fifteen in such manner and for such term as the board decides, and the majority of the board, of course, will make that determination. Others are appointed in a manner as described by the honourable member, which makes good sense. But the total, which I count as eight, four under (b), one (c), one (d), that's six, two -- if Metro gives money, then two more -- that makes it eight, and I gather the Mayor of the City of Winnipeg has been added; that makes it nine, so now we have nine as compared with twelve selected in such manner as the board shall from time to time decide and for such term as it shall decide.

And who is the board which is picked? Well, they are named and they are names of people who command respect. All those I know - and I know of most of them - command a great deal of respect in City of Winnipeg circles: civic, financial -- let's not overlook the fact that that is financial. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, if it were not for the fact that two of the members would not be acceptable I would almost expect meetings of this board to be held in the Manitoba Club or the St. Charles Country Club. It carries on a definition that these twelve shall continue until they are elected under terms which they shall determine, and in the powers given to them they shall pass bylaws dealing with, of course, their own election or re-election, the organization of, appointment to and rejection or removal from the medical staff and medical practice in the corporation, the filling of vacancies on the board or any committee thereof. Which means that the Winnipeg General Hospital - how many millions of dollars are invested in that hospital I wouldn't dare to guess - but it belongs, it belongs, Mr. Speaker, to twelve named people plus some others who are also named and who are there in a representative capacity, who have the power to do as they like. And I think that that's wrong; I think it's bad; I think the constitution should not be acceptable to any institution, any organization -- or rather any legislature that views it.

And having said that, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I believe that the people who have been on this board, which is a self-perpetuating board, which in my presence at the time I was a member, would replace persons who resigned by saying: well now, who's a good fellow to put in place of so and so, who comes from this or the other segment of the financial society of Winnipeg. And they'd say: well so and so; he's pretty good and he might be an asset. So this self-perpetuating board, I will now say has done I believe an excellent job. I believe in their dedication to the hospital; I believe in the fact that what they did for the hospital was both good and well-motivated, and I've just seen a member indicate to me: well, what are you complaining about? And I'm not complaining. I've indicated at the beginning that I'm supporting this Bill. But I could not help, Mr. Speaker, but point out that the organizational structure in the Bill is wrong, and the fact that the people who are in it in my opinion are good, well-motivated people, does not make it right and I think that that should be said because I think that if we did not have somebody to vouch for them then who is to know what sort of structure could come out as a result of this type of legislation? And I am probably not as capable of vouching for these people as are many others but I'm prepared to vouch for them that they will do right. But if they self-perpetuate themselves, then they will be doing wrong. In other words, I am hoping that having been appointed and having been given these powers, that they will use them in such a manner as to set up a much more -- may I use the word "democratic" form of selection of successors to this board who I am sure will be just as well-motivated, just as capable of running this institution for the benefit of the people.

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd.)

So, having first attacked the structure and then having accepted it, I should add other safeguards which I believe exist, and one of course is the fact that it's really the Manitoba Hospital Services Commission that has a great deal to do and to say with what goes on on that board. And certainly there must be members of this House to whom this is an irritation, because surely this is a government-appointed body that will probably have more to say with what goes on in that board as to its policies than will this self-perpetuating body itself. But I accept it as being right because the hospital is being supported largely and almost exclusively by public monies and therefore there should be that kind of supervision.

Secondly, this hospital, because of its nature, because of its growth and development, is a teaching hospital and as such it is under agreement with the University of Manitoba and as such there are certain requirements placed on the hospital in relation to the staffing of the hospital, to the quality of care and to the nature of care. And that's another safeguard which makes me feel easier about the basic wrongness that I feel in the constitution of the hospital. The fact that the University has an agreement which will indicate the power-- hopefully it will be used - of the University to see to it that the services provided by the hospital both in terms of teaching, in research, and of course in treatment, will be available to all on the basis of the best quality of care. And here again I must say that during the time I was a member of that board I was disturbed by the fact that the staffing of the hospital gave to me the impression that it, too, was a pretty self-selecting and self-perpetuating organization and that many people who may have had the highest qualifications to be on the medical staff were not granted that privilege because they may not have belonged to the right clinic or to the right group or the right circle - the right medical circle. Again, I can only express the hope that with the University entering into the closer and closer relationship with the General Hospital that that too will be corrected.

And having now said enough to make all sorts of people upset with me, I want to deal with only one relatively minor aspect but one which I think is right in principle. I do not agree with the concept that the Winnipeg General Hospital shall be freed of municipal taxation with the exception of local improvement. I do not accept the concept that as we stand now, with a number of suburban members of the Metropolitan Corporation of Greater Winnipeg, that the people of the City of Winnipeg should be responsible for the payment of the protection, of the garbage collection, or of any of the other services which are provided directly to the hospital. I don't think it's justified in any way. I think the proper thing is to establish a payment by the hospital for its proper share of the services. If fire should break out, the people of Winnipeg will provide the fire services and they are expensive fire protection services. The same applies to police. And I don't justify the section which exempts them completely from taxation. I think that there are various types of municipal services provided to the hospital which should be paid by the hospital, and of course this would add on its costs to those who provide the funds for operating the hospital. Because paying the salaries of individuals who may be involved in protection within the hospital, is no different to my mind than paying or helping to pay the salaries of those people outside of the hospital who will be required to provide protection to the hospital in the case of need. So I really don't accept that. I would think that this is probably a matter for the Manitoba Hospital Services Commission or for this government to spell out, and I think it should, because I think it's unfair to the people of the City of Winnipeg to be required to provide a service for which they are paying and for which they are not being compensated, and which are beneficial to the people not only of Greater Winnipeg but of the entire province of Manitoba.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Bill 111. The Honourable Member for Russell.

MR. RODNEY S. CLEMENT (Birtle-Russell) presented Bill No. 111, an Act to incorporate Banner County Racing Club, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. CLEMENT: Well, Mr. Chairman, it's relatively simple, as the Honourable Leader of the NDP Party -- he's always being helpful to me. For many years the racing organization of Russell have had the pari mutuel for harness races; this simply gives them permission to hold pari mutuel with the running races. It appears that no longer are there many harness races in the country and the Fair is being set up around running races, and it was in order to comply with this that we had to put a special bill through. Incidentally, there's been a bill

May 23, 1968

(MR. CLEMENT cont'd.) sitting on the Minister of Justice's desk in Ottawa, Mr. Trudeau, for some time, which if the House had have been sitting in Ottawa would have gone through, would have made it legal for the harness racing --- if you had permission for one you'd have it for the other, and this is simply an amendment to make it legal.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the honourable Member would permit a question. How could he be assured that the bill would have passed at Ottawa while it's been sitting on the desk of the ex Minister of Justice?

MR. CLEMENT: The honourable member as usual is jumping to conclusions. I said had the House remained in sitting I would have hoped that it would have been passed.

MR. JOHNSON: . . . Mr. Eric Nielsen will approve it.

MR. CLEMENT: I have a lot of faith in some Conservatives.

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Speak for yourself.

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

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, that completes the work with respect to the bills and I would make the suggestion now that we adjourn the House until tomorrow morning at 9:30, and that we agree in the meantime to go back into Law Amendments for the next hour and then return to Law Amendments Committee tonight at 8:00 o'clock and remain until we see what progress we make, if that would seem to meet with general approval.

Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer, that the House do now adjourn and stand adjourned until 9:30 tomorrow morning.

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