

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Tuesday, April 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

Before we proceed, I would like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery where we have 30 students of Grade 11 standing, from the McCreary Collegiate. These students are under the direction of Mr. Knight. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

We also have with us today 30 students of Grade 8 standing, from the Arthur Day School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Gylywoychuk. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party.

Sixty students are also with us today of Grade 11 standing, from Garden City School. Those students are under the direction of Mr. Humeny and Mr. Kirbyson. 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 Provincial Secretary.

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN, Q. C. (Provincial Secretary) (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day -- (Interjection) -- that comes later. I have a statement I would like to make to the members, Mr. Speaker. Honourable members of the House will recall that in closing the debate on second reading of Bill 37, I outlined, in answer to a question put by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition, several steps being taken by the Government of Manitoba in the continuing campaign for more uniformity in highway traffic legislation across the country. In the course of these remarks I alluded, among other things, to uniform tire standards which we anticipated would be implemented in the near future. In that regard I am pleased to advise the honourable members of the House that, providing Bill 37 is approved by the House, we shall be acting in concert with other provincial governments in imposing, effective July 1st this year, the new CSA tire standards issued in Ottawa this morning by the Canadian Standards Association. A simultaneous announcement is being made by the Ontario Government and by most, if not all, other provincial governments, so that it is likely that these standards will be implemented uniformly across Canada at that time.

These new standards are Canadian standards designed for adoption by Canadian jurisdictions after 18 months study by CSA and do not conflict with standards in the United States of America. The new standards relate to minimum performance levels for new pneumatic tires for passenger cars. To be meaningful, standards of this type cannot be generalized. Their requirements will be spelled out in exact detail and this the Canadian Standards Association has done. The standards specify tire dimensions and laboratory test requirements for bead unseating resistance, strength, endurance and high speed performance. They also define tire load ratings and specify labelling requirements. To conform with the new standards, tires must be conspicuously labelled on both side walls, with each of the following moulded into or onto the tire: size designation, maximum permissible inflation pressure, maximum load rating, identification of manufacturer, composition of material used in the ply cord, actual number of plies in the side wall and also in the tread area, if different. The words "tubeless", "tube" and "radial" where applicable, and an approved symbol. The regulation implementing this standard, again assuming the House approves Bill 37, will require that tires manufactured after July 1, 1968, meet the specifications of the new standards. However, for a specified period following the adoption of the new standards, labelling requirements may be met by affixing a label or tag giving the required information.

The honourable members will recall that Section 37 of Bill 37 permits the enactment of regulations prohibiting the sale of substandard items. As I have already mentioned, most if not all the other provincial Ministers across Canada will be acting in concert on this measure. While statistical evidence indicates that tire failures are a contributing cause in only a small percentage of accidents, our purpose is to reduce this percentage still further.

MR. BEN HANUSCHAK (Burrows): Mr. Speaker, if I may have the indulgence of the House to make a brief statement. A few days ago, an interest was expressed by some of the members to see a true specimen of the floral emblem for Manitoba, so therefore this morning I took it upon myself to accommodate the members, and to make this as nonpartisan as possible, why, I went to an area which belongs to all the people, and that's Birds Hill Park, and found crocuses there. I took them into the constituency represented by the Honourable Member for Wolseley and had them wrapped by an employee who lives in the constituency of St. Boniface - and I should also mention that Birds Hill Park is in Brokenhead constituency. The flower - I don't know, Mr. Speaker, what the history behind it is, why it was selected. The only reason that I could think of is that as the crocus, which is the first sign of vegetation that we see in the springtime, in that sense it probably symbolizes the spirit of the people of Manitoba in their wish and their desire and ambition to be first, to be in the lead in everything that we do, and I do hope, Mr. Speaker, that this flower will serve to remind the government of the type of people that we have in this province and would do what is right to enable the people of Manitoba to make the type of progress that they wish to make.

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q. C. (Attorney-General) (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that all of us would wish to thank the Honourable Member for Burrows for his enterprise and to thank him as well for the wrapping of this beautiful little floral emblem of Manitoba. I'm happy that he procured it in one of the great provincial parks of Canada, namely the Birds Hill Provincial Park where, notwithstanding my silence the other day, I could have said they abound by the thousands in certain parts of the park. We all on this side of the House appreciate his nonpartisan gesture. For my part, I'm prepared to waive the laying of any formal charges against him for picking flora from one of our provincial parks, which of course is prohibited, and in an equal nonpartisan sense to tell him that the flower was probably chosen because of its innate beauty and its close proximity in colour to that of one of the foremost political parties of this country.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party) (Radisson): Is that why it's off shade, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SAMUEL USKIW (Brokenhead): Mr. Speaker, I just simply want to say that I wish to extend an invitation to members of the House during the course of the early months of the year. If they do visit the constituency of Brokenhead, and indeed practise the plucking of the crocus from the area, bring it back to Winnipeg to identify the floral emblem more properly, and most properly, than we have been used to doing in the past, and at the same time, Mr. Speaker, take a good look at the constituency of Brokenhead, I'm sure that they'll recognize it as one of the nicest communities we have in Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I wonder if we might not get on with the business of the province now. I appreciate the comments that have been made and what has been attributed to the provincial flower.

Orders of the Day. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Has the Minister advised the City of Brandon that there are to be no extensions to the boundaries of that city, which they had previously requested?

HON. THELMA FORBES (Minister of Urban Development and Municipal Affairs) (Cypress): Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MOLGAT: A subsequent question, Mr. Speaker. Is this a recommendation from the Boundaries Commission and will the Report of the Boundaries Commission in this regard be made public?

MRS. FORBES: Yes, Mr. Speaker, it is a recommendation of the Boundaries Commission and I would be pleased to make the report public. I'll see that it is made public for you.

MR. MOLGAT: A subsequent question, Mr. Speaker. I believe that the question of industrial expansion is a real problem for the City of Brandon and that they have asked the Minister to convene meetings between the City of Brandon and the R. M. of Cornwallis. The Minister has to date not been prepared to do so. Will the Minister arrange for such a meeting?

MRS. FORBES: I don't know what your source of information is, but it's not exactly accurate. I would be quite pleased to convene a meeting at any time.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I wish to address a question to the Honourable the Minister

(MR. USKIW cont'd.) of Agriculture. There's an item in the paper today suggesting that the province is going to abandon the long-term credit field, and I'm wondering whether the Minister may give us some indication whether this is in effect so, particularly as it relates to the Agricultural Credit Corporation.

HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Minister of Agriculture and Conservation) (Rockwood-Iberville): Mr. Speaker, the question anticipates the legislation. It is my intention to make some changes in the Agricultural Credit legislation as indicated in the Throne Speech, but I'll be making these as a matter of government policy in due course.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Honourable the Provincial Secretary. We were pleased to hear from our honourable friend comments in respect of matters pertaining to Bill No. 37 and the Highway Traffic Act. May I ask my honourable friend: is it correct that, in view of a certain announcement that was made today, this may be one of the last statements my honourable friend will be making in this House? I refer to the possibility of an event on June 25th.

MR. SAUL MILLER (Seven Oaks): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I wonder could the Minister of Education tell us whether they are bringing in a Universities Act this session?

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Education) (Gimli): This is a matter that's before us at the present time. I'll be prepared to answer it at a later date possibly.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I just want to draw the attention, by leave, Sir, the members to the 14th Annual Progress Report on Agricultural Research and Experimentation, which will be passed out to all members later on in the afternoon; and while I'm on my feet take the opportunity to reply to a question by the Honourable Member from Gladstone, asking why the Highways map for the Province of Manitoba is not printed within the province. I want to assure the honourable member that it is in fact printed in Manitoba. The printers are Stovel-Advocate Press Ltd. He's referring to the notation that's at the bottom of the map which indicates that the base map, or the original negative, was prepared by this specialist map-making firm in Vermont, U.S.A. This is a highly specialized work from which we obtained the original base plate. All subsequent changes in printing take place here within the province. The process is not available to us here within the province, that is, the making of this base plate, and I just wanted him to know that the subsequent printing in changes that are made are being done entirely within the province.

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to invite the Minister of Health to make a statement. Yesterday, or a few days ago, he stated that there would be a limit in the money available for the Health Resources Fund. I wonder if he could tell us if any programs here in Manitoba will be jeopardized because of this.

HON. CHARLES H. WITNEY (Minister of Health) (Flin Flon): Mr. Speaker, I can table the letter from the Honourable the Minister of Health and National Welfare and the telegram which I forwarded to him.

MR. DESJARDINS: Fine. I'll accept that, the tabling of this letter, but would he answer the question? Will that jeopardize any of our programs here in Manitoba?

MR. WITNEY: The tabling of the letter, Mr. Speaker, it's been drawn to my attention, will require also the concurrence of the Minister of National Health and Welfare.

MR. PHILIP PETURSSON (Wellington): Mr. Speaker, I wish to address a question to the Minister of Public Utilities. Among other things that I mentioned last week when I was talking about transportation in northern areas, I mentioned the area north and west of the CNR line, the line that runs to Churchill, and suggested that transportation similar to what existed on the tractor trains on the east of that line and on into Ontario might conceivably, with government encouragement and support, be instituted there. The Honourable Minister for Churchill commented that companies already operate in that area and he said Northern Affairs paid for breaking those roads in the wintertime.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I'd be delighted to hear the honourable gentleman's question.

MR. PETURSSON: I'm getting to it. I couldn't ask the question without this . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I appreciate that and I know the honourable gentleman won't take too much time.

MR. PETURSSON: I've finished with the preamble. I would wish to ask the Honourable Minister whether this is so. Are there tractor train roads and is there tractor train operation

(MR. PETURSSON cont'd.) in that area north and west of the CPR line up in what, looking at the map, appears to be wilderness?

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Speaker, I'm unable to answer that question. I would think that it doesn't come under -- it certainly doesn't come under Public Utilities and I doubt if it would even be a matter in which the Department of Highways would be directly connected.

MR. PETURSSON: . . . refer that to the Minister of Highways?

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I don't know that it's a proper question for Orders of the Day. When the estimates of Northern Affairs or Mines and Resources - Mines and Resources have been before us - Northern Affairs or one of the other departments that might conceivably have some relationship to this, my honourable friend could then put the question in Supply.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, I have two questions I'd like to direct to the Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Urban Development. When can we expect the Annual Report of Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation?

MRS. FORBES: Mr. Speaker, when I have my estimates I will be tabling the report from the Housing Corporation - when my estimates are before the House.

MR. FROESE: A supplementary question then. Will a report be made on the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Fund too, or could we have this previous to the estimates?

MRS. FORBES: I will be giving it in my estimates, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. RODNEY S. CLEMENT (Birtle-Russell): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Honourable the Attorney-General who is Leader of the House. Would he know, due to the fact an election has been called and the First Minister and the Honourable Member from Wolseley are not here, are they already out in Marquette campaigning? Are they out on the run already? Would you know?

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the Minister of Health for the third time the same question. What programs are being jeopardized here in Manitoba because of this limit on funds?

MR. WITNEY: Mr. Speaker, I can't possibly say until we know exactly what the letter from the Minister of Health and National Welfare means.

MR. DESJARDINS: You don't know what it means?

MR. WITNEY: Not yet.

MR. HANUSCHAK: . . . the Minister of Highways. Is he aware that there appears to be a violation of the Highway Traffic Act in the course of taking a photograph which appears on the face of the 1968 maps which shows an automobile, part on the paved portion of a highway, double white line on the side of it and no driver behind the steering wheel?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I'd have to inform the honourable member that we have very observant citizens within the Province of Manitoba, several of whom have already written me personally to draw that matter to my attention, and we intend to correct it subsequently.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Public Utilities. I understand the Greater Winnipeg Safety Council made a request for a financial grant to the Provincial Government and this request was turned down. I'd like to know why.

MR. McLEAN: No money.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, a subsequent question. I wonder if the Greater Winnipeg Safety Council were supporting the use of breathalizers. Did this have anything to do with it?

MR. RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Education. In view of the length of the Winnipeg dispute between the school board and the teachers, and the seriousness of the delay, can he report to this House how the negotiations are going and when he expects a settlement?

MR. JOHNSON: I've had no report from the Conciliation Officer.

MR. DOUGLAS CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask for a correction in Hansard. This is the Hansard No. 47 of Friday, April 19th. It came to my attention for the first time yesterday, Mr. Speaker, and I did not have the opportunity of raising it then. Page 1159 gives a ruling by you, Mr. Speaker, which reads as follows - 'I'm just reading the operative part: "This I find is contrary to the established practice of this House and it is also a contravention of our Rule 46, Item (2), which reads as follows: 'Subject to Rule 36, the mover of a substantive motion must reply although the debate thereon by being adjourned becomes an Order of the Day.'" Mr. Speaker, you will notice that your word "may" has been

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd.) carried into Hansard as "must" and you will recognize that it makes quite a difference in the rule, and I would ask if you would take appropriate steps to see that that is checked. Because of the fact that Speakers' rulings are made note of, someone might look up Hansard to get the ruling and be led astray if it remained in this form.

MR. SPEAKER: I thank the Honourable the Member for Lakeside. I certainly must admit that that error had escaped me in the printed word and I can assure him that action will be taken in that regard. The Honourable Member for St. John's

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q.C. (St. John's): Mr. Speaker, may I address a question to the Honourable the Attorney-General? Last Friday I asked a question regarding the provincial law relating to the requirement for a magistrate to enable a person to have time to pay a fine rather than be incarcerated; he took it as notice. Could we have a reply?

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, the Law Officers have brought to my attention the section of the Liquor Control Act. The particular section now escapes me that applies to this matter. I don't know if there's any more detail I can give my honourable friend except to say that on reading it through, the particular section in question, it seemed to me to be appropriate to all reasonable circumstances as we find them before our courts at the present time. It leaves the matter within the discretion of the courts.

MR. CHERNIACK: Just a supplementary question. May I ask whether the practice is, in the magistrate's court and now that we have a senior magistrate, that it is expected that the courts will take this into consideration at all times or only when so requested? I'm speaking now in relation to the federal law which apparently makes it compulsory for the magistrate.

MR. LYON: To the best of our information the magistrates do use it, I can't say all of the time because I can't report on all of the cases, but they do use it in cases where I believe the words "undue hardship" might result.

MR. T.P. HILLHOUSE, Q.C. (Selkirk): May I direct a question to the Honourable the Attorney-General? Isn't it a fact, Mr. Minister, that the provisions of the Summary Conviction parts of the Criminal Code apply to prosecutions under the provincial Summary Convictions Act?

MR. LYON: Again at the risk of giving a quick answer to a legal question, the answer would be yes, except where a provincial Act purports to make some change in the regular system applied under the Code.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. 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 Seven Oaks.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, when I completed debate on Friday afternoon I believe I had about 15 minutes left. I don't know whether I'll take that full time but I want to recap some of the things I said in reply to the Minister of Health, where he attacked the amendment proposed by my colleague from St. John's and tried to create a picture which in fact wasn't so. He brought to the attention of the House all of the recommendations of the Hall Commission and the ultimate in a Health Care scheme. The amendment to our resolution, of the original resolution, didn't call for that at all. What we said, that we wanted a plan in accordance with the principles recommended by the Hall Commission, and it didn't go beyond that. It didn't spell out what shall be covered and what shall not be covered.

Now if the government had not informed the public through the press and this House earlier in the session that they intended to renege on their promise to the people of Manitoba to introduce or to allow the legislation introduced last year to stand so that Manitoba in common with other provinces could share in the federal plan, this amendment wouldn't be necessary, but because they did this and because we are now fearful in this group that they intend, as I say, to renege on their promise, we feel that perhaps they are privy to information about Ottawa's intentions that we're not aware of, and that they're going to use that and they're going to gamble on the fact that Ottawa's going to change its mind with regard to a health plan, that they're going to use that to avoid a health plan and a Medicare scheme for Manitoba. That was the purpose of the amendment and that was the only purpose: to make sure that even if the Federal Government, if they too reneged on their promise to Canada, then we wanted our government to have sufficient backbone to say we committed ourselves, we did this because we wanted it for our citizens, we did this because it's something that Manitoba needs and

(MR. MILLER cont'd.) we're prepared to continue on it.

This amendment simply says that; that the plan shall come into effect. All the other paramedical schemes and services which the Minister mentioned are not part of this amendment, although he uses them as he does a straw man to try to break down the case on this side of the House. He says he's afraid of rising costs and he says this scheme has broken down in other countries, and he talked about Europe and he talked about Scandinavia and he talked about a lot of places. It's a funny thing how a year ago he didn't talk that way at all.

As a matter of fact, Page 2859, April 24, 1967 of Hansard, he spoke on this debate and the Medicare issue, and he was surprised at some of the comments coming from some of the honourable members of the Liberal Party and some of his own backbenchers, and he said: "I explained to the House why we moved from the voluntary onto the compulsory, and since that time we have had the fears and the observations of the honourable members that we are going to have a very heavy utilization and the costs are going to skyrocket . . . and we had the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain say that the plan was a disastrous plan. I was rather surprised to hear some of the honourable members from the other side of the House - and from this side too, I might say, " - and that's his own backbenchers - "who spoke in such terms that I thought they were going to vote against it, but instead they all said we are going to vote for it. Now there is a certain inconsistency here somewhere, Mr. Speaker, and I would just like to point it out."

And, Mr. Speaker, if there was an inconsistency last year, then the Honourable Minister is part of the greatest inconsistency ever, because last year he chided some of his own colleagues and some of the members of the Liberal Party because of their doubts - and they had doubts - and today he is going far beyond that; he is going along with the idea of scuttling the plan for Manitoba.

And he said: "When we were talking about this question of cost and when we were talking about the question of utilization, we were all over Europe this afternoon, " - exactly what he did the other afternoon. "We even got up into Scandinavia, but we never got to Saskatchewan which is right next door to us and who has had a Medicare scheme operating for some four years. Now what has the utilization factor been in Saskatchewan? The utilization factor has been nowhere near what they thought it would be." And, Mr. Speaker, the truth is that even today the cost of the scheme in Saskatchewan is growing slower and at a lower rate than any other private scheme in Canada, and that includes the private scheme of MMS or the insurance companies in Manitoba, so to argue that the cost of the scheme is going to break the scheme, I suggest is trying to draw red herrings across our path and to fool the people of Manitoba into believing something that isn't.

And he said we're being consistent because when we went before the Royal Commission on Health, this government, the Manitoba Government, at that time espoused the philosophy of need. Well it's comes full circle. They did that in 1965 I think it was, or '64, whenever it was, then they dumped that and last year they were going ahead with the plan and today they're coming back to need, and this reflects the thinking of our new First Minister who talks in terms of wants and needs and separating the two, and apparently health is something you don't need; health is something you want. You don't really have to have it but you want it and if you want it you pay for it. It's not a need at all. It's this sort of attitude that, frankly, I am sure is shocking the people of Manitoba and certainly surprising people on this side of the House, because the Minister in '66, during debate in this House said: "Although education is the first priority certainly," he said, "preservation of health is also of prime concern, for the seeds of education only attain full fruition in a healthy people. Is that a want? That's a need; that's an essential need. How can we say it's a want that someone can go out and buy if they have the money? Health and education are not competing but rather they reinforce and complement each other," he said. "Expenditures in health are an investment in human resources, resources which will be repaid by higher production in our economy."

Things haven't changed. The only thing that's changed is that costs have gone up, and they've gone up not because there's been a Medicare scheme, not because there's been a government scheme, but because costs generally have gone up and the doctors are hedging on the day when there will be a Medicare scheme, because, Mr. Speaker, there will be a Medicare scheme. There's nothing that's going to stop it. They may delay it for a year, they may have people suffer a little longer, be under fear a little longer, but they're not going to stop it. It can't be done.

(MR. MILLER cont'd.)

The myth of over-utilization is one that I hear all the time in this House and the Minister touched on it the other day, but there will be greater utilization, and is that wrong? Certainly, with the advances in medical science, the expectation of people is bound to rise. There have been such fantastic advances in the technology that it encourages both the doctors and the patients to continue with treatment that perhaps a few years ago wasn't even thought of, had never been developed, and this is true of both private and public plans. You're not adding to the cost at all. In the final analysis, the cost that is being paid today has to be taken into account whenever you calculate the cost of a public scheme.

We're now paying through the welfare agencies, municipal welfare agencies. The Provincial Government is paying through various and sundry grant-sharing schemes that they have with the Federal Government, they're paying health costs. These can't be kept separate from the total health picture because, whether you pay it out of this department or that department, the health costs are being paid. We are paying through our own premiums. People today are paying through premiums whether through groups or through individuals, so you have a group who is going to be caught in the middle, and that is not the lowest of the low group. Those are the people who today are finding it difficult to carry and pay for costs of premiums which are high in relation to a government-operated scheme.

With the cost of private schemes rising faster than government schemes, and with the cost of living rising all the time, the majority of people are being placed under a fantastic pressure today. They're being financially extended, and I suggest to the Minister that the cost of Medicare, or health care, is pressing on these people and they need the security, we all need the security of a Medicare scheme so that if something hits we're not bankrupt. People don't want to go with cap in hand. They don't want to have to acknowledge their dependency by saying, "Well, I am now down to the point where I finally can qualify for assistance from the government through the payments of my premium. I'm down to \$107.00 or \$108.00 a month. I've sacrificed whatever equity I have on my house. I've given up my car." Surely we can't even continue to think in those terms in Manitoba, and yet this is what is going to happen if we have a so-called voluntary scheme.

MR. SPEAKER: I'm sorry, but I must remind the honourable gentleman that he only has three minutes.

MR. MILLER: I'll wind it up. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, people are entitled in this day and age to live without a fear of impoverishment or the necessity of becoming a charity case. No one wants that and we surely don't want our people to have to resort to that. And most essentially, I think, Manitoba, instead of doing what other provinces are doing, taking their lead from other provinces, following Quebec who for its own reasons doesn't want to go into this because they want to retain their provincial rights; Ontario for its own reasons doesn't want to because for every federal dollar that's paid to Manitoba, a larger share of that comes from Ontario than it comes from Manitoba because that's where the corporate wealth is, that's where the individual income tax wealth is. Manitoba is taking the very narrow point of view and the very foolish point of view of denying or suggesting that we don't even want federal money, because we as one of the poorer provinces are in a sense refusing to acknowledge what we've always accepted as a principle in this Canada - the equalization across the country; and Manitoba can only benefit on that basis. So, instead of joining with others in this combine to kill Medicare in Canada - because that's what it is; eight provincial premiers have decided they're out to kill this - Mr. Speaker, I suggest to them it's going to kill them, not vice versa. But it may take a little time.

But certainly Manitoba shouldn't fall into this trap. We cannot afford it here, and Manitoba should not join this combine against Medicare. It should come out tomorrow and say to the Federal Government, "You're committed. We expect you to meet your commitments. We, on behalf of the citizens of Manitoba, want a health care scheme and don't you dare try to change it." Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? Those in favour of the amendment to the main motion . . .

MR. DOUGLAS M. STANES (St. James): Mr. Speaker, 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

(MR. SPEAKER cont'd.) Member for Viriden, and the proposed motion of the Honourable the Member for Gladstone in amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, even though we have not been in session a great length of time, it seems to me that that spring feeling that seems to occur to some of the members about this time of year has already set in, and I notice a great lack of attention to most of the speeches that are made here recently even though some of them - at least by comparison with this present - have been good speeches. But not many people are listening, and I would hope and expect no other fate as I attempt to discuss this particular amendment, even though the subject itself is of tremendous importance; that is, the subject if you take it in its widest implications of dealing with Canada's wheat crops. But the Honourable the Member for Viriden, who introduced the resolution the other day, if I heard him correctly, said that he was not prepared to accept this amendment, and I'm afraid from the experience that we have had in this Session that he is likely speaking for the government, and that the government has decided that in spite of any argument that may be adduced from this side of the House, that their defence in this kind of a situation is simply: "Vote down the amendments no matter what their merit."

My honourable friend from Birtle-Russell offered an amendment that really made sense out of the resolution, in my opinion, but it was voted down with very little discussion. This one, in my opinion, makes equally good sense although it may go a little further around in order to do it, but it makes good sense also and my honourable friend from Viriden suggested that he at least was going to vote against it. Well, Mr. Speaker, the resolution as it stands - can we not get this to register with the members of the government side? - the resolution as it stands is simply inoperable. It just won't work. We can't get the Wheat Board to take our advice in this regard, and what is the use of passing a resolution that they simply will pay no attention to? In fact they will do worse than pay no attention to it, they will simply say that the Legislative Assembly doesn't know what it's talking about.

Now do we really want the Wheat Board to have that opinion of this Assembly? My honourable friend the Member for Springfield said that this could be done. Well of course it could be done. Of course it could be done, but it's not businesslike to do it this way, and we don't want the Wheat Board operating in an unbusinesslike way, in my opinion.

So what do we propose in this amendment? We propose that we invite the representatives of the Canadian Wheat Board to come over here and sit in with our agricultural committee and discuss this situation, and then those representatives I am sure will convince the members that the resolution as originally introduced is simply not going to be accepted. And we can't compel them to accept it and the Federal Government won't compel them to accept it. They could, perhaps, but they won't, and the Board won't agree to it on their own initiative.

Now, in the alternative, what we could do would be discuss this whole question of wheat marketing, and goodness knows, Mr. Speaker, this is a pretty important question now. Just a couple of years ago all of us, all of us in this Chamber were thinking that the marketing situation was very bright so far as wheat was concerned. I probably will, when we get to the agricultural estimates again, quote to you where distinguished people and distinguished bodies have said that for the rest of this decade that the marketing situation with regard to wheat was good and that the price situation was good. Capable people. Well-informed people. And yet what have we seen happen within one year? We have seen the sales slow up very greatly; we have seen the fact that our exports are probably only approximately one-half of what they were a year ago. And what, under those circumstances, can the Wheat Board do to determine that it will make payments out of the pools that it operates on a certain specific date? The payments that they have made through the years have varied in time, as has been mentioned in this resolution, but they have been made when, in the judgment of the Board, it was the best time to make them. And, while I agree with the spirit of the resolution that it's the farmers' own money and they should have it as quickly as possible, I don't think that the situation is quite as drastic as contained in one of the Whereases, namely: "Whereas the farmer must be able to rely on receiving his Wheat Board cheque at the same time every year to carry on his operations." It's true that it's important to him. It's particularly important to him if other of his operations have not been so remunerative to him. It's probably particularly important to him if the amount is large. But I think we have to recognize the fact, Mr. Speaker, that for the next year, by the way the marketing situation and the price situation appears to be heading now, that those payments won't be very large.

This is a big subject - I mean the general subject of the wheat situation - but could I bring

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd.) some element of simplification to it by quoting a few of the facts that are given in the Wheat Board Report itself? Here is the situation that any board is up against with, Mr. Speaker, and if we change this board and put somebody else in their positions they would be up against exactly the same factors. And that is that the production in Canada of wheat varies so greatly through the years. It varies because of climatic conditions; it varies because of the acreages sown; it varies because of the amounts of fertilizers and certain kinds of seed that are used; it varies according to whether we run into a hail year or a rough year, or a dozen and one other circumstances, but the fact is that it varies and varies greatly.

We have had in just recent years, going back to no further than 1962, Mr. Speaker, we have had a succession of four years in a row where the average, the average over those four years is more than 600 million bushels of production. We have also had the situation, of going back a few years ago, to where for a period at least it was less than half that amount. Now we have almost, not quite, but almost equal fluctuations in the export trade, and the export trade is the controlling factor because what is used domestically doesn't vary greatly from year to year but what goes into export does vary greatly, and the difficulty is that it bears no relation to the supplies that we have on hand. If it were the case that the export trade would be low in the years when we have a low production, that would be good, but it has happened at times that it's been the other way around and it's just the very fortunate situation that existed where we had, because of poor crops in the huge countries of U.S.S.R. and China, a situation that required them to come into the market in a big way that was able to dispose of those tremendously big crops to the good advantage that we did. But it looks, Mr. Speaker, as though that situation may have changed very greatly. And the point that I'm trying to make is: here sits the Wheat Board with the various pools that it operates - and we're talking particularly about wheat in this resolution or at least in the primary resolution - here sits the Wheat Board with its accumulation of wheat, and if we compel them to close their books while they still have a very large proportion of their grain unsold, we're simply doing something that no business concern would want to do and we want them to be a business concern.

Now, as the resolution suggests, Mr. Speaker, wouldn't it be advantageous to ask the members of the Board to come over and meet with the Agricultural Committee and talk this whole situation over? I am not confident at all that we could convince them to accept the suggestion that my honourable friend from Virden has proposed to this House. Not at all. I am not confident that we could - though we could give them some good arguments and some good opinions perhaps - I am not confident that we could persuade them to greatly change their method of operation because, Mr. Speaker, whether we like it or not, they or their predecessors have been in that job for a long time; they've got a good bit of experience. They know their business, I suggest to you, a great deal better than we know their experience. But we could learn a lot by talking to them and we could at least impress upon them the arguments that have been advanced here, that this is the farmer's money, it should be got out to him just as soon as possible under businesslike arrangements, and surely that's a logical solution to adopt.

That's what the amendment says, Mr. Chairman, and I would urge my friends on the government side to not take the position that just because we try to amend one of their resolutions that it's some loss of prestige if they adopt our suggestions on the matter. In my sincere opinion, Mr. Speaker, this is a much better solution to the matter than to pass the original resolution. If it is, then let's be sensible enough and statesmenlike enough to adopt the amendment and have something that will be worthwhile come out of this discussion instead of a resolution that will go over there that will not enhance our reputation with the businesslike people who are on the Canadian Wheat Board.

MR. M. E. MCKELLAR (Souris-Lansdowne): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Pembina, 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 St. James. The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, when the House last discussed this resolution, the Honourable Member for Selkirk indicated that the members of his group were going to vote against the government resolution because it, in fact, is an insult to the municipalities. And it was on that very basis, Mr. Speaker, that my honourable colleague the Member for

(MR. GREEN cont'd.) Seven Oaks amended the resolution so as to give it some meaning, and again, to follow up the words that the Honourable Member for Lakeside has just used, to make the resolution in some way acceptable. I notice that the Honourable Member for St. James is not in his seat but I hope nevertheless that what we say on this resolution will be in some way looked at by him, because we think that we are offering some assistance in that connection.

Mr. Speaker, we were impressed by the speech that the Honourable Member for Selkirk made with regard to his party's attitude on this resolution. Even though when we look at it we don't see anything that we are really prepared to vote against, we feel that recreation for children and adults is growing in importance; existing recreational facilities are not used to a maximum; there is increasing need for co-ordination of recreation and recreation facilities, and municipal councils should be encouraged to give leadership. We don't say that they haven't given leadership and we think that when a government member puts a resolution encouraging municipal councils, that there may be some residue of direction in his resolution that the encouragement will be followed up with some action behind that encouragement. However, the Honourable Member for Selkirk doesn't see that in the resolution and perhaps he's right. Perhaps there is nothing there.

Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, we want the government, and the Member for St. James in particular, to be given every opportunity of demonstrating that his resolution means something, that he is trying in fact to accomplish a more intelligent recreational program by virtue of putting this resolution to the House and asking the members of the Assembly to spend their time in discussing it. Because that's what he's done. He's proposed the resolution on recreation which ostensibly he says will cause a better situation after it's passed than existed before it's passed. He's taken it to 57 representatives of the constituencies in the Province of Manitoba; he's asked us to give it our attention; he's asked us to give it our support; and we have presumed that he means something by it.

We tried to make that definite by putting in an amendment which would give meaning to this resolution. At that point, the honourable member and the members of his party decided that they could not go along, and in effect, Mr. Speaker, let's look at what they have voted against, because I think it's very significant. We said in the Budget Speech debate that the members of the government party were condemning the municipalities with their taxation policies. They didn't say so in so many words, but we said that the effect of everything that they were doing was a condemnation of the municipal governments. We didn't think they would ever be bold enough to suggest in their own language that they were condemning the municipalities, but, Mr. Speaker, apparently miracles do happen and we even have, almost in explicit language but certainly in implicit language, a condemnation by this government of the municipal councils by their vote on the amendment that was put by the Member for Seven Oaks. Because what did the Member for Seven Oaks propose? And I think we should look at it very carefully.

He suggested, in answer to the Member for St. James who says that their existing recreational facilities are not always used to maximum advantage, the Member for Seven Oaks suggested that this House request enabling legislation to permit school boards and municipalities to initiate and enter into joint construction and development projects for recreation. And they voted against it. They don't want that. They say that the facilities are not being used to advantage; we agree. And they vote against a resolution which makes the facilities which are there usable by the municipal councils.

Well, my honourable friend shakes his head. Let's go to the next part of the resolution that they voted against: "Be It Resolved that this House . . . "

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order Please. I would remind the honourable gentleman that the amendment has been dealt with. I'm wondering if he's entirely proper in dealing with that subject now when he had the opportunity before.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I give notice now to the House that I intend to introduce a new amendment, and the content of my remarks now are directed to supporting argument in favour of my new amendment.

Now, the next part of the resolution which the honourable member and his colleagues voted against, is a resolution that this House commend the municipal councils, school boards and community clubs for their efforts in providing recreational facilities despite their limited financial resources. Now, Mr. Speaker, a simple commendation of the work that is being done by these municipalities in spite of admitted difficulties. We asked them to commend them.

(MR. GREEN cont'd.) And I say, Mr. Speaker, implicitly by voting against the words of this amendment, that the members of his group are condemning those municipalities. They condemned them in the budget by the actions that they took and they condemned them implicitly by the action that they took on this amendment.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we still think, in spite of our suspicions, in spite of our misgivings, in spite of our express doubt as to the willingness of this government to take action instead of merely spouting words, we still think that we would like to give the Member for St. James and his colleagues the opportunity of supporting a resolution that will mean something and which will do something towards fulfilling the express wishes of his party, of himself, the Member for St. James, in doing something for recreation in this province. And in order to do so, Mr. Speaker, we want to give the honourable member an opportunity of putting his money where his mouth is - putting up or shutting up. And I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we are now in a position where we are going to leave his resolution exactly how it stands because, although as the Honourable Member for Selkirk says, there's nothing there, neither is there anything to vote against, but if the members of this House truly want to do something, then we're willing to add something to this resolution to enable them to do it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we're talking specifically in the amendment that we are going to be proposing, we're going to take a little action on what the Honourable Member for St. James is proposing, and I want to, before proposing the amendment, refer to a situation in the north end of Winnipeg. Mr. Speaker, I was born and raised in that part of the city which was for the most part built up in residential and commercial development prior to government recognizing a real need for recreational facilities, with the result, Mr. Speaker, that probably in the north end of Winnipeg there are less recreational facilities than in any other part of the city and they are probably needed more in that area of town than in some of the other areas of the city where people have an opportunity of outside recreation and paid recreation, and certainly, for instance, in the constituency represented by my honourable friend the Member for Burrows, I can't think of one real community centre in that whole area. And the area represented by my honourable friend the Member for St. John's - not a single community centre; not that I can think of. And that's the constituency that I live in and where I have five children, and I can tell the Honourable Member for St. James that there is no opportunity for any of my children to attend a recreational centre within a minimum of one mile of where we are living.

There are schools, but you won't let those schools be used for recreational centres. There are schools in all areas of the city but no recreational centres, and I have five children who thereby do not have the services of the very essential needs that the Honourable Member for St. James was talking about. And, Mr. Speaker, what is more, there is little possibility of their ever developing unless action is taken by the government of which the Honourable Member for St. James is a member, or at least he's a member of the party that forms that government, I suppose is more exact.

Now, Mr. Speaker, those areas are all built up. Recreational centres require a great deal of space, a great deal of land, a great deal of area in order to provide the needs for the playgrounds, the skating rinks, or whatever other components a recreational centre needs, and it's impossible for a city with its limited resources to clear the property and to make those recreational facilities available. And I say, Mr. Speaker, that the province can't look at this and say, "That's their tough luck" for living in a section of the city which was built up before they provided for recreational needs. We can't take that attitude. We've got to do something about it. We've got to do something about it, not only for the children of the north end of Winnipeg, but for every other area that exists in that way.

Mr. Speaker, in the north end of Winnipeg, and I suppose that this may be unique in Canada, that they permitted -- we don't have in my recollection and maybe -- I'll stand corrected if someone can show that I'm wrong - we don't have a single indoor skating rink; but we had one. -- (Interjection) -- Well, my honourable friend the Member for Seven Oaks tells me that we have one. We had the Olympic Rink but that rink is not used as a skating rink any more, and what I'm indicating, what I'm indicating, Mr. Speaker, is that in the north end of Winnipeg is probably the only place where they let an indoor skating rink fall into disuse so that it is not used as an indoor skating rink any more. Is my honourable friend saying there is another one in the north end of Winnipeg? -- (Interjection) -- Well, I'm talking about north of the CPR main line track.

HON. J. B. CARROLL (Minister of Welfare) (The Pas): But this is near the Sargent Park

(MR. CARROLL cont'd.) there.

MR. GREEN: Near the Sargent Park. Well that's not the north end of Winnipeg. Okay. Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to make a big point out of it. I don't know of one. I know that we used to have the Olympic Rink but I don't know of another. Mr. Speaker, I say that if the attitude of the government is merely to express the desire to do something without doing anything, then we want to give them an opportunity, as I said before, of backing up their words with action and doing something, Mr. Speaker, not only for the north end of Winnipeg but for the entire province.

And having introduced the amendment, Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Wellington, that the resolution be amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and by adding after the word "public" in the last line thereof, the following: "and that in aid thereof, the Provincial Government give consideration to the preparation of a province-wide survey of recreational facilities with the object of determining areas of most urgent need, and that the Provincial Government then give consideration to the provision of financial assistance to the creation of recreational facilities where such costs would overburden the municipalities."

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

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

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

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

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 26; Nays, 27.

MR. MOLGAT: Is it noted after a recount, Mr. Chairman?

MR. SPEAKER: I did some quiet thinking myself. Are you ready for the question on the main motion? The Honourable Member for St. John's.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I've listened with interest to the debate that has been carried on on this resolution, and attempted to read what Hansard reported on what was said by honourable members on the government side in support of this. The Honourable Member for Roblin gave us an impassioned speech on this which was most interesting and indicated to me the need for government action in the rural areas of Manitoba. But I know a little more about the City of Winnipeg problems and I would have been much more interested in hearing -- unfortunately I see a couple of members already who represent City of Winnipeg seats who are on the government side, who have already left the Chamber and possibly they're going out to check on the recreational facilities that exist now in their constituencies. But there are still some left here. There are areas in the City of Winnipeg that I think are crying for assistance, and pats on the back will do nothing whatsoever to guide them in this respect. I look about the House and of course, as I say, I've noticed that the Member for Osborne has left as did the Member for River Heights. I know the Member for River Heights has recreational centres in his constituency. I don't think that he in his own constituency has any problems in regard to proper recreational facilities. But there are still some members in the government side who do represent constituencies which do have problems, and I'm sorry we haven't heard from them. The Honourable the Attorney-General, representing as he does Tuxedo, probably has not too many concerns in that regard. Fort Garry, too, I believe is pretty well looked after in terms of recreation.

But there are other areas in Winnipeg, Mr. Speaker. There are areas such as Winnipeg Centre. There are areas such as Wellington, which is represented by a member of our Party. But right next to it is the area of St. Matthews, and what do they have there that is so well provided for in recreational facilities that all we have to do is say, "Well, we'll encourage the municipal council and things will go well."

I have had certain experience as a member of the Council of the City of Winnipeg, and I have found there that there has been no lack of interest in an attempt to bring about proper recreational facilities, but I have found there -- and this was some time ago that I was a

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd.) member - that there was insufficient funds to provide proper facilities, and who has to speak much today about the ability of municipal institutions and of school boards to provide facilities with the tremendous costs that now exist, the increases in the municipal taxes, on real property taxes, such as we have already discussed, and which we on this side have accused the government of participating in. The increases in municipal costs - 12 mills, 10 mills, 14 mills, 23 mills - this last month is an indication of how ridiculous it is to say to municipalities, "We encourage you to give leadership." The leadership is there; it's money they need. And if it's leadership they need, it's a great deal more in terms of being able to work together as between the existing facilities. And who is it that defeated the opportunity in the City of Winnipeg that was asked for last year to work together? It is the government, and it is the member, the Whip of the government, the Member for St. James, who no doubt voted with the rest of his crew when they denied permission to the school board of Winnipeg and to the City of Winnipeg to be able to work together to make full use of facilities.

They denied that, and yet what is it they ask for today? Who is there in this House that is clear on what this resolution really means in terms of getting something done? Who is it on the government side who has listened to debate - debate which they have not even participated in today and that they have not participated in to any extent? I wonder who is it on the government side that really knows what the amendment was that they voted on just a few minutes ago. But aside from that - the Member for St. Matthews has now returned. How does he feel about the situation? Is this a satisfactory resolution? I haven't had an opportunity to ask him, possibly I should have asked him outside of the House, but he's here now. Possibly he'll give us the benefit of his experience and his thinking about this. The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre sat on the Council of the City of Winnipeg. He knows the recreational problems in the City of Winnipeg. He knows the costs involved, and he must know what is the ability of the City of Winnipeg to provide these facilities which are so important. And I think that the Honourable Member for Inkster has already mentioned the problems that exist in the north end of the City of Winnipeg, areas represented by him and by the Honourable Member for Burrows and the constituency which I represent, which are completely devoid of proper recreational facilities.

I had an opportunity when I was a member of the City of Winnipeg Council to try to estimate the cost of setting up a decent recreational area near the St. John's High School, which is pretty well the centre of north Winnipeg. And the cost was fantastic. To take over a city block and expropriate it today is a tremendous cost, and I don't think a responsible municipal councillor would be prepared to go into a project such as this without considerable help from senior governments. Well not only do we not get it, but the government has the affront to come to us in this Legislature, as it does through the Honourable Member for St. James, and set out for us, who know very well, the factors involved in recreational needs and the facts that recreation is growing in importance. The reason it is growing in importance is only because we are reaching the stage where children and adults have the opportunity, the time, to participate in recreation and it was never less important twenty years ago than it is today, but possibly the Conservative Government is now realizing its importance and now that it becomes aware of it it's prepared to say that it is "growing in importance." As far as I'm concerned it was always important even though the honourable members on the Conservative side were not so aware of it in the past. But I welcome them to the group. They now realize that it's growing.

And the statement is that "existing facilities are not always used to maximum advantage." How true it is that there are facilities that exist today which are used only during school hours and not being made available, and that there are private clubs that operate recreational facilities which are not available to many of the people in urban areas of which I am aware, and no doubt which other people are aware. "Whereas there is an increasing need for co-ordination of recreation and recreational facilities." The need is not increasing, Mr. Speaker, but again I say: Welcome to the group. They think it's increasing so that's fine. It's here; many of us have always known it was here.

And building up to this climatic experience that the Member for St. James must have in building the preamble to this resolution, he wishes to encourage municipal councils to give leadership and direction. That leadership and direction should come from the government because it doesn't involve just good wishes; it involves legislation which was denied last year; it involves legislation which should be brought this year, and surely should be brought not by way

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd.) of a generally worded mealy-mouthed resolution, but by legislation. If the government means it let them do it, and if the Honourable Member for St. James can't get the government to bring the legislation in, let me inform him of something he knows full well. He had a right to bring it in. But instead of that, he brought in this kind of a resolution which is pretty meaningless. And he has not, I think, achieved the support of members of his own party insofar as debate is concerned.

We have had occasion to challenge this resolution as being completely inadequate. The Honourable Member for Selkirk spoke vehemently about this resolution, and with justification. And where are the members on the government side other than the Member for Roblin, who to my recollection is the only one who has spoken on this on the government side, to speak up on it? Where are the urban members the people from Winnipeg? Where is the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer, who represents a well-settled part of Winnipeg and whose life I believe was spent in the City of Winnipeg? Does he feel that all that is needed is some encouragement to the municipal councils? Does he not, as a representative of a Winnipeg constituency, feel there's need for more? Or if he doesn't think there's need for more, why doesn't he debate this issue? He has a duty to his constituents as well as to his department, and he has not spoken on this. I've pointed out the Honourable the Attorney-General and the Honourable the Minister of Labour, both of them representatives of areas in Winnipeg. They have not spoken on this. There are other members here - I don't have to enumerate them all - who should have spoken, who should participate in an important issue, and they have been silent. And I would deplore the fact that they have not taken an opportunity to debate something which should be important to them and is important to their constituents if not to them.

And therefore, I do invite them to let us have the benefit of their advice and of their thinking on this. And in doing that, I invite not only the Cabinet Ministers I've mentioned, I also invite those people that represent urban seats, and I say such as the Member for Winnipeg Centre who's had great experience as a municipal councillor, the Member for St. Matthews who represents an area which is very heavily populated and which I imagine requires recreational facilities as much as, well, as any other area in the City of Winnipeg.

Let us hear from them. Let us hear if they are satisfied with the wording of this resolution. If they don't like the amendments brought from this side of the House, let them bring in amendments to strengthen it, to give it some life, to give it some body, to make us feel that we have not wasted our time debating an empty sort of a resolution brought by the Member for St. James, with some attempts that were made on this side to strengthen it, to give it some real meaning. And since it's a private member's resolution, surely there is nothing wrong with a private member on the government side of the House bringing his suggestion as to improvement, as to strengthening this resolution, whose intent I am sure is most admirable and worthwhile.

So that I've only spoken in the hope, Mr. Speaker, that in doing so I've been able to invite participation from members who the Honourable the Provincial Secretary would tell us - and so would the Premier - have the ear of government, because we don't have the ear of government the way their members do, and as has been oft quoted, the Honourable the Premier, in the last election that was run in this province, made it pretty clear that it's good for constituents to have a representative on their side who has the ear of government. Well I wish they would share that with others. I wish they would let us in on -- possibly in caucus they've thrashed it out. Possibly in caucus they've settled on this jumble of words that ends up with what I say is a pretty empty phrase. Possibly they all agree with it and have settled and agreed, as a compromise, that this is what they will do. I hope we'll hear from them whether they're satisfied or not so that we know - and what is more important, so that their constituents know - how they stand on this issue, because we may not be entitled to know, but surely their constituents do; surely the people they represent are entitled to hear about what they do, and that is not just the people who elected them but the people who live in that area who may have voted for other parties and will no doubt vote for other parties if this kind of performance is continued.

MR. CARROLL: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by 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 Inkster. The Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, in his absence could we have this resolution stand?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable gentleman of course loses his privilege to speak. If there is any other member wishes to take the adjournment. . .

MR. MOLGAT: I prefer to take the adjournment Mr. Speaker. I am not prepared to speak this afternoon. If no one else wishes to speak, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Member for Lakeside, 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 the Leader of the Opposition. The Honourable Member for Brandon.

MR. R.O. LISSAMAN (Brandon): Mr. Speaker, I waited till we got back on to the main motion in this interesting debate because I believe it allows me the scope I would like to have, whereas the third and fourth whereases -- the third one indicates: "Manitoba needs practical incentives for development," and whereas, the fourth one, "northern Manitoba in particular requires further growth in population."

Mr. Speaker, it's particularly along those lines, and here I'm expressing some ideas of my own, not necessarily my party's although at the conclusion I will be amending the resolution in agreement with my party, but I would like to propose a few ideas in northern development which would certainly not only be incentives to mining but also to the general development of the north. And, Mr. Speaker, if you would agree that I am in order in widening this to that scope, I would start off by suggesting to the members of this House that when we think of Manitoba and we look at that great expanse, I think all of us must have a bit of regret that so much space lies relatively barren and little use made of it. And I think, too, we would realize that it is population pressures which will gradually edge northward and make use of this land. And who knows but what in a century or two there may be uses undreamed of at this present time? As a friend of mine once suggested to me, he said, "What do you suppose land like this would be used for by a land-hungry nation such as the Japanese?" I imagine with their pressures of population, their ingenuity forced upon them by the concentration of population, uses that we simply can't dream of would be made of an area such as this.

When we think back to the development of this nation, we must realize that in the early days there was literally one great incentive that is no longer existent, and I suppose you're all familiar with the expression in natural development that "nature beckons with a finger dipped in gold." And people came here for wealth, but also there was the advantage that what they earned they kept. Taxes were minimal. Now, one or two of the proposals hinge around taxation, in my ideas of the development of the north, and while it may be fanciful for a member to get up and express his own particular ideas, I do so in the thought that very often some one person's ideas may not ultimately be accepted holus bolus, but they serve as germs for other ideas to grow upon and for other people to borrow and use in a greater scheme.

It occurred to me a few years ago that here we are, Manitoba, the only prairie province with a deep sea port and literally making very little use of this great sea port, a port with tremendous potential. Particularly after you've read such books as "Under the Ice Passage of the Sea Dragon," "U.S. Submarine," "Concept of Hauling Freight," and "Containers under the Ice," it's not inconceivable that the port could be used almost the entire winter long.

Well, about this time too we were being threatened with railroad abandonment, and it occurred to me that maybe we were looking regretfully upon a mode of transportation and neglecting to look upon one that's grown up despite all the burdens of taxation that have been imposed upon it - the trucking industry. Then of course this leads to the next thought that we would have to complete the road to Churchill, and while it might be some considerable time before there was any high degree of road haulage, we certainly must recall the tremendous tourist traffic up the Alaska highway, because it seems like people from the nation to the south of us just simply want to get in their cars and like to go as far north as possible.

Now, you couple these three ideas and I would suggest this, because I've been a great believer that corporations don't pay taxes; people pay taxes. I would first of all complete the road to Churchill. I would relieve the trucking industry of all provincial-imposed taxes - these are certainly within our scope. And the haulage costs - it's very important that a young pioneer area have low transportation costs, and heaven knows, the distances are great enough, and you can say, "Well the distances are too great. "We're hauling stuff by truck now, distances that were undreamed of 30 or 40 years ago.

And then build some warehousing at Churchill and with the tax-free trucking keep the

April 23, 1968

(MR. LISSAMAN cont'd.)... transportation down to the lowest possible cost, and there are means of making the proper controls so that just the owners don't profit by this. We would be bringing to the north country low-cost transportation; as I said before, I believe this is essential to a developing area. And I think members' imaginations can go a bit wild on this and imagine all sorts of potential results.

Coupled along with this idea, I would like to suggest that we might do similar to that which is being done in Australia. Once you accepted the possibility that taxes might be avoided or negated in the north for purposes of encouraging development, then why shouldn't we plead with the government of Canada? Because in these remote areas where living isn't too pleasant, the only real attraction is the finger dipped in gold, and the promise that people can go and make money and keep a bit more of it than they do in the south because they put up with far more privations.

Now in Australia they take in the out-back zones and make certain allowances in the income tax structure in order to encourage people to go to more remote areas and make livings there, and these are in pounds and I'm not -- they would be certainly the value of the pound before devaluation, because it was in a book two or three years old that I picked up, but in Zone A they make an additional exemption of 270 Pounds plus an amount equal to one-half the deductions allowable to the taxpayer for maintenance of dependents, and in Zone B, 45 Pounds plus one-twelfth the deductions allowable for dependents. So there is a precedent for this type of encouragement, to encourage people to go to more remote areas, allowing for the fact that living is more expensive there, and I think that we should realize too that in the early days it was always possible - and this is what made the great tremendous early expansion, I am certain, in both the United States and Canada in a new country - is that they weren't handicapped with such tremendously burdensome income tax; that in those days - well now, too, of course - it was always possible to lose a stake but in those early days it was possible to make a stake too, and regardless of what certain sections of this House may feel about making money, it is certainly one of the greatest incentives to accomplishment that you can imagine, and if we were to allow, before we start chopping away with taxes, the chance of making big, or bigger than present in the north, I am sure that this would be a tremendous incentive, because it is population pressures that will expand the north. The more people we can get there, the more roadways will be opened up, the more services will become available to the people, and I rather felt that it was rather a pity that pictures such as the homes in Churchill appeared in the paper because I think they create a misconception. It's only a few years ago that right down here in southern Manitoba people were living in homes such as were pictured. And this isn't normally what we regard as part of the picture of developing a primitive and raw country. But the more we can aid those people, then the more quickly they'll be able to afford better standards of living, and I think this is what we, as legislators, should be working towards.

Now of course, it means loss of revenue to the government and it isn't anything that any one party would want to take upon itself due to the period of time that would be encompassed with a scheme such as this, but I think it's worth members thinking about, that in the northern areas we might, by judicious relaxation of tax burdens, probably do as much as anything else we could do in the north. We could certainly allow a little bit more of the free enterprise element as we did in the early days here, its chance to work in the north. To the Honourable Leader of the NDP Party, of course, anything like this is rather a scandalous utterance to him, but . . .

MR. PAULLEY: Quite properly so.

MR. LISSAMAN: . . . a great many people in this country believe that the free enterprise system with its obvious incentives is still the best one yet devised.

So, Mr. Speaker, schemes such as these I believe should be considered in the developing of the north, and the growth in population would certainly assist in mining, timbering, all the developments that you would naturally consider to be part of the north. I don't think John Diefenbaker was so wrong a few years ago when he gave Canada the dream of the north. We are one of the few nations that have a frontier yet to develop, calling for the best in people, the adventuresome spirit of our youth, and I think everything we can do to encourage the development of northern Manitoba is all to the good.

Particularly, Mr. Speaker, concerning the purely mining element, as the resolution really concentrates upon, I would like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Churchill, that the resolution be amended by striking out all the words after the word "and" in the

(MR. LISSAMAN cont'd.)... first paragraph thereof and substituting therefor the following:

Whereas the Mineral Exploration Assistance program offers incentives to exploration and prospecting; and

Whereas these incentives have accelerated explorations and prospecting in the designated areas of Manitoba; and

Whereas Manitoba has developed a nationally recognized group of geological specialists in government and in the University of Manitoba; and

Whereas new techniques of geophysical and geological exploration and mapping allow for the development of more extensive and reliable information for prospective industry; and

Whereas long-term research and development is essential to the national interests, and particularly to Manitoba;

Therefore Be It Resolved that the Government of Manitoba give consideration to the advisability of increasing the area in which incentive assistance may be given under the Mineral Exploration Assistance Act; and

Be It Further Resolved that the Government of Manitoba give consideration to the advisability of carrying out further geophysical and geological programs to provide basic information for the mining industry; and

Be It Further Resolved that the Government of Manitoba encourage the Government of Canada to establish a national Precambrian Institute in Manitoba.

MR. STANES (Acting Speaker) presented the motion.

MR. DESJARDINS: On a point of order, it seems that this amendment is quite a bit like the original motion. I wonder -- I think there's doubt if this is in order. I wonder if you'd be kind enough to take this, you'd want to take this into consideration as it seems to be under advisement anyway. It's the same thing as the resolution. There's no difference at all.

MR. STANES (Acting Speaker): May I seek advice, -- honourable gentlemen.

MR. LYON: The point of order. I can't see at quick reading or quick listening to the amendment where it would be offensive to the main resolution or indeed would try to re-state the same proposition. In fact, it imports apparently some new ideas to it. However, in view of your position, Sir, as Acting Speaker, you might well wish to, if you have any doubt on the matter, you might well wish to refer this to Mr. Speaker who could carry it as an open item. We would have no objection at all to that course in procedure being followed.

MR. STANES (Acting Speaker): May I thank the honourable gentlemen for their advice and I take this matter under advisement.

Adjourned debate, the Honourable Member for Gladstone. The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. EDWARD I. DOW (Turtle Mountain): Mr. Speaker, we're back in this resolution to a discussion that arose last year in regards to the Revenue Tax Bill as proposed in this House. During that debate there were certain amendments offered by this side of the House to try and make a bill, that we all understand that any tax is more or less of an oppressive type of instrument, but conceding to the government's wishes that they do require money in which to operate the government's business on, and to try and make this a more workable bill we offered certain amendments. I am somewhat surprised in my thinking that over the years certain amendments that have been made by this side of the House, turned down by the government, eventually have come into legislation the following year, either by bills or by regulations. But under the Revenue Act, Sir, this has not taken effect this year.

While we go along with the fact that government must have monies to operate on and the government in power feel the Sales Tax is one way of raising revenue, we do feel, in my opinion, that there are certain inequities and there are certain classes of this type of tax that are really actually silly. The one that comes to my mind very quickly is the fact that if you have a family and if they have to get scribbles and pencils and ink to go to school, they must pay a tax on that, but if they want to buy a Playboy magazine, a comic magazine, they don't pay tax on it. Surely, Mr. Speaker, there must be some semblance of concern in regards to taxing of this sort of commodity.

While the resolution says that a Committee of Law Amendments should refer and take a look at these taxes over the years with the idea of making recommendations to the House to make this a more workable instrument of tax collection, this, I think, would have great merit to the government to accept this and bring this into force. When you consider that we have certain taxes on tax, particularly along the building line, and in spite of this, Manitoba's

(MR. DOW cont'd.)... expected to grow. Surely, Mr. Speaker, there must be some way to solve the fact, to encourage building rather than tax on tax to get buildings to build.

Then you go to the other hand of the fact that in exercising the collection of this tax, you find so many people, so many different types of suppliers, that just don't know what they have to tax. One mention was made here the other day in regards to a certain commodity - well cribbing. One supplier taxed and one didn't. Surely, surely we can get this on a uniform basis, get this into an instrument of tax collection whereby this can be understood by the people and make it uniform so we don't have the running around. I know this for a fact that people that are buying will run from one supplier to another to find out who's going to charge the tax and who isn't. There again you got the municipal tax, sales tax, on municipal commodities. Surely again, Mr. Speaker, we're taxed high enough without taxing on taxes again. And with all these things that come to my mind, with the amendments that have been produced last year, that were turned down by the government, have not come into regulations or amendments to the Act, surely the suggestion that we should go to the Law Amendments and have the people that are paying the taxes come to us and tell us what is the best workable way, the most satisfactory way, the one that will satisfy people that are paying taxes. Mr. Speaker, I commend this resolution to this House to adopt.

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

MR. JOHN P. TANCHAK (Emerson): I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Hamiota 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. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): Mr. Speaker, I beg the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand, but if anyone else wishes to speak, I'd have no objection.

... continued on next page.

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

MR. EARL DAWSON (Hamiota): Mr. Speaker, I believe that our democratic process requires that the people of Manitoba be fully informed on the workings of the Legislature and our group supports this resolution in principle. However, we shall not vote in support of the resolution because we feel it is not one of priority. There are many factors to be resolved before this type of televising and radio announcing can take place in this House. For one thing, one would ask the question, how many hours a day would we televise the proceedings of the House? Would it start from the time the House opens, from the Throne Speech right to the paper throwing at the end of the session? I'm sure that we can all envision the number of letters that we would be receiving from the viewers of television, particularly, they would not be complimentary letters inasmuch as the people that only have the one TV outlet would be swamped with about 12 to 14 hours of straight TV during the entire proceedings, this is if we televised the entire proceedings of the House from start to finish.

Then of course, we could have -- (Interjection) -- do you want to say something? I thought the Member from Inkster wanted to say something. That's way I sat down, to give him the opportunity.

MR. GREEN: I'm struck speechless.

MR. DAWSON: Then we could say that - one of the suggestions we might have is to film the entire proceedings, which might not be a bad idea, and then edit the film, possibly show one or two hours a day of the film of the proceedings of the House. But then the question comes up, who would edit the film? Would it be the Information Branch? And if this was so then I'm sure there would be many comments by members on this side of the House. Some would be saying the film was rigged to make one particular party look good, and I'm sure there would be many other comments. It seems to me that the only fair way to broadcast and televise would be to start right at the beginning of the proceedings, the Throne Speech, right till the end of the session where we have the paper throwing.

And then another question enters into it, the cost. I'm sure that the cost would be terrific and who would pay for it? And I'm sure the answer is the Manitoba taxpayer. So, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the money that would be spent in televising the proceedings of this House at present could be better spent in obtaining live TV for the north and two outlets for those parts of Manitoba that only have the one TV channel. I know that the people at present are frustrated that only have the one TV channel, particularly when they have to, if they turn on their TV set at whatever time it starts, at 1:00 o'clock in the afternoon and it's strictly one choice of channel and one choice of program the entire day.

Now can you just picture if the only choice of program was the entire proceedings of this House. I'm sure that the proceedings are of interest to many people in Manitoba and they've showed their interest, but I'm sure the people that have families, etc., would not want TV starting at 12:00 o'clock and ending at 10:00 o'clock at night and would be simply for two or three months the proceedings of the House. And as I said before, if we edit the film, I think we would be in trouble trying to decide what part of the program should be shown. So I believe that until this becomes our Number 1 priority this is not our No. 1 priority; our Number 1 priority is to obtain live TV for the north and two channels wherever there is only the one existing presently, I am sure, as many of the members in this House are, that sure as the devil, television will eventually come into the House and the entire proceedings will be televised; but until such time as we have the two channels for all of Manitoba I'm sure we're not ready for it and for this reason we shall not vote in support of this motion.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Hamiota spoke on behalf of the party of which he is a member, stating that the party agrees in principle with the resolution, but cannot accept it because it is of low priority. The rest of his speech indicates that, in undertaking to speak, he did not have the - I was going to use the word courtesy, but he doesn't owe any courtesy - he did not feel indebted to himself to read the debate which introduced this resolution, because had he taken the trouble to listen to the Honourable Member for Inkster, or had he taken the trouble to read the introduction to this resolution as given by the Honourable Member for Inkster, he would have realized that in intent at least, all the criticisms that he had to offer were non-existent insofar as the intent is concerned. There was absolutely nothing that would indicate that in presenting this resolution that we had in mind that the cost would be borne by government; there was nothing in the introduction to the

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd.) resolution to indicate that we thought that all of the hearings of the House would be televised, nor was there anything to indicate that anybody in this House or any member or any official person, staff or otherwise, would have the authority to decide what would be televised; there was nothing in the introduction to this debate that would involve anything but permission being given to those television and radio broadcasters who were minded so to do, to take whatever they want out of the debate and use it at such times and for such purposes and for such portions of the debate as they saw fit.

I don't even find myself being able to be charitable and to suggest that the Honourable Member for Hamiota, not having read the Hansard, nor having heard the speech, and it's obvious that he didn't, would still come to the conclusion that he did, because the resolution doesn't indicate anything along the lines that he said. If it did, then he would be right. But he did nothing but imagine, make up in his mind what could have been intended in the resolution and then attacked it. And he spoke for his entire party, for all members of it, so I assume they have all either failed to hear, read or understand the resolution or the introduction to it.

Let me once again state, Mr. Chairman, if what he had in mind, he calls a low priority, I would call it so low down as being unacceptable at all at this stage in a list of priorities. If what he had in mind was the cost of bringing in television here, all day throughout the session, then that would be ridiculous. If what he had in mind is that it would - well, he suggested possibly the filming of it, and then the editing and who would edit it, then of course he would be right. But forgetting the fact that there was a speech that introduced it, and forgetting the fact that the Member for Inkster had something to say about it, let's look at the resolution afresh. And the preamble states that: "The effective operation of the democratic process requires the fullest possible information being transmitted to the public to facilitate its participation". He says that's right; who can say it's wrong? "And it is desirable that all scientific advances which have been made in the area of mass communication should be used to strengthen public participation." He agrees with that. That's good, he says, in principle. So what does the resolution say? What is he critical of? What is his party critical of? And I don't want to be too critical of his party's stance as described by him, because I invite them to read the resolution again and then to say "Yes, we endorse the resolution; we'll support it", because they really shouldn't be objecting to it at all.

I think it would be best for them to wipe out in their minds the misinterpretation given by the Honourable Member for Hamiota and still support the resolution. Because the resolution says: "Therefore be it resolved that this House take such measures as would enable live television and radio broadcasting to emanate from the Legislature to the public at large". "To emanate from the Legislature" means to come out from and to be spread out to the public. Just as we have a press gallery up there, the facilities are there, the press is there; they are able there to listen; they are able to take down what they think is worthwhile; they are able to report in their media what they feel is important for the public to know. I am not aware that anybody in this House or in the Legislature pays them for doing it. Indeed it is the people for whom they work that pay them, and I suspect not as adequately as they should, for doing exactly what they're doing and all that this Legislature has provided for them is the physical space in which to operate and the permission that they have to sit there and to take their time and to make their notes, and of course they also have loud speakers to transmit to them what we have to say down here to make sure that they hear it. And they have rooms, space given to them in which to write their stories.

Now to that extent they, the press, have benefitted from measures that have been taken by this House to enable the transmission, through the newspapers, of information emanating from the Legislature to the public at large. Now that's all that was intended in this resolution; that's all that the Honourable Member for Inkster said; and what he conceived of, and I think he referred to it, was that on the opening day of the session, the television cameras are here and they took what they wanted to and they broadcast what they found was of interest and all that was done was that they were given the opportunity, the facilities, the permission, the space in which to operate. Now it may be that there would be some cost involved in giving them some portion, some cubicle, some broadcasting booth from which they could take their pictures or radio would be able to hook onto the system, but the cost of that I think would be negligible and it might well be the kind of cost that they would be prepared to pay themselves. And all that was suggested -- we have the facilities of newspapers, there are scientific

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd.) advances that have been made which make it now possible to bring live to the people in their homes, television coverage, radio coverage -- and all that it suggested is that the permission and the opportunity be granted to broadcasters so to do.

So that assuming that the Honourable Member for Hamiota has listened to what I've had to say, possibly he will reconsider what I believe was his misinterpretation of the resolution and its intent, and still find it possible to say, I did misunderstand it. In the light of what is said, I support it and so will my party. If on the other hand he finds it difficult to comprehend what our suggestion is -- and I hope that it is now clear to him -- then I invite him to clarify it or to ask a member of our party to clarify it so it is clear to him as well as to everybody else, as to what it is we intend.

So I do invite the Liberal Party, which is the only other party I believe that has spoken on this issue, to reconsider the position it took in the light of what I think was a misunderstanding of the written word and I invite the members on the government side to consider this as being worthwhile and not costly and not difficult but proper so that the people in Manitoba will benefit, both the northern and the southern residents of Manitoba would benefit from having the opportunity to hear and to see those bits of action that take place in this House which the broadcasters deem advisable so to do. It may be that the people in the press gallery about whom I spoke earlier, who make their living out of the written word, would be the only ones who would reject the thought that their competition would be brought in, but I don't believe that's so at all. I believe that they too will endorse this as a worthwhile proposal.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, we of the Liberal Party are not as fortunate as some other parties -- I guess we haven't got a monopoly on intelligence but nevertheless I would like to tell the Honourable Member that gave us this sermon that we do take these resolutions very seriously and that we do read the resolutions and we did this in this instance. Now, I think we're governed with what we think is right. At times the question of priorities comes into this but nevertheless we also sometimes accept the dictates of our conscience as members from another Party. Now the member has given a -- we read the -- I did and I know the members of my Party read the introduction when this resolution was brought in because we discussed it -- We discussed all the points -- we took it very seriously. But I think that it is wrong to come in now and to say, "All we're asking is that you make it possible. If ever somebody wants to use it, if you make it possible that the different debates be televised." I think the member is wrong when he tries to make us believe that this is all. Because if this is what you wanted you would not start it -- or I should address my remarks to the Chair, you wouldn't start by the "Whereas it is desirable that all scientific advancement which have been made in the area" and so on. You are the first "whereas", you are definitely coming out in favour of televised debate in this House. This is very very clear. You just said, "Well if somebody wants it, let's make it feasible." But your "whereas" makes it very clear to us anyway, with our little intelligence, but it makes it very clear that you are advocating televised debate.

The gentleman that spoke, my colleague that spoke wasn't sarcastic at all. He told you that there was lots of good points in this. We are receiving this with mixed feelings. First of all we don't know -- we haven't heard anybody from the television media asking for this, we haven't heard that. If they want it that bad they can ask for it. We haven't heard anybody asking for this. Secondly, the House has permission, has the right to grant this permission now. It's done on opening day as the Honourable Member from St. John's said. So this is not that difficult. If the people want it it's not difficult at all to move in here in a few short hours. The important thing is, is this right? Let's go back to that now because this is our responsibility. I don't think that you have to take the time of all the people to decide if you're going to knock a shelf or something, this is not the important thing. Do we want, do we feel that television is right, that the time is proper for this. I think that my colleague explained this very clearly. I don't think there was any reason to be sarcastic in this reply at all from the last speaker that spoke, none at all. I think that we have a right to our ideas just as well as anybody else. Now you can say what you want but my colleague said the fairest way -- and let's discuss this now that we're finished with all this other stuff -- the only fair way would be to start from the start and finish at the end of the day. It isn't the only fair way? Well we'd like to discuss this with you. You show us what another fair way is. They are here all day; they are here all day; they are here all day. And what's going to happen? You people will be the first one to accuse whoever is going to decide what will be taken. You'd be the first one to say, "Oh, they're against it." You're doing that for the newspaper now most of

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd.) the time -- that everybody's against -- (interjection) -- Oh yes you are.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege. I challenge my honourable friend to indicate on one occasion when I have spoke to a newspaper man either about good or bad coverage. I challenge him to get any newspaper man to indicate that that has happened. Any newspaper man in this city to back up whether that's happened.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I didn't know that my honourable friend to himself was the whole NDP Party. I said that the Party has made the accusation now that elections were won because the Liberals and the Conservatives own the newspaper. Is that right or isn't that right? I'm not talking about any special story or anything like that. This accusation has been made and then it's going to be said that the Party in power is controlling this. And there is a danger that this might be done, there is a danger that this could be done. So my friend said that the only fair way is if everything is taped first of all. How do you know what's going to come next anyway? You'd have to take everything on tape and somebody's going to decide. Who is that somebody? Now this is going to cause problems. We feel that the people have a right to know what's going on. But we haven't solved this yet. This is what my friend said that we were not against the principle of it but we could not see as of now how it could work for the best interest of the people of Manitoba. It's very simple. I don't see what was wrong with his presentation at all. I don't see that he had to be told that he should read the resolution and study this and take this seriously. I don't think that's right. I don't think that's right because we are taking this very responsibly.

Now there's another way that this could happen. You can say we're going to start with this half hour. What is that going to mean? What is that going to mean? Can you see the people trying to stand up, trying to stick handle to have the proper time. Isn't that a danger? You don't see those dangers at all? Well we see those dangers and I'm sure that some of the members from across see these dangers. This is what we don't want. When we're ready, when we've got the answers -- and there is a lot of other things. This is what we meant when we think that there are priorities. When we're ready. We're not against the principle but we don't see how it's going to work well now. It's going to bring all kinds of problems and we would like to study these problems. We would have to start -- we feel that television plays a very important role at this Conference of Tomorrow. I think this was good, something like this. Or, there are a lot of other points and if they want to start all right, if you bring in some specific example or suggestion, not just to build a couple of shelves like the honourable member wanted us to believe, because we've got permission now. But if you come in and say, "All right. We're going to have the Throne Speech." That might be possible. But let's discuss this. You might be absolutely right, but we feel that it is dangerous. I think that my friend the Honourable Member from St. John's said that we have no valid point in what he said. Maybe he misunderstood, maybe he misunderstood the question of costs. If you're saying, "All right let them come in and pay for it then they'll get their own people to support this." That's fine. But the other problem -- I think that the other problems are there. Now what about the people that have only one station? What about those people? This is something that you can't just come in at a Session like this and say, "All right this is what we want." Without discussing this. There's too many problems. This is all that we're saying. All right if your resolution passes you're entitled to it but I think it's wrong for the Honourable Member from St. John's to chastize the member that spoke and to say that he's not taking it seriously, that was wrong. This was definitely wrong. And it is wrong when you pretend also, when the honourable member pretends, Mr. Speaker, that all we're saying is we're making it feasible. It is feasible, it is possible for them to do it now. They do it on opening day. So what do we want this resolution for? It's a waste of time. But you wouldn't put these two paragraphs in if you weren't in favour of the debates being televised and this is the stand we took. We're answering this and we say we're not against the principle but we don't feel that we're ready for this now, there's too many problems. You convince us that these problems do not exist -- I'm sure that my honourable friend from St. John's hasn't done this today -- then we'll vote for it. But in the meantime we reserve the right to do what we think is right ourselves, and we don't like it when we are told that we don't take this seriously; we haven't read the speech; we haven't listened to anybody, that's wrong.

MR. CHERNIACK: May I ask him if he did read the speech of the Honourable Member for Inkster?

MR. DESJARDINS: Yes I did.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member from Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I had expected to get into the debate on this particular resolution but not exactly at this particular moment. However, I think I would like to bring in a few thoughts in connection with the resolution before us. On the surface I endorse the resolution in principle because I think the resolution entails a request for enabling services here. I believe in having an informed public here in Manitoba and I think they should be more fully informed on what is going on in this House, in this Legislature because too many of our people are not aware of exactly what is happening, the procedure that is being followed and how we go about in transacting business here in the House. Very few people know. Usually our galleries are vacant or very few people attend in total. We do have schools coming in but these only remain for a very short period of time and they are gone. So I feel that there is a lot of room for informing the people of Manitoba. Mind you we have the press, radio and TV at present that do a considerable amount of reporting, but here again I feel there is a lot of room for improvement. I am sure in the discussions that I have with people and telling them what we are doing, how we are bringing in the estimates and how they are being discussed and what we're spending in a given year on certain departments and so on, people generally do not realize these. Then too we spend eight days on debating the Throne Speech where any member can more or less talk of the things that are uppermost in his mind, things that he feels are important and also the requests of his particular constituency and so on. Very few people read Hansard. We know that they only have about -- what was it? 230-odd paid subscriptions -- so that in total very few people do get the actual reports of what the members are speaking in this House. Therefore I feel that this has a certain amount of validity to bring this about.

Yesterday we discussed at quite some length the Department of Industry and Commerce, the item of Information Services and where we are going to spend some 148,000 now in bringing to the people of Manitoba managed news. And this is in my opinion, this is exactly what it is going to be. It's going to be a biased report as to how the government sees certain things without the Opposition getting any way into this and putting forward their side. Especially so between sessions. While the sessions are on we are in here, we can speak and we can make our views known, but not so in between sessions.

The way I understand the resolution this certainly does not mean that we will have something going here full-time. I think it's only a matter of making the service available and that we can use it when we decide to use it. Naturally once it was set up there might be a much stronger request than we anticipate at the present time. This does not only involve TV, it also mentions radio if I'm correct, it says: "Therefore Be It Resolved that this House take such measures as would enable live television and radio broadcasting to emanate from the Legislature to the public at large." On that basis it might not need be too costly especially now that the government is going to purchase radio and TV equipment for their program under the Information Services; so that if we are already buying the equipment why not make use of it by the Opposition side as well. As far as priority is concerned, which was raised by one of the honourable members, I wouldn't say that this has one of the top priorities, I'm not so sure whether this is so very essential, but since the government has already started on this move by spending considerable monies under the Information Services, I think we could tie it in with that and bring it to greater use from this side of the House as well.

I would like to see it go to a committee first and have it studied and see just what type of service we wanted to bring to the people of Manitoba in this way. I think this would be quite proper. We could then also hear the views from the public, the news media, the radio and TV people and see whether there were any objections and what objections there were so that we could have their voices and their advice and counsel as well. We know that the government endorses TV for their educational programs in schools and so on. Certainly they could not argue that if they use it for educational informational purposes in one way that it wouldn't serve us well in another way, and therefore on that count certainly the resolution is quite in order.

In my opinion it would probably give fairer coverage to certain members of the House here. I do not want to criticize the press at this particular point but certainly this must have happened to many other members too, that you give a speech, you debate a certain resolution or matter and you feel you've made your point and then when the reporting comes out it's

April 23, 1968

(MR. FROESE cont'd.) probably on a minor thing which you felt was rather unimportant and this is the point that is being reported on. If members or if the public at large heard the members speak they might draw a completely different conclusion and therefore this would certainly be an asset in that way. It also would have its effect on members here in this House because we might on very many occasions give more reason and better thought out propositions when we are debating certain questions. Not to be too hasty in advancing certain propositions because so often we know that when we make propositions here that they do not get out to the public at large and therefore we throw them out rather lightly. Therefore this would definitely have effect on the debate that is going on in this House no doubt.

Once more, I feel very strongly on this matter that we discussed here yesterday afternoon and later on at night on this matter of the Information Services and where the government is proceeding and will be giving news that is completely according to their views and will be slanted no doubt, in my views, and therefore I think this would be something that would counteract just what they are proposing. Therefore I propose to support the resolution but mind you I would like to see this go to Committee and be studied by a committee and have it properly debated and then come in with a report, and then take action on it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, the Member for St. Boniface surprised me today. Instead of being his usual self which is being very sarcastic, he made the switch and he suggested that our Member for St. John's was the sarcastic one, and of course this is like the pot calling the kettle black. However, I will say that he didn't lose his temper, he spoke very quietly and he stuck to the theme -- (Interjection) -- for him that is, yes, correct. But he did repeat what the Member for Hamiota said, namely that this was a matter of priority. Then he brought in a conscience. I'm not quite sure what conscience has to do with the televising of debates in this House but maybe he did have a guilty conscience and if the hat wears perhaps he should fit it -- if the hat fits perhaps he should wear it. Excuse me. Now the proposition is a very simple one. We feel, and apparently everybody feels, because in principle the Member for Rhineland, both members of the Liberal Party that have spoken, both agree that in principle they approve of the idea that the information from this House should get as wide a coverage as possible. They feel that they agree in principle apparently that public participation through knowing what goes on in this House is good, that the democratic process could best be served this way. So they agree in principle, they agree with the idea and then they say "no". Now what is the stumbling block, what is it that brings them up to the very brink and then makes them back away, what is it they are really frightened of and they didn't say. To this moment I can't quite conceive and understand what the Member for Hamiota has in mind, what it is he's afraid of. Is he afraid that the people listening in on the debate might not have the intelligence to judge for themselves what they hear. I hope that's not the reason, because I think the people are quite intelligent enough to sift through what they hear and understand for themselves what they want to understand. Is he afraid the people are going to be more informed than they are today? If he's afraid of that, let him say so. Is he afraid that perhaps people might get to know more about his party than they know today? That certainly shouldn't stop them because I'm sure that he feels that his party has something to offer to the people of Manitoba; so that shouldn't scare him off.

So they're not against the principle, but they're against the Act, and the question they say really is do we think that TV is right and proper. Now newspapers are right and proper. I guess that battle must have been fought a couple of hundred years ago and won. It must have taken a long time I suspect in those days. Newspapers are proper, magazines are proper, people want to buy Hansard -- that's proper too; but to have somebody come in here and televise the proceedings and then leave it to the good judgment and intelligence and brains of an editor or a reporter, similar to the ones we have sitting up here, that he's afraid of apparently. He's not quite sure that he's willing to trust them; and he suggested we want to manipulate the news. We don't manipulate the news, we can't manipulate the news any more with television proceedings than we might with the newspapers. The Member for Froese suggests this is a danger -- for Rhineland -- sorry, I thought I did. -- (Interjection) -- Fine, I'll correct myself. The Member for Rhineland said that. So you want an informed people, many of us sometimes deplore the fact and are sorry that people don't fully comprehend all the issues in Manitoba; we want all this; why can't we take the logical step.

Why not go into the twentieth century. TV is here, it's another means of communication,

(MR. MILLER cont'd.) it's another breadth to our communication media, it's added so much more impact to education, to knowledge, why are we rooted in the nineteenth century by saying in these hallowed halls we shall not allow TV. This is nonsense. We shouldn't wait until they come pleading with us, we should encourage it. We should say to them, these Chambers will be open to television media, as they are to any other media. Come in here -- if you want to televise 10 hours, televise 10 hours; edit what you will; show what you want to show. I may not like what you show but I may not like what's now reported in the papers. That doesn't alter anything. Obviously these people are frightened of the new media, otherwise they could not possibly oppose it because it's simply another tool in making people aware of what's going on. It's another tool which is now given to society to acquaint them and to make them more knowledgeable of what is about them. We use it in everything. It's all right to sell potatoes, it's all right to sell soap, it's all right to tell the story of industry and of commerce and of business and of everything else, but it's not all right apparently to tell them about how their government is run and what the people they elect are doing here for day after day and week after week. That apparently is not permissible on TV. So we have the best and most potent instrument devised yet to influence man and we don't take advantage of it. Government should be the first, the very first to say this instrument that man has designed and has developed should be used for the best purposes and that is to convey to the people knowledge of their affairs and not simply as a means of another commercial to be sold at so many dollars. The cost involved, as was pointed out, would be negligible because in the final analysis the television stations would use it the same as they would use any other public affairs' programs; some they might be able to sell, others they're just part of the game.

There was no intention in the resolution, there was no intention in any of the remarks stated by the Member for Inkster, and there was nothing in the remarks stated by the Member from St. John that this was going to be imposed, that it was going to be regulated, that it was going to be controlled, that it was going to be censored or that there was going to be a cost involved to the taxpayers as was suggested, to the taxpayers of Manitoba. The taxpayers of Manitoba would not be charged one nickel, just as they aren't being charged for newspapers today. So frankly unless there is a more reasonable point of view presented by the Liberal Party I can only assume that they are against this because they're against the dissemination of information to the public.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. PETER FOX (Kildonan): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Burrows that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: In saying so I must say it's been a great day for the Fourth Estate today. The adjourned debate of the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Emerson. The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. FOX: Mr. Speaker, I adjourned this debate for the Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, in reading the speech of the Honourable Member for Emerson, I couldn't help but agree with him. It was quite apparent that this is a resolution worthy of support and I wish to say at the outset that we do support the basic principle expressed in this resolution.

However, in getting on to the end of the honourable member's debate, it leaves me at a loss to know why he presented this resolution in as limited and restricted a form as he did by limiting the weather reporting services only for agricultural purposes, when he does state that there is merit, there is need for weather reporting for the benefit of other industry. And no doubt there is, Mr. Speaker. He refers to the tourist industry, the construction industry -- one could think of a variety of industries and occupations wherein it is of importance and value to receive weather forecasting. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, as I've said we do support the basic principle of this resolution but we would like to see it broadened, and also we would like to see the responsibility placed on the shoulders of those where it ought to be placed and that is on both levels of government, the provincial and the federal. I see no particular need in tying in the news media into this resolution by making them responsible for the provision of weather forecasting reports. Let the news media handle this in whatever way they wish. But in addition to that there should be some offices, some source of information, or sources of information throughout the province from which a person would be able to obtain the type of

(MR. HANUSCHAK cont'd.) information that this type of facility would be able to offer at any time that he should choose. Now there is one available in Winnipeg. It's rather difficult to find; it's listed in very fine print in the telephone directory but nevertheless it's there. I do not know, in fact I do not believe that there is a similar service available elsewhere. As a matter of fact it's extremely difficult to get weather reports even on existing weather conditions at the time of enquiry, 30, 40, 50 miles away. If one has any doubt about this all one need do is go out of Winnipeg and phone any police station, any town or the nearest town, and ask them what's the weather like 50 miles down the highway - particularly if you're driving in the wintertime in case of a snow storm - and the local police station will simply tell you that they do not know. So, therefore, I suggest that this responsibility should rest squarely on the shoulders of both levels of government and that they ought to make facilities available for the provision of such information at all times.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, I therefore move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Logan, that the resolution be amended by deleting as follows: (1) Delete the preamble; (2) Delete the word "therefore" in the first line of the operative part of the resolution; (3) Delete the words "and the news media" in the second line of the operative part of the resolution; (4) Delete the words "primarily for the benefit of agriculture" and substitute therefor "for the benefit of all the people of Manitoba seeking such information".

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move that debate on this matter be adjourned. Seconded by the Honourable Minister of Health.

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 Portage and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Wellington standing in my name.

I have had the opportunity of studying the proposed amendment and I find it quite in order; but with developments of recent days I'm wondering - particularly yesterday - I'm wondering as to whether or not the mover and seconder would wish to proceed. But, however, having these thoughts in my mind I feel I would like to have the matter stand to have a further look at it to see that I'm in the proper position to advise and guide the House in this direction.

MR. LYON: I was going to rise on a point of order after you had made your ruling, Sir, with respect to the amendment to raise the very point that I believe you are hinting at in your subsequent words. And if it would be of any assistance to you, Sir, to refer you to Citation 148 of Beauchesne, Fourth Edition, Page 126 -- (Interjection) -- 148 -- (Interjection) -- Page 126, which is the standard rule with which I'm sure Your Honour is familiar dealing with questions of anticipation or revival of debate. And here we are I think in an awkward situation with respect to this resolution because it is dealing with a substantive matter that the House has already passed judgment upon in the estimates of the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce in committee yesterday. There was a vote in committee with respect to the reduction of these estimates to a point and here I try not to interpret what that debate was, I'm perhaps out of order myself in commenting upon a matter that's been settled by the House - but to sum it all up, Sir, I suggest that the House is in the awkward position now of really engaging in an academic debate. The matter has been decided. The money has been voted in committee. It's true there has to be a concurrence resolution come back to the House, but at the same time if we get back to the root of the rule which is that we should not be debating the same subject one, two, three or four times in the House for the very good sound common-sense reason that there must be some finality to these matters, then I think that the situation that we are faced with in this present resolution becomes readily apparent. And we can look at Rule 148 or Citation 148 I think with some benefit to determine the rationale behind this thinking. 148 says, 148 (1): "It is a wholesome restraint upon members that they cannot revive a debate already concluded and it would be little use in preventing the same question from being offered twice in the same session if without being offered its merits might be discussed again and again." Subsection (2): "It is irregular to reflect upon, argue against or in any manner call in question and debate the past acts or proceedings of the House on the obvious ground that besides tending to revise discussion upon questions which have already been once decided"

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I think we're debating . . .

MR. LYON: I'm in the middle of a point of order, Mr. Speaker. My honourable friend

(MR. LYON cont'd.) can wait till I'm finished.

MR. FROESE: What did he say?

MR. LYON: which have already been decided such reflections are uncourteous to the House and irregular in principle — (Interjection) ---

MR. SPEAKER: . . . the Attorney-General has the floor on a point of order.

MR. FROESE: He's debating a point where we have no information on -- we have no copies of Beauchesne to follow what he is debating. Therefore we should have copies of Beauchesne in order to follow . . .

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I'll be glad to send mine over to my honourable friend or he can go to the library and ask for a copy.

MR. SPEAKER: I believe, if I may intrude on the Attorney-General, that I appreciate what he is attempting to do and his advice is on solid ground but even at the conclusion of what he might have to say I would still be in some doubt as to exactly what I might do on the spur of the moment. So I would ask that you would leave the matter with me -- allow this matter to stand in order that I can consider it in all its aspects.

MR. LYON: Fine.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, --- on a point of order, and I appreciate the fact that you are going to take this under consideration, but I think that the remarks of the Honourable Attorney-General who has suggested to you one method or one reason that might influence your decision, that there should be, or that you would take under -- I don't mean. . .

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable gentleman isn't suggesting that anyone would influence my opinion?

MR. PAULLEY: No, no, Mr. Speaker, I inadvertently used the wrong phrase. I don't mean it in that context, Mr. Speaker, I assure you. But a point that you would take under consideration and not influence in the normal sense that you correctly refer back to me. I would suggest this, Mr. Speaker, that in the consideration that I'm sure that your Honour will be giving to this matter, that the most important thing would be the vote that was, or the matter that was voted on last night, which I respectfully suggest has no relationship at all to the amendment that has been proposed by my colleague, the Member for Wellington. The vote last night in Committee of Supply, dealt with the question of dollars and cents and an appropriation, as to whether the appropriation should be 148 or \$73,000.00.

MR. SPEAKER: May I interrupt and inform the honourable gentleman that is the very reason for my stand today, is that in view of what happened yesterday, and the Order Paper was being printed overnight, I feel that I should hold the matter in abeyance, which I intend to do, and come back with a ruling when it next appears on the Order Paper.

MR. PAULLEY: I appreciate that, Your Honour, and this is, I think, quite proper; but because of the fact that my honourable friend the Attorney-General has used Citation 148 from Beauchesne, dealing with a matter of anticipation, or repetition, that I should respectfully draw to the attention of Your Honour, that the motion last night is dissimilar to that that we're dealing with at the present time, the amendment, and it is not repetition. Same subject matter, certainly. Certainly it's the same subject matter but dealing with an entirely different proposition.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a brief part in this discussion on the point of order because I think there is a question here that the House should consider very carefully and you as the Speaker of the House should also consider carefully, and that is while I have always been advocate of Mr. Speaker when in doubt, reserving his decision so that he has an opportunity to consider the matter at greater leisure than making a decision on the spur of the moment and with conflicting interests involved, I also feel though, that because we are bound by the rule that once Mr. Speaker has given his decision on a point of order, it is not open to debate, that for that reason we members of the House should have the opportunity of expressing our opinions so that, quite frankly, quite frankly, with the feeling that we can influence your decision on the matter, because we are not going to influence the impartial and fair manner by which you look at the various points involved, but I think we have a right, indeed a duty, to bring up the points that are involved, because once you deliver your judgment on this matter, we are prevented by the rule from saying anything at that time.

So believing that to be the case, I would like to add my small contribution to this debate and I would, I would have to agree with the position that the Honourable Leader of the New

April 23, 1968

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd.) Democratic Party has taken that the amendment which is proposed at this time is a completely different amendment to the subject matter that was discussed yesterday in the House. Now it's true that the basic matter is the same but the method of approach, in my opinion, is different and for that reason I think that your consideration of it will be one that will be to the advantage of the House as a whole.

MR. SPEAKER: I thank the honourable gentlemen for their comments and certainly the last speaker, and when he spoke about influencing my opinion, I've always accepted the suggestions from the floor with deep concern and deep appreciation. I took the challenge and I rose to it, I thought, that no one influences me in the final analysis.

I'd like the Honourable Member from Lakeside to understand that.

It's now 25 minutes past five. Shall I call it 5:30? Agreed. It's now 5:30. I'm leaving the Chair to return again this evening at 8:00 P. M.