



Legislative Assembly Of Manitoba

DEBATES and PROCEEDINGS

Speaker

The Honourable A. W. Harrison



Vol. II No. 9 A      March 24, 1959      2nd Session, 25th Legislature

Printed by R. S. Evans, Queen's Printer for the Province of Manitoba, Winnipeg

ELECTORAL DIVISION	NAME	ADDRESS
ARTHUR	J. G. Cobb	Melita, Man.
ASSINIBOIA	D. Swailes	366 Lansdowne Ave., Winnipeg 4
BIRTLE-RUSSELL	R. S. Clement	Russell, Man.
BRANDON	R. O. Lissaman	832 Eleventh St., Brandon, Man.
BROKENHEAD	E. R. Schreyer	Beausejour, Man.
BURROWS	J. M. Hawryluk	84 Furby St., Winnipeg 1
CARILLON	E. Prefontaine	St. Pierre, Man.
CHURCHILL	E. J. Williams	Fort Churchill, Man.
CYPRESS	Hon. Marcel Boulic	Legislative Building, Winnipeg 1
DAUPHIN	Hon. Stewart E. McLean	Legislative Building, Winnipeg 1
DUFFERIN	W. C. McDonald	Roland, Man.
ELMWOOD	S. Peters	225 Melrose Ave., Winnipeg 5
EMERSON	J. Tanchak	Ridgeville, Man.
ETHELBERT PLAINS	M. N. Mryhorczuk, Q.C.	Ethelbert, Man.
FISHER	P. Wagner	Fisher Branch, Man.
FLIN FLON	F. L. Jobin	120 Main St., Flin Flon, Man.
FORT GARRY	Hon. Sterling R. Lyon	Legislative Building, Winnipeg 1
FORT ROUGE	Hon. Gurney Evans	Legislative Building, Winnipeg 1
GIMLI	Hon. George Johnson	Legislative Building, Winnipeg 1
GLADSTONE	N. Shoemaker	Neepawa, Man.
HAMIOTA	B. P. Strickland	Hamiota, Man.
INKSTER	M. A. Gray	608 Main St., Winnipeg 2
KILDONAN	A. J. Reid	561 Trent Ave., E. Kildonan, Winnipeg 5
LAC DU BONNET	A. A. Trapp	Brokenhead, Man.
LAKESIDE	D. L. Campbell	326 Kelvin Blvd., Winnipeg 9
LA VERENDRYE	S. Roberts	Niverville, Man.
LOGAN	S. Juba	858 William Ave., Winnipeg 3
MINNEIOSA	C. L. Shuttleworth	Minnedosa, Man.
MORRIS	H. P. Shewman	Morris, Man.
OSBORNE	L. Stinson	334 Balfour Ave., Winnipeg 13
PEMBINA	M. E. Ridley	Manitou, Man.
PORTAGE LA PRAIRIE	C. E. Greenlay	419 Ash St., Winnipeg 9
RADISSON	R. Paulley	435 Yale Ave. W., Transcona, Man.
RHINELAND	W. C. Miller	200 Dromore Ave., Winnipeg 9
RIVER HEIGHTS	W. B. Scarth, Q.C.	407 Queenston St., Winnipeg 9
ROBLIN	K. Alexander	Roblin, Man.
ROCK LAKE	A. W. Harrison	Holmfield, Man.
ROCKWOOD-IBERVILLE	R. W. Bend	Stonewall, Man.
RUPERTSLAND	J. Jeanotte	Meadow Portage, Man.
ST. BONIFACE	R. Teillet	129 Traverse St., St. Boniface, Man.
ST. GEORGE	E. Guttormson	Lundar, Man.
ST. JAMES	D. M. Stanes	381 Guilford St., St. James, Wpg. 12
ST. JOHN'S	D. Orlikow	206 Ethelbert St., Winnipeg 10
ST. MATTHEWS	Dr. W. G. Martin	924 Palmerston Ave., Winnipeg 10
ST. VITAL	F. Groves	3 Kingston Row, St. Vital, Winnipeg 8
STE. ROSE	G. Molgat	Ste. Rose du Lac, Man.
SELKIRK	T. P. Hillhouse, Q.C.	Selkirk, Man.
SEVEN OAKS	A. E. Wright	22 Primrose Cres., Winnipeg 4
SOURIS-LANSDOWNE	M. E. McKellar	Nesbitt, Man.
SPRINGFIELD	W. Lucko	Hazel Glen P.O., Man.
SWAN RIVER	B. Corbett	Swan River, Man.
THE PAS	Hon. J. B. Carroll	Legislative Building, Winnipeg 1
TURTLE MOUNTAIN	Hon. Errick F. Willis, Q.C.	Legislative Building, Winnipeg 1
VIRDEN	Hon. John Thompson	Legislative Building, Winnipeg 1
WELLINGTON	R. Seaborn	594 Arlington St., Winnipeg 10
WINNIPEG CENTRE	J. Cowan	512—265 Portage Ave., Winnipeg 2
WOLSELEY	Hon. Dufferin Roblin	Legislative Building, Winnipeg 1

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

8:00 o'clock, Tuesday, March 24th, 1959

MR. SPEAKER: Proposed Resolution of the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks

MR. WRIGHT (Seven Oaks): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Fisher, the following resolution: WHEREAS modern mechanical blessings such as the automobile, the tractor and the outboard motor are responsible for an ever increasing number of tragic accidents; and WHEREAS adequate medical attention to care for severely injured and critically ill persons is available mainly in Winnipeg; and WHEREAS present policy favours centralizing hospital facilities in the larger cities; and WHEREAS it is often desirable and necessary to move severely injured and critically ill persons as expertly and speedily as possible to these larger centres. RESOLVED that in the opinion of this House the Government of Manitoba should give serious consideration to the advisability of the establishment of a Government-owned Ambulance Service both on land and in the air.

Mr. Speaker read the motion.

HONOURABLE DUFF ROBLIN (Premier): . . . . . a point of order that I made previously on these Resolutions. If the Honourable Member will be kind enough to put in the words 'give consideration to the advisability of establishing' - I think it will then be in order. I'm sure the House will be glad to accept . . . . .

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Speaker, you will notice that I made the correction . . . .

MR. ROBLIN: I'm sorry -- I was reading not listening.

MR. WRIGHT: I thank the Honourable, the First Minister for drawing it to the attention of one of my colleagues this afternoon.

MR. SPEAKER: The correction was made.

MR. ROBLIN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry I didn't notice it.

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Speaker, this is a subject that I have been interested in for many years and I noted with satisfaction this afternoon in hearing the other speakers and in noticing that the Government proposes to do something about Water Safety, these are all to the good. I'm not an alarmist along the lines that I am asking for these services, such as ambulance services because as the Honourable the Minister of Health will know, sometimes in conveying people to hospital to be alarmed is far worse than to leave these people alone. But I have noticed over the years of service with the railway times when we have had to flag some of the crack trains to convey injured hunters to hospital, taking considerable more time than if they could have been flown out. I would also like to point out that I have no quarrel with private ambulance service as it exists today -- I think they are doing a terrific job -- because a few years ago in the city of Winnipeg I believe we had only one ambulance beside the city of Winnipeg police ambulance. Now in Civil Defence, Mr. Speaker, we are told that in case of an emergency that most of these emergency stations would be situated away out in the periphery and that they would be brought into the centre in case of any disaster. And yet today we have the tendency to establish our medical centres right in the heart of our large cities. And I can well understand the reason behind this because of such things as the Cobalt bomb - the necessity to have all these latest inventions. But I would like to point out, Sir, that I don't think that an ambulance service is something that there is very much profit in. And I'm led to this conclusion because the other day I noticed in the paper that the private ambulance companies in Winnipeg were drawing to the attention of the Chief Constable of Winnipeg their concern over the City police attending accident cases. I wish to go on record here, Sir, as commending the Chief Constable of the City of Winnipeg for his answer. He said it was the duty of the police to respond to all emergencies and to assist wherever possible. But I also realize that these private ambulance companies are not making huge profits for these reasons - if there was money in this emergency work, we would have people engaged in supplying private fire protection and I don't think anyone would argue that there could be much profit in that because today we are building our homes with 100 amp. wiring, with lined chimneys -- the tendency to emergencies along that line are less today than ever before and yet we realize the necessity of keeping these emergency services. We couldn't get along without them. But because of increased traffic today, and because of the urban areas growing out into the country, because of traffic congestions becoming more and more difficult to get seriously

(Mr. Wright, cont'd.)....injured people to these larger medical centres.

Now I know that there are times when it's desirable to give them emergency treatment than from a standpoint of shock to leave them there without becoming alarmed and rushing them great distances. But by the very nature of these accidents today, with traffic moving at high speeds, the damage is terrific. These are horrible some of the injuries received in these accidents and therefore it becomes necessary to get them to the centres where they can get the proper attention.

Now in Saskatchewan, I know to mention that word is to get somebody up here - I spent last summer travelling to and from to our sister province and I was quite surprised when I was told that they have had an air ambulance service in Saskatchewan since 1946. Now this is very popular - I suppose it was quite logical it should start in Saskatchewan because of the great distances, and because of the winter conditions that they have there similar to ours, but in Saskatchewan you can get an ambulance to fly out to your farm for \$25.00. Now this \$25.00 only represents 16% of the total cost of getting that ambulance to the person injured. And it's so popular that I'm told that in the spring when landing conditions are difficult that in certain communities it is a community project to maintain the landing strips during this in-between season. I suppose and I don't know this but I think some of the service clubs are engaged in maintaining these strips because they are considered to be so important. Now we hear a lot about mercy flights in the north and I had a hint of it yesterday here when someone said that this wasn't anything new, that when an emergency arose naturally people would be glad to let an injured person be conveyed to hospital and I think that we have to recognize that a lot of fine work has been done in these mercy flights. We recognize that, Sir, but these planes are not equipped as ambulances although they do do the job and I suggest that now with the development anticipated in the northern frontiers that it would be well for our Government to consider such a service. I know that we all say - that could never happen to us -- we can never see any of our loved ones involved in an accident, it's just one of the failures of human thinking I think, but when we do see these accidents we are certainly moved to do something about them. Especially people who are closely connected and because our large medical centres are being established in the urban areas I would just like to say that I think we should emulate the example set by our sister province, I think we should make this service available to our people here and I think as soon as possible some consideration might be given to it.

MR. M. A. GRAY (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I wish to support the resolution - there is a biblical saying that 'saving one life is equal to saving a nation.' The cost is so small that it would be good business of saving life and limb. In many cases one hour's delay may mean life of the patient, particularly in the smaller urban districts where not sufficient doctors or if there is a doctor, he has to be out probably to another case, many miles away and it's difficult to get him. Especially in an accident or in a heart attack - and there is--the heart attacks now is on the increase, as everybody knows. Another reason is that many of the doctors, this is something we probably cannot help, are moving to the urban districts, moving to the larger towns, after staying several years or less in a small town. Even in Winnipeg it is very hard to get a doctor, I know it from personal experience, at night one says he doesn't make any calls, the other one may be out for a call of his own and particularly they do not want or are reluctant to call, particularly at night, to come to a call particularly at night if the patient is not theirs. If it's not their patient. With the establishment of the many clinics where most of the doctors are there, very few if any, care to come at night. I've had many complaints from people of this difficulty. Many times they have had to call the police or police ambulance and for the police to bring a doctor. The cost of an ambulance is very small and the saving and the good it will do, I think it's worthwhile for the Government to consider.

MR. A. A. TRAPP (Lac Du Bonnet): Mr. Speaker, speaking to this Resolution I have no quarrel with the first section of it where it says - whereas modern mechanical blessings such as the automobile, the tractor and the outboard motor are responsible for an ever increasing number of tragic accidents - that certainly is the truth. As time goes on when we get more mechanical contrivances we will have more accidents I am sure. However, I have no quarrel either with the second section but when we come to the third where it says 'whereas present policy favours centralizing hospital facilities in the larger cities' - then I say that that statement is not completely correct in my opinion. I have had the opportunity to serve on a Commission

(Mr. Trapp, cont'd.)...whereby we had to study the hospital situation across Manitoba and I'm fully aware, as a lot of other honourable members are, that there are hospitals scattered throughout Manitoba in little towns, in little hamlets and some larger towns clear across - and I'm sure the province is fairly well covered with hospitals, and therefore, I feel that this is not entirely so as it is stated in this resolution.

Now as to the advisability or the desirability of having an ambulance situated somewhere where an injured person could be transported to hospitalization in a short a time as possible that indeed would be a desirable matter. However, accidents are not usually decided ahead, accidents happen at any place at any time wherever fate seems to have decided and it could very often be that an ambulance wouldn't be within miles of where the accident occurred. And while I for one, feel that there might be some area where an ambulance could operate it, that would be in between two hospitals, or two towns where hospitals are located and a town in between that probably did not rate the hospital at the time these hospitals were set up, possibly there, an ambulance service could be of considerable value to the people in that area. I know of several instances where that could be, but whether this situation is applicable to Manitoba as a whole is something that I'm not too sure of.

Now as to the establishment of an Air Service, a Government Air Service in Manitoba, that is another matter. The gentleman who moved this Resolution, he said that Saskatchewan is a bad word in this House - and that it would bring someone to his feet. The constituency that I happen to represent has the Manitoba Air Service Base at Lac du Bonnet, and that is the constituency that I represent. It is very often that I see planes come and go, and very often that some unfortunate individual in some part of Manitoba is brought in and from there on rushed into Winnipeg or to Pine Falls, or to Beausejour Hospital, or to Whitemouth, wherever the case may be, and I'm told, and I've seen it, that there has been in many cases, almost in all cases, I should say, quick consideration given to all these whenever a case is reported. At the present time about 30 to 35 mercy flights are made to the development in Kelsey area. There are -- that is I should say around one a month. There are approximately 30 to 35 mercy flights made during the year, and if one will remember back to the fall of this past year, you will remember when a helicopter crashed on the banks of Lake Winnipeg, between Manigotogan and the H.... River, and that was on one of the occasions when they were out on a mercy flight. It was in between seasons where a plane could not land and could not take off, and a helicopter was put into service. The service that is rendered is available to people of Indian origin or white; it doesn't make any difference; and I think the people engaged in the air service should be given a lot of credit for the very good job they're doing. In my opinion they're doing the job that the honourable gentleman from Seven Oaks requested, and I see no reason why we should support this resolution.

MR. STINSON: This is not a complicated matter. It shouldn't take up a great deal of time in this House, but it is nevertheless an important question. Our contention is that the system in the Province of Manitoba is on a hit and miss basis, and we should have this type of thing planned. In Saskatchewan it is a definite scheme designed to take care of emergencies in that far flung province, and our proposal is that Manitoba should adopt a similar plan. Now, we would not necessarily have to copy exactly what has been done in the Province of Saskatchewan, but I think a planned service of this kind should be undertaken in the Province of Manitoba. And I would suggest to you, Sir, that we not spend a great deal of time on this matter. Perhaps we could vote at the present time on it. Very often in Sessions that I have attended, resolutions have been carried over, day after day, week after week on the Order Paper. People will adjourn them, -- sometimes for good reasons, sometimes perhaps the reasons are not so good. But let's establish a precedent for once in the Manitoba House and have a quick decision. Let's do something about this and do it tonight.

MR. CLEMENT: Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words in regards to this motion. I think that in Manitoba there are few, if any, districts that do not have an ambulance. I'm sure that in our part of the world there is an ambulance and that if anybody is in serious condition, or hurt seriously, they are able to get to a hospital, and they don't necessarily have to come to Winnipeg. With regards to the Air Service, Manitoba does have an Air Service and in the northern part of our province, where accidents have happened, I'm sure there are many occasions that the Manitoba Government Air Services have flown on mercy trips. With regards

(Mr. Clement cont'd.) . . . . to rural Manitoba, there are also a great number of privately-owned aircraft, and I think you could go to any district in Manitoba, at least any constituency, and you would find at least one or two or three private aircraft in that constituency. And I know that the private owners of these aircraft are only too willing and anxious to help in a case of emergency. It so happens in the Birtle-Russell constituency that the member of that constituency owns and operates an aircraft, and on more than one occasion have there been 'phone calls to me to help in bringing a patient to a hospital, and I have done it -- on more than one occasion. I know the Honourable Member from Rupertsland, if he doesn't own an aircraft now, has done in the past, and I'm sure that he has done the same, and after all we still have a Democracy in Manitoba. We don't have to have everything done by the government, and I'm sure the people of rural Manitoba are being well looked after at the present time.

MR. E. J. WILLIAMS (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Rupertsland that the debate be adjourned.

Mr. Speaker read the motion, and following a voice vote, declared the motion carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. A. E. WRIGHT (Seven Oaks): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Radisson, the following resolution: whereas some of the newly formed and proposed school divisions would have preferred to consolidate their school districts into one instead of having a multiplicity of school boards; and whereas indications are that newly formed divisions may in time prefer to consolidate into one school district, resolved that in the opinion of this House the government should consider legislation which shall permit the consolidation of school districts where residents, by a vote, have signified their desire for consolidation. Mr. Speaker, I wish to add in after the word consider the advisability of bringing in legislation.

Mr. Speaker read the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Speaker, when we were considering the new educational legislation, at the last Session, I think that had we thought at that time, we might have placed something in there in the way of permissive legislation, to accomplish this very thing, and I can do no better at this time than to bring to the attention of the House the situation in the community which I represent.

There is a bill which has had first reading in this House to consolidate four school districts in the Municipality of West Kildonan, Old Kildonan, West St. Paul and Parkdale. The respective secretary-treasurers of these school boards are very concerned that this bill be passed in this House for the following reasons: That they cannot proceed with the making of their budget. I understand the Utility Board has told them that they must budget on the basis of last year. Councils are concerned too because they must provide the money, and I think that if we would go along with this resolution, we could make this a lot easier for those areas who wish to consolidate.

As you know, in the Municipality of West Kildonan, they had every right to consider themselves, by reason of their assessment and their number of teachers there -- they had every right to be considered a division by themselves. But looking carefully at the matter, and thinking of the Boundaries Commission, they agreed that the unselfish attitude was to go along with the recommendations of the Boundaries Commission. But they could also see the difficulties by having two boards of administration -- one for the elementary and one for the secondary schools, so that consolidation seemed the logical answer there. And, a lot of hard work has been done in promoting this, not only selling the idea of the larger division, but in promoting the idea of consolidation. Now, I don't know of any matter that is more important to these communities today than the passing of this bill. And the reason I say it's very uncertain is because we are wondering whether it will see the light of day, because it hasn't had second reading as yet. So, we'll just urge that we profit by the experience, and I think that had we had this in the bill at the time, we would have saved this worry and concern at the present time.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. R. O. LISSAMAN (Brandon): . . . . seconded by the Honourable Member for Pembina that the debate be adjourned.

Mr. Speaker read the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable Member for St. Johns.

MR. D. ORLIKOW (St. Johns): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the House to stand this over.

MR. SPEAKER: Stand. Proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable, the Leader of the C.C.F. party.

MR. L. STINSON (Osborne): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Assiniboia that in the opinion of this House, the distribution of natural gas in Manitoba should be on the basis of public ownership.

Mr. Speaker read the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. STINSON: Mr. Speaker, some honourable members may be of the opinion that resolutions put forward by private members of this House and by, particularly by members of the Opposition side, have little value. Our experience shows, Mr. Speaker, that resolutions of this kind have considerable value, because a great many of the improvements that have been made in legislation here have originated in this way.

A day or two ago, the Honourable Member for Carillon was complimenting his leader upon some of the achievements of the former government, and he mentioned redistribution as one of them. And, he no doubt will recall that that was raised in this House by way of resolution, and it happened to be my own resolution. He also might have gone on to say that the question of an investigation of education by way of Royal Commission originated with my honourable friend and colleague from Assiniboia.

The former member for Winnipeg South, Mr. Evans, now Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, has had what might appear to be some success in this connection also, because I recall a motion that he moved when he was a private member in connection with dividing the work of the Municipal and Public Utilities Board into two parts. And now he is sponsoring legislation in that connection. It remains to be seen whether he succeeds with that or not. But if he does, it will perhaps help to prove my point.

MR. EVANS: It is not my legislation. It was introduced by the Minister of Public Utilities.

MR. STINSON: Yes, it is the legislation of another minister -- that is true.

Now tonight, we wish to raise this matter of the public ownership of the distribution of natural gas, and I want to take you back to the Special Session of 1953, which dealt with the re-organization of the production and distribution of Hydro-Electric Power in this province.

And, at that time, the decision was made by the Liberals, aided and abetted by the Conservatives, that the gas utilities should remain in private hands. We said then, and we say now that the distribution of natural gas should be on the basis of public ownership. It should be considered a public utility. It should be publicly owned and operated.

If the former government had taken our advice six years ago, this province would have been saved a great deal of trouble. The people now would be able to enjoy the benefits of natural gas at the lowest possible cost. Now, if I may give just a slight bit of history in this connection, in 1880 an act of the Manitoba Legislature gave the Manitoba Electric and Gas Light Company a franchise to operate anywhere in the province in heat, light and gas. In 1898, all rights of the Winnipeg Electric and Gas Light Company were acquired by the Winnipeg Electric Company. And, the Winnipeg Electric Company thrived and prospered throughout the years as a private corporation.

Then, in 1953 we had the re-organization of the Hydro-Electric Power in this province, and actually what was done at that time, was to carry out in a rough and ready sort of fashion, what was called "Plan C". In effect, that's what the result was, because all Hydro-Electric power came under public ownership at that time. But, the government of the day insisted that the gas utilities should remain in private hands, and in that they were supported by the Conservative party, then in opposition. During that short Session, the C.C.F. group of seven, fought as hard as we could to prevent the incorporation of this private company. We opposed it at every stage. It was on January the 15th, 1953, that Bill No. 4, which set up the company, was given second reading. The vote was 38 to 14. All Liberals voted for it, plus some of the Conservatives, while our C.C.F. group, plus some of the Conservatives, voted against it. The

(Mr. Stinson cont'd.) . . . Conservatives were divided.

The next day, January 16th, I moved that the bill be referred back to Committee for further consideration. This was defeated 38 to seven. The Tories this time voted entirely with the government.

Later on, third reading, we moved for a six month's hoist, and this was beaten 32 to 13. The Conservatives once again were divided, -- back in those days they couldn't make up their minds about what to do as a party.

Now, why were we so determined in 1953 to prevent a private monopoly in the gas business? Because of our conviction that utilities of this kind should be owned and operated by the people on a basis of service at cost, rather than by private corporation for profit. We wanted, if at all possible, to avoid what happened in 1928, when the Bracken government gave Seven Sisters Falls to the Winnipeg Electric Company. That's what happened. Well, my honourable friend was here at that time and he no doubt will be able to explain the fiasco of the Seven Sisters deal.

MR. SWAILES: Well, they got it anyway.

MR. STINSON: Yes, they got it anyway.

MR. SWAILES: They got something out of it too.

MR. STINSON: Now, Mr. Speaker, our former leader, Mr. S.J. Farmer, in what I consider to be the most notable speech of his career in this House, said on February the 2nd, 1928, and here I quote, "I take the position that these services can be enjoyed in fullest possible measure by the people, through complete public ownership of power sites production and distribution". It took the former government 25 years to find out that S.J. Farmer was right in 1928.

Now, how long is it going to take the government that we have now to find out that we were right in 1953? And, I hope that it will not take 25 years.

I have come across a very interesting quotation which I wish to put on the record in connection with public ownership. It is taken from the Winnipeg Tribune of January the 5th of 1912, and a similar story is to be found in the Winnipeg Free Press of the same date. This is the report: "Speaking at a smoker held in the Maw Block, Conservative Headquarters in Winnipeg, on the proposed establishment of a public service commission, the Premier said, 'Some years ago the Province of Manitoba, led by the Conservative party of this province declared for the principal of government of public utilities. We were fought at that time bitterly, persistently and cunningly by not only the corporation influences that were affected, but by our Liberal friends. From that day down to this moment, the corporations and the Liberal party, led by the two grit organs in this city, have done what they could to discredit public ownership, hoping thus, by the destruction of the principle of public ownership, to give the powers to private corporations and monopolies. Mr. Chairman, however, I stand here tonight and say that the flag of government-ownership has been and is still nailed to the mast-head of the ship Manitoba, and all the influence of corporations, of the Liberal party and the grit press, will never be able to haul down that flag from the mast-head'. This was greeted with applause at the meeting". The speaker was Sir Rodmond Roblin, Premier of Manitoba at that time. A powerful combination.

Now Sir, this present issue is similar in principle, but not in all details. We cannot as a province take over the production of natural gas, as this comes to us through the Trans-Canada Pipe Lines, the creation of C. D. Howe and Nathan Tanner, about which we heard so much in 1957. We cannot control that part of the operation, although the people of Canada should do so. But we can control the distribution of natural gas in the Province of Manitoba. We can own it and operate it if we so desire.

Now, if I may be permitted to use that bad word, that almost vulgar word "Saskatchewan", where there is a C.C.F. government, the Saskatchewan Power Corporation has been authorized in that province as the distributor of natural gas. People of that province therefore have the assurance that the greatest possible number of users will be served at the lowest possible rates. They have two independent systems in Saskatchewan, -- the northern and the southern. Both are operated by the Saskatchewan Power Corporation.

The northern system serves a large number of towns and the cities of North Battleford, Saskatoon and Prince Albert. The southern system serves several towns and the cities of



(Mr. Stinson cont'd.) . . . Swift Current, Moose Jaw and Regina. Municipalities are given the option to own and operate their own local distribution system and when Yorkton is added this summer, all of the cities of Saskatchewan will have natural gas. 1958 was a phenomenal year in that province in the development of the distribution of natural gas. As a matter of fact, the power corporation purchased 20 billion cubic feet of natural gas in 1958, -- 13,800 customers were added, -- bringing the total to 46,800 -- an increase of 42% in one year. They added 250 miles of transmission lines in 1958. The average rate for domestic users is 70¢ per thousand cubic feet. Mr. Fines, the Provincial Treasurer, told me just a couple of days ago, that his own rate in his own home in Regina this winter averaged about 65¢, so that they have under public ownership in that province, a wide coverage and the best possible rates.

Now, the story of rates in the Winnipeg area is one of muddle and grief. In March 1957, the Winnipeg and Central Gas Company wanted an average of \$1.13 per thousand cubic feet from residential users. The Public Utility Board cut this to \$1.06. Later, the Company proposed a schedule of rates which entailed an average rate of \$1.03 per MCF. In August of 1958, the Company filed an application for the reduction in rates to an average of 96¢, but with the publication of the Commission's report, this application was withdrawn and the Company said that they would meet the requirements of the report and sell gas for 90¢.

Prior to this, on July 15th of 1958, a spokesman for Winnipeg and Central, Mr. Osler, said this: "The Company cannot live on 90¢ -- it can't finance. If it can't finance -- it can't expand, and if it can't expand the customers can't get service". And yet, we find now that the Company is providing service at the rate of 90¢, and not complaining.

This Company recently changed its name. It is now known as the Greater Winnipeg Gas Company. I'm wondering why the name has been changed. I think perhaps the new sounds as if it were now a public utility, owned by the people. It is a similar name to that of the Greater Winnipeg Transit Company, and it would appear that the Greater Winnipeg Gas Company didn't like the old name -- it created a kind of foul atmosphere in the Greater Winnipeg area, under that particular name. Anyone familiar with the tactics of the old Winnipeg Electric Company, I think, would be naturally suspicious of the antics of this offspring Company.

Now I contend, Sir, that the objective of this Company is to maintain a monopoly in the field of gas distribution and then as soon as possible, get an increase in rates. I think the House should be reminded, Sir, that there were two other companies who were willing to take on this job, at less than 90¢ -- back when the hearings were being held. For example, on July the 15th, 1958, the Great Northern Gas Utilities Limited, a very large corporation, said it could supply gas to the suburbs for an average of 81¢ per thousand cubic feet and to the whole of Greater Winnipeg area for from 85¢ to 89¢, depending upon the valuation of the properties of Winnipeg and Central. Then, another Company, called the Great Plains Gas Company said it could be done for 74¢.

In Saskatchewan, the average rate is about 70¢ per thousand cubic feet. Brandon and Portage, in our own province, have more favourable rates than Winnipeg has. In Brandon, the Great Northern has been supplying gas at an average rate of 68¢, and in Portage la Prairie, Inter-city Gas charges an averages of 73¢. Why should Winnipeg users pay more? I should think that Winnipeg users would be in a more favourable position with this large population, and yet we are paying 90¢.

As I recall the report of the commission that investigated the question of natural gas, I think the most surprising feature of that report was its recommendation to give the Winnipeg and Central Gas Company a second chance. Actually, they rewarded this Company for making a mess of the gas business. They gave them an unprecedented opportunity of establishing a monopoly in the distribution of natural gas in this area. The enquiry commission was so anxious to favour private enterprise rather than public ownership that they leaned over backwards to give the Winnipeg and Central Gas Company every possible advantage.

And remember, Sir, that it was the new management, not the old incompetent one, that argued under oath that gas could not be sold for less than 90¢. And so it would appear to me, Mr. Speaker, that in the interests of the people of Manitoba, this government should undertake the expropriation of the holdings of the Greater Winnipeg Gas Company -- in the interests of the people of Manitoba. The advantages of public ownership, particularly in the field of financing such an enterprise, were deliberately passed over by the Royal Commission so that private

(Mr. Stinson cont'd.) . . . enterprise could maintain control in this field.

Now, I think there are one or two questions that perhaps one should ask of the government. Has this government given any serious study to establishing a publically-owned system? Has the Minister of Utilities or any other Cabinet Minister made a first-hand study of gas distribution in the Province of Saskatchewan?

During 1958, the Winnipeg and Central Gas Company must have spent large sums of money, fighting for its position, and, also more important, to argue that gas would not be sold for 90¢. After the pressure was applied, they found that they could sell it for 90¢. Now, Sir, it will be interesting to know if the Greater Winnipeg Gas Company can claim these incurred expenses as legitimate expense of business, charge it to the gas consumer, or possibly put it on the rate base as a development charge. We would be interested to know what the Minister of Utilities has to say in reply to questions of this kind. There is one thing I can promise you, Mr. Speaker, and that is that the C.C.F. in this House, and in this province, will continue to fight for the public ownership of utilities of this kind, because we believe that only under public ownership can there be a guarantee of both -- of good service at reasonable cost. The old government failed us in this respect -- they failed us lamentably in 1953 -- and I now put it to the new government, -- will they do any better?

This, Sir, is entirely a provincial matter. No one can say that we are shooting at John Diefenbaker in this particular speech or in the particular resolution. This is aimed directly at the provincial administration. We consider this to be one of the most important issues facing the people of this province, and it is our contention that the distribution of natural gas would be much better on a basis of public ownership.

MR. W.B. SCARTH, Q.C. (River Heights): May I ask the honourable member a question Mr. Speaker? Could you tell me, Sir, the distance that Regina has to pipe the gas into -- from what field -- that is, how far it has to pipe the gas into Regina, and how far gas has to be piped into Winnipeg, from the field where we get it?

MR. STINSON: In the Province of Saskatchewan, they have several pipe lines -- they have not only the major one -- the Trans Canada Pipe Line to pipe gas from, but they have several other lines that they have developed themselves, and that is the reason why they have been able to have the distribution over such a wide area. But as to the question of distance, I could not give a precise answer at the moment. I know what my honourable friend has in mind and I don't think he's correct.

MR. SCARTH: Well, are you aware, Sir, as to whether or not that gas is piped from Saskatchewan?

MR. STINSON: What gas?

MR. SCARTH: The gas that Regina is using.

MR. STINSON: From Saskatchewan?

MR. SCARTH: Yes.

MR. STINSON: Some of it may come from their own pipe lines and some of it from the Trans-Canada, which gas originates in the Province of Alberta.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

HON. J.B. CARROLL (The Pas): I move, seconded by the Minister of Labour, that the debate be adjourned.

Mr. Speaker read the motion, and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Rockwood-Iberville, resolved that consideration be given to the advisability of broadcasting the Manitoba Hospital Services Plan to include the care of patients in nursing homes.

A MEMBER: He was here a minute ago.

MR. SPEAKER: It has been moved by the Honourable Member for Gladstone . . . .

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Speaker, I didn't notice that the Honourable Member for Rockwood-Iberville was out of his seat at the moment, so I will change that to the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. SPEAKER: I didn't get the seconder yet.

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

Mr. Speaker presented the motion.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Speaker, I think perhaps at the outstart I might do worse than to read what I consider a fairly definite definition of the word nursing home, and I have to go and use that horrible word "Saskatchewan" to get it. I have it right in front of me here you see. But, the people in Saskatchewan and the people in Manitoba, they need the same kind of care, so I'll use their definition. Nursing home means a family home or larger structural unit in which the operator or management, whether for profit or not, has undertaken to provide maintenance, personnel and skilled nursing care for four or more persons, not related by blood or marriage to the operator, or any member of the management, who by reason of illness, physical infirmity or advancement of age are unable to care for themselves. Now, that's the way they define nursing home.

Now, the people of Neepawa have demonstrated in a very concrete way that they do care for their elderly people and have taken measures to look after them. About 1950 or thereabouts, when we built a new hospital in Neepawa, arrangements were made for the United Church of Canada to take over the old hospital. They took it over for the sum of \$1.00 and spent about \$25,000 more on it, and developed it into a -- what is now known as the Osborne Home for Senior Citizens. Just last year, they built two new units; the new units are really intended for married couples, -- there is accommodation there for married couples, -- whereas the old Osborne Home was really set up for single persons. Now these two units, three actually -- the old hospital and the two new ones, -- there is accommodation there now for about 35 or 40 people. And ever since they developed these homes, they had realized that while they do serve a definite need, there is something lacking, and the something that is lacking is that we have no place to care for the older people that require a limited amount of nursing care. Now, my experience on the Council, I was on the town council at Neepawa for about four years, is that councillors generally when they are considering what must be done with their elderly persons that are in need of a limited amount of nursing care, the first consideration is, well, let's put them in the hospital -- they get it for free there; whereas if we put them in a nursing home, it's going to cost us some money. Then, number two is if we do put them in a nursing home, they'll have to be removed from Neepawa because we just haven't any accommodation in Neepawa to look after that type of patient.

I can well recall, prior to July the first, and I personally know of two or three cases there, particularly one -- a man and his wife who were -- they were both really in need of limited nursing care. The daughter, their only daughter was working during the day, trying to support the three of them, and she did have to get a married lady in to look after them while she was working. Then she would come home from work and look after them all night. But, on July the first or thereabouts, very shortly afterwards, she removed them to the hospital. Now actually, they did not require hospital treatment. They could have done very nicely in a nursing home and would have preferred to go there. And, to substantiate that statement, shortly afterwards, they were removed to a nursing home in Brandon or Carberry. Since that time, the one -- the gentleman, I think he passed on since that time -- I think his wife is still living.

Another case, I would like to cite, happened to be my aunt, and she has since passed on too. Prior to July the first, and for about 12 months before that, she was in Hospice Tache. She was blind, bed-ridden, but was certainly satisfied with the treatment that she was getting at Hospice Tache. But there again, the hospital bill had to be paid by my uncle who certainly was of very meagre means. On July first, he removed her to the hospital. She stayed there until she passed away. Now, I understand that the Hospice Tache rates have been adjusted, but at the time she was there, I think the care was costing \$105.00 a month, and she was removed to the hospital at Grandview, where the cost of the care would be at least triple -- at least triple that, -- probably more. And I suggest that if we had any persons left in this province that are interested in saving money, then we must do something about this important matter.

Another case I might cite, the Rural Municipality of Rosedale had a patient in the Neepawa Hospital. He was there for probably three or four months and eventually he got to the point that he didn't require active nursing care, but still required a limited amount of nursing care. He was removed to a home where, the municipality were only billed for \$2.00 a day and he's still in it. Now I don't know how that they were able to get this home at \$2.00 a day, but they got it, -- he's still there. And there again, he was removed -- this is the reverse -- he was

(Mr. Shoemaker cont'd). . . . removed from a bed that was costing \$14.00 a day to one that would cost \$2.00 a day, and they were reluctant to make that move.

The Town of Neepawa presently have at least two persons - that's all I can think of at the moment, there may be more, that are in nursing homes in Brandon - there both indigents. We have at least two in Carberry - at the Margaret Memorial Home in Carberry, the care at Carberry is costing us \$90.00 a month; and at Brandon, I think, it's less than that, it's something like \$75.00 at the Salvation Army Home there. And there are several more that I could mention in the rural municipalities. So that it certainly would seem to me that we are missing the boat badly when we do not care for these people in nursing homes at \$2.00 or \$3.00 a day, and whereas we are quite willing to pay for their care at anywhere from \$12.00 to \$20.00 a day. As recent as a week ago last evening, the Ministerial Association at Neepawa met with the Town Council; and the Neepawa Press of March 17th reports, and I think most of you can see that, a growing need here for nursing homes. And while I was home over the weekend, the Reverend W.A. McDonald who is the Chairman of the Ministerial Association had quite a lengthy discussion with me. He told me he was going to write me this week. I haven't received the letter as yet. But his point is this, that while we have no complaint about the care that these people are presently receiving in Carberry, Brandon, Minnedosa and these other nursing homes, -- we have no complaint about the care that these people are receiving, -- these people want to be at home where their relatives can go and see them. And I suggest that this is the least that we can do for them. Leave them as close to home as it is possible to do.

Just last week, I had a very nice conversation with a fellow from Killarney who described a home that has recently been built down there. The Honourable, the Minister of Agriculture probably knows a lot more about it than I do. But I understand that they built a big eight-bed unit down there. True it is called a Home for Senior Citizens -- it cost them \$92,000 and they received a grant from the government of something like \$32,000. Just slightly over one-third of it in way of grant. This chap told me that part of it could well be used for a nursing home, that is probably seven or eight of the beds or as many as were needed could be used for a nursing home.

And I suggest that in a place such as that where they have 38 persons, and in a place such as we have at Neepawa, whereas in three units we have accommodation for 30 or 40 persons, there isn't a week that goes by that what one of those persons - because they are all over 70 - will require a limited amount of nursing care and could be removed to another section of the home. And I certainly urge that serious consideration be given to this resolution of mine.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words on this resolution. I certainly agree with the Honourable Member from Neepawa who is really covering the field in all types of care other than acute hospital care; from the type of patient who can be looked after at home on a home care programme, up to the nursing home level; and then again into a nursing home type of care in some instances, where the emphasis would be more on medical care and other aspects more on nursing home care or pure nursing care rather than medical care. Certainly this is the problem as we see it and have seen it for some months now, and as I indicated the other day, we are making attempts to assess these existing nursing homes. I think what you are thinking of largely, having visited your home in Neepawa, you have what we call - classify in our minds as a hostel with infirmary beds, which a lot of municipal people have indicated to us is the type of accommodation they feel is most urgent in the province. And in view of that I would like to lend my support to the proposition that the government do everything they can to bring the certain types of homes within the plan if at all possible.

MR. R. W. BEND (Rockwood-Iberville): Mr. Speaker, I thought probably that the Minister in his remarks on this resolution would bring us up-to-date on what has taken place between himself and the Minister of Health and Welfare at Ottawa. I was disappointed when the First Minister today said that the usual channel was being used to get the release of the information, the correspondence between the two governments, meaning by mail. When we were asked the same question for the correspondence between the two governments a little more than a year ago, I took the trouble to 'phone Ottawa to get the release. But apparently

(Mr. Bend cont'd). . . . we have to wait until letters go back and forth and as I say, I was disappointed. So I thought that maybe the Minister would take this opportunity to let us know how he's making out with the Federal Minister.

This resolution, in my humble opinion, is certainly one of the most important ones on the order paper at the present time. And I certainly think that the honourable member who is introducing it, made his case very well. But I think that there are several things that could be mentioned at this time. I pointed out last night, and indeed I have done on several occasions, and I feel the Minister agrees with me, because in his remarks he pointed out that one of the difficulties - one of the major difficulties - was getting the transfer of people from the active hospitalization to nursing home care. Now while the Minister said that he was in favour of this, he did not say specifically in his few remarks whether he was going to do what he could do to broaden the Manitoba Hospital Services Plan. Now this is the real meat of this resolution. The real important point, in my humble opinion, is whether this plan is to be broadened or whether it's not to be broadened to include nursing home care. Now I am sure that every member in this House, Sir, knows that this does require considerable finances, and that the ideal way would be to have it brought in under the Manitoba Hospitals Service Plan as such. I pointed out last night and I noticed at that time the Minister nodded his head that he had followed up the lead that I mentioned about the Federal Minister being more than sympathetic towards the suggestion when I was speaking to him. And although I can't recall the correspondence, I believe that one of the latest letters will mention our stand on this, and a stand taken not alone at all. Because as I mentioned last night - and I think it's worth repeating because I noticed the Honourable the First Minister did say, and I was glad to hear him say, that he was not giving up on including mental and T.B., and that's very important to this province. And I'm sure that now the positions are reversed they understand why I on behalf of my colleagues struggled so hard to try and get it included. And how gratified we felt when the Prime Minister, who was then the Leader of the Opposition, made it quite clear then that he did not consider a hospital plan was complete until it did have these in, and placed his Party firmly on record as believing they should be in.

And so I once again draw to the attention of the Minister, the First Minister that is and the Minister of Health, that both the present Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance, Mr. Fleming, are on record in Hansard, on the public platforms, that not just the two which the Honourable the First Minister mentioned the other night, but the third one which is even more important -- nursing homes was part of the Progressive-Conservative platform offered to the people. And so I simply say that when the Honourable the First Minister presents his case, as he said he would, that he includes nursing homes with it.

Now I'm being quite serious about this, and I was disappointed that the Minister did not give us his full feelings on this, and I assume he will later on; how important he believes it is that nursing home care become part of the Manitoba Hospital Services Plan, and that's what this resolution is asking for. And that is not what the Honourable the Minister spoke about. He said he was sympathetic to the building of these homes and I know he is, but does his acceptance - I assume he's accepting the resolution - mean that it is going to be his aim irrespective of what occurs between the two Ministers, the Federal and himself, that it will become part of the plan. Because, Mr. Speaker, I'm as certain of this as - well as certain as one can be of anything - that if this plan is to work and work properly that has to come in. And once again I reiterate that Mr. Monteith at the time I spoke to him agreed and only requested that the plan operate for a while and when changes were to be brought in that not only the one, if it was necessary, but several changes might be made at the same time. And so in all seriousness, I request the Minister to chase this one down right to the bitter end, because you are going to have these difficulties no matter what facilities you build; no matter what assessments you make of existing facilities. The major difficulty remains, Mr. Speaker, so long as the two types of care are not treated in the same way.

And I would like to point this out and re-emphasize again, and maybe this is 'thrashing old straw', but it's very important -- that if you have a situation continuing to exist where a person receiving active hospital care receives that care under the M.H.S.P., and does not receive it in nursing homes under the same financial conditions, then building all the nursing homes, that you want to build does not solve your problems -- for the simple reason that the

municipalities who have cases that are their responsibility, will be reluctant, and you can hardly blame them, for transferring a patient from where everything is paid to where they have to pay.

If nursing homes could be brought under, and I don't think I have ever been one to advocate spending a great deal of money unless you examine carefully the result thereof, I say without fear of contradiction here, this would be money well spent on part of both governments, because what is going on today is what the Honourable Member mentioned in introducing this resolution -- that you have people receiving \$20.00 a day care who could be looked after since its custodial care, if you will, that's required, at a very much lower figure. But the difficulty the Minister finds himself in, the difficulty that his technical officials find themselves in is the difficulty in getting them transferred. And he mentioned, as I said the other night, some 200 cases in the hospitals, as I understood him, in Greater Winnipeg alone, of this particular category. And so I know the Minister knows this is a problem, but I think this was the opportunity to tell us, what has he done as correspondence? Does it exist between he and the Federal Minister? I know he's been East since he took over the honourus position that he holds. What did the Federal Minister have to say then? Is he still of the opinion that this problem would arise, and is he still of the opinion that it should be brought under? Because, I honestly believe that only when you get a correlation between the two, only when a patient can be transferred from one form of care to another without any financial penalty or increased financial obligations to those responsible, whether it be the patient himself, his relatives, his friends or municipal bodies, or the Provincial government if it happens to be a patient through whom they are responsible, only when there is no difference in the financial obligation insofar as the money that has to be paid.

And so I would like to give with all the emphasis I can in a real honest constructive, .. I hope. . suggestion. That this should never be let dropped because your plan, Mr. Minister and Mr. Speaker, will never work correctly and will never give its full benefits until both types of care are included under the Manitoba Hospital Services Plan. Then you will be able to utilize all the existing facilities, and any of those that need to be built in the future -- because there will need to be some, there's no question about that, -- and when you get a complete correlation of the two then you will have removed one of the chief difficulties that the Minister finds himself in now.

MR. ROBLIN: I hadn't originally thought that I would speak on this topic - are words that we hear frequently from the lips of members who rise on the spur of the moment as I do now - but I feel that if the Minister had been aware that this subject was going to receive the thoughtful treatment that has just been evidenced by the Honourable Member from Rockwood-Iberville, that he might perhaps have said a little more about what the government has done and what the government has achieved. And perhaps allay some of the fear just expressed, and perhaps indicate that substantial progress has been made in this particular matter under discussion.

We don't oppose the resolution. After all if the honourable member who made it was listening carefully to the honourable minister when he spoke the other night, he will be aware of our appreciation of the problems that are involved. But perhaps it would not be amiss to tell the House some of the things, that we perhaps have been saving for a later stage in the debate or a later stage in our discussion, but which in view of what has just been said might well be brought forward now.

In the first place I want to assure my honourable friend that we're well aware of the difficulties that municipalities face when they seek to place people from active care beds into nursing homes and other types of care of that sort. We know perfectly well that there are two great problems, first of all to find a place to put them because to be fair, as I think we should be, to the municipal people who are involved, many of them take considerable trouble to try and find suitable accommodation for people who need their care; sometimes they can get it and sometimes they have difficulty. In connection with the difficulty of placement as we have indicated before, we intend, if the House gives us the money, to establish a director of placements who will have the responsibility of mobilizing the facilities that are available for the people who need that kind of care. There was never anything to prevent my honourable friends opposite from doing that when they were in office; nothing to prevent the Honourable the former

(Mr. Roblin cont'd)... Minister of Health and Welfare whom we all regard as an able gentleman from doing that, and we commend that to the consideration of our friends opposite.

We are also doing something else. We are establishing within the hospital branch, a standards division insofar as nursing homes are concerned. Because I am sure the honourable member who just spoke is well aware that if one is going to have any luck at all in bringing nursing homes under the plan in a general way, as he proposes, and with which I am in agreement, it was necessary to achieve certain standards of accommodation and of service before it will be considered by the Federal authorities. And we have reason to believe that if we succeed in establishing this standard of nursing home care that meets the requirements of the Federal authorities, that there is a good possibility that this kind of care may come under the plan. But first of all you have to make the initial step of standardizing, getting your regulations ready and all that kind of thing. We are proposing a director of standards for this particular thing in the estimates that will be placed before the House. So we have in that way taken a couple of steps which by no means complete and certainly haven't been brought to full fruition, certainly indicate that we are aware of the need that exists and we have some idea as to how to meet it.

But we have other ideas than that. Because it has been pointed out, and quite rightly, that there is a shortage of this kind of accommodation. And in the bill that will be proposed in due course in connection with elderly persons' housing, members will be interested to learn that provision has been made for the financing by a very substantial grant from the province of hostels. Now hostels are accommodation for single people. And they are run, when possible, in connection with old folks' accommodation where you have family units as well. And the desirable thing from one point of view is to have hostels and family units together - sometimes it isn't possible. But in the case of the hostels we are making arrangement for the provision where those local authorities desire it, of infirmary beds where those elderly people who become ill and need nursing care can get that kind of treatment in the hostel in which they may be living. One has to be careful not to convert these hostels into infirmaries per se and we have looked into that, but some effort has been made to provide accommodation of that sort.

The whole question of convalescent care and the building of larger hospitals or let me say the building of new accommodation of a convalescent nature in addition to the nursing homes we now have, is a matter which it has been indicated is receiving attention on the part of the government. We simply have to say that you must do one thing at a time. Our efforts at the present time -- up to the present -- have been fully absorbed in working out the plans for our Social Allowances Act, and I want to mention that in a minute because it has a bearing, it's fully employed upon the re-modelling of the administrative machinery of the present hospital plan to take the burden off the municipalities insofar as collections and responsibilities of that sort are concerned. It's been fully absorbed in the many other things that the department has underway at the present time and which have been mentioned and will be mentioned further as the House proceeds. That is not to say that we are not aware of this problem or haven't taken some substantial steps of the nature that I have mentioned to deal with it. And as soon as we can assemble the basic information and data as to what the necessity is for convalescent hospitals, that matter will be tackled too. It's only a question of the time and energy required to get these things underway.

But I want to say something to my honourable friend across the way. Not only have we taken the load off the municipalities insofar as people who can't pay for themselves are concerned, we're taking that 100% off their backs if the House passes our legislation and there will be no question of municipal men trying to save an honest dollar here and there in connection with this matter. It will be handled by the provincial department and by provincial grants itself. But I would like to say this ---- Beg Pardon?

MR. BEND: Would it not be as important for you to have that type of care - it's just as important for you as the government. ....

MR. ROBLIN: Yes, but nobody has charged the government so far with refusing to move people out of accommodation because they don't have to pay the bills some place else. And I think that was the implication of what my honourable friend said.

MR. BEND: I was not charging any such thing.

MR. ROBLIN: Well, you may not be charging it but you referred to it. Let's put it that

(Mr. Roblin cont'd)... way. But let me tell you something else. Under our Social Allowances Act, those in need regardless of whether they come from a municipality or not, those in need who are in nursing homes and can't pay the bill will be able to have the bill paid through the welfare services of this government. And we in turn will be able to collect one-half of that bill from the people at Ottawa. That's going to take care of the cases in need. But the point that I want to underline, Mr. Speaker, is simply this. My honourable friend urges us to action. I tell him that that remedy that I've just related to the House was open to him any time that he chose to apply for it. Because we have not, Sir, received any favouritism from Ottawa -- no laws have been changed -- no regulations have been altered to fit our case. We have simply examined the regulations that existed and tailored our legislation and our plans to fit. And as a result of that..... Pardon?

MR. BEND: .... wouldn't of even had the plans started....

MR. ROBLIN: We'll come to that in a short time too. But you were sitting on your hands all the time when you could have got this money for the province and could have got this accommodation for those in need. Because that's what my honourable friend the Minister did and he went to Ottawa and he looked over the legislation carefully. He realized the potential, which my honourable friend obviously failed to do, and he brought in legislation into this House which will enable us to get 50% from Ottawa on the care that we give to these people in need in nursing homes.

MR. BEND: .... ride a wagon that was already started.

MR. ROBLIN: Well, you weren't able to get on the wagon at all because you missed the step. You didn't climb up on it and you should have tried. This thing was open to you. You didn't do it. Perhaps some day you will give us an explanation as to why you didn't do it. But my Honourable friend the Minister of Health and Welfare did it and I am happy to tell the House that we have that arrangement and it's worth a lot of money to us, and it takes care of those who are in need.

Now let me come back to the place where I started. I am not by any means saying that we do not desire to follow the general tenure of this resolution and bring nursing homes under the wing of the hospital plan because we believe that is the thing to do. All I am trying to say, that right now, as far as cases of need are concerned, we are on a 50-50 basis with the authorities at Ottawa in respect to this kind of care. And with respect to the remaining problems that exist in this field, we have taken practical and constructive steps to meet the situation. All we require is a little support from our honourable friends opposite and we'll be able to finish the job.



MR. BEND: I know that the Speaker can refuse or not as he sees fit. I had two questions. I didn't want to interrupt him with them, I wonder if he'd be willing to answer them.

MR. ROBLIN: I'll listen to the questions and then we'll see.

MR. BEND: That's playing it pretty safe.

Number one; is it the plan of the Provincial Government to have the premium that is now paid for hospitalization, cover nursing home care, because that's the teeth of this resolution? And number two; what was meant by saying that making sure our nursing home care meets federal requirements? Federal requirements for what?

MR. ROBLIN: I'll answer the first question. We're going to get as much as we can under the hospital premium, -- under the Hospital Plan, for the premium that's paid. And if we have any chance of getting the nursing homes under there, we will certainly take advantage of it. Now repeat your second question, and I'll try on that one.

MR. BEND: The second question was where you were discussing nursing homes, that you wanted to make sure that your nursing homes met Ottawa requirements. Ottawa requirements for what, is my question.

MR. ROBLIN: No I can't answer that question. I'm not the Minister of Health and I'm not going to be able to answer the question. But my friend obviously implies this; he says how do we know, at least I take it from what he says, is this, how do we know that if we set certain standards of care that they will meet the Ottawa standards? Isn't that what he's asking?

MR. BEND: No, Mr. Speaker, in the Honourable the First Minister's speech he said "we wanted to make sure that our nursing homes met Ottawa requirements." Now my question is this; Ottawa requirements for what? Inclusion in the scheme, or what Ottawa requirements was the Honourable the First Minister referring to?

MR. ROBLIN: Well that's very simple to answer. My honourable friend is asking me to get these nursing homes under the plan. That's what we are trying to do. And in order to get them under the plan there has to be standards of care and standards of treatment. Now we know that and we're working on those standards in order to get them under the plan.

MR. BEND: There is no nursing homes under the plan at all.

MR. ROBLIN: Well there's geriatric units in Saskatchewan, and they're a type of service of this sort and my honourable friend knows all about that.

MR. GREENLAY:..... ask the Honourable First Minister a question. I think he referred to the matter that they were going to-- they had an arrangement under which the present government was receiving 50 percent of the care of these people in nursing homes. Is that correct?

MR. ROBLIN: No. We won't get it until you pass our legislation.

MR. GREENLAY: Well, Mr. Speaker, is it not a fact that at the present time this government is receiving 50 percent of the cost of patients in nursing homes, from Ottawa? Mr. Speaker, I'd like the answer to that. Is that not correct?

MR. ROBLIN: Yes. On what we bill them, but what my honourable friend has overlooked, is that we have made arrangements to bring under this plan and under the arrangements that they have with Ottawa, a great many people that presently, under the present regulations, do not qualify. And that's the point that I'm getting at.

MR. GREENLAY: A supplementary question. I'd like to know who those people are. What class of people are they? Mr. Speaker, I'd refer the Honourable the First Minister to the forms, which are sent in every month from the municipalities and which compiled - make the return which goes to Ottawa for refund.

MR. ROBLIN: All those details will be given at the second reading of the Bill on Social Allowances.

MR. GREENLAY: But are they not there now?

MR. STINSON: Mr. Speaker, will the Honourable Gentleman permit another question, and there's no trick to this, he can relax.

MR. ROBLIN: Thank you.

MR. STINSON: Just a matter of information, on this 50-50 deal, are other provinces taking advantage of this? And if so, does he know how many?

MR. ROBLIN: I'm afraid I can only answer for the Province of Manitoba Mr. Speaker.

MR. STINSON: Well, a supplementary question. The Honourable gentlemen did mention Saskatchewan, and I wondered if he might elaborate upon that. Maybe there was a trick to this after all. I didn't realize it.

MR. ROBLIN: No, I'm afraid I'm not going to elaborate on Saskatchewan.

MR. GREENLAY: I should like to say a few words in connection with this particular matter to try and straighten out some of the thinking that has been going on here, or lack of thinking. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that if the honourable ministers opposite will take a little time to reflect, and look into the returns which they have before them every month, that they will find that the aid which is given to persons, where persons are maintained in a home, -- granted the home must be one which is approved and accepted by the Provincial Government, -- but where a patient either in receipt of Old Age Assistance or Old Age Security, or where a person who is not in receipt of either of those things is kept - maintained in a home, that those returns come in. The cost which is attributed--which is paid by municipality, is included in the returns which are sent to Ottawa each month and 50 percent of that is repaid to the Province of Manitoba. This has been in effect before this government took office, Mr. Speaker, and it seems to me that somebody has not been doing their homework. Now I didn't intend to speak on this particular point at the present time, but Mr. Speaker, I have here in my desk if I can lay my hand on it in the moment -- Mr. Speaker, I have here the return to an Order of the House number two, Mr. Speaker, which was asked of the Honourable, the Minister of Health, and I should like to just discuss these questions briefly. The first question is the number of old age pensioners in Manitoba. And what is the answer to that, Mr. Speaker? It seems to me it's pretty, pretty - cutting the thing pretty fine. There are no old age pensioners in Manitoba. There are no old age pensioners in Manitoba - so the return said. Then it goes on with the reply with regard to the number that are under Social Secur -- or Old Age Assistance and Old Age Security. And then the next question the number of old age pensioners whose income does not exceed the present pension allowance. And the answer to that is, there's no information with regard to those in receipt of old age security and I can readily understand that because the means test does not apply to those in receipt of Old Age Security, but it does apply to those in receipt of Old Age Assistance, and I have no quarrel particularly with those first two clauses. But Mr. Speaker, here is the 'fly in the ointment'. We come down to the third question, the number of pensioners, if any, who have been granted supplementary payments and the amounts of such payments. Mr. Speaker, the answer to that, and I'd like to read it fully "as supplementary payments to pensioners are paid by municipalities and are discretionary matter with the municipalities, and as these payments when reported by municipalities are often not separated, from other municipal relief payments, it is impossible to state exactly how many pensioners are receiving supplementary payments, or of the amount of such payments. However, from the ledger of municipal claims in 1958, compared with those of 1957, there does not appear to be any significant numbers or amounts of supplementary payments." Now, Mr. Speaker, I take it from that, the Honourable the Minister of Health and Welfare is not able to tell us what aid is being given to persons in receipt of Old Age Assistance and Old Age Security, but I wonder if he's ever heard of the pink forms. The form (a) specials, which are made out by the municipalities every month, Mr. Speaker, and on which you list all of the persons in that particular category that are getting assistance from the municipality, and the province pays 80 percent of that assistance, and in some cases, that is maintenance of the individual in a home. Now, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that this return is completely erroneous and gives us the wrong impression and it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that what this discussion has gotten around into, is a discussion of the matter of assistance under the social assistance provisions, rather than what the resolution starts out to say in that the Hospital Service Plan should be expanded so that the care in nursing homes would be -- would come under the provisions of the Manitoba Hospital Service Plan, as extended. But I wanted to correct the impression Mr. Speaker, that this proposal of the Honourable the First Minister, that they were going to get these things in under the plan where they get 50 percent from Ottawa has already been accomplished - was in effect before his government took office.

Mr. Speaker, those were the things that I wanted to bring to the attention of the House at the present time, in view of the discussion which has gone on here.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for

(Mr. Martin cont'd.)... Roblin that the debate be adjourned.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Order! Order! Proposed Resolution standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Manitou-Morden.

MR. M. E. RIDLEY: (Pembina) Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Morris, "whereas in the Province of Manitoba there are many farms comprised of more than 40 acres, where the land is not contiguous, and the buildings are situated in unincorporated villages or community settlements, the said farms being operated from these buildings and, whereas there are a number of farms of less than 40 acres where the occupant's chief source of income is from the land due to specialized crops being grown; and whereas under section 1011, sub-section two, of the Municipal Act a farm must be comprised of not less than 40 contiguous acres. Therefore be it resolved, that the Minister of Municipal Affairs, do refer to the Union of Manitoba Municipalities, the Manitoba Urban Association and the Municipal Advisory Committee for consideration, a proposal that the farm buildings of any farmer be exempt from taxation where the occupants chief source of income is from the land regardless of the acreage involved, and that where the buildings of the occupant of this farm are situated in a community settlement or unincorporated village, that the land in such community settlement or unincorporated village be subject to frontage tax to pay for local improvements such as street lights, streets, water and sewerage.

MR. SPEAKER: It's been moved by the Honourable the Member for Manitou-Morden, seconded by the Honourable Member for Brandon---Pembina-- Are you ready for the question?

MR. RIDLEY: Mr. Speaker, this is a situation that probably does not occur all over the province, but there is places in Stanley Municipality, part of which I have in Stanley, but I am not involved really in my own constituency with this problem. But there are places in the constituency which I used to represent. Down there there are people that are farming on 30 acres of land, and their chief livelihood is farming, and believe it or not that is the only income they have.-- They grow specified crops, and for the reason that they are under 40 acres, their buildings are not exempt from taxation. Then we have places down there that have 40 and 60 and 80 acres, but for the simple reason that the building is probable a half a mile away from it, and when the Act reads "contiguous" they have got to be joining there, or else they are also paying taxes on the farm buildings.

Now I think it seems unfair, that because that word contiguous is in the Act - it does cause trouble - because possibly that's the only buildings they have and if they were on the 40 acres they would not have to pay. And I think the word contiguous is very severe in there, because there has been cases where a farmer has bought a strip of land a few yards wide from somebody else just so it would be contiguous -- that he would have adjoining.

So I do ask some support on this resolution, and I hope that when it goes to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and to the Advisory Committee, that they will give it every consideration.

MR. PREFONTAINE: Mr. Speaker, I do not rise to oppose the motion of my good friend. The honourable member is such a nice fellow, a genial gentleman, but I am really puzzled by this resolution. It asks us to do something which the Minister has a perfect power to do, and I am wondering whether the member has seen his Minister and asked him to bring this matter before these bodies, especially his own Advisory Committee. And I am surprised that we have been asked here to instruct the Minister to do things that he can very well do on his own. I am puzzled also as to whether the member wants us to approve the principle or the proposal involved in this resolution before we hand it over to the Minister. I might say that this is a very involved question, that the previous Minister of Municipal Affairs, has referred the matter to the Union of Manitoba Municipalities, and to the Manitoba Urban Association, and to his Municipal Advisory Committee; has been discussed fully by the ex-Deputy Minister of Municipal Affairs and the ex-Minister of Municipal Affairs. It's a very involved problem.

You will find that there are some farmers owning 40 acres of land in one municipality and the buildings would be in the neighbouring municipality, in a small community. That's a difficulty. There are many angles to this problem, and I don't think that this House should express an opinion on the principle involved. As far as this House presuming to instruct, because it seems to me with my knowledge of the English language - if it's somewhat adequate - that this House would be instructing the Minister to refer this matter. And I think that the Member for

(Mr. Prefontaine cont'd.) . . . --- mind you I do not want to oppose the resolution at all but, it seems to me that it is absolutely unnecessary that this matter should have been brought before us at this time. The Minister has perfect authority to refer this matter, if he wants to, at any time, and I don't think that we should express an opinion on the principles involved.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker---- does the honourable gentleman-- do you want to speak? Oh!

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE Q. C. : (Selkirk) Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to oppose the substance of this resolution, although I feel like the last member that has spoken, I feel that--in a quandry as to why it was brought into this House. I think that the honourable member as a member as a member of the government could have spoken to this Minister, his Minister has an Advisory Committee and the matter could have been put in motion by that means. But since it is in the House, I would like to say this, that as the last speaker has already said, this is a very involved and highly technical question. It's a question which has given the Municipal Advisory Committee, the Union of Manitoba Municipalities, and all other Municipal bodies a great deal of sleepless hours during the past years. But I am glad that the honourable member has brought it in for this reason, at the last Session of the Legislature, I mentioned the fact that some people who were market gardeners obtained Old Age Assistance, and by reason of their being in receipt of Old Age Assistance they lost the exemption that their buildings previously had under the Municipal Act, since their chief source of livelihood did not come from the four acres of land that they were farming. Now the government at last session promised to take that matter under advisement, and I hope that they have taken it under advisement, and I hope they are going to do something about it.

Now there is another matter which I would like to mention, and that is this. We, in this Session, and at the last session, have spent a great deal of time talking about the depressed state of agriculture and of discussing ways and means of assisting farmers. Now I have in my constituency a number of farmers who, due to the depressed prices that they are obtaining from their commodities, cannot make a living on their farms. And these people are farming in some instances a quarter of a section, in some instances a little more than a quarter section. Now, by reason of the fact that they are working out, and the only reason why they are working out is because they are farmers and they want to be able to stay on the land - but by reason of the fact that they are working out, their chief source of livelihood does not come from that farm and consequently their buildings are assessed by the municipality in which they reside.

Now I would ask, if this matter is going to be referred by the Minister to his Municipal Advisory Committee, that the Minister instruct his Municipal Advisory Committee to take under consideration the two matters which I have mentioned, along with the matters mentioned by the Honourable Member from Pembina.

MR. R. PAULLEY (Radisson): Mr. Speaker, the other day the Honourable Member for Carillon promoted me to the distinguished office of Minister of Municipal Affairs and I thought that possibly I should make a comment or two on this resolution. I beg your pardon?

MR. ROBLIN: It's directed to you.

MR. PAULLEY: Oh it's directed to me. Thank you kindly. . . . .

I can understand quite well the reasons behind the mover of this resolution, but I am wondering whether or not--first of all I may say that I agree with the point raised by the Honourable members on this side who have just spoken, that there is provisions already set up with the Municipal Advisory Committee, through the Minister, for questions of this nature.

But in dealing specifically with the resolution, I would like to urge a word of caution in this resolution. Many who are in the house today will recall the schmozell that we had over the question of equalized assessment two or three years ago, and in the discussions at that time, I raised the point and I raise it again now, that while I have no objections of Municipal Councils making exemptions for taxation on farm buildings of 40 acres or more, or in the case of the market gardener 12 acres or more, that -- 4 acres or more--that a matter of this nature, if carried through to it's ultimate, could quite adversely affect the basis of our equalized assessment in the Province. Because it is my understanding that these exempt properties--buildings --in the municipality, are not taken under consideration in the equalized assessment.

And further in this particular resolution, again in caution Mr. Speaker, I would draw reference to the final paragraph in the resolution itself, that where these buildings are situated

(Mr. Paulley cont'd.): . . . in a community settlement or an unincorporated village, that the land in such community settlement or unincorporated village be subject to frontage tax to pay for local improvements, etcetera and only then. What about the farmer who has less than 40 acres who happens to live in a town, or a city? I can appreciate the point raised by the Honourable Member for Pembina where he says that in order to get around the provisions of the present Act, sometimes it is necessary to buy out a parcel of land, in order to give him a roadway in-- from his buildings in to his acreage. But I am wondering whether or not that that point has been given consideration of the member who introduced it, and would suggest to the Minister of Municipal Affairs that not only the matter of the present resolution be considered but also the likelihood of this Act going further.

I certainly want it clearly understood Mr. Speaker, that in no way am I attempting to place any additional burdens, or perpetuate any burdens, on any of our farmers in our various communities in the Province. But knowing that this matter has been discussed before in the Union of Manitoba Municipalities, and if I recall correctly on a couple of occasions was rejected by the Union itself. Possibly the Minister of Municipal Affairs was not aware of that, I believe I am stating a truism when I say that. You might investigate that. I know some six or eight years ago, this matter was discussed, and there were more aspects to it than just appears on the resolution itself. So I suggest to the Minister that this matter be given serious consideration. -- I have no objection to supporting it, going that far, although in conclusion, again I say, that this could have been handled without the necessity of a resolution before this assembly.

MR. PREFONTAINE: I ask for the privilege of clarifying one point brought in by the previous speaker. I would like to state that the Union of Manitoba Municipalities did not, I believe, reject this proposal but they were divided and did not express an opinion. But the Manitoba Urban Association has definitely opposed this, so has the Municipal Advisory Committee.

MR. E. R. SCHREYER: (Brokenhead): Mr. Speaker, since we are in this resolution dealing with the matter of municipal taxation, I consider the time opportune to make three observations, three comments on this same field.

Firstly, I would like to say that insofar as I am concerned I agree quite fullheartedly with provisions of this resolution except that I would maintain some reservations about the last four lines. The situation which the Member for Pembina described, is also quite common in areas around Greater Winnipeg, especially along the Red River. I would also like to say that I agree with the statement or statements made by the Honourable Member for Selkirk, and the problem that he referred to, namely the fact that there are a lot of farmers, who because of the cost-price squeeze, have to go to work in industry, are now being subjected to taxation on the dwelling. Now, I realize that the provisions of the Municipal Act regarding taxation are such that it was unavoidable up to now, but I suggest that the Minister of Municipal Affairs take this into consideration and I hope that something could be done about it.

The third matter which I wish to raise, is perhaps a more specific one, shall I say it is not as common. I refer specifically to those cases arising where you have people living on 4 acres or more making their livelihood off the land and consequently they are exempt from paying tax on their dwellings. But, the moment they become recipients of Old Age Assistance or Disability Allowance, and if this allowance happens to be more than they are making from the land, they automatically become taxable on their dwelling. Now that is a paradox, and I realize that particular situation is fraught with difficulties, but there again it seems to me, that this paradox should be eliminated and I have faith that the Minister of Municipal Affairs could do something about it, and I hope that he will.

MR. S. ROBERTS: (La Verendrye) Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Emerson that the debate be adjourned.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Second reading, the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. C. E. GREENLAY (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, I wish to move seconded by the Honourable Member for Carillon that Bill No. 5, an Act to validate By-Law 3465, of the City of Portage la Prairie be now read a second time.

Mr. Speaker read the motion. Are you ready for the question?

MR. GREENLAY: Mr. Speaker, the honourable members who were in the House two

(Mr. Greenlay (Cont'd)). . . . . years ago will recall that there was an Act passed which gave permission to the City of Portage la Prairie to expend some \$983,800.00 without reference to the ratepayers for improvements in the sewage and water provisions for the City of Portage la Prairie. Under this particular project, --part of the project was to remove the disposal of sewage from the river, and put it into a lagoon. The lagoon system has been established and this was partly done in order to take care of the effluence which will be coming from the Campbell Soup plant, and to more adequately service the soup plant.

Mr. Speaker, many of these provisions of the bill which was passed at that time and the projects that came under the expenditure of money provided in the By-law, which was approved at the time by this legislation, have been carried out. There have been however, some additional costs which were unforeseen at that time, and which are complementary to the systems which were put in with regard to this service, and this bill would grant permission--would approve of a By-law which would authorize \$150,000.00 if it is fully required or such part of it as is required to complete the services which were being put in to service the plant, and to some extent change and improve the disposal of sewage from the City of Portage la Prairie.

It has long been felt that the City should change the face of its disposal from the River and put in some other type of disposal plant, and it is in accordance with the recommendations of the Provincial Sanitary Control Commission that these provisions and these services are being changed and put in in this way.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? Those in favour please say Aye. Those opposed please say Nay. In my opinion the Ayes have it, and I declare the motion carried. Bill No. 7. The Honourable Member for St. Vital.

MR. F. GROVES (St. Vital): Mr. Speaker, I would like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from St. Boniface, that Bill No. 7, an Act to validate By-law No. 42, of the School District of Norwood No. 2113, be now read a second time.

Mr. Speaker read the motion. Are you ready for the question?

MR. GROVES: Mr. Speaker, this Bill is almost identical to Bill No. 38, that was presented at the 5th session of the 24th legislature, by the School District of St. Boniface No. 1188. This Bill was presented at that time by the Honourable Member from St. Boniface, who is now seconding this particular Bill. The present School Act does not provide for indemnity of this nature to School Trustees.

The Norwood School District is a large school district, and its trustees must of necessity spend a great deal of time, in order to do a proper and competent job. The By-law mentioned in the Bill provides for the payment to the trustees of indemnities and mileage. The Chairman of the Board is to receive the sum of \$600.00, and each other trustee, the sum of \$500.00, as remuneration and allowances for expenses incidental to the discharge of their duties as trustees of this School District.

This By-law will apply for the year 1959, and subsequent years. -

It is my privilege then Mr. Speaker, at this time to introduce this Bill for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? Those in favor please say Aye, those opposed please say Nay. In my opinion the Ayes have it and I declare the motion carried. Bill No. 8, The Honourable Member for Brandon.

MR. LISSAMAN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Vital, that Bill No. 8, an Act to amend the Brandon Charter be now read a second time.

Mr. Speaker read the motion. Are you ready for the question?

MR. LISSAMAN: Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the Honourable members for their kind interest in these Brandon Bills, and I think the Section 1, is self-explanatory. The Mayor and Council are increasing the salaries by this Bill.

Now Section 43 of the Act. . . . . such By-law--oh, this is the one concerning the grant to the fair grounds, the fair board--the Provincial Exhibition. As you know, the fair grounds are within the City limits of Brandon, and for years there was a grant made to the Provincial Exhibition Board, and it is desirable to carry that grant on. . . .

Clause 3, while it--from the reading of a Section in the Bill--tells very little, it goes back to an earlier City By-law, which at the time of the founding of the Brandon Library, the

(Mr. Lissaman, Cont'd) . . . . . Act specified that one mill would be used for the purposes of financing the Library, and at that time one mill raised \$10,000.00 in Brandon. Now, both the figure in dollars and cents, and the mill rate were included in the Bill, and since then of course, the expenses in connection with the Library have come up with the years, and also the amount that a mill will raise has increased during the years. The mill rate is somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$18,000.00 at this time, so they wish to remove the reference to the amount of dollars, and still retain the mill rate which was passed by a----majority at that time.

Clause 4 is in connection with the Brandon Recreation Committee. I understand that originally it was a body of nine members, the majority of whom must be Council members. And I wish to change that now so that the Commission shall be a Board of not more than twelve persons, of whom just three shall be Council members.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that's a fair explanation of the Bill.

Mr. Speaker presented the question, and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 12 -- The Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne.

MR. M. E. McKellar (Souris-Lansdowne): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Arthur, that Bill No. 12, an Act respecting the Glenboro Medical Nursing Unit District No. 16B, be now read a second time.

Mr. Speaker read the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. McKELLAR: Mr. Speaker, an explanation of this Bill is the transfer of money from the municipalities of South Cypress, Argyle and the Town of Glenboro to the Capital Account of the Glenboro Medical Nursing Unit, No. 16B.

The amount of money in each case is the South Cypress Municipality - \$1,250.00; Glenboro Town - \$709.19; and the Municipality of Argyle - \$185.00.

Mr. Speaker presented the question, and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 14. The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lakeside, that Bill No. 14, An Act to validate By-law No. 538 of the Town of Gladstone, be now read a second time.

Mr. Speaker read the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Speaker, the By-law, being a By-law of the Town of Gladstone authorizing, ratifying, sanctioning and confirming an over-expenditure in the cost of construction and installation of its waterworks and sewerage system, in the amount of \$18,000.00, and of issuing debentures therefor.

Now, I will just read the explanatory note in the brunt of the Bill -- "Due to unforeseen difficulties in the construction and installation of the water works and sewerage system in the Town of Gladstone, because of soil conditions and other factors, it was recommended by the contractor and consulting engineer that the deep trench crossing of the Whitemud River be made at Bay Street instead of Morris Avenue at an additional cost of \$8,000.00. And, it was deemed advisable that the recommendation be followed and the work authorized, and the additional expenditure incurred; and further the overall cost of the construction and installation of the water works and sewerage system exceeded the estimated cost thereof by an additional \$10,000.00, because of increased cost of labour and materials and other unavoidable contingencies. These factors have made it necessary for the Town to raise an additional sum of \$18,000.00 to meet these additional expenditures, and this legislation is to provide for the financing of this additional indebtedness by the issue and sale of the debentures of the Town of Gladstone in the sum of \$18,000.00." And I have a letter here from the consulting engineers, Underwood, McLellan & Associates, Winnipeg -- a very reputable firm, and I will read it to you if you wish .

A MEMBER: It isn't necessary.

Mr. Speaker presented the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 32 -- an Act to amend the Greater Winnipeg Sanitary District Act. The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. W. B. SCARTH (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, I wish to move, seconded by the

(Mr. Scarth cont'd.) . . . Honourable the Member for St. Matthews, that Bill No. 32, an Act to amend The Greater Winnipeg Sanitary District Act, be now read a second time.

Mr. Speaker read the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: Those in favour please say "Aye".

MR. R. TEILLET (St. Boniface): I would like an explanation of the background of this Bill.

MR. SCARTH: Yes, Mr. Speaker, at the present time, the Mayor of Winnipeg is Chairman of the Board, and heretofore the Deputy Mayor, or the Acting Mayor has been the Deputy Chairman. Now it was not always practicable to have the Acting Mayor as Deputy Chairman for the Board, and the Board now wish at the first meeting each year to elect its own Deputy Chairman.

MR. TEILLET: . . . . . be permitted a question. This is in no way connected with Bill 42 coming up later is it?

MR. SCARTH: I'm sorry Sir, I did not . . . . .

MR. TEILLET: Is there any connection between -- any tie-up at all between Bill 32 and Bill 42 coming later -- that is the Greater Winnipeg Water District Act?

MR. SCARTH: Yes.

MR. TEILLET: Is there any relationship there?

MR. SCARTH: Yes.

MR. TEILLET: What is it?

MR. SCARTH: Well on the -- also, the Greater Winnipeg Water District are asking for the same power, but an additional power in regard to restriction of water -- I'll come to that shortly.

MR. TEILLET: Mr. Speaker, -- the reason for my questioning -- I would like to be sure that there is no more involved than it appears in the explanatory notes in the Bill. That is the purpose of my questions -- I don't want to delay this Bill -- on the other hand, I would like to be very sure it goes no further than indicated here.

MR. SCARTH: No, it does not, Mr. Speaker, the clause is very short, and if I may read it, if anybody wishes in the House. It's quite simple -- "that the Directors themselves shall appoint the Deputy Chairman at the first meeting of the year." That is all it says.

Mr. Speaker presented the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 34, -- The Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne.

MR. McKELLAR: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Hamiota, that Bill No. 34, an Act respecting the Rural Municipality of Whitewater and The Minto Cemetery Company, be now read a second time.

Mr. Speaker read the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. McKELLAR: Mr. Speaker, this is just a transfer of property, originally looked after by The Minto Cemetery Company, which was formed in 1891. Since then the Directors have passed away, and all we want to do now is transfer this property to the Rural Municipality of Whitewater.



Mr. Speaker presented the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried. Bill No. 42, The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SCARTH: Mr. Speaker, I wish to move, seconded by the Honourable, the Member from Winnipeg Centre, that Bill No. 42, an Act to amend the Greater Winnipeg Water District Act, be now read a second time.

Mr. Speaker read the motion. Are you ready for the question?

MR. TEILLET: Mr. Speaker, if there are no comments on this Bill, I would beg to move the adjournment of it. I would move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Flin Flon that debate be adjourned.

MR. SCARTH: Yes, if the honourable member will allow me--this Bill Mr. Speaker, is very much in the same category as the last one in that it allows the Board at the first meeting in each year to elect a Deputy Chairman from amongst its members. The second--that is Sub-section 6, then goes on to provide certain administration of any absence of the Chairman and the Deputy Chairman that the body itself may elect--or may appoint a Chairman for the evening. And then, the last provision in the Bill is that the Board itself may by Resolution restrict the use of water within or without the district in such manner and for such time as it shall see fit.

MR. J. M. HAWRYLUK (Burrows): Mr. Chairman, is that something new that's added to that Bill, about having sole power to do that--to cut off the water?

MR. SCARTH: No, they--this is a --it was restricted last year you remember by Council, but this is a --this gives the Board the power to restrict.

MR. STINSON: ..Does the gentleman consider that there is any element of Socialism in this motion?

MR. SCARTH: Well, I hope not.

MR. REID: Mr. Chairman, does this Bill now mean that the Province is going to control the watering of lawns--I mean, when we have a dry area, the Province is going to tell us when we are going to water our lawns or otherwise, because that used to be under control of the local government before. The control of water --the honourable member--like before, we had a dry season the municipality used to have control whether to tell you to shut the water off or otherwise in the watering of lawns --Well, is it the intention of the Province to take that power over now?

MR. SCARTH: No, it's the Water District.

A member: Oh no, we'll not take it out of the government hands.

MR. GRAY:....support the Conservative gentlemen moving this Bill, but being on the Water District Board for a few years, I think this is a very good legislation, and it happens during the summer months sometime, we have to restrict water for gardening--for gardens or for --to get washing cars, to beautify their lawns...

MR. STINSON: This is the kiss of death, the Bill will never pass now.

MR. GRAY: And I say this is a very good Bill, it gives the power to not one individual, it gives the power to the Water District Board.

MR. GREENLAY: This particular clause in this Bill, while it appears innocent enough, and probably looks very nice on the surface, that this restriction can be made, I wonder when it says that the water can be restricted both within and without the district. There are some municipalities, Mr. Speaker, which purchase water from the Greater Winnipeg Water District under an agreement, and are still not within the Water District. Now the point that I would like to raise is that it seems to me that some safeguard should be put in here to provide that those municipalities which have agreements providing for water to be supplied to them, although they lie outside of the Greater Winnipeg Water District, should have some safeguard in here, and it seems to me that there should be some appeal from a decision of that body. There should be some safeguard put in there to protect some of these municipalities which have an agreement and are not within the district and are therefore not represented on the Board.

MR. E. R. SCHREYER (Brokenhead): In carrying on where the member for Portage la Prairie left off, there are some four or five municipalities in the Greater Winnipeg area that are not members of the Greater Winnipeg Water District, and I do know that for some months now they have been expressing concern about the very thing which is being stipulated in this Bill, and it would seem that we should be careful not to--shall we say, transgress on these

(Mr. E. R. Schreyer, Cont'd).....non-member municipalities.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Honourable Member wish to adjourn the debate?

MR. TEILLET: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move seconded by the Honourable Member from Flin Flon that the debate be adjourned.

Mr. Speaker read the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried. Adjourn debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Hamiota for an Address to His Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor in answer to his Speech at the opening of the Session, and the amendment to the amendment thereof. The Honourable Member for Rhineland, I understand wishes to speak.

MR. W. C. MILLER (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, I'm somewhat in a quandry whether to offer you my congratulations because of the high regard I hold you, or to offer you my condolences because of the very tough job you have. I think perhaps Mr. Speaker, I'll do both. We are old friends, and I know that no matter what our political differences may be, we will continue to be such good friends.

I want to offer you my congratulations because you've attained this high office. I want to thank you for the consideration you've always shown me when you sat on this side of the House. I seem to recall...

MR. STINSON:.....of the same party.

MR. MILLER: No, he was—the Honourable Member was in Opposition at that time. I seem to recall an occasion in the Town of Killarney, when you went out of your way to compliment me. As a matter of fact, I remember the words you used, "As long as the present incumbent is in charge, the people of Manitoba need have no fear for the educational future of this Province." My Leader was on the same platform, and he gave me an astonished look, and thought to himself very likely, I really have somebody there.

And, I want to offer you my condolences because you have a very tough job. I know where-of I speak because I sat in that chair, and I know that it is very difficult until one becomes acclimatized and has the feel of the House, to—not to feel frustrated at times.

And, I remember very well, Mr. Speaker, that at that time the Opposition was not very numerous, but they were very vociferous, and the smaller their number the more the demands and objections they made to any decisions that the Speaker made.

A MEMBER: Oh, we weren't tough on you.

MR. MILLER: Thank you. But there was, on this side of the House, a small ginger group, consisting, I think the name was the "New Democratic Party" or something like that—"Manitoba Democratic Party"—"Movement Democratique du Manitoba". And, the Leader of that group was the former member for Swan River--the members consisted of I think, the Deputy Leader was my colleague from Carillon. There was also in that group the Honourable Member for Manitou-Morden, and the Honourable Member for Iberville, and also the present Leader of the government. Well now, I can't ...

MR. ROBLIN:..very friendly independent.

MR. MILLER: but I think I'm correct in stating that he referred to the Member for Swan River on more than one occasion as "My Leader".

MR. ROBLIN: that may be true --yes.

MR. MILLER: and possibly he also attended the caucus of the democratic movement. We also had a very energetic group--the group to my left. And they questioned the Speaker from time to time, and indeed they sometimes said that there might be, the reason why the Speaker appeared to be a little bit favourable to the government, was because of the great battalions.

Now Mr. Speaker, I want to give you an experience, and I know you will take it in good part. I made up my mind to be as impartial as I could. I particularly was very careful about the expressions used by the government group, and I'm sure that my Leader will recall one occasion when the Speaker at the moment, was the former Attorney-General of this Province, the late James McLenaghan, and I don't know the occasion, whether he was berating my Honourable friend, the First Minister for some statement he made, or whether about highway safety, or whether he was berating my Honourable Friend, the Leader of the C.C.F. party about penal reform. However, the late James McLenaghan was the best friend I had in this House, and we always ate together, and he went off the beam a bit. And I remember well

(Mr. W. C. Miller, Cont'd)...that I asked him to withdraw, I think you will remember that too Mr. Speaker. I know that my leader does. Because the reaction was not exactly that which I had expected because the then Attorney-General prided himself on his observance of the rules, but on this occasion he was carried away a bit, and I asked him to withdraw, and he got red a bit and looked quite annoyed, and then he smiled and said - "I withdraw and bow to your judgment". "Well", I thought to myself, "this is the end of a beautiful friendship", and that evening we went to dinner together and I said "Jim, I'm very proud of you", and Jim chuckled and he said, "You know, Wally, even a Speaker has a right to be wrong". But he mustn't be wrong too often, because Jim certainly didn't think that he was in the wrong.

Now I feel with you at times but I know that with your fair play and your interpretation of the rules --and another thing too is that I wouldn't bother too much about Speaker's decisions, because after all they are only guides to the rules, they're precedents that might be quoted. But if you look through the rule book, the various rule books, you will find that even Speakers contradict themselves. And so, Mr. Speaker, you have my very best wishes, I can't wish you long tenure, I wish I could, but otherwise, the best of luck.

I also want to congratulate the mover and the seconder, the Honourable Member for Hamiota and the Honourable Member for Wellington. They did a very good job. They put their facts before the House and to me, at least, they had one of the very best qualities that any Speaker in this House could observe --they were brief. And I suggest they were very well trained and I know that they too, in the future, if they're back, and again I say, I can't wish them long tenure, but if they do happen to come back I know they will make a contribution.

Now Mr. Speaker, this has been in the vernacular some session, some session.... I've seen many things happen, I've seen government programmes presented on a specific amendment to the amendment--I don't object to your ruling--I noticed the strategy of the honourable gentleman opposite. I saw through it right away. We on this side objected but the Honourable, the Leader of the C.C.F. party fell in the trap, and that's why I'm speaking tonight because I propose to talk as have so many others on every subject that I can think of except the subject matter which is before the House. ...Now, the Honourable the Minister of Education, and I am going to refer to his speech a little later, but he made a few observations about members of the official opposition and he said that he divided them into like all of Gaul into three parts or in three categories, and was quite nasty about it. And, that is yet another reason why I am on my feet tonight, Mr. Speaker, because I want to examine the political philosophy of my honourable friends opposite, both at the Federal level and at the Provincial level. And in order to understand that political philosophy, Mr. Speaker, you must remember that the Conservative party both federally and provincially is firmly committed to the leader cult. They are firmly committed to the leader cult, --without a leader whom they profess to idolize, they can't operate, and their whole campaign whether federal or provincial, is on the question--I'll come to you later. Now, I must say this Mr. Speaker, at times this is very effective and particularly if a leader can produce. He has tremendous powers -- follow John, follow John. In the last election wasn't it "You followed John, why not Duff?" So you have this leadership cult, not leadership, leader cult, and that gives the leader tremendous power.

And I now want to say a few words about my old friend the Honourable, the First Minister. You know, we're really good pals. We've kicked that back and forth in the past, sometimes we called each other names, --very seldom. And I seem to recall that the Honourable the First Minister always accused me of lack of leadership. I remember on one occasion when he was supporting his then colleague, the Leader of the C.C.F. party who was berating me about being, showing no leadership in the promotion of larger units of the Dauphin - Ochre site. And he said--Oh, he did that too and it was all on the same question and now both of you have changed your mind. But he compared me to a character out of Gilbert and Sullivan, and as I recall it the reference is this, "He leads his army from behind, he's the Duke of M....." something like that.

Interjection by Mr. Roblin.

MR. MILLER: Well, whatever it is, I am going to go him one better tonight and I am going to compare him to a Shakespearian character, who was a man of eminence in his time,

(Mr. W. C. Miller, Cont'd)... a real person, not a figment of the imagination, and that is to Julius Caesar. I mightn't go as far as to call him Caesar, but I can say, use the diminutive

MR. ROBLIN: Just call me "Julie".

MR. MILLER:... Little Caesar. And I want to ask this question because he has come a long way since the days when I first knew him. "Upon what means has this our little Caesar fared that he has grown so great?" Well, we must all have a little fun.

I do want to congratulate the First Minister on the progress that he has made. I know that at the present time he doesn't want to talk, to let us talk too much about federal politics or federal affairs, and I think I'm correct in stating that at 4th June 1957, he wasn't very anxious to talk about federal politics either. As a matter of fact, I wonder if he didn't suggest, to his followers to keep out of federal politics, because he wasn't too sure how far John would go. But, Mr. Speaker, there was no doubt in his mind after June '57. The road was clear and away jumped Duff on the bandwagon - and that's when he became a devoted disciple of visionary John. The leader of the House, the leader of the government is a very, very evil man. He is a powerful speaker. He marshalls his facts and he sounds most impressive when he's most troubled. He has the faculty of being convincing in his speech when he has reason to feel troubled, and I think, Mr. Speaker, that he was probably a little bit troubled during the session.

I mentioned the fact that the honourable gentlemen opposite are thoroughly addicted to the leader cult, and that makes my honourable friend's job very easy. And I am going to divide them in terms of importance, not into three categories, but four. And at the top I put my Honourable Friend, the First Minister, —the leader, good disciplinarian, he keeps his followers in good shape - sees that they don't jump over the traces..... I sometimes see that right index finger going, and believe me I never saw anybody not drop back on his seat when that finger was going. And I congratulate the Honourable the First Minister on that.

Then, next in importance, now I might say that the leader is all powerful. He has.... rights. Next in importance, we have the Treasury Board, stream-lined, consisting of my Honourable Friend the First Minister, my good friend and neighbour the Honourable Minister of Mines & Natural Resources, and the Minister of Education, plus I think, the Provincial Secretary sits in doesn't he? And this Board has tremendous powers and they have at their beck and call an array of experts, experts in methods, experts in every kind of analysis. As a matter of fact as I read their qualifications I'm surprised that we haven't got a Minister of Methods, and I suggest that possibly my good friend and neighbour might qualify for that position as well. (Interjection)....

Now then, we come to the third category, and those are the lesser lights of Cabinet, and they carry out the recommendations of the Treasury Board, if they have any problems they submit them to the Treasury Board. And last, not leaſt, is the rank and file, the private members and "theirs is not to reason why, theirs is to obey or die". No, they have some importance. They have preferred entree to government departments. And there, Mr. Speaker, you have the set up of the honourable gentlemen opposite.

Now we've heard many remarks. I've heard many remarkable statements in my time, many remarkable statements - but I never heard a more remarkable statement than that attributed to the Honourable the Minister of Education under date Free Press March 19th-- Oh no, we can't let you forget that one - that's a dandy; we'll hear more about that as time goes on. But before I deal with that, I want to refer to my Honourable Friend the Attorney-General. Now he says, "We use the positive approach, nothing negative about ours, nothing negative". The First Minister does the same, probably he told him what to say. "Positive approach" - "positive approach" - if you do what I tell you, you'll get assistance. If you don't, my heart bleeds for you. The Honourable, the Minister of Agriculture, used the same, in effect he indicated that in some cases members of the opposition will not receive too much consideration.....interjection.....thank you, thank you.

MR. ROBLIN: Oh, we'll look after you alright, don't worry.

MR. MILLER: Is that right? Is that a promise?

MR. ROBLIN: Yes, we'll really look after you.

MR. MILLER: If you do that I'll invite you down to the constituency during the campaign.

MR. ROBLIN: You'll see me, we'll fill you in.

MR. MILLER: But the Honourable, the Minister of Education really took the cake. I've heard, I've been in politics for a long time --some say too long. (INTERJECTION).... Well, I don't know, you know although you're in the upper bracket, you know, the inner Junta ...

MR. ROBLIN: I wish you'd spell that. I'm having trouble with. . .

MR. MILLER: "Junta".

MR. ROBLIN: Oh, thank you very much, now I know.

MR. MILLER: Now, I'm not going to delve into the secrets of the inner circle but I suspect that after that speech that his leader took him to task, and rightly so, rightly so. And I don't know, but in some jurisdictions when a man makes a mistake like that, an unforgivable mistake, he's purged. He's purged --off with his head. But I really must read this to the House again; having dealt two cards, Mr. McLean pulled out a third, and this is a real one, this the meat of the whole meeting, the meat of the whole meeting. "If you have a conservative MLA", he said, "You will have a better entree into the departments of the government". Not to the Ministers, if you please, to the departments of the government. And, I think (Interjection by Mr. Roblin)..... Oh no, no, no, I've had my difficulties. Do you want me to relate my experience with one head of the government, of a department of government. I had an appointment at 11 o'clock, and I cooled my heels in his ante room until 35 minutes past eleven, while he was pleasantly occupied discussing appliances with an appliance salesman. And waiting behind me was the mayor of a town and a delegation of a rural council. And we started chatting. Incidentally I wouldn't have brought that up and I'm not referring to you, -- no, but I will talk about you too if you want me to-- and I knew these chaps very well although I wasn't with them, or they weren't with me, they came after me. And they said, "Wally, times have changed a bit. We never had to wait five minutes before getting into Wally Miller's office. Particularly when they came from the country. No, not only from Rhineland either. I even let the Flin Flon boys in. No, that's a fact. Now I don't know why, but my Honourable Friend the Minister of Education wants a reference to him, he's so fond of sticking his neck out. He doesn't answer his mail. I wrote a letter to him on September 6th and I haven't had an answer yet. But fortunately I got the information I wanted anyway.

MR. ROBLIN: As a matter of fact, you're getting it all the time.

MR. MILLER: Oh, I'm doing not too badly now. After all the House is in session now. Now what does this mean? I'll have to get serious for a minute. I'm afraid, I'm afraid because of the examples that I've cited, because of the attitude of the First Minister, and his father-knows-best attitude, because of the attitude of my Honourable friend the Attorney-General who believes in positive action, and certainly nothing is more positive than the action that all these gentlemen propose, that we're reverting to the... I'm afraid of that, sincerely afraid of it. I've never heard of such a statement made by a responsible Minister of the crown. I've never heard of an approach that is being used by members of the government in promising everything under the sun, promising financial support if the people do what they tell them to do. Where is democracy? Where is democracy? And I want to suggest, I want to suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that they better mend their ways, they better mend their ways, because the reaction of the people of Manitoba might be different to what they expect.

And now Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about education. I have stated before and I want to state it again that the honourable gentlemen opposite have no educational policy. They had none before the last election. They have none now. The Honourable, the First Minister went up and down this country and said "I promise you 50% increase in educational grants, no strings attached, nothing". What did he do? Did he carry out his campaign promises? No. And along, just when they were in despair of figuring out some kind of a policy, along came the interim report of the Royal Commission on Education. And I want to know, and I haven't been able to find out who asked for it? Who asked for it? The Royal Commission was set up to do a job. At the opportune time, very timely, this interim report appeared, it's promptly released to the press but to nobody else. I want to know who released it. I want to know who released it. I want to know why this information was given to the press and not to the members of this House. I want to know, and I repeat again, who asked for the interim report?

There are many other things to be considered than those mentioned in the interim report. There is the whole question of teacher training, examinations, curriculum, the position of the private schools and everything else.. And they all fit into the educational picture. But

(Mr. Miller, Cont'd).....what do my honourable friends do? They adopted the report of the Royal Commission, the interim report. My honourable friend said that I had said the Royal Commission was fine, that there was nothing wrong with education in Manitoba. I never said that in my life. I said that, my suggestion was that they would find that not all was wrong, as my honourable friend suggested, not all was wrong with education in Manitoba. And I think the mere fact that they found that the best solution to the administrative problem was an extension of the policy that we put in. That was accepted by the Royal Commission, and accepted by the Royal Commission, and accepted by my honourable friends opposite and my honourable friends to my left, who prior to the election certainly were chastising me at every opportunity they could get for not promoting another type of larger unit of administration. And my Honourable Friend, the First Minister, says "Your plan's no good". I asked my Honourable Friend opposite to help develop the secondary area planned, and what was the answer of the former educational critic of the conservative party, my friend from Brandon - "Why should we do what you're paid to do"? What an answer! All right, what did we do on this side? We supported the plan in principles, we made our reservations, there are many but I don't know of anybody who opposed it. I supported it, I supported it. I made my reservations, certainly. I was present at meetings at which the main speakers were two eminent ministers of the crown. And on one occasion, at least, I was sorely tempted to make a political speech because he took all the credit, he took all the credit, and if there were any reservations, he blamed them on the Commission.

Now what reservations did we have? And, this is another thing that they mentioned, why I heard the First Minister. What are they kicking about, they all voted for it? Certainly we supported the legislation in principle, and we made our reservations at the time they should have been noted, because right now our reservations mean that we were right. The Honourable the Minister of Education is proposing legislation now to take care of some of those. We mentioned at the time that care should be taken that the divisions should not be too large; that there should be an opportunity to appeal; that the local people should be consulted. However, I am very glad that so many people endorsed the plan although there was a very substantial negative vote. And as you look over the results, I find that in certain areas, particularly areas that had consolidations and so forth, where they weren't too enthusiastic about it. I believe that the plan is a good one, but I do wish that government speakers, and I'm not talking about the members of the civil service, I'm talking about the Ministers, that all the emphasis placed on monetary consideration, and at every meeting that I was at, I suggested sincerely that they should look at it, the people should look at it in the light of educational advantages to their children and not only on monetary grounds.

Now what is the Honourable the First Minister going to do? Is he going to reject his campaign pledges? Is the Honourable, the Minister of Education going to bring in legislation, --I see he has one bill still to come--that will take care of those areas who voted "no". I think they should be given some consideration, because not only are they penalized, not only are they put in competition with, as to teachers, with the teachers in the division, but they are also helping to finance as provincial taxpayers, the people who are getting more consideration. I want to mention particularly the question of construction grants. Who inaugurated that policy? Did the Minister--he might have been courteous enough with me on the same platform, to say, well, we have to give credit at least to your member for that, because we went far beyond anything that was ever suggested from that side. And yet, they say nothing was ever done. I'm going to make another prediction. I'm going to make this prediction, that when the Commission finally makes its full report that they will find too that while there's much room for improvement,--and that is something that I've always said,--that the standard of education in Manitoba and the results obtained in Manitoba educational system, compares favourably with the rest of the provinces--with the rest of Canada and the United States.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think time has gone on. I want to say another thing and that is with reference to a merit system. Now I know that the Minister set up a committee, and I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that this present government always tries to hide behind committees. The Minister shuns responsibility --he shuns responsibility. He's setting up a board of reference--independent... he has all the other committees and investigating committees on the merit system. And what does the commission say about the merit system? That was a

(Mr. Miller, Cont'd).....direct recommendation, and if the papers reported, a member of the commission correctly, that member stated that the commission would have never recommended the scale of grants unless the government were prepared to tie it to the merit system.

Now what have they done in education? What changes have they made in education? Not a thing--not a thing. And the answer that I'll get --we have to wait for the report of the Royal Commission. In one respect--in one respect only, do they say they are going to do something, and that is, they are going to build an institute or put into existence an Institute of Technology. While you are waiting for everything else why don't you wait for the Commission report on that? Much is made about the increase in contributions to the University, operational and capital. I want to tell this House that the University received every cent they asked for in the last three years, both as to operational and to capital. This government, the previous government was not niggardly with the University, and no responsible university official, no member of the Board of Governors ever said so. We saw that the affiliated colleges were doing a good job, and last year you did something about it, and we tied that capital support to a formula which was initiated by Canada Council and the affiliated colleges, with one exception, accepted that. I noticed that the Minister is changing that, he is making a flat contribution. The contributions that we made amounting to some \$990 thousand, over a period of time was tied to the Canada Council formula based on enrollment, I think of December 31st '57.

Now I'm not too happy about all these Ottawa formulas, but that was at least one which the university and the affiliated Colleges accepted.

I wonder too, what my honourable friend is doing about accreditation. The high school examination board of which we heard so much and for whose action I was always blamed by my honourable friends. I couldn't hide behind the board, they wouldn't let me.....

MR. STINSON: You survived it all right.

MR. MILLER: If there's anything wrong, blame it on Wally Miller. That was popular.

MR. STINSON: ....Broad shoulders.

MR. MILLER: Oh I'm still alive. I'm in good shape. The only thing is I'm a little hoarse tonight.

What has he done about accreditation? He was to have a report as to whether accreditation was to be discontinued or not, because for his information I might tell him that the sole jurisdiction over accreditation lies with the High School Examination Board. Has he discussed matters with the High School Examination Board about exams? Has he discussed matters with the University about their system of rating students? I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that my honourable friends opposite find it much easier to talk about money and money expenditures than about the fundamental things pertaining to education.

Now Mr. Speaker, I have spoken too long. I want to reiterate, I am very very perturbed about the political future of Manitoba, if the people of Manitoba, if the people of Manitoba ever gave my honourable friend a majority. We have seen his index finger wobble and it will wobble much more if he has a majority.

A member: It will wobble on both sides of the House.

MR. MILLER: Well, I tell you right now, Mr. Speaker, there won't be much consideration given to this side of the House if he has the majority, because with all his good qualities, if he hasn't his way he gets petulant and petty. And he likes to crack the whip and he even makes such remarks as he did the other night. I thought it was not worthy of him because I really admire his many qualities, when he said well let's have a vote; we want to find out who wants to work or not. What utter nonsense coming from him. He knows full well that he held up when he was sitting here, my estimate for two days because I gave him the chance when he wanted to make a speech. I didn't have to. Talk about steamroller. And then when he wanted another extension on that the third day I said, uh, uh, that's enough, that's enough. And that was the day when we cleaned up my estimates and the estimates of the Department of Agriculture, when farmer Gurney and you, Mr. Speaker, were holding the fort while the present Leader of the Government and his chief assistants were basking in the reflected glory of visionary John.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the speaker a question? Because I'd like to sleep comfortably tonight. I'd like to know what are his views on the Federal-Provincial health insurance plan?

MR. MILLER: I'll be very glad to answer that. The same views as are the opinions of the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture, the Honourable Minister of Education and all other honourable gentlemen there.

MR. STINSON: Mr. Speaker, as there are other honourable members who wish to participate in this debate I should like to suggest to the First Minister that he adjourn the House.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I'm not unwilling to do this, but I would like to point out, when speaking to the point of order, that I hope it wouldn't be expected that we should do this again because as everybody knows the rule on the Throne Speech is restrictive in that only three amendments are allowed and if it goes beyond that as we--only three adjournments, I'm sorry--three adjournments on each amendment are allowed, and as we go beyond that as we do by agreement sometimes, by having the matter stand over we allow others to take part. But I would hope that we would be able to conclude this tomorrow because I want to know whether I'm going to be able to sit in this chair after all the speeches that we've heard or whether we're going to have to move out. So I'll be quite prepared to adjourn the House, but I would ask for the co-operation in having a vote at least on the sub-amendment tomorrow.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, just before the Honourable the First Minister is finished. What he has said in respect to the three adjournments is perfectly correct. What he omitted to say --that it is always in the power of this House, whether the adjournments are reached in the debate even on the Throne Speech, it is always in the power of the House to adjourn it, the House itself, and there the matter would stand on the subject under discussion at that time. Although I do appreciate his desirability of having the vote reached on the sub-amendment.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the house adjourned until 2:30 tomorrow afternoon.