

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA  
2:30 o'clock, Tuesday, April 19, 1966

Opening prayer by Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions  
Reading and Receiving Petitions  
Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees.  
Notices of Motion  
Introduction of Bills  
Orders of the Day

HON. DUFF ROBLIN: (Premier) (Wolseley): Madam Speaker, if we have passed the Orders of the Day may I request that . . .

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Madam Speaker --

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable the Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: Before the Orders of the Day, Madam Speaker, on a point of privilege, yesterday the Minister, or at last night's session, the Minister of Agriculture denied that the government had made -- he said that I was wrong in stating that the government had promised completion of the Floodway by 1965 and he repeated and he mentioned that. I think it is only fair that I should point out and quote, Madam Speaker, from the bunch of little books put out by the Progressive-Conservative speakers and workers talking points for the provincial election of 1962. Mind you, it was marked "confidential" but this is what it says - this was put out by the government before the 1962 -- and I quote: "The Red River Floodway about which the previous Liberal administration procrastinated for eight years, is now under construction. When completed in 1965 it will provide flood protection for over half the population of Manitoba." When completed in 1965. Well, Madam Speaker, I won't say that the Minister called me a liar but he repeatedly said that this wasn't the case, and I think this, on a point of privilege, this should be corrected. There's quite a few things that he said yesterday . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, would you be good enough to call the adjourned debates on second readings, and we'll proceed with the second reading of bills.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the second reading of Bill No. 37. The Honourable the Member for St. George.

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): Madam Speaker, I wish to speak not so much on the contents of the bill as on the method in which the government is handling this bill. It seems to me that it's wrong for the government to bring in a bill such as Bill 37 and then indicate to the House that it's going to be sent to a special committee of the House following second reading, when everyone knows that this committee will die upon dissolution, therefore the bills -- the government has no intention of making this bill law. It seems that the government is using this bill entirely for window dressing. We have a great deal of work to do in this House and this is the second bill that we've been confronted with - the other bill I'm referring to is Bill 82. They're both extensive bills, and it seems wrong that we should take up the time of the House by bringing in bills which the government has no intention of proceeding with and will virtually die, because as everyone knows, once the House is dissolved, the committees that the bill is referred to also die and therefore the bill will not be proceeded with in any way.

Surely if the government thinks that the contents of a bill are good, then they should proceed with the bill, give it third reading and put it into law, so that the benefits from the bill can be gained. From the procedure that's being followed now it's just window dressing; it's of no value at all because it won't ever become law until it's re-introduced at another session, so I would suggest to the Minister that he either withdraw the bill or tell the House that he is going to proceed with it and put it into law.

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN, Q. C. (Dauphin): Madam Speaker, if no other members wishes to speak on this bill I would be glad at this time to close the debate on it.

Madam Speaker, the introduction of this bill has taught me quite a number of things, and I suppose that I might be a first candidate for one of the psychologists that we've been talking about on another bill. What I find rather difficult, of course, to understand - and I recognize that perhaps it isn't a very popular thing to do sometimes - is why some of the members at least aren't prepared to read the record and listen to what is said. One would think that I had

(MR. McLEAN, cont'd) . . . committed some unpardonable sin in the introduction of the bill, and if the honourable members would be good enough to look at the record they would find that much and many of the speeches they have made since it was introduced, or since we entered upon second readings, are entirely without any foundation.

It has been represented both here and elsewhere, I wish to point out, as though I had said that this bill was not going to become law. May I just remind the members that I pointed out, when speaking on second reading, that this was a new venture so far as Manitoba is concerned; that a great deal of time had been spent in preparing the bill; that I had been informed that there were a large number of people who were interested in the bill and who wished to make representations on it; that I was asking that rather than the bill going to the Law Amendments Committee which would be the normal course, that it would be referred to the committee - not a special committee, but a committee of the House, Standing Committee of the House on Statutory Regulations and Orders, and Madam Speaker I said that if, "if" there was any disposition in the committee that they wished to hold it over for further consideration beyond the normal time of this session of the Legislature, that it would be in order to do so. I at no time said that we were not going to proceed with the bill, and indeed I made it quite clear that the procedure from committee forward would depend on the wishes of the committee.

Now if the bill is no good as all the members say, I am sure that the committee will probably have a similar view. I'm flattered to think that it's as good, because perhaps in the drafting of this Corrections Act I took a more detailed and personal interest than the Attorney-General normally takes in the preparation of a bill, because I have some special interest and because also we had not too many guidelines to go by, and I'm happy to accept the commendation, both implied and expressed, that has been expressed in it. I have to confess I didn't think it was that good, but if it is, fine and dandy. And I'm still quite prepared to leave the fate of the bill insofar as committee is concerned, in the hands of the committee.

I would have to acknowledge that, because it has taken so long now, I confess that I'm a little puzzled to know what the position of the Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders is going to be, and we may have to consider our position because it could well be that only the Law Amendments Committee will be sitting a sufficiently length of time to consider it. However, all I want to say is that I at no time said the bill was not going to be enacted and the matter is in the hands of the committee. That's what I said in the first place; that's what I say again; and I would welcome any observations that may be wished to be expressed to us. I would assume, of course, because of the letter, general letter addressed by the Community Welfare Planning Council, that probably there won't be too many come forward; it's been certainly indicated that they ought not to do so, and probably those who would normally be interested will not come to the committee and if they don't, well I have no comments to make on that.

May I say one other thing. This has been referred to, for example, by the Honourable the Member for Ethelbert Plains as a publicity stunt. I think somebody else said it was an election gimmick and so on. Now I would acknowledge that I'm not really very astute in political matters, but I think I at least know enough to know if I was concerned about either a political gimmick or political stunt, that I wouldn't have chosen, I wouldn't have chosen The Corrections Act for that purpose. I can think of a lot of other things that I might have done that would have taken a lot less time and been much easier and I really think more effective.

This bill was presented in a sincere attempt to bring our Corrections procedure and our philosophy in our general field of corrections up-to-date. I make no extravagant claims for it. Many of the things that are here are done elsewhere. Many of the things that are in this bill are already being done in Manitoba, and I hope that I have made that abundantly clear at the start. I make no extravagant claims for the provisions of the bill. It does have one or two new ideas which I believe are worthwhile and which I hope are received in the spirit in which they are put forward, but that is all that I can ask for the bill.

There have been some suggestions that the bill ought not - that there ought to be time taken for consideration of it, and that there is a difference of opinion. I'm aware of that difference of opinion but have no desire other than to leave the matter in the hands of the committee.

I think that one or two questions were asked. For example, the Member for Seven Oaks asked whether a forensic clinic would have a psychiatrist. I would expect indeed yes, they will. They will probably have more than one. In other words, it would have to be --

(MR. McLEAN, cont'd) . . . a forensic clinic is a clinic which is staffed with psychiatrists as that's the type of work that is done in a forensic clinic and that type of personnel would be required.

He asked whether time on the Work Release Program would be time on the person's sentence. The answer to that question is yes. Time spent, assuming compliance with the rules and regulations pertaining to the Work Release Program would be time which would count toward the completion of the sentence of the person concerned.

I believe perhaps those were all of the specific questions that were presented during the debate that has taken place. I again recommend the measure to the members and will be happy to have the matter considered by committee as soon as this can conveniently be arranged.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Would the Honourable Minister permit a question?

MR. McLEAN: Yes.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Did the Minister not say when he introduced the bill that this bill would be referred to a Special Standing Committee that would sit between sessions?

MR. McLEAN: Madam Speaker, I said I was asking that it be referred to the Standing Committee on Regulations and Orders.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the second reading of Bill No. 71. The Honourable the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): Madam Speaker, I have some very serious reservations about Bill No. 71, an Act respecting the Establishment of Universities. Some two years ago now, I made a statement that in my opinion we needed a Council of Higher Education in the Province of Manitoba to undertake a complete review of the problems of higher education, to make sure that there was some co-ordination of the activities of the various bodies, and that there was some planning done now so that we wouldn't find ourselves at a later date with an unco-ordinated development of higher education. Subsequently to that - and I might add that this was the result of a very considerable study by a policy group of my party - subsequent to that a resolution was prepared and I presented it to the Clerk of the House before the opening of the Session of 1965, and that resolution read, Madam Speaker, as follows: It was moved by my colleague the Member for Emerson who normally speaks for us on education matters. The resolution said:

"WHEREAS the University of Manitoba, the Affiliated Colleges and other post high school institutions are finding it increasingly difficult to cope with the educational, administrative and financial needs of higher education in this province; and

"WHEREAS there is a need to consider the establishment of new institutions of higher learning such as community colleges in other parts of the province; and

"WHEREAS there's an urgent need to define the responsibility of government to all institutions of higher learning and to establish the relationship and responsibility of these institutions to higher education in Manitoba,

"THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Provincial Government appoint, as a permanent body, a Council of Higher Education, and that this Council as its first responsibility be instructed forthwith to study and report not later than December 1965, a proposed plan to meet the present and long-term needs of higher education in this province."

Now Madam Speaker this, as I said, was introduced prior to the opening of the Session of 1965 by my group. The Throne Speech revealed that the government had accepted the proposition, and there was a section in the Throne Speech saying, "A Council on Higher Learning will be established to assist the universities and affiliated colleges to deal with emerging problems in their field," and as a result of this, Madam Speaker, you ruled our resolution out of order, to which we didn't object because the government had clearly stated that they were going to proceed then with a Council of Higher Learning. Our wording had been Council of Higher Education but the wording was immaterial. The idea had been accepted and there was to be a Council to plan and develop our programs of higher learning in the Province of Manitoba.

Well, then some months elapsed before the government proceeded to appoint their Council of Higher Learning. They did not accept our particular recommendation that a report be ready by December of 1965. Now suddenly we find that without having received the report from the Council of Higher Learning, the government is proceeding to propose to the House some changes from the structures in higher education, which seems to be a very odd manner of

(MR. MOLGAT, cont'd) . . . proceeding, Madam Speaker, because if the government was sincere in its desire to give the responsibility for the development of higher learning to the Council, then surely the government should not be proceeding now to bring in legislation on which the Council itself had been instructed to report, because it appears to me that this is anticipating the work of the Council, and it is in fact telling the members of that Council, in my opinion, that the government really doesn't care too too much just what it is that they are going to do, because the government intends to proceed on its own without waiting to hear what their own Council has to recommend.

Now what, then, can be the purpose of this Act? I cannot understand, Madam Chairman, the actions of the government in this regard. I would like to know from the Minister why it is that they had appointed the Council and now are proceeding to bring in changes to the University Act which I would think would be one of the major items that the Council would be looking at, after all, without having any recommendations from that Council.

Well, let's go back to what the University Act itself says, Madam Speaker, and what this new Bill says to us. The University Act is most specific and it says in its preamble, "Whereas it was desirable to establish, and it is desirable to continue, one University for the whole of Manitoba for the purpose of raising the standing of higher education in the province and of enabling members of all classes and denominations to obtain the advantages which may be afforded by universities; Therefore Her Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba, enacts as follows:" -- and they set up the University.

But the clear statement there, Madam Speaker, is that it is desirable to continue one University for the whole of Manitoba. Well I don't necessarily agree that we should leave that as is, Madam Speaker. I'm quite prepared to change that. In fact, I have spoken in this House on a number of occasions now, and I repeat that I think that it is time that Brandon College, for example, should become a university on its own. I've said that on a number of occasions in the past and I'll repeat it now. I think the time is coming very near, in fact it may be here, where United College may be ready to establish itself on a university on its own, and quite frankly when we proposed some two years ago that there be a Council of Higher Learning, it was in the anticipation that these steps would be following on, and the reason that we were recommending a Council was that we felt that such a Council could assess the needs of the province, could assess the development of the University proper, of Brandon as a university, of United College as a university, possibly of other colleges at a later date, but to provide a sensible plan for development, and this was the basis of our recommendation at that time. I repeat that we felt that the time had come when we thought it would be useful to do this and on a planned basis.

Well, what is it that the government then proposes? Now, in this bill in comparison to the University bill, there is an obvious conflict, because this bill, as I read it does not in any way change the University of Manitoba Act, so we would end up if we passed this bill, Madam Speaker, with one statute being chapter 276 of the Revised Statutes of Manitoba 1954, saying there shall be only one university - that's what that Act says - and this one tells us on behalf of the government now, that the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council may, of its own volition or upon petition in writing from a college mentioned in Section 55 of the University Act, which means the affiliated colleges - and they are specifically mentioned in 55 as being the College St. Boniface, St. John's College, United College, St. Paul's College and Brandon College Incorporated, and I see no amendments so I presume that those are the group. So either on its own volition or upon petition from any of these, the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council may establish that college as a university and a body corporate in politic, under such name as may be set out in the Order-in-Council. So we would have an immediate conflict, Madam Speaker, if this bill were passed, because we have one Act saying there shall be one University only, and we have a bill presented to us by the government now saying there shall be as many universities as the government decides by Order-in-Council, and I submit that this Act then would be in conflict.

But Madam Speaker, I want to come back to the main objection that I have to the bill, and that is that this would give the government the power to set up the university strictly by Order-in-Council of the government, and I don't think that that is a good precedent to set. I think it is quite proper that this House, this Legislative Assembly, be the one to determine in the final analysis which bodies are going to be accepted as universities. But what should happen is not an Order-in-Council passed by my honourable friends whenever the spirit moves them, such as in the heat of election campaign possibly, but rather that this be done on a planned basis, and that my honourable friends come into the House with a proper bill, present it to us, and the House give its seal of approval to set up another university.

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

After all, a university is a most important body. The history of universities goes back a long, long, time in our education structures. And I think it is proper that their establishment be maintained on a very high level, and that is that each one of them have an Act of its own set up by this Legislature in a proper way, not simply an Order-in-Council establishing a separate university by itself. I think that when this Act was passed originally that was the purpose, Madam Speaker, because prior to that these various bodies that I mention were operating, were operating pretty well on their own. There was no co-ordination. The feeling then - and I think this goes back many years; I don't know exactly when this bill was passed - it was many years ago. No, I do not find the date here, Madam Speaker, but whatever it happened to be, that there should be some co-ordination.

Well now, because of the development of our province we have come to the conclusion that the time has come that we can expand and have other bodies. Surely the proper way to do it, Madam Speaker, is by an Act of this House and not by an Order-in-Council of the government to be passed whenever they wish to pass it. I submit that a university is too important to be handled in that way. It deserves a proper Act establishing it by this House itself. I repeat, Madam Speaker, in my opinion the time has come when we should have Brandon College set up as a university, but I think that that should be done by bringing in an Act to this House on the part of the government, not simply by the setting up by Order-in-Council in a machine factory-style universities for the Province of Manitoba.

So I say, Madam Speaker, that the Minister should withdraw his bill, in my opinion, that it is in conflict with the present Acts that we have on our Statutes, in direct contradiction because this one says "one university" and this one says that the government may put up as many as it likes by Order-in-Council. I think it is an insult to the members of the Council of Higher Learning that the government has set up and are now proceeding to propose changes without any reference to this Council of Higher Learning, and I think basically that it's the wrong way to set up universities. So I would recommend to the Minister that he not proceed with the bill.

MR. DOUGLAS L. CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. George, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the second reading of Bill No. 75. The Honourable the Member for Carillon.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Madam Speaker, may we have this matter stand? If anyone else wishes to speak we have no objection.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Madam Speaker, I might say just a few words or attempt to get some further information from my honourable friend the Minister of Municipal Affairs. I note on April 7th, when the Minister was speaking to the bill and citing the changes, or what he considered to be the real important changes in the bill, he touched on one or two points that I think concerns the area that I represent, and he said, "Members will note too that there are some additions to the methods for the levying of taxes for local improvements. In the past generally the special tax for local improvements had been levied as a frontage tax, and in some instances it had been levied as a mill rate against the assessment of the properties involved, and in many areas where there is a new development going on and where the land is not necessarily subdivided when a local government works are desired to be undertaken, it will make a provision now that the levy can be placed against the area on an acreage basis."

Now, some years ago the Town of Neepawa extended the boundaries, as my honourable friend will know, and it is now two miles each way, and as such it takes in quite a little bit of farm land, agricultural land - I would think in total, oh, probably, oh nearly two sections, and in some of the areas the town has assessed farm lands, and I don't know whether it's on an acreage basis or on a frontage basis or how they have assessed them, but they have been assessed for waterworks and so on, and yet the town could not even entertain the idea of supplying them with the services if they wanted it, and it seems to me to be a little unfair to tax farm lands for certain local improvements if the farm lands cannot under any consideration benefit from the improvements, and I wonder if my honourable friend could clear me up on that particular point.

And then I note too that he says that there will be an amendment to the section of the Act which exempted certain properties from the imposition of municipal taxes, particularly to make

(MR. SHOEMAKER, cont'd) . . . it clear in the case of buildings used for the housing of the aged and infirm. Now, my honourable friend knows well too that in the Town of Neepawa we are favoured with quite a number of senior citizens' homes - quite a number. I think there's accommodation there now for at least 55 and they're proposing a new building this year which will cost well over half a million dollars. Well, where do we stand now in light of the new amendment that my honourable friend proposes to the Municipal Act? Where do we stand now in respect to the taxes that will be levied on the housing of the aged and infirm?

Then I notice too that he points up, to the delight he says, of the Honourable Member for Lakeside, the provision there for grants in lieu of taxes on land that is expropriated, and cites the land that will be taken for the Portage Diversion and the grants in lieu of taxes on the properties for a period of three years.

I think that's about all that I had to say at the moment, Madam Speaker, and I will await with interest the answers that I will eventually receive, but I guess not today in light of the fact that it will stand in the name of the Honourable Member for Carillon.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the second reading of Bill No. 82. The Honourable the Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Madam Speaker, I didn't realize that we would be on government business this afternoon, and I'm not prepared to proceed. I would ask the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand.

HON. GEORGE HUTTON (Minister of Agriculture) (Rockwood-Iberville): Madam Speaker, I wonder if I could say a word or two on this subject.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable the Minister of Agriculture.

MR. HUTTON: At this morning's session, I, along with other members of the Legislature, was treated to quite a lengthy dissertation on the merits of Bill No. 82 and some of the weaknesses of this bill as viewed and understood by the Honourable Member for Lakeside. If I can use a phrase he uses sometimes when he's particularly exasperated with the Minister of Agriculture, it passes my imagination how anyone who has had such a long and intimate association with public affairs in the Province of Manitoba, and certainly during that period an association and reason for utilizing the Expropriation Act, the provisions of it, how anyone with this background of experience could conceive of the description of the use of the Expropriation Act as the Honourable Member for Lakeside described to us this morning, it just, as my honourable friend would say, it passes my imagination. I just don't understand. Because he seems to feel that there is something very sinister, very threatening about the term "expropriation" and that the word, the Act of expropriation indeed strips people, citizens of the province, of their property rights, and this of course is not true and I'm quite sure that the Honourable Member for Lakeside doesn't believe this is true, although he gives you that impression when he talks about the Expropriation Act and the way it has been used and the way he contemplates this new Act would be used in the conduct of public business in Manitoba.

I'm not going to get into the argument with him about what "upon" means, the term "upon" means, in the Expropriation Act. I'm a farmer, I'm not a lawyer. All I know is how it worked, and the way it worked it couldn't have meant upon, simultaneously, at the same time, coincident with, because there were cases where land was expropriated and the person didn't get an offer for a good deal more than a year. We knew that this had happened and this is why we brought in the year. This is why we brought in the limitation of one year, and this term "expropriation" does not rob -- or the act of expropriation does not strip the individual of his rights, and I think -- I'm not going to speak a long time on this subject. I'm just going to show you how it worked in the case of the Floodway.

There were 551 files that we had to deal with. To date, 533 settlements have been completed and compensation paid; 533 out of 551. In only 12 cases -- there are three cases only, three cases only had gone to arbitration and we only contemplate nine more. Twelve cases out of 551 going to arbitration where the whole area, the 12,000 acres, was expropriated. Twelve. 97.8 percent of these cases were dealt with through negotiation with the individual. Expropriation didn't upset or deny the former owner of the property his rights in negotiating a settlement with the government agency that was responsible. Only 12 cases where settlement couldn't be reached and to date three have gone to arbitration. There is a chance the other nine may go, but that's a dozen out of 551 files.

Madam Speaker, I think that it is wrong, I think that it is manifestly wrong for anyone to get up and describe the Expropriation Act and the provisions of the Expropriation Act and

(MR. HUTTON, cont'd) . . . the practical execution of the Expropriation Act in such terms as to create in the minds of people who have not had reason to deal through the procedures of the Expropriation Act, to create in their minds the sense that there is something sinister, that there is something threatening, that indeed if expropriation procedures are used that they are going to lose, that their rights as citizens of this province are eroded.

This is not true. It just isn't true, and the facts of the matter, the results of our experience, especially in the last few years when because of very large public works projects we have been required to acquire large tracts of land, we have proven that it just isn't so that the Expropriation Act robs the individual of his rights as a citizen. As a matter of fact, the Expropriation Act protects the rights of the citizen, and it has always been used in that way and it is only under the most difficult circumstances when there is no hope whatsoever of reaching a mutually satisfactory settlement, that the owner resorts to his right to an arbitration hearing. It is only under the most extreme situations that even this procedure is used, and then as I have demonstrated here, almost 98 percent -- and I think that you would find the same thing is true of other situations in the purchase of other properties, I think you would probably find the same thing was true when my honourable friend from Lakeside was the Minister of Agriculture for Manitoba and the Premier of this province, that even where expropriation is used, it doesn't deny the individual his rights as a property owner to negotiate a fair settlement to himself.

What the Expropriation Act does provide is for the government to get control quickly and the right quickly, to develop, carry forward its public works projects in respect to that land, and it makes it impossible for an individual to, by merely holding out, to postpone at great cost to the government and the other citizens of the province and to the disadvantages of his fellow citizens, it prevents him from holding out for unreasonable terms of settlement. But I think the record in the last five or six years on property acquisition, and the record prior to that time when my honourable friend was responsible for these things, will show that even where the Expropriation Act was used it certainly did not diminish in any way the rights of the individual, and I believe that it's wrong to create the impression in the mind of the average citizen in Manitoba that there's something sinister, threatening, undemocratic about the procedures of expropriation. This Act here is based on the experience that we have had in the last few years when we have had to buy massive amounts of property from citizens of this province and it is an attempt, not to diminish the rights of the property owner, but to ensure them and to clarify the procedures as our experience has indicated they should be clarified. I'm not saying that everything that's in this Act, or all the provision in the Act are perfect, because there are always differences of opinion amongst the most experienced men in these fields. The provisions in the Act represent a consensus of opinion based on experience and knowledge in these matters, and there may be things that my honourable friend takes issue with, but certainly there's one thing I want underlined is that provisions that are in this Act are not in there to diminish the rights of the individual citizen in Manitoba. They are in there to clarify the procedures, and if anything, to make sure that the property owner, in cases where we used the procedures of expropriation, has all the rights without any diminishment at all because it's necessary to use the procedures of expropriation in gaining title for Public Works projects.

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker, may I ask a question of the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture? Does my honourable friend the Minister really believe that it is protecting the rights and is fair, protecting the rights of the owner and is fair to the owner that as provided in this Bill, that the authority can expropriate his land by simply filing a declaration - and not even notify him of that for six months?

MR. HUTTON: Madam Speaker, that isn't what the Act says. The Act says that -- this new Act says that we've got to notify him within three months. It doesn't say that the notification will go out at the end of the three month period. It says that it has to go out within three months. --(Interjection)-- Oh yes.

MR. FROESE: Madam Speaker, could I ask the Honourable Minister a question? I wonder if he could tell us how many bodies have the delegated power through legislation to expropriate, such as school trustees and municipalities? How many of these bodies have we that have the power to expropriate?

MADAM SPEAKER: . . . stand in the name of the Honourable the Member for Rhineland. The adjourned debate on the second reading of Bill No. 89. The Honourable the Member for St. George.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Madam Speaker, I would ask that this matter be stood over but if

(MR. GUTTORMSON, cont'd) . . . anyone else wishes to speak we would have no objection.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the second reading of Bill No. 92. The Honourable the Member for Selkirk.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Madam Speaker, could we have this matter stand? But if anyone wishes to speak we would have no objection.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the second reading of Bill No. 97. The Honourable the Member for Emerson.

MR. JOHN. P. TANCHAK (Emerson): Madam Speaker, I would like the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand.

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Education) (Gimli): presented Bill No. 102, an Act to amend The Education Department Act, for second reading.

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

HON. ROBERT G. SMELLIE, Q. C. (Minister of Municipal Affairs) (Birtle-Russell): presented Bill No. 105, an Act to establish a commission to recommend the reorganization of boundaries of local government units, for second reading.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SMELLIE: Madam Speaker, this matter was dealt with fairly fully at the resolution stage. This of course is the legislation which was recommended by the Municipal Affairs Committee with some minor modifications. The proposal is that the Boundaries Commission to be established under this Bill, would have the responsibility for examining the boundaries of all Local Government Units, giving priority to those areas of school administration where there is need for immediate change. It's second priority would be the examination of, particularly the municipal units in the Metropolitan area, and it's third priority would be to establish an over-all plan for reorganization of Local Government Units throughout the remainder of the Province of Manitoba. Hopefully, the Commission would be able to examine the needs of different types of Local Government Units and propose boundaries which would be coterminous as much as possible. This doesn't necessarily mean that all different types of Local Government Units should be the same size, but that within regions they should have the same outside boundaries.

This of course, has many advantages. The question of providing the roads necessary to give transportation required under an expanding school system where the needs of the modern educational system require some centralization of education have created problems in some areas for the municipal unit that was responsible for the provision of roads. This would assist in the over-all planning for the future of such areas and hopefully, would provide a better standard of service as between different Local Government Units, and the example used of course was that between schools and municipalities.

The work to be undertaken by this Commission is not only important, but is staggering in its proportions. When the Michener Commission examined the question of boundaries, I think they admitted quite frankly that it was impossible for them to do the kind of job they would like to do in the time that was available to them; and although the Michener Commission did make some recommendation as to how boundaries might be reorganized, I think they were quite frank in saying that this matter had not received enough study, and that further study was required. Those Members of this Assembly who served on the Municipal Affairs Committee, who heard the representations throughout the province last summer, will recollect that most of the municipalities said to us in making those representations that "We're just fine the way we are, but we think that probably some of those other fellows need some reorganization." But in almost every case when these people were questioned they indicated to us that they would much prefer to have an opportunity to see an over-all plan; something that they could offer criticisms about rather than discuss the matter in the abstract. I think everybody had some doubts in their mind as to what the proposal was for the Boundaries Commission that was proposed at that time. They didn't know exactly what that Boundaries Commission might say, and many people were afraid that the recommendations of such a Commission might be implemented without giving them an opportunity to make their expression of opinion as to the particular proposal that the Commission was going to make. But I think it was pretty generally agreed that it was desirable if possible, to present for public discussion the over-all plan so that the advantages and disadvantages of the total plan could be discussed before there was any action which could not later be reversed.

Hopefully, the legislation which is before you can provide that opportunity. Members

(MR. SMELLIE, cont'd) . . . will note that there is provision in the Bill before you for the preparation of the plan and the report to be filed with government; but the Bill before us does not provide for implementation of the plan. I think this should give some reassurance to those who had some doubts when we heard them last summer. We hope that this can give us the basis for public discussion on reorganization, that even the people who appeared before us and said they didn't need any but the other people did, might be able to discuss in an intelligent way and in the best interests of the future of Local Governments in this province.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party) (Radisson): Madam Speaker, I understand the Member for Gladstone is going to adjourn the debate. I think rather than adjourn it following the Minister a word or two should be said in respect to Bill 105.

I was intrigued with one word that the Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs used throughout his introduction for second reading of this Bill; and that is the word "hopefully". It seems to me as one reads the Bill that the government "hopefully" hopes that this matter might be considered or the Bill might be considered without any repercussions insofar as the government is concerned. I think from what the Minister said the government "hopefully" expects that the problem that we're facing in Manitoba will go away. The problem is of course the reorganization of the boundaries of local government areas and units.

I want to say to my honourable friend the Minister of Municipal Affairs that I doubt very much whether there is much hope that the government will be able to get around its responsibilities by the enactment of Bill 105. The more one reads this Bill, Madam Speaker, the more one is concerned with the direction of government, and particularly the government of today; because on one hand the government states in Bill 105 that this is an Act to establish a commission to recommend the reorganization of boundaries of Local Government Units, and then turns around in the body of the Bill and tells them what they should do.

I suggest, Madam Speaker, that to be consistent that if the government is already telling a Commission what it should do, without establishing a commission, that the Minister of Municipal Affairs, or the government itself, should say to the experts in his or their departments, you go ahead and lay out a plan for reorganization of the municipal boundaries in the Province of Manitoba and make that recommendation to us and then on the basis of that, we'll ask the municipalities for their consideration.

But my honourable friend the Minister and the government through this Bill have not got the gumption to do this. They are endeavouring through this Bill to set up a commission and to say to the commission what they should do. For instance, Madam Speaker, the commission "shall" -- and throughout the whole Bill we find the word "shall" -- the commission shall make all enquiries and take all such measures as are necessary to enable it to recommend to the government the territory to be included in and the boundaries of proposed government units in the province. The commission "shall" in the consideration of its report, consider the recommendations made from time to time by the Manitoba Royal Commission on Local Government Organization and Finance and by the Municipal Enquiry Commission in Manitoba. Not Madam Speaker, that the commission might if they so desire to consider these two reports referred to in legislation -- but they shall do it.

In other words, Madam Speaker, what the government is establishing is another section in the Civil Service itself, without giving to the commissioners the benefits of being members of the civil service, because in the Act it specifically states the commission may employ and fix salaries and staffs, but persons so employed are not civil servants insofar as the Civil Service is concerned. In other words, the Minister is setting up a commission telling the commission what it shall do, exactly the same way as it would do any section of any department within the government itself.

And then what does it say? Does it say to the commission that you have any arbitrary rights so far as your recommendations are concerned with the local government districts or units? No. This legislation says to the commission that it "shall" as far as practical make the boundaries of the various classes of the proposed local government units coterminous. And then, Madam Speaker, turns around and says but you shall not, in effect, in the preparation of your plans set aside -- or let me put it in the positive -- that in the consideration of your plans you shall give precedence within the priority or in the priority to the preparation of a plan and making of a report, such areas of the province as from time to time be designated by the Minister of Education. Before even the commission starts, Madam Speaker, its hands are tied by the legislation, because it can't make up its mind, in areas where the Minister of Education has priorly made up his mind insofar as the areas are concerned. What tommyrot!

(MR. PAULLEY, cont'd) . . . What nonsense! What an abdication of responsibility of government in this legislation that we have before us.

Why didn't the Minister or the author of this literature, this Bill, also include in the recommendations for study, include other commissions that we've had on local government. The Karl Goldenburg Report; the Report of 1952 of the joint Municipal-Provincial Government Commission that sat and made its recommendations -- and as I recall, Madam Speaker, the recommendations at that time contained considerable information insofar as readjustments of boundaries are concerned on economic units.

Did the Minister of Municipal Affairs pick out as one of the "musts" for the consideration of this commission, the Municipal Enquiry Commission Report, because that commission report suggested that the field of education should be under the auspices and direction of a committee of council rather than separate school boards. Is that the reason that this particular commission was selected by my honourable friend - as a must? Not as a "may", Madam Speaker, but they "shall" from time to time take into consideration these recommendations. Why? Why is my honourable friend setting up a commission to investigate this very very important problem and then telling them what they shall specifically investigate, what they shall specifically consider in their investigation and then set up an order of priority.

As I read the Bill, Madam Speaker, the priorities would supersede any recommendations that the commission might make. And then what happens, what happens, after the commission has made its report? - "after holding public meetings as required the commission shall prepare a final plan and make a final report to the Minister recommending the territory to be included and the boundaries of each local government unit in the province, into its final plan and final report referred. Why? Why to the Minister? Why should the responsibility of holding the hearings in the area be left with the commission and then referred to the Minister? Why doesn't the commission be given the authority to report to the Minister and put some onus on him?

The way this whole Bill reads, Madam Speaker, is an evasion of responsibility of the Minister and of the government, because as I state they first of all set up a commission, presumably independent; they tell the commission what they shall read, what they shall do; they tell the commission that if the Minister of Education has set up an area - not only him, but Health Unit areas as well - if they have set up prior areas of administration, they're the first priority for the commission. Then they turn around - the government in this legislation - and said "when you've done this, you the commission go to the people - the people that my honourable friend the Minister of Municipal Affairs possibly admitted that he was afraid of a few moments ago, because he said they all have different ideas. But is the Minister or the government prepared to go to the people with a recommendation? Oh no; oh no. Give it to the poor commission. Let them go and face the public and the devil take the hindmost.

That's the attitude of the government, Madam Speaker, in this regard. Then after all this is done, there's not even a provision within the Act for any report whatsoever to be made to this Assembly. Why? Why not, Madam Speaker? - a report of the commission to this Assembly? Is it because the Minister and the government are afraid that if a report is made to this body and members of opposition - which maybe them as the result of the next election - don't receive the report? They can have no argument as to the contents? Why? Why not to this Assembly? This Assembly establishes a commission, then surely this Assembly is entitled by the Act itself to obtain the report of the commission.

So I say, Madam Speaker, I'm not highly enamoured of the legislation that's being proposed by my honourable friend the Minister of Municipal Affairs and as I said at the outset, I can understand why this legislation is "hopefully" introduced on a hope and a prayer, that the commission having been directed as to what it should do, having to direct it in the first instance as to what areas it can consider and not consider, we hope, says the government, that like Topsy the problem will dissipate and we will be able to say well, we did set up a commission; and let it die right there.

I suggest this is not good enough, and this legislation is not good enough; and I say to the Government of Manitoba if it wants to set up a commission on the reorganization of the boundaries of the Province of Manitoba in respect to municipal units, better have enough gumption to do so and to say bring in your report, but let the government not tie its hands before the commission makes even a start in consideration of this problem.

MR. MARK G. SMERCHANSKI (Burrows): Madam Speaker, I'm concerned about Bill No. 105 from the standpoint that the suggestions under this proposed bill to establish the

(MR. SMERCHANSKI, cont'd) . . . commission are rather far reaching and I'm just wondering if this is an indirect approach to reorganize Metro. Under the terms of this proposed commission it will have the jurisdiction over the health, education, medical, schools, and the boundaries of the municipalities and the Metropolitan Corporation of Greater Winnipeg. Now we have heard much of the pros and cons of total amalgamation in Greater Winnipeg and we have heard much about the efficient and inefficient methods of metropolitan government in Winnipeg, and I am concerned, Madam Speaker, in that this imposes another level of taxation on the people of Winnipeg and Greater Winnipeg. I'm concerned because there have been some suggestion that the boundaries of Metro should be extended to the perimeter highway, and this may well be that the proposed commission may well consider taking action on Metro which was imposed upon the people of this City by this government, and it might well be an indirect approach to do something with Metro without giving the people of the area the proper voice in whether they do want additional taxes in terms of additional services.

Madam Speaker, we have a municipal form of government. We have a Metropolitan form of government in Greater Winnipeg, and we have the Provincial form of government and then we also have a Federal form of government. I'm wondering if by the suggestion of Bill No. 105 if it is the intention of this government, through this commission, to create a major type of Metro plan for the entire province. And if it is, I think that some of these conditions should be spelt out rather than asking for an over-all blanket policy in order to not only reorganize or change the boundaries of the various municipalities, but also interfere with the Metropolitan Corporation of Greater Winnipeg as well as the health units, the laboratory units and the school units. It is for this reason that I would like to see the control of this commission report directly and be more directly responsible to the dictates of what has been established in the past and to look very carefully before we disturb the present situation as it exists, because there is no other better example of what happened when this government forced Metropolitan Corporation of Greater Winnipeg upon the people in Winnipeg and a large percentage of this people didn't want this form of government. Whether it's right or wrong, there's also the approach that maybe total amalgamation might have been better. But in any event, Madam Speaker, I feel that there is the possibility to this Bill to again tamper and again force a situation upon the residents of Greater Winnipeg, something in which they would have no say but they would have to pay the additional taxes that would be levied on them.

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

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

MR. SMELLIE presented Bill No. 111, The Commissioner of Northern Manitoba Affairs Act, for second reading.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SMELLIE: Madam Speaker, throughout a large part of the Province of Manitoba there are many small communities that at the present time have no form of organized local government. In addition, there are some communities which at present have some part in local government districts but which are scattered far from the centre of the local government district and which really have very little contact with their local government district except for the payment of taxes.

In the past there has been an attempt made through the Department of Mines and Natural Resources, at one time, to co-ordinate government services in the northern communities. The attempt was by and large unsuccessful because I believe that it was an attempt made through people who were primarily interested in another area of service. This Bill will provide for the establishment of a staff under the Commissioner of Northern Manitoba Affairs, which will be in direct contact with the people of those communities. You will note that the Bill provides for the establishment of a Director and such other staff as may be necessary to carry out the proposals. It is our proposal that the Director should be stationed in northern Manitoba. Under this Bill it would also be possible and is intended to provide administrators, each responsible for a separate section of the territory involved and who would be in direct, regular and frequent contact with each of the communities. Through this contact, the services ordinarily provided by the province can be offered directly to the people, and there is a focal point through which the people can approach the province.

You will note that with the permission of the Minister concerned that the Director or the Commissioner of Northern Affairs may direct certain services of other departments of

(MR. SMELLIE, cont'd) . . . . . government in the areas where the Commissioner of Northern Affairs has responsibility. It is hoped that through this approach -- and I see my friend from the New Democratic Party shaking his head again at the fact that we have some hopes for the future of the north -- It is hoped that through this approach that the services that are already available by government, and which many of these communities have never taken advantage, may be brought to the people in a tangible way. In some of the communities in the north that we are concerned about here we know there is going to be growth within a short period of time. In many of the other communities that have existed for some years past which are small and will likely continue to be small, they have different problems. Here they have problems in that there is no way now by which they can co-ordinate their efforts to assist themselves to a better standard of living; and as a result in many of these communities they have lacked some of the facilities that most of us throughout the province consider as usual and normal standards of living in this last half of the twentieth century. By the use of this system those communities can be assisted to help themselves. It's intended that not only the resources of the province but in many cases the funds of the province will be used either solely or in co-operation with funds raised in the local community to provide services that they haven't had in the past.

Provision is made, you will notice, for local participation in the operation of their affairs and arrangements are made for advisory councils, local committees, either appointed or elected, and again I would hope that wherever there is any possibility of establishing an elected local committee that this will be done. The Act certainly contemplates the establishment of elected committees for people to assist in the guidance of their own local affairs.

In Part 2 of the Act there is provision for the establishment of agreements with other bodies for the purpose of establishing and developing new town sites for the purpose of providing and maintaining or improving local services for the benefit of the inhabitants of any particular community. This has of course been done in the past, but there has been no real legislative provision for such agreements, and they've been treated on an ad hoc basis. I believe that this provision will provide a procedure to be followed for the completion of such agreements in future, and that there is under this part a regular system whereby this House sanctions the making of such agreements for the purpose of developing this great area of the province, and also for the purpose of providing some of the amenities of life to people in those communities where they have been unable to organize any such system in the past.

I think that this is an entirely new concept from the concept that we have had in the past of local government districts. In the past in local government districts in many cases the local government district has been treated, in fact in some cases the administrators have acted as if they themselves believed that their sole responsibility was that of the collection of taxes. This has not always applied and we've had great variation, but certainly it is not the intention of this Legislation to provide merely a tax collection agency. This is an agency that is designed to promote the development of communities where people now live or where people may live in the future, where population is small and where the tax base would not allow for the establishment of a regular municipal corporation, but to provide some method whereby in those communities we can provide some of the municipal services that you would expect in small regularly constituted municipalities, so that those people can enjoy some of the amenities of life that are enjoyed in other parts of the province.

This is a new experiment. It's one that I'm looking forward to with a great deal of anticipation because I believe that this experiment can make a tremendous difference to life in the last frontier in this province. I believe that through this system that we can encourage the people who have been pioneers in the northern community, and that we can attract to those communities some of the other people of our province and our country to assist in the development that we all recognize must take place if Manitoba is to grow the way we all hope she will.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I just wish to say a word or two in connection with Bill 111. I admire the Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs for scouting around and skirting around many points within this Bill that I find disfavour.

May I first of all say I agree with him that the people in northern Manitoba are entitled to all of the amenities of life on a comparable basis with any other citizen of the Province of Manitoba. I would like to suggest to my honourable friend that a good starting place would be the provision of live TV to the people of the north.

I agree with him that in this Act there are provision whereby the Commissioner of

(MR. PAULLEY, cont'd) . . . Northern Manitoba Affairs can assist in providing services of varying description to the people in the north. They certainly are entitled to receive these services if they can be provided. But I question greatly, Madam Speaker, some of the contents of the Bill itself for it gives tremendous power to the Commissioner, even the laying down of qualifications of voters of the local areas, and I would suggest, Madam Speaker, that insofar as the qualifications of voters are concerned in any community in Manitoba they should be the same as those that already apply to our various municipal units.

One area in the Bill, however, Madam Speaker, that I must take great exception to is the power given to the Commissioner of Northern Affairs, whom we understand will be the present Minister of Municipal Affairs, the power to enter into agreements on behalf of the Government of Manitoba with any person, firm or municipality on such terms as the Lieutenant-Governor may approve for the purpose of establishing or expansion of industry or providing, improving services. I don't think it will come as a surprise to the Minister or to the government for me to say I just don't trust you boys in any agreement at all insofar as giving authority without investigation, for any Minister or the government itself to enter into an agreement on behalf of the Government of Manitoba, which in effect means the people of Manitoba.

The last two or three days, Madam Speaker, we listened with a great deal of interest to a debate in connection with the establishment of an integrated forest industry in the neighbourhood of The Pas. I'm convinced, and I'm sure that the people of Manitoba will be convinced when they study the agreement entered into, not by one, Madam Speaker, by six Ministers of the Crown, that Manitoba has been sold down the river in respect of its forest industry. What this Bill purports to do is to say that one Minister, not six, can enter into these agreements. --(Interjection)-- Pardon. With the approval, yes; with the approval of all the rest. I don't think they're capable of approving any agreement, as evidenced by the agreements we've been looking at over the last two or three days. And among other things that the Minister will be charged with will be taking care of the people in the area, the amenities of life and the services for well-being.

In the agreement signed between Monoca and the government, my colleague from St. John's asked the question as to how the individual in the area was treated in respect of stumpage charges. We have yet to hear an answer from the government, because it has been established by an Order for Return that where stumpage rates in respect of an individual log operator in the same area the Churchill Forest Industries are going to operate, on a basis of 37-1/2 cents per cord stumpage, the individual concerned in respect of lumber will have to pay between five and six dollars per acre in respect of pulpwood. Between a dollar and a half and a dollar seventy-five per cord, for spruce pulpwood. This is the government that now suggest that one man, subject to the review, I admit, of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, can enter into agreements. They're going as the protector of the people of the north; and yet with the agreement that we have before us in respect of an outside outfit from Switzerland, their stumpage charges are going to be 37-1/2 cents per cord, for the Minister has not as yet told the Committee that the individual operators in Northern Manitoba will be able to receive the benefits of a lesser amount of stumpage charges. Is it any wonder then, Madam Speaker, in the absence of any answer from the government, that I as Leader of my party who is interested in the preservation of, for the use of the people of Manitoba its natural resources question the advisability of supporting Bill No. 111. So I say, Madam Speaker, this government, this Minister, is taking onto themselves too great a power.

So you know what they can do, Madam Speaker under Bill 111? Forgive all taxes. They can give away what remains in northern Manitoba under Part 2 of this Act, practically every resource that we've got in northern Manitoba, subject to an agreement for the payment of grants in lieu of taxes by any party to the agreement, for the payment by the party of any amount at all, by them. We have just given away, just given away, Madam Speaker, what was it? -- 40,000 square miles of timber rights for a buck a square mile. We have said to this Swiss firm that you are not going to have to pay in respect of fire protection. This is northern Manitoba. But we say to the rugged individualist, the individual logger in northern Manitoba for fire protection in the rest of Manitoba, for fire protection you're going to pay \$12.80 per square mile per year as a fireguarding tax.

This is the type of agreement, Mr. Speaker, that this government is entering into at the present time. No spirit of equality between the various sections of the province or the

(MR. PAULLEY, cont'd) . . . various operators. I haven't heard the Minister of Industry and Commerce or the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources turn around to the operators in the area of Pine Falls and say "Now because of the fact that we're not going to charge our Swiss friends for fire protection, we're going to relieve you of the costs of fire protection in your area." I haven't heard the Minister of Industry and Commerce or the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources say to Manitoba Paper Company, "Now boys, for the next seven and a half years, we're going to put you on equal terms regarding stumpage and only charge you 37-1/2 cents." Or, "We're not going to charge you the same as we're going to charge Monoca for the next 20 years, and reduce your charges down to 75 cents per cord stumpage." Oh no. And yet this Bill, like so many others, Mr. Speaker, that's coming before this House now, wants us, the Members of this Legislature to give unto them, the Ministers of the Crown, more power to enter into more agreements to give away more of the natural resources of our province, which instead of returning to the people of Manitoba benefits, is going to in the final analysis cost them money.

So I say to my honourable friend, I join in his hopes that the people of the North will have some of the amenities of life. I certainly do not agree with him that it will be possible under this Act, to further give away the birthright of the citizens of the Province of Manitoba by any single Minister, or by the united efforts of the Cabinet -- and here again, here again, Mr. Speaker, the government or the front bench does not even have to tell the Legislature what it's done. It's quite conceivable under the type of legislation that is being introduced in these last few days of this Session, for on the change of government -- which surely is going to come -- for the government, whoever it may be that succeeds that outfit will find that all of the resources of the province have been given away for naught.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable the Leader of the NDP has suggested that there will be a Commissioner of Northern Affairs and he suggested that it was the intention of our honourable friend that he would be "if" -- well, if that is so, then -- if that is so, why don't we name it in the Bill. I have noticed in Hansard of April 4th that apparently he is self-appointed, that is he is hopeful that he will be the Commissioner. He says "if" -- Well, I don't suppose the Executive Council would object to him being the commissioner, and if that is so why not say in the Bill now that until further notice or until a further Cabinet appointment is necessary, that the Minister of Municipal Affairs shall be the Commissioner of Northern Affairs or whatever wording is necessary. Why not put it in, why not put it in? --(Interjection) -- Mr. Chairman, he's suggesting that I move his nomination, I think. Well, I perhaps could do that, and someone could -- he might get a seconder within the Executive Council.

Now, Mr. Speaker, another thing that concerns me a little is the size of the proposed staff of administrators and others. On Page 1486 and 1487 of Hansard No. 64, when the honourable minister is speaking upon the introduction of the Bill, he says, The proposed staff would be a Director, that would be under himself, and several administrators, each of whom would be responsible for a special district, and the ordinary clerical staff to assist them to do the job. And then on the following page he says that there will be some 80 to 90 communities varying in size from a dozen inhabitants to possibly 80 or 100, so that if you assume that you have 80 communities and assuming that the average number of inhabitants are 40, then you have roughly 3,200 people; and we are going to have administrators and a clerical staff under each and every one of those to look after 3,200 people? That is the inference that is left here. The honourable minister's speaking. He said "there will be several administrators and each will have a staff under them to look after possibly 80 or 90 communities varying in size from a dozen inhabitants to possibly 80." Well, gee whiz, that seems to me that you could conceivably end up with an administrator or a clerical staff for every inhabitant. So I think this certainly needs some clarification here. I have heard Mayor Juba talk about Winnipeg being over-administered when they have something like 200 administrators for half a million people, where apparently my honourable friend is suggesting that he is going to have several administrators and a staff under each one for 3,200 people or thereabouts.

So, Mr. Speaker, I do hope that there will be some way of pointing out to the members of the House the size of the staff in relation to the population that they intend to administer over.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. GORDON W. BEARD (Churchill): I'm rather amazed at the acceptance by opposition -- or the reluctance, pardon me, to accept a Bill such as this, because I would prophesy

(MR. BEARD, cont'd) . . . that they should take it home and frame it, because this will be the future of a northern Manitoba and many of the small communities. Certainly represents a large step forward for many of our small areas.

I can't conceive the thinking that went into the speech that we heard from the Honourable Leader of the NDP Party as far as what was going to happen, and I would wonder when he refers to Monoca, to Churchill Industries as to what he is looking for. He complains about stumpage charges. I wonder if he'd care to go back and check on the number of stumps that are there today that we didn't get any revenue from. Hundreds and thousands of them over the years. No revenue, costs of looking after the area and yet he tries to condemn one of the most forward-looking projects that have been conceived in northern Manitoba, and tries to paint it black, and this is what he is trying to do; because I feel personally that the incentives were necessary to introduce this type of industry into northern Manitoba. It's not competitive with the great forests in other areas of Canada unless these incentives are offered. It will not go further into it, not because it wouldn't make a good speech, but if he'd been listening carefully he'd of heard it when the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce read his report the other day.

But, Mr. Chairman, I will suggest that he take time off and take a trip up there and see what northern Manitobans are thinking about it. These are the people that are greatly affected, these are the people that have been looking for it for so many years, these are the people that are being directly affected. Go into these areas that Bill 111 affects. These are small communities that through one reason or another, particularly because of communication, because of transportation, because of isolation, they have never been able to regularly set their problem in front of government as we have in southern Manitoba. Far too often months, and sometimes I suppose years go by in the past where nobody has been able to get through the red tape to government; and this is what Bill 111 does. I don't suppose the Minister would say it, but I think I have the right to say it, it cuts out the red tape. It allows people to go up there and govern with a heart, and I think they will do the right thing. They will certainly be called to task if they don't. But it bothers me, it bothers me when members of this Assembly speak on this when they don't know the problem that faces government and also the people of Northern Manitoba, when they haven't been into these small communities, when they haven't seen what they've had to put up with in northern Manitoba. They don't know what isolation is.

Isolation comes in many forms, Mr. Speaker, and if we haven't lived in these small communities, we don't know very many of them. There are many unfortunately, there are many of our programs which these people could have taken advantage of only there was no way for them to take advantage of it because they didn't know about it and there was no means of government to see that they got their just rights - and this is what they're getting. They're offered the incentive for living, for bettering their type of living; for bringing roads, small roads into the community for the first time. Many of these communities don't have cars, many of them. Why? Because they haven't got a road or nobody to help them build a road in their own little community. These are the communities that we talk about that are frustrated through rougher weather conditions than we're used to in the south, or the more southerly part. There are problems up there on communication, where they can be sick and they have no means of communicating with a doctor in a hurry. And I've stated it before and I state it again, it amazed me when I come into the City and we see an ambulance rushing down, sirens blaring, they've got to get to the hospital within five or ten minutes, or two minutes, everybody knows a minute means an awful lot; but in these areas they do without all that. These are the problems that I think we should overcome. Not because they've lived with them in the past and they can continue in the future, but if we're going to help them at all, then we must have a way and means of doing it, and Bill 111 I believe is the way and the means of providing this assistance; somebody to go in there with the authority to look after these problems, small and varied, as they're presented from time to time.

You must remember that they've had no opportunity, real opportunity up till this time, of presenting to anybody that really can do something about it on-the-spot. To assist, I understand from the Minister, that in these small communities there will be council or members of one, two, three, depending on the size of the community to work with the administrator when he comes in to present these problems to him. They've opened up this line of communication direct to the Commissioner. And when my friend, the honourable member from Gladstone refers to the number of staff that's required, then I would tell him that rather than reading from Hansard, take the opportunity of using his ticket and go up there on the railroad and get

(MR. BEARD cont'd)... into some of those communities and find out how many people are going to be necessary to service them, particularly at first. It's going to take the staff - it's going to take some - more than one or two staffs to look after these places.

I think that Bill No. 111 will provide the tools that many of these small communities require to get up off the floor and to help themselves. Certainly the Administrator must have the authority of going into these little communities and deciding how he can help them and how they can help themselves; and if they have a program that they want to introduce then he has to have the authority to go in there and say I can help you with this. He will have to sit there and assess just how much these people are able to help themselves. You must consider that in many cases these small communities require assistance but they may only have two or three business people in that community. Their taxation is almost nil and if they did raise this money for the projects through the taxes then it would revert back to costs of products which are already high enough in the community anyway -- it would go back to the person that was buying the groceries, and these are the staples of life. Or, the product that he brings in to trade with whether it's fur or whether it's fish.

Also I think we should keep in mind that unfortunately, as it has grown in the past, most of these communities are populated by people who do not pay land tax. You've got to face the facts. They're squatters in many cases. They live there. This is their home, their father's home. They had no services many years ago so of course there was no tax. Today, there's been a growth, there's been a desire for different types of services, but there's really no program I don't think that you could conceive at this time in which you could tax these very people that need the services so badly. If we're looking for poverty areas I suppose that's one of the first places we're going to find them, but really these people cannot pay any set amount for taxes the way we have grown up and in southern Manitoba to expect to pay. So it seems that - as I seem to think of it, that the administrator would have the authority to go in and say well, here if you want to produce so many dollars we'll put up the rest and build this road or put a grade in or culvert or help you with a community hall or projector, fix up a dock, fix up paths, help them stake out an area to tie up their dogs. Many of these small little problems that require money to do them. If we can train these people to accept some of the financial responsibility themselves, whether its 5 percent of 10 percent, then they've at least been able to contribute toward helping themselves.

While I don't pretend to stand up here to lecture the Assembly this afternoon on my philosophies of Indian people, working with them, I do feel that perhaps we should take into consideration that in many cases most of the communities that we're talking about are Indian or Metis and when this is the case we've got to take a separate view, and I think the very idea that a commissioner is being set up for northern Manitoba, accept the fact that this is extenuating circumstances, that you have got to look at it at a broader viewpoint than giving away the resources of northern Manitoba, because no man in a sane mind would want to do this. And I certainly wouldn't be supporting a bill like this if I thought this is what would happen or could happen, because certainly whatever this commissioner does he is responsible not only to the Cabinet but to this Assembly. And when you are dealing with these small communities how are you going to outline what assistance you are going to allow the commissioner to give these communities? When he has to have elbow room to work, we have to have faith in the appointment of the right people to do the right job; and certainly if he doesn't then I'll be the first to complain about it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the one other point that I was going to make was the fact that the other day the government was condemned because roads were being put into these communities and that Monoca was going to be asked to pay 50 percent. These are public roads. These are opening up some of the communities for the first time. But we say no, no. We heard, this is subsidizing free enterprise. And I don't look at it that way. I say that here is an opportunity for the first time for a community to get out of its shell and get out of its isolation and be able to communicate with the rest of Manitoba. And by golly if we can get free enterprise to pick up the tab for half of the road costs, then I say go to it - go to it. This is what has happened in many of these small communities and I think that for the first time that you will find a co-operation between government as a whole, people in northern Manitoba who have never been able to get at government for the demand such as they are in the south, and also with industry who for the first time are going into the north to take out some of the revenue and we can be sure that they will be leaving behind many benefits which will help northern Manitoba get off the floor.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Madam Speaker, I wonder if my honourable friend would permit a question and it is simply this: does he concur in the statements made by the Honourable Minister

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd)... of Municipal Affairs in that there will be between 80 and 90 municipalities or districts or communities to serve; and does he agree that the population in them will vary between 12 and 80; and how many administrators does he think - because he is knowledgeable on the subject - it will require? I notice that he was speaking in the singular and talked about an administrator whereas the Honourable Minister refers to a director and several administrators and staffs for each.

MR. BEARD: I have no idea, Madam Speaker, how many of a staff it will require but I did warn the members that they would require quite a few, because this will take in an area of not only half of Manitoba, which I always feel Churchill constituency is, but it will probably be three-quarters of Manitoba; so I think that you should keep this in mind because these communities are widespread and some of them will be many hundreds of miles apart.

MR. FROESE: Madam Speaker, I wish to say a few words in connection with this Bill. On the day that this Bill is passed I think we should have a coronation here in Manitoba because we're going to have a King of northern Manitoba. The commissioner in my opinion, will have more powers than the First Minister of this Province -- (Interjection) -- Pardon? He will certainly have wide powers. He will certainly have power to impose taxes, he will have power to exempt taxes, he has a whole list of powers listed under the sections of this bill. It says here "the commissioner has in respect of the northern area the all powers, rights, privileges and duties including the power to make bylaws that a municipality has within its boundaries." Then they go on, and list the various powers. He has power to purchase, lease and expropriate and otherwise. This also means I suppose confiscate if necessary. This is also contained in more than one of the sections. And then he has a wide range over the various facilities that he is supposed to care for and the Honourable Member for Churchill mentioned I think medical needs, looking after medical needs, and I don't find them listed here though. So this is probably an extra one that he is also in charge with. I know there is a covering clause here that would take care of anything that's left out I imagine.

There's also provision here for setting up committees in some of the communities where the commissioner feels it desirable; it's not mandatory, he need not put up a committee in any of them. I feel that there should be a certain section that if we have communities that are large enough to warrant a committee, that there should be a committee set up, it should be made mandatory. Then he has power to pay them or not at his pleasure and if there's someone on the committee that probably is not too well liked well, he just need not pay them and off they go.

So that in my opinion, this Bill is really setting up a dictatorship for the north and the commissioner certainly has very wide powers. Well, as already stated apparently there has been no covering legislation on the books at the present time and if that is the case certainly we should have legislation of some kind for the northern area of this province. However, it seems to me that the powers in this bill are really very wide and I think in some cases excessive. But if we have the right man for the position I suppose the people in the north should certainly get more attention now than they've ever received in the past. At least the provision is there and that he can spend the money.

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q.C. (St. John's): Madam Speaker, I have just a few comments to make. I must say that the Honourable Member for Churchill has been very persuasive -- and not that I think that we needed persuading that it is important to provide further services to the far north -- he has been persuasive though in building the case. I must admit he has also been persuasive in indicating a tremendous lack of communication in the past - and I'm not going past the last eight years, I'm thinking within the last eight years.

Apparently there has been so much red tape involved in getting to the government from these settlements in the far north that I think he said it takes months and sometimes years for them to get through to the Cabinet, and he indicated that this Bill would clear away all the red tape. I, not knowing too well the localities of the various members of this House, it suddenly occurred to me with some surprise that apparently there are a couple of Cabinet Ministers and a couple of government back-benchers who represent much of that area, and certainly the honourable member has convinced me that in the last eight years there has been this trouble of communication and this red tape, and certainly if this Act, as he says, does nothing more than brush aside this problem of communication it would be a very good measure. As is indicated there will apparently be about four or five administrators and clerical staff to look after this area. One for every 20 communities, is what the Honourable Minister indicated, and I guess maybe that will be necessary. I certainly believe that the Honourable Member for Churchill coming from that area must know the problem of communication and the need for this type of brushing

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd)... away of the red tape, the problems of the last eight years of communication.

I was also interested in hearing his comments about seeing ambulances in the City of Winnipeg and thinking of the problems that have occurred in the far north in similar matters. I wonder if we would care to check the record that no doubt appears in Votes and Proceedings as to how this government voted on the question of air ambulances which I believe the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks has presented on more than one occasion. Air ambulance of course, would have to do with the far north, and the very problem which the honourable member took for an example is one which this Party has been bringing to this House for some period of time, and I have yet to hear of air ambulances as being accepted by the government dealing with the problem.

Madam Speaker, I don't intend for a moment to repeat what my Honourable Leader had to say. He was talking about cheques and balances and he was talking about certain controls, and I must say that it has been a very difficult adjustment for me, coming as I did from municipal life, to adjust to the fact that this province is run in such a manner that there is no statutory need to report so many of the actions of the Cabinet. We have discovered that there is no responsibility placed on Ministers to actually give a written report as you will recall the discussions -- we had the Honourable the Attorney-General who said he thinks that there's too many reports being presented -- so we're not even sure that this Commissioner of Northern Affairs will give us a written report; a statistical report; a report as to progress; and it therefore is so unlike the operations of a municipal council which holds meetings in open; which has records and bylaws and minutes which are available to the public, to see what is being done, and the points my Leader made of course were along those lines.

The other point that my Leader made, and I didn't see the Honourable Minister for Industry and Commerce rise to the occasion, was to point out to the Honourable Minister that certain questions had been asked of him which he did not have time to deal with, and when he did later have time he did not deal with them again, and I share with him the responsibility for his overlooking it, because he asked what questions had been asked because he hadn't recorded them all, and I only reminded him of one, so he dealt with that one in his own fashion. But my Honourable Leader did, in speaking of this, refer to the fact that there have been variations made in connection with stumpage charges, fire protection and roads, and he asked whether the Commissioner of Northern Affairs would see to it that this type of deal which is made as between various people or groups, would be made on a preferential basis, or would there be incentives negotiated individually, or would there be certain principles and policies laid down. This I think was a proper occasion for the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce to rise up and answer the questions which were asked of him yesterday, and that is, is there a difference in the stumpage charges as between the example being Monoca and the others, as reported in the Order in the Return to the order which was requested? Is there going to be relief given for fire protection on the square mile basis as others are paying it? Is there going to be something about roads?

Now the report that we received in that Order for Return was that other people who have the rights to deal with lumber and pulp are building their own roads; as a matter of fact, I think it's the Manitoba Pulp which is building roads for the use of others. Now that's one type of arrangement, and the Honourable Member for Churchill is so pleased of the fact that now he's reversed it. Now the government has succeeded in getting Monoca to participate in half the cost of roads which he thinks are being built for the benefit of these communities. Now I don't know if that's really so. I'm not sure that the government is going to tell the Monoca Company where to build roads, and whether they're going to be built from community to community. I am rather under the impression that the roads are going to be built to enable the movement of the material, of the pulp and the wood that is cut, to the pulpmill; and therefore, this enthusiasm for the government's method of being able to make such deals is one which I don't quite understand. I am sure that the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce, who is of course, or who I assume is aware of this, would be able to explain how governments and how ministers look on the development of the North, and how it is likely that the Commissioner of Northern Affairs would look at it, seeing as he does now the fact that black spruce pulpwood, the stumpage prices vary now from \$1.50 to \$3.00, whereas another company has been given a concession at 37 1/2 cents rising to 75 cents; seeing as he does now that winter roads are provided by timber operators at their own expense and that the Manitoba Paper Company builds a better road available to use for others.

Has the Honourable Member for Churchill seen this Order for Return which was just filed?

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd)... Possibly he should look at it and point out that pulpwood and timber berth holders pay a flat rate of \$12.80 per square mile for fireguarding. Will the Honourable Commissioner for Northern Affairs make these preferential deals and will he then be bound to report them to the Legislature, to whom he is of course supposed to be responsible, but how will he be able to report them if the practice continues as in the past?

So I really rose to invite the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce to deal with those questions which he overlooked answering and which I overlooked reminding him about.

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Industry & Commerce) (Fort Rouge): Madam Speaker, I should be glad to make what contribution I can. The matter of stumpage of course is a matter for the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, and I do know that the situation in which the present cutters in the Northern area are a matter of present concern to him. He has it under the most active consideration. I am unable to tell you at this stage, and I think he would be unable to tell you at this stage what the final outcome will be. Nevertheless he does recognize that there are two rates of stumpage and that he proposed to deal with the matter within his own department. That I think is all that I'm able to say on that subject.

I think it has been thoroughly established that the present cutters in the North have their interests better looked after than any other agreement of a similar nature that I have been able to discover, and I've looked at most of them. In most cases, the present cutting rights when they run out are not renewed. This I'm sure is true of every agreement that I have seen. We have not only made provision for the continuation of the present cutting rights in the North by the private or small operators, but have made provision for them to increase their cutting rights to double what they are now; so far from losing them, they double them.

Then there is a further advantage to the present independent operator in the North as follows: He has virtually no market now for pulpwood. Virtually none. It's too far to ship pulpwood to the present markets for pulpwood. There will then be created a market for this product in the North. He will have the opportunity of supplying that market in one of two ways: either by sub-contract for the company, that is to say Churchill Forest Industries Limited, by sub-contract for them, or possibly as independent operator selling to that company as an independent company. This is where the impact of the stumpage rate comes in, and it's I think my honourable friend can see, a complicated matter. If he acts as a sub-contractor using some of the company equipment, I think the matter of stumpage rates doesn't arise. It would probably be cut on the company's stumpage rates under that arrangement.

If however, he continues for some reason, as he may prefer to do, to act as an independent operator selling his own wholly-owned product to the company, under some terms or other, there may be an effect, a considerable effect by reason of stumpage rates which will have to be considered. I think I can't say more, first of all because that's all I know about it, and I think that's as far as the arrangements have advanced. Now while I'm on my feet I don't think there are ... (Interjection)

MADAM SPEAKER: I think I've allowed a great deal of laxity here. I realize that the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce is answering a question, but actually I think members have strayed a long way from the principle of the Bill, the Commissioner of Northern Manitoba Affairs. In all probability I would like to see if members could confine their remarks to the Bill rather than the question of, that the Honourable Minister has been speaking -- (Interjection) --

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, does not the Bill give to the government or to a Minister of the government the right to enter into agreements in respect of the North? This is what we've been discussing as to the advisability or otherwise of giving to a Minister or to the government this power. I would suggest it is within the confines of the Act where he has this power. If he didn't have that power, Madam Speaker, then I would say that you are perfectly correct.

MADAM SPEAKER: I am still of the opinion that you are within your rights to discuss this, but I do not think that we should go into a particular company and ask questions and get answers. I still would ask members to stick to the principle rather than discussing a particular agency that happens to be interested in the North.

The Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce.

MR. EVANS: Thank you, Madam Speaker, I think within the limits of your ruling which I regard as a very proper one, that is all that I can offer at this time.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. SMERCHANSKI: Madam Speaker, I would like to add my few comments in reference to the Opposition in establishing a Commissioner of Northern Affairs, and in particular, Bill 111.

Madam Speaker, if one has travelled through what is known as Northern Manitoba -- and when you go into the settlements that are removed from the Hudson's Bay Railroad, and I would think that the Hudson's Bay Railroad would include those settlements that are within 20 or 30 miles of the railroad, such as the Split Lake settlement -- that in these so-called isolated settlements, let us just for a moment review the type of people we have in these settlements at the present time. In some of them we have the RCMP detachment. In others we have the Department of Indian Affairs. We have a Nursing Health Unit, which under our Department of Health, under Northern Health Services, we spend some \$170,000. We usually have the provincial government with its game inspection branch in connection with the trapping and administration of the traplines. We usually have some type of provincial government fish inspection branch -- usually accompanied by one of the federal fish inspectors. We also usually have some type of business which could well be the Hudson's Bay Trading Company or a private trading firm. We also have missionaries in these settlements; so that these so-called isolated settlements in our description and in our understanding are not so in the eyes and livelihood of the settlement that enjoys a very close community sort of life.

Now Madam Speaker, the very fact that we have to have these various agencies in these settlements is proof enough why we don't need a commissioner of northern affairs and why we don't need any administrators in these settlements. Completely uncalled for. And when we speak of communications in the north, Madam Speaker, two years ago I outlined in quite close detail the type of communication that the Manitoba Telephone System had in these areas; and usually this type of ground communication is augmented by the Manitoba Air Service and by all other private flying airplanes in the area who invariably are tied in on the crystal frequency of the Manitoba Telephone System so that at any one time the private aircraft operator who is flying will contact the station at The Pas or Gimli on the every half hour and on every hour, and in this way there is a constant source of communication in the area. And if work is being undertaken in any isolated part of this area and away from the settlement, then invariably you provide yourself with a portable telephone receiver communication, such as a diamond drilling proposition or mining development camp, and you are in constant touch with the radio station at The Pas and at Gimli. When I hear stories of isolation, Madam Speaker, the only type of isolation that exists in the north is when you are removed from the settlement. I wonder how many of this House have had to put up with expecting an airplane to come to a certain isolated lake and pick you up on a prearranged date and then find that that airplane is some three or four days late and on the second and third day you would swear that you hear an aircraft flying and approaching your tent almost every minute of the hour.

However, one good point about this type of isolation, Madam Speaker, is that you have a radio on which you can make contact with the outside world and that piece of equipment is of uncountable value. So that in the event of any misfortune or an accident in any part of this so-called isolated area there is sufficient communication as it exists today to take care of the needs of this area. This has been established for over the last 26 years and it's a properly functioning means of communication.

Madam Speaker, what will this commissioner do over and above what is being done in these settlements at the present time? Especially in small communities. Let us take for instance the community of God's Lake or Island Lake. We have communication and contact with the RCMP Station at Norway House. We have constant communication with the Hudson's Bay Fur Trade in the Winnipeg office with the radio station in Island Lake. We have constant communication with the Manitoba Air Service at Lac du Bonnet. We have the Department of Indian Affairs that is in constant communication with all other isolated settlements of the north, such as Island Lake is in constant touch with Red Sucker Lake, Sandy Lake, God's Lake, God's Narrows, and it is on this type of basis, Madam Speaker, that although the distances are far, although the distance between these areas is completely isolated and nobody lives in this area of 60 or 80 or 90 miles, but that radio is a constant contact with the other settlements, and what will a commissioner be able to add more than is being done in these communities at the present time? What will the administrator for instance, another administrator in the settlement of Island Lake -- what will he contribute that is not being done at the present time in Island Lake? And I only use Island Lake as an example. The other communities Madam Speaker, along the Hudson Bay Railroad they have continual contact with the people in this area by virtue of the regular freight and passenger service that goes between The Pas and Churchill.

(MR. SMERCHANSKI cont'd)...

Now, Madam Speaker, when it comes to a matter of services in terms of water and sewer to some of these settlements you know this is a problem that can be resolved very expeditiously and it is not like the problem we face in the southern part of the province. Most of these communities are located on the shoreline of what one might consider an ideal lake country and you invariably have enough elevation between the lake and the shoreline and immediately back of the shoreline that you have excellent natural draining conditions, so that water and sewer in these isolated areas is not a problem as we know it in the southern part.

Now, in addition I would like to find out what this commissioner will do. If one is established, he will have to deal with the various departments in the same manner that any one settlement of the north today can readily do with the various departments of this government. Is there a suggestion that the various departments and levels of the government are not available or are unable to be contacted properly to assist these communities if a report comes forward from these communities for some sort of assistance?

I will use the settlement of Island Lake as a further illustration. In this settlement we have sawmill operations, we have the building of houses carried on under the sponsorship of the federal department of Indian Affairs. The settlement of Island Lake is a very complete unit. It's a very functional unit and the only thing that it requires is some sort of industry to encourage that local settlement. Now a commissioner of northern affairs, Madam Speaker, would not be in a position to do this because he would have to go through the Department of Industry and Commerce which is set up to look after conditions of this type. So that this commissioner would be duplicating the efforts of the various departments in this government as they are established at the present time. Madam Speaker, when we mention the development of the north and to appoint a commissioner of northern Manitoba; and when we are considering that there is roughly one-half of the territory of the Province of Manitoba that is not available to us by road or railroad, then it means that this commissioner of northern affairs will have to establish many administrators in order to cover this territory at least once a year. And if he does nothing more than travel the full year, this is about as much as he can do to cover the area of northern Manitoba.

No, Madam Speaker, what has been represented by the government of the day is in itself sufficient evidence, in itself sufficient fact, as to the reasons why not to have a commissioner of northern Manitoba. And for this reason I feel that it is completely unnecessary to have a commissioner of northern affairs, because all you're going to create is more paper work, more positions for administrators - and quite frankly ask yourself what function will they perform? But they will have to be paid out of the tax revenues of the Province of Manitoba, Madam Speaker, and this will mean a higher cost of government, a higher cost of administration and this will have to come out of the taxpayers of Manitoba; and with a population of one million we're overtaxed as it is.

MR. BEARD: Would the honourable member permit a question, Madam Speaker?

MR. SMERCHANSKI: Certainly.

MR. BEARD: Did I understand you right to say that there would be no commissioner of northern affairs required for Manitoba, that constant source of communication every half hour or hour of the day in all communities, there is sufficient means of communication for northern Manitoba and that water and sewer is not a problem in the north as it is in the southern community?

MR. SMERCHANSKI: Madam Speaker, all I can answer is this. Is the honourable member suggesting that Manitoba Telephone System does not have a proper system of communication in the north as outlined by the Minister of Utilities? There is an excellent system of telephone communication in the north. Secondly, when I'm referring to half hour and one hour intervals, I am referring to when you are in flight in any aircraft in this area it is customary that the radio station at The Pas and Gimli reserve on the hour and on the half hour the ability to contact this station at all times and to have that channel clear from other communication that might be going on in the area.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the...

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Emerson, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. JOHNSON presented Bill No. 16, an Act to Amend the Public Schools Act (1) for second reading.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. JOHNSON: Madam Speaker, in speaking to the principle of this Bill, it is divided into many sections as you see. Generally I would like to - the important provisions that are contained in the Bill I think are measures of the widest significance to all of us in the House and to the people of Manitoba.

Many of the provisions here are the result of the activity in the department over the past year. I have indicated during estimates and other debates that we had a conference during the year to which we invited wide representation to look at the vocational, the method by which vocational high school opportunities might be offered to the boys and girls of the province, and provision is made in this Bill for the setting up of a - referral rather of this matter to a Boundaries Commission who would be asked to group divisions together into regions for the purpose of - and to recommend sites for the location of regional vocational high schools.

Major sections deal here with the result of studies conducted by officials of the department over the past year or two, and I'd like to give the Committee this background briefly, namely that certain divisions in the province and larger districts have discussed with us their boundaries. They felt after seven years the divisional system - there has been no provision in the Act to permit any alteration in division boundaries and so on, and while we believe the divisional system has been highly successful in the large increase in numbers of boys and girls going to our high schools under this system, that we wondered whether in isolated instances there was justification for altering certain boundaries in the light of the period of time that has past since they were first born.

Our studies revealed that one of these large districts for example was most anxious to give up its fiscal control to the division in which it was located. In another instance a large district wanted to form a single district division. We've been reluctant to tamper with divisional boundaries because they have served an excellent purpose; they have offered equality of educational opportunity over wide areas; but on the other hand we don't want to be inflexible, we feel there has to be some opportunity to review this if possible, and in this Bill provision is made for the Minister to refer such a matter to a Boundaries Commission. There are amendments here dealing with the provision of a much wider exchange of educational services amongst districts and divisions than has heretofore been the case. Also authority for divisions and districts to enter into agreements for the provision of such services. For instance, various arrangements provide for legalizing for example of arrangements between say, the Department of Indian Affairs and a particular division, and wherever it involves a government agency, federal or other government agency, it has to be approved by the Minister. This is to make sure that we know just what type of arrangements may be made; and also it would provide for school divisions to make arrangements between themselves for the provision of a certain service of individual arrangement.

Legislation is here placing the responsibility for the assumption of educational services for the trainable and educable retarded under division boards and makes it possible for a division to arrange for a district within its division to arrange such service for it, but payments will be made to the divisions and areas and provides for regulations thereto. In that amendment you will see districts mentioned. This would refer for example to the School District of Churchill which is not in any division, sort of by itself, and in that district payments could be made to that district for the provision of capital and current operating grants towards the operation of trainable and educable retarded facilities.

A very important section in this Act provides for the methods by which we may attain unified fiscal and policy authority in local school organizations. For example, in this Bill provision is made for the transfer of districts under the official trustee to divisional boards; also referring all schools that have been closed for two or more years to a board of reference, and if not dissolved by that board then transferred to the division. It also permits individual districts to opt out on the petition of the board or 20 percent of the resident electors to the Minister who would refer it to the board of reference. There'd be a public hearing and award and provision is made for an appeal. It also has a provision that when 50 percent of the districts within a divisional boundary representing 50 percent of the pupils under the board are under this, by individual districts opting in and official trustee districts and closed districts, a referendum shall be held.

The important method though - this is just one other method of achieving - the most important measure here is the other method of wherever a petition of 20 percent of the resident electors of a division petition a Minister he may call a referendum for a single district division,

(MR. JOHNSON cont'd)... or on the volition of the Minister. This is to provide for example in the case of one or two divisions who have indicated, whose elementary boards have indicated, for example, a unanimity in wishing to form their division, the Minister could call for a vote, and if the referendum carries there would be a single district division formed.

I might also inform the Committee that we have already designated a planning officer in the division of the Department of Education to work with the - I believe they have met with the Manitoba School Trustees Association and the Manitoba Teachers Society hopefully to in concert conduct the education campaign directing the benefits of a single district division concept to the people throughout the province. Already activity is under way. It may well be that certain divisions will be ready to hold votes in the not too distant future, depending on the indication we receive from them. In other cases we hope to carry forward a campaign aiming for single district divisions.

Then there are other important sections in the Bill providing that, where for example you didn't get a single district division formed and consolidations are occurring, there's provision in this Bill making it necessary for any consolidation to be referred to the Boundaries Commission before the Minister would approve same. For example, there may be 15 large consolidations referred to the Minister for approval. This could be forwarded to the Boundaries Commission to make certain that in any long range planning this consolidation is a logical one in the boundaries of the division in which it may occur.

Also the provision is made in this particular Bill for the pilot Interlake project which has been worked on in the past year where as I have indicated before the whole matter of the divisions within the designated area in the Interlake, I believe there are five altogether, we would refer the matter to the Boundaries Commission who would be asked to declare these existing - to look at both the boundaries, for example, to look at the sites for graded elementary schools and to name such sites, to look at divisional boundaries if necessary and to recommend the location of central high schools and to make a recommendation to the Minister as to the advisability of a single district division in that instance or possibly the formation of a series of consolidations. But in any event to rationalize elementary facilities and secondary facilities within these boundaries and make one or other recommendation to the Lieutenant-Government-in-Council who cannot alter but who can send back such a recommendation for further consideration. I think I've dealt with this previously.

There are other several minor amendments to the Act which probably could be dealt with in some detail if the Committee feels necessary, in Committee. Probably one of the more important ones is the provision in this Act for the - which I'll be submitting a slight amendment. It was thought that Section 3 in the Bill before the honourable members covered adequately the adult day school - a provision to permit divisions to conduct adult day classes. I'm told just yesterday that it was a little uncertain in this division and an amendment will be brought forth under another section here to make it clear that divisions may operate adult day classes.

Section 3 for example would provide that the department, in addition to what I mentioned previously, could make arrangements for any division to conduct basic upgrading classes within a division or that we could make any arrangements between the Federal-Provincial Governments and divisions for the provision of adult day services at both vocational or academic services.

There's minor amendments here permitting the payment of mileage to trustees in districts over 200 miles in area. There is correcting something that wasn't in the Act before covering the payment of travelling expenses to trustees at national conventions and certain other matters of a smaller nature which I would hope to explain or could answer questions on to the honourable members.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I would like to ask some specific questions of the Minister if I might without closing the debate. Is that possible? - on some specific points? I'm interested for example on the Bill. Is there a provision here to permit for the enlargement of the numbers of trustees on a division board? I must confess I haven't found one. I have found it with regard to the Interlake area, that is where under 313 (c), but this seems to me to apply specifically to 313 (c). That was one question. The other one was with regard to Section (2), Subsection (a). Is it the intention definitely to abolish the office of the Official Trustee and transfer of this? This simply says "may".

MR. EVANS: Madam Speaker, it is now 5:30. Before dealing with a motion to adjourn, did I understand other honourable members want to speak on this motion?

MR. TANCHAK: Madam Speaker...

MR. EVANS: I wonder if my honourable friend would take an adjournment of this motion now.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable the Member for Emerson. It is now 5:30. I would ask for an adjournment motion please.

MR. TANCHAK: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. George, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. EVANS: Madam Speaker, if we adjourn the House now, we'll go to the head of the Order Paper again this evening I presume, that is to the second readings. It would be my proposal to call these second readings again when we meet tonight. We've passed two motions this afternoon, and I would hope that honourable members would be prepared to speak at the earliest opportunity, if possible tonight. Thank you for your indulgence, Madam Speaker. I move now, seconded by the Honourable the Attorney-General, that the House do now adjourn.

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