

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Tuesday, May 14, 1968

MR. SPEAKER: I'd like to make a short announcement regarding the problem, with regard to help that I mentioned last evening. It is my privilege to inform the House that we have with us today a page of last year, in the person of Wayne Arnason, who has promised me efficiency plus for the balance of the session.

Presenting Petitions.

The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): To the Honourable the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba in the Legislature assembled, a petition of the undersigned: Mrs. Rose-Marie Marguerite Prefontaine, Lot 7, Main Street, Headingley, Manitoba; Dr. C. Burton Stewart, River Road, Headingley, Manitoba; Mr. Vincent Fischer, Manitoba Avenue, Headingley, Manitoba and others. The residents of Headingley, West Assiniboia and West Charleswood do hereby protest the toll charge for telephone calls to the City of Winnipeg. Whereas this is an urban community and we are fully dependent upon the services of the Metro area for our own municipal offices, the police, fire department, hospitals, schools and so on, and these are outside our exchange. As the residents have no listing in the Winnipeg directory necessary communications from schools, hospitals and stores are impeded; And Whereas the majority of residents are employed or have businesses in Winnipeg, there's no doubt but that Headingley is increasingly part of the Metro Winnipeg area both socially and economically. Indeed we pay Metro taxes. And whereas charges of 15 cents minimum per call with an additional five cents per minute after the first three impose a financial burden on many residents. In addition they hinder necessary social and business contacts; and Whereas we understand that considerable sums of money will be expended to install equipment within the Headingley Exchange area which will tie this urban area . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I'm merely calling on the members for silence.

MR. PATRICK: Whereas we understand that considerable sums of money will be expended to install equipment within the Headingley Exchange area which will tie this urban area into a rural system for many years to come, this is clearly a waste of money and will require further expense to correct planning once it becomes obvious even to the Manitoba Telephone System that Headingley is in fact part of Metro Winnipeg; and Whereas future development of Headingley, whether residential, commercial or industrial will be hindered by the inadequate communication system; and Whereas Headingley residents pay Metro Winnipeg taxes; and Whereas residents pay taxes to both Charleswood and Assiniboia and therefore we can no longer be classed as rural area; and Whereas the Telephone System is presently extended to within approximately one mile east of Headingley, we feel that service must be extended to include the concentrated group of 170 families; and Whereas a small percentage of residents in Headingley have city telephones and long distance calls are therefore necessary even between residents of Headingley; Therefore Be It Resolved that long distance tolls or charges between Headingley and Winnipeg now paid by residents of Headingley, be removed. Wherefore your petitioner humbly prays that your Honourable House may be pleased to pass the petition for the purpose mentioned and as in duty bound, your Petitioner will ever pray.

MR. SPEAKER: Reading and Receiving Petitions.

Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees

Notices of Motion

Introduction of Bills.

Before the Orders of the Day I would like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery where we have 108 students of Grade 7 standing from the River Heights School. These students are under the direction of Mrs. Cowan, Miss Teskey and Miss Schaefer. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce.

We also have with us today 14 students from the John Henderson School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Toews. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Kildonan.

On behalf of all the honourable members of the Legislative Assembly I welcome you all here today.

Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for St. John's.

MR. SAUL M. CHERNIACK, Q. C. (St. John's): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd.) Day, if I may address a question to the Honourable the First Minister. I put in an Order for Return which was accepted on April 10th requesting for information regarding a report which has been in the hands of government for some months, entitled "Transition in the North" . I'm wondering just when we could receive that. I believe we have the assurance it will be before the session ends.

HON. WALTER WEIR (Premier)(Minnedosa): Mr. Speaker, I expect to table the order within the next few days.

MR. CHERNIACK: If I may, Mr. Speaker, may I also address a question to the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce. On April 1st I put in an Order for Return requesting for a breakdown of certain information contained in the financial statement of the Manitoba Development Fund. I'm wondering whether that can't be obtained in sufficient time during this session.

HON. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q. C. (Minister of Industry & Commerce)(River Heights): Mr. Speaker, I would hope so.

MR. CHERNIACK: I didn't hear the answer, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I will repeat my answer. I would hope so.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party)(Radisson): So would we.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, then if I may, just one supplementary question. Is the Honourable Minister aware that the time is running our pretty rapidly?

MR. SPIVAK: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

MR. SAMUEL USKIW (Brokenhead): Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask a question of the Honourable Minister of Agriculture. On March 15th I put in an Order for Return asking for copies of communications between his department and the Vegetable Inquiry Commission and other members of his department. I to date have not received the Order. I was wondering when we might be getting it.

MR. HARRY J. ENNS (Minister of Agriculture and Conservation) (Rockwood-Iberville): Mr. Speaker, I recall Order for Return having to do with the correspondence between the Vegetable Marketing Commission and government. I'm not really aware of what else the Honourable Member for Brokenhead is asking for.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, the Order for Return, which was provided to the Members of the House was Order No. 79, which was asked for a year ago, in other words, during the last session. I did not get the Order for Return which I asked for during this session. Order No. 12.

MR. ENNS: I would be very happy to look into that, Mr. Speaker, and take it under advisement.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Honourable First Minister and has to do with an Order for Return No. 29, which was accepted by the House on April 1st with respect to Cabinet Ministers' travels outside the province. I've asked this question now twice, I believe. Can I assume that this Order will be tabled during this session?

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, I answered that question the other day and I would hope that the same answer would apply.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. Since he is interested in promoting business in Manitoba I wonder whether he would speak to the officials of the Liberal Party who apparently have placed an order for buttons in Minneapolis and not in Winnipeg.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. I wonder if the Honourable gentleman would put this question. I'd like to hear it.

MR. DOERN: Fine. I'll repeat it then. I wonder if the Minister would consider speaking to the officials of the Liberal Party who apparently have placed an order for election buttons in Minneapolis and not in Winnipeg which has dismayed some of the local Winnipeg button makers.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. PHILIP PETURSSON (Wellington): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Highways. Some time back I asked for an Order for Return

(MR. PETURSSON cont'd.) giving information about winter roads in the northern part of the province, North of the CNR railroad going up to Churchill. Would there be any possibility of getting some information on that within a reasonable time? Before we close?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, this Order for Return is being worked on. I think the honourable member appreciates that northern roads, that is the winter roads that he also included in his request, is rather difficult to ascertain. They are built . . . I'm trying to indicate, Mr. Speaker, that it is a bit of work involved in making a complete and detailed reply to the Order.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the Attorney-General.

HON. STERLING R. LYON Q. C. (Attorney-General)(Fort Garry): I rise on a point of order affecting the previous proceeding of the House today when the Honourable the Member for Assiniboia read a petition to the House before it was presented to the Clerk and I was wondering if Your Honour would care to take under advisement the situation in this regard because I think in so doing he's created a precedent in that the rules call for the petition to be presented by the member and then after it has been examined by the Clerk it is then read by the Clerk to the Chair. And I suggest that rather than let the occasion pass and have a precedent established by this that it might be advisable, Sir, if you would take that procedure under consideration because I certainly wouldn't want to see us slipping into a procedure whereby petitions, no matter how valid, could be read ad nauseam at great length into the records of the House before indeed they are deemed to be acceptable.

MR. SPEAKER: . . . his remarks have been noted. Orders of the Day. The Honourable the Provincial Secretary.

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN, Q.C. (Provincial Secretary)(Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, the Honourable the Member for Portage la Prairie asked a question concerning Manitoba Hydro discounts on summer cottage rates and I would like to give an answer to that question now. These are the terms and billing procedures for seasonal residential services, which of course means summer cottages. Services are available on the year round basis at a yearly energy rate commencing from October 1 of one year and terminating September 30 of the following year. In the billing procedure meters are read once each year during the latter half of September. Accounts are billed twice each year. The first billing covers the annual minimum charge for the service and is issued during the first half of May, seven months after the start of each annual service term commencing October 1st. The discount period for the first billing is scheduled from June 1 to June 15 contingent upon the date the accounts are mailed. The second or final bills for the year covers charges for energy used in excess of the power supplied for the minimum charges. Final bills are rendered during the first three weeks in November with the regular 10-day discount period allowed.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Attorney-General. On March 28 I asked for an Order for Return about the number of boys and girls in Vaughan Street and also the children's wards, and also about a month ago I had an Order for Return about expenditures on magazines and books in various penal institutions in the province. I wonder when I will receive a reply.

MR. LYON: I would hope shortly, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Portage.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Honourable the Minister of Utilities. I don't believe, Sir, your statement answered my question. My question was: Why is there a discount charged or a penalty applied for the usage of a service before the usage takes place?

MR. McLEAN: Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, if the honourable the member would read my answer in Hansard when he receives it I believe that the point was covered in that answer.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. EDWARD I. DOW (Turtle Mountain): Mr. Speaker, a little over a week ago I asked the Minister of Agriculture in regards to a policy on the Souris River Water Basin, the water supply being critical and wanting be known to them as to what policy might be set up to alleviate this?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, both our Water Control Department and PFRA are investigating the matter. I have yet to hear a further report from them.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps while I'm on my feet I may just draw to the attention of the members of the House by leave, Sir, a somewhat brighter fact of agriculture. It was interesting to

(MR. ENNS cont'd.) note - in the release of the latest DBS figures that Manitoba was the only province in Canada that enjoyed a net increase in farm incomes during the past year. I thought it was of note to mention in the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture. Has the Minister anything further to report on developments in connection with the Pembina River Basin Development. He mentioned some time ago that meetings were being scheduled with Ottawa and I would like to know whether any progress has been made.

MR. ENNS: No, Mr. Speaker, no further developments to report at this time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. GORDON W. BEARD (Churchill): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to report progress, Mr. Chairman. I'd like to table the copies of the questions that remained unanswered during the Public Accounts Committee that were requested by the Honourable Member for Lakeside, the Leader of the NDP and the Member for Rhineland, I believe.

MR. DOUGLAS CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, might I enquire in thanking the honourable member in what capacity he submits these reports?

MR. BEARD: As Chairman for the Public Accounts.

MR. CAMPBELL: Thank you very much.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition)(Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to either the Premier or the House Leader . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MOLGAT: In view of the fact that we're not likely to reach too many more estimates, and we may not therefore reach the Highways estimates for example, could we have an undertaking that the normal program for the Highways Department, the one that my honourable friend has previously presented to the House in mimeograph sheet form will be presented to us either before the Orders of the Day or on arriving at that item even though we don't have an opportunity of discussing it?

MR. ENNS: yes, I'm prepared to table the program in its usual format to the House, hopefully, during the debates on my estimates. If not then either before the Orders of the Day or on such other occasion as makes it possible.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Virден and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Lakeside in amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOUGLAS WATT (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on this resolution just briefly. I had intended when the resolution first appeared on the Order Paper, Mr. Speaker, to make a few remarks in respect of this resolution. I thought it was a good resolution. The longer the time has gone on the debate of this resolution the better I think it is in spite of the fact that it has been amended and amended and apparently a deliberate attempt on the part of the Opposition to stall it off and to wash it out to the point where there would be nothing left of it.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, I'm surprised because when the resolution appeared on the Order Paper I thought for sure that it would have the support of every member of the Legislature and particularly the farm members on both sides of the House. But unfortunately it has not received that treatment and for what reason I am not sure. We have been described on this side of the House, and I suppose particularly the Honourable Member for Virден, for being irresponsible or in effect irresponsible in bringing something that was completely impractical and probably impossible before this Legislative Assembly. And in effect, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that what the opposition members have been saying is that the farmers cannot and should not expect to have a pay day, and this I can't understand.

Mr. Speaker, if we think for a moment about the people, we'll say across in the Great West Life Building over here where hundreds of people work to a common end, if we consider the people out in Versatile or the International Harvester, or Eaton's or Hudson's Bay or any place throughout the province where people work to produce the commodities that our society needs, if such a time should occur when management should finally say to them, "You no longer will have a pay day. We'll give you a deposit on your labour when you deliver it and someday when we have sold the produce or the fruits from your labour, we'll pay you

(MR. WATT cont'd.) something." What a situation this would be. Mr. Speaker, I say the farmers in Manitoba, in Alberta and Saskatchewan are in exactly that position now and have been for some years. And let me say, Mr. Speaker, that in spite of the inference from the Honourable Member for Lakeside that we have in effect indicated our lack of confidence in the Wheat Board, that this is not right. For one, I have every confidence in the Canadian Wheat Board as a government agency, as a government appointed agency, to handle our produce, but I see nothing wrong, Mr. Speaker, with the resolution which simply in -- not in effect but actually requests that agency to consider a final pay day in respect to wheat for the farmers of Manitoba.

I have one objection to the resolution, Mr. Speaker, and when I said a few moments ago it had been my intention to speak on this resolution I had considered that I might amend it by simply striking out the words "Canadian Wheat Board" and replacing there, "The Government of Canada," because in my opinion it is the Government of Canada that are responsible for the direction and the actions of the Canadian Wheat Board. This does not appear to be the opinion of the Honourable Member for Lakeside and some other members opposite. It brings up to me an interesting point, Mr. Speaker -- and I as your Deputy Speaker should probably not attempt to deviate from the Rules of the House which says that we must speak directly to the item at hand. But you're a pretty tolerant fellow, Mr. Speaker. In fact you're almost as tolerant as I am as your Deputy Speaker and Chairman of the House and so -- and I say that I am not going to be deviating completely from the item at hand -- but I want to say this in respect to the responsibility of governments and government boards, commissions, agencies, Crown corporations or what have you, and I want to make a comparison here. The Honourable Member for Lakeside says that we should be dealing directly and bringing in for consultation the Canadian Wheat Board. Not too long ago, Mr. Speaker. . . .

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to correct that statement. It was Mr. Runciman and Mr. Parker that I suggested we bring in.

MR. WATT: I'm referring to a speech earlier in the debate on this particular resolution when the Member for Lakeside I believe supporting an amendment whereby the Wheat Board would be asked to come in and consult with the Committee on Agriculture before this resolution was proceeded with.

But I was going to say, Mr. Speaker, that in a former debate -- and I refer to the debate on the Budget Speech -- at that time the Leader of the Opposition, the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose, standing in his seat made the statement that the Government of Manitoba had increased taxes, directly increased taxes as a result of the announcement of the Manitoba Hydro Board's intended increase in hydro rates. Now if he is right in this then in the debate that the Honourable Member for Lakeside took part in, and completely out of order at that time as was the Member for Souris-Lansdowne, when the Member for Souris-Lansdowne said that at one time the Government of Canada had sold wheat and could do it again. And at that time the Member for Lakeside, speaking immediately after the Member for Souris-Lansdowne, said that this was not true, that the Government of Canada never at any time had sold wheat, that it had been The Canadian Wheat Board. Now they both can't be right. If it is true that the Government of Canada never sold wheat then it is not true that this government is increasing taxes through the Manitoba Hydro Commission. And I would just like either the Honourable Member for Lakeside or the Honourable Member the Leader of the Opposition to get up and one agree with the other or both agree to disagree. I'm not sure what they'll do.

Now if I have been out of order, Mr. Speaker, in that particular respect I Let us take a look for a few moments, Mr. Speaker, at the operation of the Wheat Board, and again I say that I have no fault to find with the operation of the Wheat Board in itself, but I say again, that there is no board, commission or agency that should not be prepared to accept requests from assemblies such as this -- the Government of Manitoba and the Opposition.

Operation of the Wheat Board -- and I say this more for members of the House who probably do not or probably do know what the operation of the Board is. I speak in respect of the Board's crop year. They operate from the first of August of a given year to and through the 31st day of July. Now as far as the actual operation of delivering grain is concerned, the quota system is set up and that is their crop year -- whether it be increased to six bushels or beyond about all that applies as far as the farmers is concerned is the fact of the quota system and the initial payment. Nothing wrong with this. I think the quota system is good. I think it has proven over the years that it feeds into the hands of the farmer and from there into the

(MR. WATT cont'd.) hands of the businessmen and into industry, into the general good of the people across the Dominion. I think it's a good idea. Some of my friends may not agree with me on the operation of the Wheat Board in this respect but I have always maintained that the Wheat Board handling a non-perishable commodity, sometimes difficult to sell commodity, is a good operation.

But let's have a look at the selling operation of the Board -- and I'm going to, Mr. Speaker, just give you an example of what has happened in many cases to farmers, and I'm using my own particular case now which is parallel with hundreds more. In 1966, I harvested a crop of wheat and through the years, the fall of 1966 and 1967, I delivered to the Wheat Board, but I could, as other farmers could and can, elect to sell that crop in whatever pool they wish, so in the summer, July of 1967, I delivered 1966 wheat to the Canadian Wheat Board through the Manitoba Pool Elevator Association, but I put that grain into the 1967-68 pool, that is I delivered it to the elevator prior to the 1st day of August; on the 1st day of August I sold to the '67-'68 pool. Now, the Canadian Wheat Board pool, which we are paid our annual payments when we get them, is based on the crop year. So the grain that I delivered in 1967 and grown in 1968 will be closed out with the '67-'68 crop year but will not be settled for until 1969, so that sometime, under the present system, in 1969 I will be finally paid for the 1966 crop.

Now, Mr. Speaker, under the present system -- and let us admit that wheat is not too easily sold, that is, good hard northern wheat that we grow in Canada, it's not too easily sold. And I really have no quarrel with the length of time that it has taken to market my wheat and finally pay me in order that I can pay those people that I owe money -- and they are all over! There is the fertilizer companies, there is the machine companies, there is the fuel dealers, I could go on and on; but we have to pay them. So 1966 wheat is settled for in 1969 and all that the Honourable Member for Virden is asking in his resolution is the fact that by 1969 that some way or another they should be able to find it possible to establish a date that on or before that date they can make us our final payment, in order that we can say to our creditors, to the people that we owe money to, if you can hang on until February 1st I hope to have something to pay you. But for some reason or other, the Opposition, the Liberals and the Socialists and the Member for Rhineland, are against this resolution. They want to stall this resolution off by bringing in the Manitoba Farm Union, the Grain Growers, the Manitoba Pool Elevator Association. Nothing wrong with these organizations, Mr. Speaker; but there is no less nothing wrong with the resolution. Why should it be stalled off? Why should we have to wait and discuss these things? When will the discussions end? Let me ask my honourable friends who will lead the discussion if we cannot go to the committee of agriculture with some agreement in this House what we want from the Canadian Wheat Board, who is going to say what we want? Is it going to be the Member from Lakeside? Is it going to be the Member for Brokenhead? Or is it going to the Minister of Agriculture? If it's going to be the Minister of Agriculture or the Member for Virden, they are going to say we want a fixed date, if it's possible; we're requesting it; we're asking you to look at it. Why don't we settle it now in the House then? But I have my doubts if we will. Because I think, Mr. Speaker, that no matter what happens, it will about floor me if the Opposition finally give in and say I guess we'll go along with it. Maybe if you fellows over there think the farmers should have a pay day, maybe they should, because by and large there's not many of them there that know whether there should be or whether there should not.

The Honourable Member for Lakeside has said it's not practical but he hasn't told us why. I can tell you why the Wheat Board up to this point have not set a date. When a farmer delivers his wheat at the end of the crop year, it's on the tail end of the sales, there's no question about that, and so the Wheat Board under the present system that they have now, of their Pool being cut off, not at the end of the crop year, but at the time that the last portion of the quotas that have been accepted by the Wheat Board are sold. Now I see nothing wrong, Mr. Speaker, with the cut-off being exactly at the end of the crop year. As far as I'm concerned, the Wheat Board has been operating for 20 years. They are permanent. I say 20 years off the top of my head, it's probably more than that. They are permanent. They will be there and it makes no difference to me whether the grain that I grow this year is sold in next year's pool or the next year after that for that matter; it makes no difference. Average it out over the years, there it is, so much money? We could gamble a little, not very much, but we can gamble the way it is now because we can as I said before 'elect' to deliver our

(MR. WATT cont'd.) grain in the crop year -- as an example '66-'67 -- but we can elect to have it sold in the pool year of '67-'68. Nothing wrong with this; no more than there would be anything wrong with the cut-off date for the pool being exactly the same as the crop delivery year.

Now I'm not saying that this is possible; but I am saying, Mr. Speaker, that we should pass this resolution in this House and it should be presented to the Wheat Board and to the Government of Canada who I say are responsible for the actions of the Canadian Wheat Board, and if the Wheat Board have good reasons, which has not been shown to me thus far, that it is not possible to have a pay day or a final day to settle for a given year's crop, then I say the Committee on Agriculture should meet and we should invite the Wheat Board to come and tell us why. I think we're pretty well all reasonable people. I'm sure that Mr. Parker is a reasonable man, that he would come in and in conjunction with the Wheat Board explain these things to us, or Mr. Runciman. But I would like to see some resolution in the hands of the committee in order that we would have something to ask them to come and consider.

I don't think there's much point in me saying anything further on this, Mr. Speaker, I say to honourable friends that all we're asking for here is that we request the Canadian Wheat Board to consider what appears to me to be a reasonable request.

MR. MOLGAT: I wonder if the honourable member would permit a question. He stated that he did not know a great deal about the Wheat Board, Mr. Speaker, and that he felt that we should hear at the Agriculture Committee stage from the Wheat Board, Mr. Parker and other people, to tell us why this couldn't be done. Isn't that exactly the amendment that he voted against -- he and all his friends?

MR. WATT: Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the amendment washes out the main motion.

MR. MOLGAT: Well, Mr. Speaker, does my honourable friend want to hear from the Wheat Board or does he not? -- because he voted against the amendment?

MR. WATT: I want to hear from the Wheat Board that they say that it is not practical to establish a date on or before the final payments will be made.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, wouldn't it be wise -- my honourable friend says he doesn't know if it's right or wrong -- to find out before voting whether it's right or wrong?

MR. SPEAKER: the question on the amendment? The honourable member for Brokenhead,

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks that debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Inkster and the proposed motion of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition in amendment thereto. The Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

HON. DONALD W. CRAIK (Minister of Mines and Natural Resources)(St. Vital): Mr. Speaker, I wanted to say a few words about this resolution and I'd like to say them as a member of the Legislature representing a suburb of the area which would be affected by the resolution if it were passed or by the amendment to the resolution. So what I have to say is primarily a private opinion, does not reflect government opinion but reflects what I think is in general the average opinion of the area in which I live and reflects to some extent I think the thoughts of some of the people in public life in the area in which I live.

The amendment which has been proposed to the resolution brought forward, the amendment brought forward by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, would ask the people at the earliest possible date -- I presume it's the earliest possible date, because the resolution calls for amalgamation I think at the earliest possible, and the Leader of the Opposition has said that we must get on with this immediately. This amendment would ask the people of the Greater Winnipeg Area to immediately go to the polls and vote on whether or not they wish to have total amalgamation within the area of Greater Winnipeg.

I would first of all like to say that I think there was some valid points made in the original motion that were in support of amalgamation made by the Honourable Member for Inkster, some points were made by the Honourable Member for Burrows and in the argument for the amendment I felt that the justification for a referendum was really very weak. Essentially what it amounted to was somebody with their finger in the political winds who had decided that now was the time to hop on the bandwagon, to go to the people, to get a voice of their opinion, not which would give an opinion on whether they wanted amalgamation but

(MR. CRAIK cont'd.) whether or not they were against Metro; because this is exactly what we would be voting on if we were to go to the people of Greater Winnipeg at this time. It is, Mr. Speaker, I think, completely irresponsible on the part of a senior government to recommend to another level of government something which they themselves have not adequately studied or researched or been able to take advice on and have made their judgment on what appears to be the basis of little more than a judgment of the political climate, the number of hot line telephone calls or the number of letters which one gets in the mail. And in this connection I would like to present some counter evidence to that presented by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition who quoted his experience on a hot line program and quoted the amount of mail which he had received on this topic since he came out earlier this year in favor of total amalgamation. I would like to point out that the J. C. group of three of the suburbs of Winnipeg have gone to the trouble to ask what they feel might be representative portions of the population, or at least have requested opinions on this, and the answers which they have got back have in the majority been against amalgamation at this time. So I would say that public opinion may or may not be for amalgamation. Most of that which is for amalgamation is really an anti-Metro vote which has been brought about, I would contend, to a large extent more by the political climate in Greater Winnipeg than by the actual facts of the operation of Metro or the City in which people now live.

I would like to say further, Mr. Speaker, that I'm not against amalgamation. What I'm trying to say is that there is a great lack or dearth of evidence right now upon which anybody can make a logical decision and certainly if we as MLAs in this Legislature haven't got the information upon which we can make decision, because this is part of our life, can we expect people who do not devote that much time to it to have even that much, which is not enough. We're really by this resolution and by the amendment saying, "you decide now whether or not you want total amalgamation."

Now to get down to the facts of the matter, why do you want amalgamation? I think that the points that have been made by the Honourable Member for Inkster and others have said essentially that we would get a better level of service. They were very careful to say that it did not necessarily mean lower cost. I think that this is a fair assessment of the sort of average statements which we were getting and I think that really the statement that we would not necessarily get a lower cost is probably the understatement of the year, because all the evidence which has been tabulated indicates that not only do costs go higher with amalgamation but they rise steeply and until we get proof otherwise to ask the people to go to amalgamation -- when the Leader of the Opposition says, we want amalgamation, he doesn't say in the same breath, we want more taxes, because that is exactly what he may be saying but he's very careful to stick handle around this particular aspect of it.

Now I think that there is some evidence to back up the possibility that we may be inviting ourselves to a dinner of higher taxes, municipal taxes, by going to total amalgamation. For two reasons I'd like to -- or by two methods I'd like to back it up. First of all, there has been a fairly extensive study and I imagine there's maybe been many studies done. One of the ones that comes to mind is one that was done in Halifax which had the Dalhousie University do a fairly extensive study of the cost of municipal services in various sized communities and having studied the Canada-wide scene, their conclusion, in a nutshell, that the optimum-sized city in terms of adequate services to satisfy average people, etcetera, to provide a community which offers not only normal municipal services but the social requirements of people, turns out to be the size of 40 to 60 thousand in population. There is no argument presented, in this publication at least, which would indicate that there's any great gains to be made by taking a city the size of Winnipeg or Vancouver made up of a number of municipalities or suburban cities and amalgamating them into the one large unit. As a matter of fact all the evidence is that the costs essentially will rise and rise steeply. The reason for this is that when you amalgamate a group of cities into one, you never level down to the lower or even the average common denominator. The cost in all the suburbs goes up to the cost of the highest suburb or very nearly to it. Not only that, the services which are offered in the more affluent municipalities or cities tend to spill over into the others, and the first thing that you find yourself with is a severely increased cost.

Now to bear this out, I would like to quote a statement made by the Chairman of the municipality of Metropolitan Toronto who went through the exercise of amalgamating their police force -- and police and fire were two of the services which the Honourable Member for

(MR. CRAIK cont'd.) Inkster had suggested should be included, were important in amalgamation - and he says: "The police forces in Metropolitan Toronto were not an original thought in Metro. Their amalgamation was brought about some years later. The story to be learned is simply this: police costs in Metropolitan Toronto have increased and increased sharply. I don't think anyone who proposes a complete unification of any service could successfully prove his point by saying that unification and centralization will decrease costs. The facts are to the contrary. Police costs have soared and I think justifiably so. The interesting point is perhaps why they have soared." And he goes on and presents his case here which gives some justification for it. "On a simple basis it is this: Thirteen forces were brought in to one. Wage rates immediately had to be brought to the level of the highest, an action that is bound to follow in any unification of two or more service forces. Wage rates did go up, pensions went up, costs of operation, whether it be police or any other type of service, will always rise to the level of the highest unit being absorbed."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I'm not - the basic point I'm trying to make is that first of all amalgamation may be a good thing; all I'm saying is that the people are not aware in Greater Winnipeg that they may be in for considerably increased taxes. We don't know yet whether or not the amalgamation will be a good thing. We are saying - the proponents of it say that we'll get a better level of services, but I can't honestly say that in the area in which I live that there's been any great cry for better services in terms of police or fire protection, or the other services that may be offered by a municipality. I think that there is not the case to be made here for better municipal services as the case was for better educational services, which were undertaken and have been undertaken and have been improved greatly over the past few years. There is not an analogous case between the situation in education and the situation in municipal services, and we know that education costs. The improvements in our educational system have cost us money. We are well aware of it and many people are disturbed about it, but I think the majority of the people are still willing to have paid the price for the improved educational system. But the hue and cry is not there for the improvement in municipal services that I can detect, at least in the area in which I live.

The only other, I think, major consideration that one can take into account in considering amalgamation is whether or not it will reduce costs. If it reduced costs and reduced them considerably, we would have a strong case for amalgamation. The evidence which I've seen, some of which I've given to you today, I think indicates that there's a good chance that the costs would likely go up rather than go down. I think once you've eliminated those two points you really come back down to the point. Do we ask individual communities in the cities or the suburbs in which we live, would we feel better on a social basis living in one large city? Do you feel that by living in a suburb which is designated by a more efficient designation, 54th and 46th Avenue - something like this - is more better psychologically for the housewife in January who is living in what she now thinks is sunny St. James or is it better to stay with what we have where the housewife maybe feels some sort of local pride in the fact that she lives in the Cathedral City of St. Boniface, in sunny St. James, or any other particular location where some community pride has been built up through the local level of politics, through the community clubs, and through their own activities in their smaller sphere of operation.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, all I would like to say is that with the evidence which we have to ask an unsuspecting public to pass judgment at this time on amalgamation would not be responsible legislation on our part and would impose, by way of referendum to the people now, an injustice to the democratic process.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. T.P. HILLHOUSE, Q. C. (Selkirk): I'd like to ask the honourable member a question. I assume that the Honourable Minister who has just spoken believes in the principle of Cabinet solidarity, and assuming that you do accept that principle, do you consider that your position in this House is severable, that is that you can sever your Cabinet position from your position as a member in this House?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I consider this to be a private member's resolution on Private Member's Day, and it's my understanding that it is my free will to express my opinions, to reflect my constituents.

MR. HILLHOUSE: You're not speaking as a private member though, you're speaking as a Cabinet Minister.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my remarks for a moment to the amendment to the resolution, because I think the amendment is an abdication of the responsibility of the members of this House, and furthermore, with all due respect, it's not a sincere proposal. And I would ask the members of the House to look at the resolution, as amended, if the amendment were passed, and I want to read it in full as it would read if the Honourable Leader of the Opposition's amendment was approved. This is what we would have: Whereas this House recognizes the effectiveness and desirability of integrating and co-ordinating municipal services for the Greater Winnipeg area, and such services should be administered by one municipal government; Therefore Be It Resolved that this House endorses in principle the implementation of such measures as would be necessary to establish one municipal government responsible for the administration of municipal services in Greater Winnipeg; and Be It Further Resolved that before the amalgamation be proceeded with, a referendum be held throughout the Greater Winnipeg area.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this would say that we are going to implement the -- or we're asking for the implementation of such measures as are necessary to establish one municipal government, and before doing it we're going to have a referendum. Now, Mr. Speaker, I related a story in the House last year which I think bears repeating. It's a story that took place in my university days when the student paper did a take-off, a satire on the Greater Winnipeg Electric Company "Take One." At that time it was the private electric company and the Electric Company and the students were having a bit of a war; the students mainly because of the fact that they thought that they should have a reduced fare and the Electric Company not of course conceding the reduced fare. So there was a little bit of a by-play between the students and the "Take One," and one day they published a satire. I remember it very well. The title was headed "Vandalism", and the story read somewhat as follows: "There has been serious vandalism on a Cathedral Avenue bus where several seats have been slashed. In view of the fact that university students sometimes ride on Cathedral Avenue buses, it is assumed that the slashing of these seats was done by university students, and in order to punish the university students the Electric Company has decided to remove all the seats from the university buses. However, because the Electric Company is a reasonable and a judicious organization, before doing this a poll will be conducted amongst university students to see whether these seats should be removed." And then the article concluded, "Therefore the poll will be conducted; the results will be tabulated; and the seats will be removed."

This is the type of resolution that the Leader of the Opposition now is purporting to put before this House, and, Mr. Speaker, I say this with great regret because I thought in December that those people who have been supporting the amalgamation for some time had now found another supporter, indeed a significant supporter, the Leader of the Liberal Party of the Province of Manitoba came out and spoke for amalgamation and said that this is what should happen. I suspect that since that time he feels that he has received complaints from -- and I agree with him -- not from the people but from local politicians on whose behalf the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources has just spoken and has spoken with their voice, and he has decided that he must have the best of both worlds.

So he will say he is only in favour of amalgamation if the people want it and support a referendum, and then he says he hopes they do support it. But, Mr. Speaker, what if they don't support it? Is the Leader of the Opposition then saying that amalgamation is not a good idea, because if he is doing that, then he is resorting to the device of a referendum which is always called upon when a politician is in a difficult position, has to decide a difficult issue which can hurt him by one segment of the population no matter which way he votes, and therefore he says, "Let's have a referendum; let the people rule."

Mr. Speaker, I repeat, the people are in this Chamber right now; they are here in a position to look at the facts, to examine the details, to hear the debate, to get the advice of experts through their committees, to do all those things which are necessary in order for a person to be able to make an intelligent choice. And the Leader of the Opposition says let's have a referendum, let's take the subject matter which has been referred to the greatest experts on municipal affairs, which they have wrestled with; which they have studied in greatest detail, both economically, socially and in every other way; which they have written reams of paper on; let's say to the voter, "You decide without any information on these subjects." Why would anybody do that except to avoid political responsibility, and it's with great regret that I heard the

(MR. GREEN cont'd.) Leader of the Opposition pushing forward the suggestion of a referendum.

Mr. Speaker, I am in principle against a referendum on a question of this kind. I advised the Minister of Education last year that my experience has been, and still is, that politicians are much better legislators than they are salesmen. The Leader of the Opposition says he's going to go across the City of Winnipeg selling this question just as they sold the school question, just as they tried to sell Plan C. And what did the people do? They voted against the issue, not because they knew what Plan C was - which the Member for Lakeside will know that it was a massive change in the system of electrification in this City of Winnipeg - it's not because they had any engineering information before them on which they could make a decision but because there was an argument between the Winnipeg Free Press who apparently - and I was younger at the time and not as knowledgeable - but I'll guess they were supporting the position of the people who wanted a private electric company and the sensible technicians who examined the problem and saw that this was the best way of doing it in the City of Winnipeg. The politicians said, "We won't make a decision because one way or another we are going to be criticized," so they said, "Let's turn it over to the people; have a referendum; let the people rule."

Mr. Speaker, if we followed that to its logical conclusion we wouldn't have legislative assemblies; we wouldn't have debates; we wouldn't have committees; we'd have computers, and they're going to be able to do it. They're going to be able to do it in a very short period of time. On every single question we could put a computer on every corner and tell the people on their way to work, "Bang the computer and let us know what the government is going to do tomorrow." That's the kind of government that is being suggested by the Leader of the Opposition, and I say he doesn't do it sincerely. I say with all due respect to him that he doesn't do it sincerely because he doesn't want that kind of government; I don't want that kind of government; and, in the last analysis, the people of this province don't want that type of government; and to hold that up to them as somehow being a greater expression of democracy is really an injustice. It's not a greater expression of democracy. The greatest expression of democracy is to realize that the people are in this Chamber right now to the extent that they are represented by we political people, and if we do the wrong thing, they express themselves by voting us out.

So I say this, Mr. Speaker, that I am in principle against the referendum. I want to qualify this because if my vote against the referendum meant that we would not be able to go towards amalgamating Greater Winnipeg, I would not vote against the referendum on that basis. I would not fall into the mistake, for instance, that the people who were against capital punishment did in Ottawa, who said that if they can't have entire elimination of capital punishment, if they can't wipe it out in every single case, they won't vote for a step in that direction. I am against referendums but I will not be against the referendum if that's the only condition upon which this Legislature says that they will amalgamate Greater Winnipeg. If that's the only thing they leave to me then I will abandon my principle in this regard, if members have it this way, and say okay I'll go along, but I don't believe it's the way of doing it, and at the moment I don't see myself supporting this resolution. However, as I say, if I assess the situation and came to the conclusion that my vote would prevent the amalgamation of Greater Winnipeg because I didn't agree with a referendum, I would have to look it over again. But I say with great regret that I do not feel that this amendment is a proper one on the basis of this resolution, and I again ask the members to read this resolution as if it were passed as amended and see whether it makes any sense whatsoever.

With regard to what the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources said, Mr. Speaker, I'll be dealing with his remarks more fully when I'm given the opportunity to close debate on the subject. However, I do want him to realize that the position that he's put, that he has put this afternoon, fails to recognize that Greater Winnipeg is an economic unit. What he is really asking for is what municipal councils have traditionally asked for. They want the benefit of being in Greater Winnipeg, the benefit for instance of the economic and social activity that is generated by the hard central core, but they don't want any responsibility for the upkeep of it. I assure the Minister that I don't get the same police protection on Cathedral Avenue that I have to pay for that takes place in the hard central core of the city, and just because somebody happens to live on Rupertsland or -- (Interjection) -- not Churchill, I want to pick a street that's in -- Berrydale, that's in St. Vital or St. -- no, St. Mary's is a

(MR. GREEN cont'd.) metro street -- (Interjection) -- Ferndale - thanks - the Member for Seven Oaks has helped me out. Just because my street is Cathedral and his is Ferndale doesn't mean that we are not both responsible for the economic maintenance of that which makes us all possible, and that is the heart of central Winnipeg.

I can't claim from my City of Winnipeg that I should pay less for the police force because I happen to live on Cathedral Avenue, and I can't claim that I shouldn't be responsible for the maintenance of the fire department which costs far more in terms of central Winnipeg than it does of Cathedral Avenue. If I could, we would be talking about paying for municipal services on an area basis; and if you want to follow it more logically, on a street basis; and if you want to follow it more logically, on a house to house basis. What part am I using? What police service do I get? What fire service do I get? It's a neat argument, Mr. Speaker, but it doesn't make - for what is now a respectable phrase - it doesn't make for a just society, and I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the greatest benefit of the resolution that I have put is that it presupposes a just way, a just society in terms of handling municipal services in Greater Winnipeg.

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

MR. SAUL MILLER (Seven Oaks): Mr. Speaker, if I might - I held back from participating in this debate. This is a private member's resolution put in by the Member for Inkster, and of course he's entitled to his opinion. On the other hand, I think that he is drawing a picture which is very black and white, where in fact that isn't the case. He draws a beautiful line, he puts us in the position where either we see it from that particular point of view or all is lost.

The fact of the matter is this, that all the people in the suburban municipalities are not dunderheads and all the elected officials in the municipalities, both councils and school boards, are not all parochial, small people who look at everything from a purely parochial and personal point of view.

Metropolitan government came into Winnipeg, not because members of this House asked for it but because the members of the councils of Greater Winnipeg asked for it. People seem to forget this. It didn't just come into being; it came in because it was agreed by various municipalities, the City of Winnipeg and West Kildonan and St. Vital, that there had to be a central authority. They couldn't after the -- (Interjection) -- Let me refresh your memory my friend. The problem was that after the metropolitan investigating committee heard all the recommendations, when they came in with the final recommendations and they came in with the recommendation for eight cities, then things went wrong. The City of Winnipeg was adamant from the start, and I will say this categorically, at no time did the City of Winnipeg want anything but total amalgamation - no question - that was their position. One other municipality said, "Let us be" - Tuxedo. Every other one - and the record will show this - came out in favour that there shall be and should be a central authority, a central authority to deal with those matters which are common to all. And the Member for Inkster is right, we all share in the responsibility and that's exactly what Metro was designed to do, to deal with those matters of responsibility and those costs which are common to all.

And what are some of those costs? That the parks which are used by everyone, the major parks, shall be a burden upon all taxpayers, not just the City of Winnipeg, and that's fair. It made sense that the zoo shouldn't be a charge on the City of Winnipeg ratepayer, that the member living in the City of Winnipeg shouldn't have to pay the full cost of it; that inter-municipal roads, arterial highways should be paid for by all residents of the area. Mosquito abatement - and since mosquitoes know no boundaries and they might fly from my house to the Member for Inkster's house - we should certainly both share in this cost.

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder if I may interrupt the honourable gentleman for just a moment. It has been said this afternoon that I've been somewhat tolerant and I want to continue to be that way in the interest of the House and the business of the province, but I think you will agree with me that we are sort of getting away from the matter under discussion, as we do with other ones, not in this particularly, and I wondered if the honourable gentleman would assist me in expediting the business of the House in keeping to the point. I get no pleasure in interrupting you and I don't wish to interrupt you, but I'm afraid I will probably have to do so if the present procedure continues. So I ask the honourable members to co-operate with me.

MR. MILLER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm not quite sure - is it that you want me to limit myself only to the referendum aspect of this?

MR. SPEAKER: Well, I'm sure the honourable gentleman will agree that mosquitoes . . .

MR. MILLER: Very well, I'll use the referendum as the basis for what I have to say.

We're faced with a proposal by the Leader of the Opposition that this should be put before the public in the form of a referendum, and as I was saying, at no time was this matter placed before the public in the form of a referendum and it couldn't be, because a referendum could not have resolved the problem. It could not have created Metro in the first place because it is a complex problem. As I was pointing out to you, Mr. Speaker, Metro came into being to deal with services which were common to all and, as such, the costs should be shared amongst all the people living in the metropolitan area, and that included sewage disposal, pollution and everything else. To have put that to the public in the form of a referendum would have been absolutely impossible. It is a difficult problem and no person, least of all people who are not completely knowledgeable in these things, could be expected, or should be expected to vote intelligently on that subject.

There was one other aspect which has been skirted and that aspect was the question of the school divisions. Mr. Speaker, if a referendum is put tomorrow, will that referendum also include in its terms of reference the question of school divisions? Is it the suggestion by the Leader of the Opposition that the referendum which he would put to the public would include a statement that all school divisions shall be abolished and there shall be one -- (Interjection) -- I'm asking the question because, Mr. Speaker, because this is a very important point to many people in Greater Winnipeg, and if this is not included, I suggest to you, if this is not included in a referendum, then we could be getting ourselves into a far worse position than we are today, because if the public should accept the referendum which accepts the proposition that municipalities shall be amalgamated and leaves these school divisions as they are, then, Mr. Speaker, the people in the suburbs or the people outside of Winnipeg School Division No. 1 are in an impossible position tax-wise. They are then in a position where they are paying the higher municipal cost of the City of Winnipeg and the higher school costs of the suburbs. This is an impossible situation. So unless that referendum specifically and clearly spells out that this means the end of school divisions, you can't put it.

I think the Member for St. Boniface put it very clearly when he said, "Unless the recognition that St. Boniface School Division shall remain, he cannot support this concept." And I think if you look in Hansard the Member for St. Boniface will see a reference to his remarks with regard to education in St. Boniface still being under control of the St. Boniface School Board.

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I did not treat education any differently in St. Boniface. I stated that all the administration, not the raising of tax, but all the administration of all schools should be completely divorced from municipal services.

MR. MILLER: I'm sorry I don't have the member's remarks here. I was under the impression he said it. I still think it's somewhere in Hansard and it'll appear.

But I would suggest to the Member for St. Boniface, and to other members here as well, that this matter of school divisions is not to be pushed aside, that if this House is going to consider amalgamation, whether through referendum or otherwise, they cannot ignore the fact that the school divisions become a vital and key point in any discussions with regard to amalgamation. And I would further suggest to you that in order to present a referendum intelligently, the people have to know what they're voting for.

A Boundaries Commission was established. The idea of the Boundaries Commission, we assume, was to evaluate, to study, to research, to come out with statistics, projections and an evaluation of what it would mean if boundaries were to be consolidated, whether they be school boundaries or municipal boundaries. And surely what must come out of it is this, that the school divisions and municipal boundaries must be coterminous. This should be all through Manitoba and certainly within the Greater Winnipeg area.

Mr. Speaker, if I'm to limit myself to the referendum, I won't go on to other aspects which perhaps I'll discuss at another stage of the debate. But I too would join with the Member for Inkster and the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources to state categorically that a referendum, although it sounds good to say let's go to the people, I suggest to you that a referendum unless it's properly researched, unless it has a number of options, unless the people know exactly what they're voting for, can't mean anything and will simply be confusing. We would then be getting perhaps amalgamation for the wrong reasons. We might be getting into a worse pickle than we are today.

(MR. MILLER cont'd.)

So if we're going to have amalgamation, let's not do it for the wrong reasons. Let's not do it because people are angry at Metro today or they're angry with something else or they're angry with the Provincial Government - and there's no question, people are angry. Let's not take an issue and say to them, "Vent your emotional spleen on this issue," because this is what we'd be doing. It's too important and the effect it's going to have on Metropolitan Winnipeg and on Manitoba for years to come are far too serious and will have far too long range an effect for us to treat it lightly and to simply try to slough it off to somebody else and say, "You worry about it," because this is what we'd be doing if we asked people how do they feel about amalgamation.

So, Mr. Speaker, I have to join with the other members who have spoken in opposition to a referendum because I think it's not fair to the public; it would be misleading the public; and it wouldn't achieve the desired effect of finding an answer to the thorny problem within metropolitan Winnipeg.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, just on a point of privilege, I'd like to set something straight. The Minister apparently will not accept my statement -- the member I should say -- so I would like to refer him to Hansard of May 7th on Page 1687 - and this is the only thing I had to say about education - right up in the first portion of the page and I quote: "I would like to make it quite clear at this time though that I do not feel that the question of education, that is the school board should be tampered with or should be covered with this resolution. I think the matter of education should remain separate, divorced from municipal services."

MR. MILLER: Thank you. Is that not what you said? That bears out what I said.

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

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface and the proposed motion of the Honourable the Minister of Health in amendment thereto, standing in my name. With reference to the amendment of the Honourable Minister of Health which was questioned in the light of another resolution on the Order Paper standing in the name of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, the said resolution appears to confine itself to the Government of Manitoba requesting the Prime Minister of Canada to call for a Federal-Provincial meeting to discuss the problem referred to therein, copies to be forwarded to the First Ministers of all provinces.

In my opinion, the resolution in question refers to the possible improvement of the physical plant in the interests of better health for the people of Canada - and I'm talking, if I may, the nursing homes and that. However, to go beyond that, I would say the amendment of the Minister of Health indicates a distinctive different avenue of approach to the overall problem of health expenditures. As such, it does not contravene our Rule 31 dealing with anticipation. Accordingly, I rule the amendment in order.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I take it for granted that this is not debatable at this time. Well then I regretfully must . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I have ruled -- order please. I have ruled that the amendment is in order.

MR. DESJARDINS: . . . regretfully would challenge you ruling then, Mr. Speaker, if I can.

MR. SPEAKER: That's your privilege. The question is, shall the Chair be sustained?

MR. SPEAKER put the question and after a voice vote declared the ruling of the Chair upheld.

MR. DESJARDINS: Yeas and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

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

YEAS: Messrs. Baizley, Beard, Bjornson, Carroll, Cherniack, Cowan, Craik, Doern, Einarson, Enns, Evans, Fox, Froese, Green, Hamilton, Harris, Jeannotte, Johnson, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McGregor, McKenzie, McLean, Masniuk, Miller, Paulley, Petursson, Roblin, Shewman, Spivak, Stanes, Steen, Uskiw, Watt, Weir, Witney, and Mesdames Forbes and Morrison.

NAYS: Messrs. Barkman, Campbell, Dawson, Desjardins, Dow, Guttormson, Hillhouse,

(STANDING VOTE cont'd.) Johnston, Molgat, Patrick, Shoemaker, Tanchak and Vielfaure.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 39; Nays, 13.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the ruling of the Chair upheld. Are you ready for the question on the amendment? The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to debate your decision of course. This is forbidden by the rules of the House here, but I certainly intend to take this government to task for hiding behind such an amendment to try and destroy a resolution with such - and I think especially after the Honourable Member from Arthur just a few minutes ago explained that this shouldn't be done on a previous resolution, and I certainly intend to take this government to task for bringing in erroneous and false statements that I will prove this afternoon. I might say immediately that the members of this Party will not accept this amendment, we will not prevent it from asking for a Medicare plan by this amendment . . .

MR. SPEAKER: . . . not mention the amendment, I hope; that has been dealt with. He's making reference to the ruling that is made in spite of himself, so I think if he would omit mentioning the word "amendment", I would appreciate it.

MR. DESJARDINS: We have an amendment. I'm discussing an amendment right now, Mr. Speaker. I'm debating on a point of amendment, the amendment that you just called in order.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member doesn't have to raise his voice to me in answering me in that respect.

MR. DESJARDINS: I'm just stating a fact that I'm debating on a question of amendment, and you're telling me that . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I would hope the honourable gentleman -- I can make mistakes as well as anyone else. If that is the feeling of the honourable gentleman at the moment, I'll accept that as such, but he doesn't have to raise his voice to me.

MR. DESJARDINS: I'm just bringing in the point that we are discussing an amendment and I'm puzzled, I was puzzled -- I'm sorry if the Speaker feels that I'm raising my voice, I'm just maybe emphasizing a point that we are debating such a thing as an amendment and this is exactly what I want to do. And I might say to the Honourable the Minister of Health that we will not accept this amendment - this is what I was saying - we will not be prevented from asking for proper care for the people of Manitoba.

Now, on the one hand the Minister of Health has been saying that the leaders of the Conservative and the Liberal Parties want to call a meeting. He spent an hour here the other day telling us that this is what is going to happen. Stanfield had said publicly and Trudeau -- and he took my words because I said that Mr. Trudeau when questioned while he was a candidate for the leadership of the Liberal Party said that he would gladly discuss anything and meet with the provinces at any time.

Now the Minister chose to play on these words and to say that definitely both the leaders have promised, have stated that they want a meeting. Why then does he feel that he has to bring a resolution asking for a meeting? And then I explained - I have a resolution that I haven't introduced as yet - but I clearly explained this during the estimates what I wanted, and it's very clear in my resolution, my proposed resolution, that I feel that this meeting should treat on the question of health of the people of Manitoba and also on the question of improving this Medicare Plan, and if this is not what he wants it's a puzzle to me.

Now I have tried and tried and tried again to restrict myself from debating only matters that we could do something about here in Manitoba. I begged the members of this House not to bring this in to play politics on this and to go in the federal field. I've done that every time I spoke, but the Minister is not satisfied, he has insisted in bringing this into federal politics. Well, I've made some research and I'm going to refute here very strongly the erroneous statements that he has made.

I want to say that, first of all, the Minister says that there's been changes made in this Act and that is not the case. That is definitely not the case. There has not been any changes made in this Act. Now there has been an amendment brought up to the Bill, which is a different thing than the Minister is saying, because this Bill is not law and this is a point that should be cleared up.

Now I want to say this, that on December, 1966 before this Bill became an Act, became law, the members of his Party - I'm talking about his Party because he always wants to include

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd.) the Liberals in Ottawa and the Conservatives in Ottawa - and I'm saying here that on December 8th at 2:30 p. m. that a motion was introduced, an amendment was introduced by the members of the Conservative Party asking that the original date of July 1, 1967 be re-introduced, and all the members, all the members present of the Conservative Party voted in favour of this. The Minister probably doesn't know this and if he does, well he's trying to mislead the members of this House.

I see here in the Journals, Page 1125, the name of Mr. Churchill - Mr. Diefenbaker was leading the Party - Mr. Dinsdale, Mr. Forbes, Mr. Jørgenson, Mr. Mandziuk, Mr. Muir, Mr. Stephanson and Mr. Simpson voted in favour of a motion moved by Dr. Rienhardt, seconded by Mr. Brandt, that the said bill be now read a third time -- be not now read a third time, that it be referred back to the Committee of the Whole with instructions that consideration be given to amending it by striking out the "1st day of July, 1968" in line 9 of paragraph 2, and substituting the "1st day of July, 1967." So I hope that the Minister has got this very clear, very clear.

And then we had finally the third reading of this Bill, and again, Mr. Speaker, again all the members that I've mentioned - two of them left the House since then and Jørgenson left the House - the others voted unanimously; all the members of the Conservatives voted in favour of this Bill. The only two was Thompson, who is now a Conservative but wasn't a Conservative then, and Johnson, another Social Credit. Well, let's get this straight, that it's the members and the people that should have been representing Manitoba here - this is what we're going to hear - the people that should have been representing Manitoba here -- from here I should say, in Ottawa, had a chance to postpone this or to throw it out and they didn't do it. So let's not try and put the blame and play politics like the Minister has been doing all this session. I begged him not to bring in this question of Federal Government think that we can't -- we have no control over it, but he insisted and this is the reason why I brought this up.

Now I want to say this also, that it's easy for the Leader of the Opposition now, Mr. Stanfield, to say that he doesn't want this. Now he stands in the House of Commons and calls for postponement of Medicare flanked and backed by an entire Party who just a year earlier had condemned and chastised the government for postponing the original Medicare Plan. Mr. Diefenbaker stood up in the House and ridiculed the government and decried the decision to defer Medicare for a year.

Let's hear from the Honourable George Hees. This is on Page 10868 of Hansard. "I endorse 100 percent the very able and cogent remark of the Honourable Member from Simcoe East, Dr. Rienhardt. That is why this Party is going to support very enthusiastically the amendment he has put forward, and he argued" - Mr. Hees argued - "that the government's decision to postpone Medicare was a political one and had nothing to do with economics or financial or fiscal consideration." This is your Mr. Hees that said that. "The government," he said, "wanted to call an election in the Spring of 1968 and intend once again to offer Medicare as a vote catcher." This is what they said at the time.

Then Dr. Louis Brandt seconded the motion. "I should like to see every member of this House vote for this amendment so that those people who can not wait until 1968 for health services can be assisted in meeting these expenses." This is what he said in the House, this is what Dr. Brandt said in the House.

The Minister also tells us that he was never given any answer from Ottawa, that they never had a chance to meet. All right, think what we can come on this.

Well, first of all I want to say what Mr. Robert McPhee, MP for Halifax, from Nova Scotia where Mr. Stanfield comes from, this is what he had to say. "For most Canadians, including the members of this Chamber, there is no problem of inflation involved in health services." Listen to this please, Mr. Minister. "We either pay directly to medical doctors or we pay through group insurance plans. Either way the payment is made and we receive health services in return for that payment. Under a Medicare Plan if we adopt some different method of payment, in this case by payment of taxes, it would be a substitute payment for that which we have been making previously. How can anybody say that this is inflationary. The argument that somehow the process of inflation is involved is a shallow argument, a sham argument." - a shallow argument, a sham argument - and this is one of your members saying this. It certainly could apply here to your government.

In 1966 Mr. Stanfield while he was the Premier, was in the conference and he didn't object to this at all. This is what he stated in fact. "Mr. Stanfield bounced back with the

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd.) statement that he was not objecting to the timing, that in fact we would like to see Medicare available to the people of Nova Scotia as soon as possible." So who's playing politics now? Why do you insist - when you're not on solid ground especially - why do you insist on dragging in things that have nothing to do with the people of Manitoba here? That is something -- we elect people for this.

Now Medicare is permissive legislation and does not in itself set up a medical care insurance program. It does not involve the Government of Canada, the administration of any such program. I'm taking this from some information because I took the trouble of finding out things after the Minister kept repeatedly referring to Ottawa and blaming everything on Ottawa. "The legislation simply authorized the Federal Government to pay approximately half the cost of provincial medical care programs which meet certain criteria which the Government of Canada believes should be part of any program involving the expenditure of public funds. Federal payments will be available July 1, 1968, but it is up to each individual province to decide if and when it wants to take advantage of the Federal legislation." I've got a few things marked in here that I think the Minister should . . .

Now we've heard an awful lot about how much this is going to cost, and this is another reason - the cost - why all of a sudden the Government of Manitoba changed its mind, and I think that I should read this preparation. "Will Medicare cost the country a billion dollars a year? There has been a great deal of confusion and misunderstanding about the cost of Medicare. The most recent estimate of the cost of a nationalized program covering all the population is \$885 million. This is for the 1968 calendar year. However, even without a national program Canadians will be spending approximately \$805 million this year for medical services. This cost is made up of direct payments to doctors and payments made through a variety of prepaid plans, private and public, so in the main Medicare involves a transfer or re-channelling of money already being spent. The additional cost for the calendar year 1968 will have been 80 million and for this additional 80 million all Canadians, regardless of their income or where they live or the state of their health, could have received the benefits and advantages of prepaid medical services throughout 1968." -- (Interjection) -- I'll give it to you afterwards if you want. "Undoubtedly the total cost will be eventually reached to a billion dollars annually due to increase in population and steadily rising costs in medical care, but again all but 10 percent of this will be money which is already spent by Canadians for those medical services including Medicare." This comes from the office of the Minister of National Health in Ottawa.

Now the only reason why I brought this part in is because this government and the Minister has made these erroneous statements and has tried to blame everything on Ottawa, and I think now that we've got this straight I hope we won't hear about this any more. The Minister said that we've never had any answer from Ottawa and he's had a lot of answers from Ottawa -- public, in the House of Commons also.

Now let us see what has happened in this House now. Let's forget Ottawa -- I hope for awhile anyway. First of all, last year this government brought in Bill 68. The heading here: "Witney Announces Plan for Compulsory Medicare." It was accepted by the members of this House. It was accepted by the Roblin government reluctantly, but it was accepted. It was accepted by the members of the New Democratic Party. It was accepted by the members of our Party except one - reluctantly, but it was accepted. It was accepted, so let's not hear any more. This is another erroneous statement that we don't want it because it's compulsory; it was accepted last year. All right. This is another thing that I hope we have straightened out.

But what has happened? The Minister told us last week that we weren't consistent, and I wish to read from the Free Press of April 28, 1967. "Liberal move to stall Medicare Bill fails. A Liberal move to stall consideration of the Provincial Government's proposed compulsory medicare insurance plan was defeated Thursday in the Law Amendments Committee of the Manitoba Legislature. Larry Desjardins, Liberal of St. Boniface, moved a double-barrelled resolution aimed at delaying acceptance of the compulsory plan which is scheduled to go into effect on a Federal-Provincial sharing basis on July 1, 1968. While he had voted for second reading of the Bill and was in agreement with the principle of a comprehensive medical plan for all citizens of the province, Mr. Desjardins said there was no urgency in approving a compulsory plan. He suggested that a plan might be considered which would allow private medical insurance companies to compete with the public body to be set up" -- and this is apparently what you want now. "This would remove the compulsory aspect of the plan, and if it could be worked out, a new Bill could be presented later to a special session of the Legislature." But

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd.) all I heard at the time was from the Premier of the time - Mr. Roblin - to say, "This is not what the Federal Government says, you can't even think about that." And I said what's happening in Alberta? - It's not going to count. Now you're using Alberta as a test case.

And I continue here. "His move was not just a gimmick to kill the principle of the Bill, Mr. Desjardins said, 'I just don't think that this plan should be compulsory and that the government or a government agency should be the only one involved.' If this suggestion is not carried, then he asked that the Bill be not proceeded with until a schedule of fees to be charged had been negotiated with the doctors and presented to the Legislature. Health Minister C. H. Witney said, however, that the Federal Government had insisted that the medical insurance plan set up by the provinces must be a non-profit organization responsible to the government or a Minister of the government. 'It must be a provincial responsibility; it cannot be delegated to an agent,' he said. Mr. Desjardins' motion was lost by a wide margin on a voice vote and the Bill for the compulsory scheme was then given approval by the committee to be passed on the Legislature for third reading." Now we tried, we tried as much as we can, but this is what the Minister told us at the time, and the members of the government.

Now we also asked, and we were successful at the time then to have a clause permitting extra billing, to have this clause deleted. I think that the Minister remembers this. I don't intend to read this again, I think that the Minister knows. This was passed and now the government is changing its mind. I know that the doctors were not in favour of this and I think that this is what I agree with the Member from Inkster, I think, that said that this was one of the reasons why this whole thing was delayed so the doctors could have their direct billing again, which this government voted against last year.

Now then if we follow the steps, what happened? The government passed this Bill - we didn't want it, there was no rush for it - we suggested that they go to the provinces and discuss this with the provinces, but they passed it anyway. So then we brought in another resolution, another suggestion. We felt that the fees, the schedule of fees should be part of this Bill, because we could not see how you could ask for a compulsory plan and not know what the fees would be. The Minister promised at the time, he said that this will be negotiated. It wasn't ambiguous at all; it was quite clear. Now he's saying no. He promised and he definitely told us that this new board, the Manitoba Medical Service Insurance Corporation, would negotiate. All right, this hasn't been done. This isn't being done at all. We didn't want to wait to discuss with the provinces; we closed the door; we forced it - we forced this thing on Manitoba. There was no reason, we had until July, 1968. The members were well paid. We offered to come back for a week or so to discuss this but nothing happened because the government felt we want this. We told them to try to modify this plan. We asked that we have a schedule of fees to negotiate, and we felt that we would -- we asked for the co-operation of the doctors and we felt that we should have it.

Now we are told, well things have changed, and I think that I refute this quite a bit. Things have not changed that much. And let's see. I have a quotation here from Mr. Roblin on October 12, 1967. "Premier Roblin of Manitoba today indicated Manitoba will go along with the national medical care program which the Federal Government is prepared to put into effect next July 1st. 'The Federal Government is calling the shots', Mr. Roblin told the news conference, 'so we have to play their way.' Mr. Roblin said, 'The provinces are compelled to take the government plan or no plan at all'." He didn't like it but he felt that this was it, no plan at all if we didn't want to take this plan. Mr. Speaker, October 12, 1967. And you know when this government changed its mind? It changed its mind hardly a month after that on November 27th - November 27th when Mr. Weir replaced Mr. Roblin, and this is what we've been saying all along.

And here at the convention, "Weir stand calling for a halt to the Federal Government's medicare program as it exists in its present form. He did not elaborate on this point except to present the view that in a country with such a high general standing of living no one should go without proper medicare treatment because of inability to pay." I'm sorry I missed a sentence here I think. Oh yes, "The cheering" - I should have started at the top of the quotation - "The cheering at this point was surpassed only by Mr. Weir's stand calling for a halt on Federal Government's Medicare Program." And what was he elected by? - about 200 votes or something like this, and this has changed the whole picture on Medicare here in Manitoba.

I appreciate and I think that Mr. Weir, the new Premier is sincere in wanting to hold the

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd.) line and I think that this is right, but this is over his head. He wasn't prepared. He didn't know what this was all about. And the people of Manitoba -- he's not saving anything, he's costing the people of Manitoba a lot of money and the people of Manitoba will not be covered for at least one year. These are his words.

And even on January 4th of this year, this was supposed to be all decided. On January 4th of this year what did the Premier say? "We're still in limbo," he told the Tribune. "We are actively considering Manitoba's position at the moment in light of changing economic conditions within the province and Canada." And this I have certainly refuted. This is not the reason at all. We were told they would tell us what would happen. I quoted the other day that the Acting Prime Minister, Mr. Hellyer, quoted right in the House of Commons -- and here, "Medicare starts July 1st - Pearson." This is big enough heading. "Prime Minister Pearson announced in the Commons Monday that the federal medicare program will go into operation July 1st as scheduled."

So why aren't these people a little more honest and sincere? Why do they - if they want to change their minds this is their privilege - but why blame it on Ottawa when it's not true. And why bring all kinds of other reasons which the Minister knows are not true. The New Premier decided that he would not go into this; he changed his mind; he sent a telegram on February 2nd saying that he will not go into this for at least one year. All right, this is exactly what has happened and this is the way it should be presented to us, then we would debate this question - is it right or is it wrong? - instead of bringing all kinds of other things that have nothing to do with this at all.

Now what are we saying? We're saying that we haven't got this status quo anymore. If the government had listened to us last year, would have provided a schedule of fees, if this would be made part of the Act, then things might be a little different. We would not have an increase of 85 percent or so on this Medicare Bill and we would not have direct billing. This is something that the Minister remembers.

Now we have made the statement - I have never said anything, I have never blamed the doctors - I have said this, I have said that the doctors are getting in the best possible position to negotiate, to bargain with the government because they expect this. They expect this; they talk about this at all their meetings. I quoted that organized medicine has no intention of being out-negotiated by government. This is one of the headings that I have.

I have another one here of June, 1967. "Canadian medicine appears on the brink of entering the country's rank of organized labour. Last week at its own Centennial meeting in Quebec City, 25, 000 members of Canadian Medical Association voted to create a new department of collective negotiations. Canada's doctors had been talking about organizing in a series of ten bargaining forces ever since it became apparent in 1964 that Medicare would emerge nationally." They're not hiding. They're not doing what the government is doing; they are getting ready to negotiate, so you don't blame them at all for what they are asking. "CMA Told Organized for Coming Medicare." All kinds of headings like this. We've been warned about this; we've been told about this. It's no secret at all, but you have to -- a negotiation is between two different people if you have a contract, and we represent the people of Manitoba. We are the only ones. Nobody has suggested that the doctors should not have just pay, that we should freeze their salary, that they should be underpaid. We're not suggesting this at all, and if they more than anybody else want to keep us away from this compulsory plan, at least they should protect their status quo and they should wait a little while and ask just for a reasonable thing. Right now they feel that this is coming anyway, and this is what we're going to have.

Now there's been another statement made that no increase has been made since 1962, giving the impression that the doctors' salaries have not been increased since 1962, and that is not true at all. This is not true at all. "Their schedule of fees may have remained stationary but not the income" - and I'm quoting now from the Tribune of October 18, 1966. "Premiums have been raised, and groups which have been using the service more heavily than the average have had their rates increased as well. This year the 900-odd doctors on MMS will receive a gross income of about \$20 million. The income has risen partly because of the increasing number of subscribers and the increased service offered. Doctors are working longer hours" - but they were getting better pay so this is not quite right.

We've been told that they've done a wonderful thing and we agree with this, but they are expecting to negotiate, and although my friend is backing down now, the Honourable Minister of Health, he had told us this new board would negotiate, represent the government. This was his

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd.) answer to us last year, and as I quoted the other day, Dr. Robert Tanner, the Chairman of this Board, warned the medical men that they would not get away with fees which would send insurance costs and thus premiums soaring. So we don't have to hide behind anything. We are trying to get a certain plan; the doctors are going to try to negotiate for the best possible plan. They're expecting this. They're expecting to negotiate with us and this has been refused in this House.

This government has brought in a resolution - a Bill - then it tried to change their mind; it blamed everybody else; but it's not accepting its responsibility at all. And what do we hear? The First Minister got up last week and said, "Hands off, no negotiation; we're not having anything to do with this at all." I asked the Minister of Health four questions and he said, "I don't know what you're debating about, I'll answer all the questions in this House on the estimates." And he hasn't answered any of these questions at all, these four questions that I asked.

Now we are told, "Watch and wait - watch and wait." And what's happening to the people of Manitoba in the meantime? Now if we feel that this is right -- I think that all of us read with some interest, the article of the Tribune on May 11, 1968 with this interview with Dr. MacCharles, and Dr. MacCharles made some pretty valid points at the time. He said that the MMS died last summer, and I think that I could do worse than read this, and if I have the time this will be the end of my remarks because I think that this is important. "The death warrant of the Manitoba Medical Services was signed last year when the Manitoba Medical Association members decided to insist on getting 100 percent payment of their fees." I don't want to read it all. I come to another point here, "Service plan meant that MMS agreed to provide service on the premium payments alone. In its agreement with member doctors, it was agreed that doctors would accept the MMS payment as full payment. That's why MMS died as a service plan last summer when the profession decided no longer to accept MMS for remuneration as payment in full and called for extra billing to get 100 percent of their fee. Dr. MacCharles said "the MMS has had provision for some time under which the doctors could extra bill patients with incomes over \$10,000 per year. But then this is what we wanted from the beginning, a service plan for the low and middle income people and an insurance plan with deductibles and co-insurance, extra billing payments for those who are better off". This is what he was suggesting. We have never been able to sell the idea to the medical profession.

Dr. MacCharles said: "When the MMS Plan was designed, the labour movement accused doctors of scheming to get maximum money out of the public." He said, "We were shocked at this reaction. This had never entered our minds." Yet this is exactly what happened. The medical profession has been able to improve their income, so let's not hear so much about what they're doing. They've helped themselves too, and they know it. "The MMS has been paying us much more over the years than we would ever be able to get from our patients ourselves." "Does Dr. MacCharles regret the developments between the Medical Association and MMS in recent weeks?" "And how," he answered. "As for the future, there is really nothing you can say, too much depends on what steps the various levels of government intend to take," he said.

So you see there are some doctors on both sides. We are not suggesting that they shouldn't be paid well but we want to negotiate and we feel there's very few, if any, doctors truly expect us to capitulate, to say "Here, everything you want, the government accepts it." Very few expect it, that this First Minister of this province would get up and say "Hands off, let's watch and wait," while the people of Manitoba were not protected in this sense and while our premiums kept going up and up.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I felt that I had to make this speech because for too long now the Minister of Health and other members on that side have been trying to blame everything on somebody else and this is not right. I think we have to set the record straight, and it boils down to forget all the preliminaries, this government has changed its mind for no other reason than that they have changed the First Minister. I'm not saying that he is not sincere, that he didn't feel that this was the right thing, but he wasn't ready; he didn't know what this was all about, and now he does. I think that this -- I hope that all the members of this House will certainly vote against this amendment that would just shelve what we're asking for. And if you want a meeting, the Minister of Health said that both Trudeau and Stanfield says that they'll meet, so you don't have to vote in favour of this resolution. And I have another resolution asking for the same thing, exactly the same thing as far as I'm concerned, so you can vote for this. I hope that the members of this House who are sincerely interested in the welfare of the people of

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd.) Manitoba, in the low income people of Manitoba, will vote against this amendment and vote in favour of the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. PAULLEY: I must say at the offset, Mr. Speaker, that I've listened to a great contribution to this debate by my constituent the Member from St. Boniface, and I wondered as I listened to my honourable friend where stood he insofar as Medicare is concerned, because on one hand, he says by reference to a resolution, that he is proposing that the whole matter has to be reviewed as contained in another resolution that my honourable friend has, and on the other he condemns the government because they suggest something similar, and suggests that we should vote down this particular amendment and support him in his. My honourable friend, every time he takes to his feet in this Chamber, acknowledges the fact that he voted in favour of Bill 68 last year which calls for a compulsory Medicare scheme, but apologizes as vigorously as he can for doing so because he doesn't like the plan, because he wants a voluntary plan, yet turns around and of a same tongue suggests we should change our bill. Now you can't have it both ways. -- (Interjection) --

MR. DESJARDINS: Oh, coming from you that's terrific.

MR. PAULLEY: You can't have it both ways, Mr. Speaker, as suggested by my honourable friend from St. Boniface. He doesn't like Bill 68.

MR. DESJARDINS: That's right.

MR. PAULLEY: "That's right," he says, so he's confirmed it. He doesn't like the national Medicare scheme.

MR. DESJARDINS: That's right.

MR. PAULLEY: That's right. And he has a resolution before this House at the present time, condemning the government because they haven't gone into the two plans that he hates by July 1st.

MR. DESJARDINS: That's also right.

MR. PAULLEY: And that's also right.

MR. DESJARDINS: And you know why.

MR. PAULLEY: Yes, I know why. My honourable asked me why.

MR. DESJARDINS: No I didn't ask you why. I told you why.

MR. PAULLEY: I'll answer my honourable friend as to why; it's because I think that he thinks that he can make some political hay out of the position that he's taking, and this coming from the Honourable Member for St. Boniface who has just finished saying we shouldn't make politics . . .

MR. DESJARDINS: That's right.

MR. PAULLEY: . . . out of Medicare, and I agree with him, and I only wish to heaven that he would do it, because he's not. How can a member speak two ways on the same resolution? But I want to say to my honourable friend the Member for St. Boniface that I agree with him when he says that we should reject the amendment proposed by the Honourable the Minister of Health. I think in this, though, that when I say that I agree with him, we can part company because of the reasons for our approaches to the opposition to the scheme as we have it at the present time, because as I listened to my honourable friend the Minister of Health the other day speaking on this resolution, he didn't seem to evidence any care or real concern for the medical needs of the people of Manitoba and Canada. He was concerned about the cost of providing the service. This was his concern. Not whether or not Medicare should be provided, but the cost of the same. And I think in this that he is supporting the general contention of his Leader the First Minister of this House. I say this is a phoney, Mr. Speaker, this is a phoney approach indulged in at the present time by both the likes of my Honourable Member for St. Boniface of the Liberal Party, and the Conservatives.

During the oration of my friend from St. Boniface a few moments ago he quoted from a document of the Honourable Allan MacEachen, Minister of Health of the federal authority, and MacEachen said in the document from which my friend read excerpts, that the total cost of institution of a Medicare scheme as contained in the federal legislation would only amount to an additional \$80 million a year to cover everybody. Mr. MacEachen said that at the present time, collectively the citizens of Canada are paying out somewhere in the neighbourhood of six, seven hundred millions of dollars for Medicare. My friend then went on to say, in defence of this portion of his speech, that it would be approximately another \$80 million, where at the same time a member of the same federal Cabinet, the Minister of Finance, was trying to lay the

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.) seeds of bogeyism insofar as the cost of Medicare across Canada, by saying if we proceed with a Medicare scheme it's going to cost a billion dollars in Canada, conveniently omitted the fact of the greater proportion of that being paid at the present time. And this is the type of tripe that the Honourable the First Minister has bought, because this government has not taken into consideration the cost for Medicare in the province at the present time being paid by the individual. So I say my friend from St. Boniface is just as phoney in their arguments for the delay in Medicare and the reconsideration.

Mr. Speaker, the Government of Canada asked a very eminent Chief Justice of Canada to look into all aspects of Medicare in Canada - and he wasn't a New Democrat. And he looked into it, and the commission sat for a number of years. They had all the technical personnel necessary. They gave thorough investigation into all aspects of Medicare in Canada and made projections as to the cost for the future, and now my honourable friend the Minister of Health suggests that despite the overwhelming evidence contained within the report on the Royal Commission on Health headed by Mr. Justice Hall, it should be set aside and reconsidered by what? A group of politicians, or a conference of politicians. What an approach! What a waste of the energies of a very capable commission headed by a qualified man into all aspects of Medicare.

And what does my honourable friend in this Resolved portion say? "Resolved that this House request the Federal Government to convene a conference of the provinces for further discussion and deliberations on the cost of the national medical insurance plan and its ability to effectively meet the needs of the people in the various regions of Canada. I would suggest that insofar as health is concerned that the needs are fairly equally distributed across Canada.

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if my honourable friend the Minister of Education applied the same yardstick to education as the Honourable the Minister of Health attempts to apply that yardstick to health needs. The Minister of Education, speaking in his estimates here today and yesterday, decried the every-increasing costs of education. The Member for Emerson, speaking in the debate on the estimates of the Department of Education, complained about the increasing costs of education. But did either one of them, the Minister of Education or the Member for Emerson, suggest because the costs are going up that we should abandon the provision of education in Manitoba or in Canada? Absolutely not. And I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that there is a parallel. What's good for the development of the mind of the citizens of Canada, I suggest is equally good for the development of the body of Canadians. This point is being overlooked by both Conservatives and Liberals in this debate. There is no relationship, may I suggest, between the propositions of the Honourable the Minister of Health and reasons for a new conference. I say, Mr. Speaker, that the government and most of the members to my right are only endeavoring to use the question of costs as a methodology of preventing adequate health care for the citizens of Canada and of our own province.

What strawmen are being raised by the Honourable the Minister of Health in respect of health care! He made reference to British Columbia, who have announced that they're prepared to come into the scheme under a Social Credit government incidentally, and he said if their scheme there is acceptable - and in their opinion here it is not - but if it is acceptable under the present federal legislation, then they'll take another close look at it. Well, I suggest to my honourable friend the First Minister and the Minister of Health that they could have at least made a start toward the establishment of a similar scheme to that of British Columbia, in the hope that if British Columbia's scheme is inadequate, as it is in some respects, was acceptable under the federal plan, that this province would have been in a position to join in the scheme. Absolute strawmen.

They raise the question, and I object most strenuously, to the imposition of deterrent charges in the Province of Quebec, but another strawman that the Government of Manitoba's attempting to raise insofar as entry into the plan is concerned, possibly Saskatchewan won't come into the scheme because of their deterrent charges. You know I really think, Mr. Speaker, that this government and the Honourable Member for St. Boniface - and I don't know whether he's speaking fully for the Liberal Party or not in Manitoba - but I think both of them would be most happy if there wasn't a Medicare scheme on the books in Canada. I'm sure from what I've heard from some of the Liberals in this House at least, they'd love to go back to 1919 and start all over again making their continuous convention and election promises. And I'll bet you, Mr. Speaker, that the Honourable the First Minister wishes he'd never heard the term "Medicare Insurance Plan," and it wouldn't be something that should, if it doesn't, bother his conscience. And the same with my honourable friend the Minister of Health.

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.)

Let's go back in our mind's eye just to a year ago. How jubilant my honourable friend the Minister of Health was when he raised on high a document, the Manitoba Medical Services Plan. Looking straight over into this corner of the House of the New Democratic Party with a great gleam and twinkle in his eye -- we've beat you to it; we've got a scheme for you. My honourable friend knew then, or he should have known then if he has the intelligence that I give him credit for having, that the costs would have gone up. They're bound to go up, just as we knew in this House last year when we were considering the question of education costs that they were going to go up, and yet that is the phoney argument being used by the government today for reconsideration.

I give some credit to the Liberal Premier of Newfoundland, for he made an announcement the other day that on, I believe it's April 1st in 1969, the Province of Newfoundland is going to enter into the Medicare scheme. Nothing from this government. Nothing from this government at all, except further delay, further procrastination in the provision of the health needs of the people of Manitoba.

You know, Mr. Speaker, it wouldn't be quite so bad if the government of Manitoba were suggesting some alternative to the plan -- which they're not. The Honourable the Minister of Welfare has rejected request after request of people on low, fixed income for the provision of a card entitling them to Medicare. Do you know, Mr. Speaker, that under the present regulations, that anyone who obtains the additional \$30.00 a month supplemental allowances on the Social Security of Canada cannot get a Medicare card if they have more than a 300-dollar pre-paid funeral plan and a couple of hundred bucks? And yet we hear the bellowings of the former Premier of this province the Member for Wolseley, the Honourable the First Minister, and others saying, "We don't want to go into a federal Medicare scheme the way it is but we want to treat the people on the basis of need." Phoney. It's as phoney as the day is long; it's as phoney as the night is long where they have the midnight sun.

This government, the First Minister, the Minister of Health, should take another look at the proposition presented to us because it is a deliberate attempt on the part of the Government of Manitoba to kill the provision of Medicare to the people of this province. Costs? Phoney. As MacEachen said in the statement quoted by the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, all that's required across Canada for the provision on the basis of those figures, an additional \$80 million, because the major costs were being paid for at the present time. And what's the new Messiah saying now, the Liberal Party, in the elections? Reconsideration. Let's go back. That's what the Liberals here in Manitoba are saying too: "Let's forget where we stood last year.

MR. DESJARDINS: That's not true.

MR. PAULLEY: Yes, it is.

MR. DESJARDINS: That is not true.

MR. PAULLEY: You said it. Let us go back. . .

MR. DESJARDINS : It's a lie.

MR. PAULLEY: Let us cast it aside. What is the new Leader of the Conservative Party saying? "No, we have to have a few more conferences before we can institute a proper Medicare scheme or a Medicare scheme to cover Canadians."

You know sometimes, Mr. Speaker, our politicians and others pride themselves on saying that we have the second highest standard of living in the world, and yet when it comes to providing some of the basic necessities for all of the people of our country, we're negligent and fall to the bottom of the totem pole, where many of the poorer countries of the world have been able to supply to the needs of the country. This country and this province reject provisions. And how wrong is my honourable friend the Minister of Health and members opposite to condemn the British Medical scheme, another bogey, another straw man picked up by the government just recently, this government just recently, is because of the fact that in Great Britain under their health scheme they recently put on a shilling charge for the issuing of a prescription for drugs. Our health scheme that we have suggested for Canada, or Hall suggested for Canada, a basic plan which is the only plan for which there is legislation, didn't cover prescription costs, para-medical costs, optical costs or dental costs, as it is in under the British Health Scheme. But my honourable friends opposite love to turn around and say, "Well, look what's happening over there under their scheme, and it's going to happen here with our costs." but they don't compare the provision under each of the schemes; they don't compare that at all.

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.)

It's true, it's true that there is contained in our legislation a provision for expansion from the basic medical care if and when the government decides to do it. If what they're doing with a basic premise in Bill 68 is any indication, we're going to wait a long, long, long time before the people of Manitoba receive any benefits for any of the other services apart from the basic provisions in Bill 68.

In addition to all of this, Mr. Speaker, at the time that the government is complaining of the possible costs of Medicare, they're showing little or no concern for the increased cost to the individual in Manitoba under MMS coverage and other coverages as well. I have repeatedly tried to extract from the First Minister information as to negotiations which may or may not be going on at the present time between the doctor-controlled MMS and the government. We elicited from the Minister of Health the other day the amazing announcement from him that since we met last year in March he hasn't had any consultations with MMS in respect of premiums. When my honourable friend the First Minister became leader of his Party he suspended, in effect, the Manitoba Medical Services Corporation from conducting negotiations between MMS and the take-over of MMS as provided for in Bill 68. I say in doing this, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable the First Minister violated all of the basic premises of democratic government, because we in this House passed that legislation, and that legislation in that respect was proclaimed that this corporation should conduct negotiations with MMS. They didn't, on the order of the First Minister, and what is the result? Tremendous increases in premiums to many Manitobans under MMS, and the net results of which I predicted the other day will be fewer and fewer Manitobans will be able to make their contributions to MMS.

Sixteen dollars a quarter for a single person, a student going to university; \$72.00, Mr. Minister, \$72.00 a year under MMS at the present time is the requirement of a single person going to university for the provision of Medicare. I suggest that the Honourable the Minister of Education should add that \$72.00 to the costs of education for those that are going to university.

And so I say, Mr. Speaker, the proposition of the Honourable the Minister of Health should be consigned to oblivion, that it's only a methodology being used by government to forsake its responsibilities to the people of Manitoba. The Honourable the Minister of Health is endeavouring to establish a red herring in this House to defeat the basic principles for the provision of Medicare as suggested by the Hall Commission. We don't need any politicians at the federal or provincial levels, or jointly at the federal or provincial levels, to tell us as to the needs of the people respecting Medicare. Mr. Justice Hall did that, and I suggest that rather than set them aside we should abide with them and carry through the provisions and the recommendations as contained in the report of recommendations of the Hall Commission on medical services.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a small part in this debate because I have said on more than one occasion in this House that I don't think there's another member of this Assembly that has been faced with as many medical expenses as I have in the last four years, and I said on more than one occasion that in four years' time, in addition to paying premiums, I have spent well over \$6,000 on doctors' bills, medical bills, prescriptions, and hospital bills of all kinds both in Manitoba and in the United States, and I'm one that can appreciate that the sooner we have a national Medicare plan and the sooner that Manitoba enters that plan the better it will be for all of the people of Canada and for all of the people of Manitoba.

Now the government of the day, immediately prior to the last election, in fact I think three days before the last election in June 1966, and I believe the last speech that the Premier made publicly was that he would call a Fall session if elected. This is not new, or was not new to Mr. Roblin because he used to promise that on every election nearly. I think we had in total five special sessions during the nine years that he headed the government, but once again he promised that there would be a Fall session -- to do what? To do three things, and I think in this order: To deal with purple gas for farmers, because he caught on that that was a pretty important thing when he was fighting that election. What was the second thing? The abatement of municipal taxation to shift the burden from the real property base to some other base. In fact, he talked about the 50-dollar school tax rebate and inferred that that could easily be doubled to 100. What was the third thing? Medicare. That's the three things that he was going to do, immediately upon assumption to office; call a session to deal with these three things,

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd.) important things.

Now the Minister of Health, as has been said by the Honourable Member for St. Boniface and certainly the Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party, has introduced an amendment here that will once again postpone, delay and destroy the provision for a Medicare plan for Manitoba. And, Mr. Chairman, if I can interpret the amendment correctly, it would strike out the two second preambles, the two second paragraphs of the preamble, because the amendment says that the resolution be amended by deleting everything after the word "and" in the fourth line.

Well, why in the world would my honourable friend want to delete the third and fourth paragraphs of the preamble? Does he not believe there is any figment of truth in these third and fourth paragraphs? Here's what they say: "and Whereas the Manitoba taxpayers will therefore be required to pay their share of federal taxes to finance this plan and will not be getting any benefits from the plan," -- is not that a fact? I want my honourable friend, or certainly somebody on the other side, to stand up on their two hind legs and say that that is or is not a fact, because I understood my honourable friend to say the other day, and say a year ago, that if Manitoba did not enter the plan it would mean leaving "\$17 million lying on the table at Ottawa." So why would he want to strike that out? Even if two provinces enter the plan, is it not a fact that Manitoba will make their contribution to implementing the plan in those two provinces or three?

And then, does my honourable friend not agree with the fourth paragraph in the preamble, which reads: "Whereas many people are finding it increasingly difficult to meet the increasing costs of present medical coverage"? Does he not agree that that is so? Is he not the gentleman that said a year ago, and I think during this session, "The people that we are concerned about in Manitoba are the 30 percent that are not presently covered, and why are they not presently covered?" he said - or some member of the government. "Why are they not presently covered? Because they haven't got the money to pay the premiums to afford them the coverage." So then, why would he want to strike out the fourth paragraph? If my honourable friend was really sincere in amending it in the fashion that he did, well why did he not tag the amendment on to the bottom? Why delete two concrete facts that are contained in the preamble? I can't understand it at all.

Now, my honourable friend is asking the federal government to call further federal-provincial conferences. I would like to ask my honourable friend how many that he has presently attended as Minister since 1965, and I would like him to answer that one now if he knows right off the top of his head. How many has he attended and how many have been called? Does my honourable friend have the foggiest notion how many he has attended on the subject of Medicare? Because, if he hasn't, I can tell him and I can tell him every date on which one was called.

There have been eight in total. There have been eight federal-provincial conferences. Item No. 7 on Page 16 of the paper that I have in my hand from the -- and dated the 13th of May, which wasn't -- it was received here on the 13th of May which was yesterday, so it's not out-of-date. The question is asked; did the Federal Government consult with the provinces when this program was being planned? "Of course. There have been eight federal-provincial conferences on Medicare since 1965. In addition, there has been continuing consultation with individual provinces at the elected and official levels to discuss such matters such as cost estimates, interpretation of the legislation, proposed changes in the provincial legislation, and various administrative matters connected with the medical plan." So you have had, if my honourable friend has attended them all, you have attended eight of them now to discuss exactly what my honourable friend is asking for in his amendment. Well, surely to goodness, we don't need nine or ten more of them, and I am completely amazed that my honourable friend would attempt to destroy a completely good resolution that we have on the Order Paper at the present time.

Now my honourable friend infers by the amendment, too, that it is customary when the Federal Government announces a plan that the provinces automatically fall in line the first year that it's announced. This is not so, as my honourable friend should know. Why, back in 1927 or 1928 when the Old Age Pensions were introduced there were only one or two provinces went in the first year; one or two went in the next year; two or three went in the next year; and I think it was ten years before all of the provinces entered into the agreement for Old Age Pensions. So if we have two or three provinces entering into the national Medicare plan this

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd.) year, two or three more will follow next year, two or three more the next year and so on, until eventually the whole ten provinces has entered into an agreement, this isn't unusual at all. This is only normal, as history will prove, that this is the habit of the provinces to follow this line.

Now the point that I have been attempting to make on two or three different occasions is that presently the people of Manitoba - we'll limit it to that - the million or nearly one million people that are residing in Manitoba now, are paying for medical insurance or medical costs, or both (in my own case), substantial amounts any way, very very substantial amounts anyway, and so that entering into a Medicare plan is really only a transfer from private funds to public funds. It's only a transfer and not an additional cost at all. As a matter of fact, I believe that the Saskatchewan Government has been able to administer their plan over the years with administration costs of something like six percent, or six cents on the dollar; I believe that MMS has been operating on about that same overhead cost. But private insurance companies, as my honourable friend knows well and I know well, as representing several, their administration costs are in the neighbourhood of 40 and 50 percent, so surely to goodness the administration costs of operating a national plan - a national plan - should even be less than the six percent administration costs that Saskatchewan have experienced, because the more that you get into the plan the administration costs should drop slightly, so that there is no added cost. This is what I argue and maintain. We're paying for the cost anyway; we're paying for medical protection whether it be by way of premiums or by way of direct billing for the services that we receive, and I am completely disappointed with my honourable friend the Minister of Health for attempting to destroy this very timely and worthwhile resolution that we're dealing with at the present time.

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

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

YEAS: Messrs. Baizley, Beard, Bjornson, Carroll, Cowan, Craik, Einarson, Enns, Evans, Froese, Hamilton, Jeannottee, Johnson, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McGregor, McKenzie, Mclean, Masniuk, Roblin, Shewman, Spivak, Stanes, Steen, Watt, Weir, Witney, and Mesdames Forbes and Morrison.

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

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 30; Nays, 22.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the amendment carried. Are you ready for the question on the main motion as amended?

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Hamiota, and the proposed motion of the Honourable the Member for Brandon in amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I adjourned this debate for, I believe it's the Honourable Member for St. John's.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, this motion is a matter that has appeared before us on several occasions in recent years, and is a matter dealing with the proper audit and control of the accounts of the government, and one which we have felt on this side merits consideration because there is a great deal that goes on in an operation as large as the government's which does need proper review and investigation, and although we've had explanations in the past for the responsibilities of the Comptroller as he functions now, we have felt on this side and in this party that there should be a more adequate reporting to the Legislature on the vast survey that is made by the Comptroller on what goes on. It has been our feeling that the Comptroller does not act as an independent auditor would, but rather as a person who has to approve disbursements as they are made and check them against the expenditures authorized in the estimates. So that the question often arises as to whether the Comptroller actually looks into an expenditure as to whether it was well-planned, well-conceived, disbursed in such a manner as

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd.) is the greatest benefit for the moneys expended, and not just a question of whether a Minister or a Deputy Minister or other authorized person signs a voucher and sends it in. So that the suggestion has been made in this House time and again, and rejected by this government, that there be an independent auditor responsible directly to the Legislature with his report, and we have indicated not a lack of confidence in the Comptroller at all, but rather a doubt as to whether there is sufficient review and reporting to the Legislature.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the amendment brought by the Member for Brandon would seem to indicate that the government is now having second thoughts about this whole concept. I draw the conclusion from the amendment which he has proposed that the government feels that this too should be reviewed, along with the entire function of the Cabinet, with the entire proposed or considered re-arrangement in Cabinet structure, and of course, as going on in Ottawa now we are told, and it's happening in this House we are told, the Honourable the First Minister mentioned when we dealt with the problem of a part-time Minister of Agriculture and a part-time acting Minister of Highways - or shall we say two full-time Ministers embodied in one body - we found from the First Minister the fact that there is such an investigation taking place. And I'm glad that the government has decided to go along with an investigation of the entire problem of a review of the administrative and financial management and the functions of the Comptroller-General. This is a good thing, and I think we can support the government's efforts to streamline, to improve, to review its procedures up to now. The only thing that we feel should be added to this concept is the fact that the benefits of these studies should be made available to all the members of the Legislature and to the people of Manitoba so that they will be able to approve of any decisions which will be made, so that they will be able to consider any recommendations that are being made by this review committee. So that in extending our support, the support of our party, to the amendment and in accepting this step in the right direction, we feel that we should make an addition that we ought to see to it that we participate in the information and the opinions that are brought about as a result of the review.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Logan, that the amendment be amended by adding the following at the end thereof, after substituting a comma for the final period: "and that a copy of such review be sent forthwith to all members of this House."

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Provincial Treasurer) (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Attorney-General, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer, that the House do now adjourn.

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