

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

8:00 o'clock, Tuesday, June 23, 1970

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions.

REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, and the amendment proposed by the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre which I have taken under advisement. I have considered the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre. In my humble opinion it is a motion offering instruction, hence this is the proper time to receive it and I find the motion in order. May I refer honourable members to Beauchesne 4th Edition, Citation 221 (2) and 222.

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motion.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

HON. SIDNEY GREEN, Q. C. (Minister of Mines and Natural Resources) (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, may I have the leave of the House to have this matter stand. (Agreed)

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BUD BOYCE (Winnipeg Centre): Mr. Speaker, I would ask leave of the House to withdraw this bill.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Honourable Member have leave?

MR. GREEN: It could be just withdrawn from the Order Paper on the basis that he is not proceeding with it.

MR. SPEAKER: Before I proceed, it has been drawn to my attention that the Assistant Clerk of the House has found an instrument which may be of extreme value, particularly at this time with the speed-up motion in effect, a watch. If anyone has lost a watch, he might describe the one which he has lost and it may be the one in the possession of the assistant clerk.

ORDERS OF THE DAY - GOVERNMENT BILLS

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on second reading of the proposed motion of the Honourable the First -- the Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if we could commence where we left off this afternoon at Bill No. 79. Does that continue to be in the name of the Member for -- (Interjection) -- Well then, could we go to Bill No. 86 so he won't lose the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of . . .

MR. ARTHUR MOUG (Charleswood): Mr. Speaker, on 79, the Member for Churchill . . .

MR. GREEN: Is he finished?

MR. MOUG: . . . not being here, could I speak on that?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill has not concluded his debate.

MR. GREEN: Apparently he has, Mr. Speaker, then it's agreeable that we call 79. I thought that the Member for Churchill had not concluded, but apparently he has.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. MOUG: Mr. Speaker, I only have a few words to contribute to Bill 79 in regard to snow vehicles. Mr. Speaker, I feel that I have to say a few words but I'll be short on this, and unlike insurance, I do take part in selling toboggans. I find that toboggans play a great part in our recreation in our province now and well within the constituency of Charleswood. They are used extensively for pleasure as well as industrial, fishing, hunting, trapping and so on. A bill to cover the control of snow toboggans I feel is long overdue really. Everybody has been riding them and trespassing on the highways, let's say trespassing or making use of highways, and I think it's something that should have been controlled previously. It will not only let them know where their rights are and what they are doing wrong, but it will also give them an opportunity to make use of them without prejudicing their use. The registration no doubt will be a major issue and it will serve a very good purpose, both for policing and for protection of private properties.

(MR. MOUG cont'd.)

I would hope that the fee won't be too high and kept within the reach of those that want to make use of the snowmobile. I think on the age group, every time that we think about somebody driving a mechanized vehicle we aim at the age 16, and I think, Mr. Speaker, that we should give consideration to lowering that age. I wouldn't want to see where it was left to the local authorities at all, but I think that we should give consideration, before we pass this bill, of thinking that 16 might be a little high. There's areas, particularly rural and throughout the Province of Manitoba, not speaking of Metro Winnipeg which I represent, but speaking of the rural areas, I think that there's younger people, students, that use this for an area that they have to get back and forth to school. They're of the age group that they have to get the younger people, and possibly you could rule this out by saying, well there's school buses, but I don't agree with it, I think that it's a transportation area that the younger people are using and I think that the Minister of Transportation should take this into consideration and think whether or not the 14-year-olds are making use of this and carefully.

Of the area in that that I speak, Mr. Speaker, I would say that never have I been able to read in the newspaper that anybody under the age of 16 was part of a fatality in the province. I say I know, but I think I know that there was probably four or five fatalities since snow toboggans became of multi-use in the province in about 1960 and I think those three or four deaths were of the older group, none of them were under 16, and I would hope that the Minister of Highways gives consideration to the children in the rural areas that are making use of these toboggans for transportation and for several other reasons, some of them getting back and forth to school.

I think it would be unfortunate if the 15-year-old is denied the privilege and responsibility of operating a snow toboggan. I think if you look at the fact that I had a boy that went back and forth to school - and we lived right on Roblin Boulevard, not on Roblin Boulevard but on the corner of it - and he rides a bike one mile to school every day and he took it to kindergarten at age 5 and he took it to school at Grade 6 and carried on from there. It's a 40 mile an hour route that comes in from the Perimeter Highway controlled by Metro, and I want you to believe that your teeth chatter in the morning when the boy leaves for school, but at the same time all his buddies ride the bike to school and it's pretty hard for you to say that he can't. And I would like the Minister to take that under consideration.

One other thing I would like to bring up that's fairly contentious right now is helmets on motorcycles, and I think that the helmets on snow toboggans are as equally contentious. I think that the guy wires, barb fences, snow fences and support thereof throughout the areas, particularly rural again where they're being used, I think that helmets are a must. It's more hazardous, I would say, than that of a motorcycle operating on a paved highway.

One part of the bill now is 22 (2) in regards to sidelights and mufflers. I would think, Mr. Speaker, that in regard to mufflers, I realize that every municipality, every city has an anti-noise by-law. There is mention that in the first, the (b) is the mufflers, the 22 (2) is "Every snowmobile of a model or make of the year 1971 or later shall be equipped with" - and it says - "a noise muffler attached to the exhaust system." Now a noise muffler attached to the exhaust system is not good enough. I think that you have to go to something where there is a required noise level that you can hold the people and hold the operator of that snowmobile down to a level, and it has to be something that I would think is far greater than that of putting it back to the local authority level. It's much the same as the age group; the age group can't be left with the local authority level.

The Warning Lights. "Two warning lamps casting an amber light, one of which will be placed in a conspicuous position on each side of the snowmobile near the front and which cast a light visible under normal atmospheric conditions from a distance of 500 feet." The 1971 models are out. I have one on display and there is no amber light displayed on either side. I would think that unless these are put on in the factory that they are going to be a problem. They are going to be a light that can be broken off every time you go through a willow bush, every time you come in close contact with another machine. I think this is something that the government has to take into consideration and feel that it's impossible to put on the 1971 models, or any model previous right back to 1960. I would hope that the Minister would give this some consideration. For the 1971 models and older, he would take part (a) of 22 (2) out of there and say that an amber reflector will be sufficient, and supposing that an amber reflector in front, like I see motorcycles equipped with now on the side, an amber reflector on

(MR. MOUG cont'd.) the front side of the machine and a red on the back side of the machine. I think that this is something that would be practical and well in keeping with the law if it were put that way. The fact is that in some conditions the way the lights are set up on the machines that do not come out equipped with a light, the headlight and the taillight, or two taillights which they have, are using up all that the alternator in that small motor will put out, and if it's required of the owner to rewire the machine and set on two more lights, the alternator will not carry the load unless you go back and relevel all the lights, including your headlight and your two taillights, to make provision for the other two lights that you intend to put on.

Another thing, Mr. Speaker - in reference to age again - I would hope that the Minister would give real consideration, as I mentioned before, to the age group and those that are qualified to make use of these machines. That and the amber light is the two -- the age group, the amber lights and the mufflers, and the noise by-law that has to be levelled by local authorities, was the three main items that I picked out of the bill that I felt was most important to give consideration to. The fact that snowmobiles seem to be the thing that is with us now and it's an accepted thing, it's in the Province of Manitoba, I would say it's far widely used, far and above that of boats and outboard motors. It's like skating was 30 years ago. Everybody owned a pair of skates; today, everybody owns a toboggan, every family owns one and in a good many cases there's two.

I would hope that one regulation that the government would take into consideration is toboggans that are being used for racing purposes only. I think if the Minister of Transportation takes this into consideration that toboggans that go for no other purpose, are never used during the week, they're only used on Saturdays and Sundays for racing purposes, I would wonder if they would be classified; would they have to be registered; would they have to carry these several lights on the side; would they be forced to pay this fee, whether it be nominal or otherwise, yearly or every three years. These toboggans would be raced on private property in practically every instance, and I would wonder whether they would be taken into the same consideration or would they have exemptions of some kind.

And also, Winnipeg hosting the starting line of the International 500 that runs from Winnipeg, and in most cases out of the Charleswood constituency from the Perimeter Highway at Roblin Boulevard, to St. Paul, Minneapolis, I would wonder if those people would be required to register their machines and bear licence when they take off on the starting line. Those are one or two things, Mr. Speaker, that I wanted to bring up in regards to snowmobile and hope that I can deal with this further in committee.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. JAMES H. BILTON (Swan River): Mr. Speaker, it's not my purpose to delay this bill but I have been giving some thought to it over the past few days and I feel rather concerned. My honourable colleague from Charleswood has given an opinion which I agree with in every respect, but at the other end of the pole, Mr. Speaker, I'm thinking of those people in Northern Manitoba . . .

HON. ED SCHREYER (Premier) (Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, was the Honourable Member for Swan River advised that he spoke on this debate earlier?

MR. BILTON: I checked it out, Mr. Premier, and I questioned the thought in my own mind but apparently I had not. It's funny how noble minds think alike. However, I'm only going to take up the time of the House for just a few moments, Mr. Speaker, and I'm thinking in terms of the people in Northern Manitoba who rely on these vehicles as a mode of transport. For many years as you know, Mr. Speaker, the dog team was the call of the day and they did the job, but today it's now the snowmobile.

HON. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q.C. (Minister of Finance) (St. John's): On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the honourable member would care to have me read out of Hansard some -- oh, I see these were questions apparently saying he had no intention of making a speech, but then he did go on to make some . . .

MR. BILTON: Well, I learned it from the Honourable Member from St. John. I did check it out, I was being quite honest in the opinion I gave. He's not doubting that I'm sure.

MR. CHERNIACK: Well I'm certain of that, but it would - I would indicate on Page 2970 that the honourable member spoke following the Honourable Member for Morris and he said a very short speech I must say.

MR. BILTON: Well, if the Honourable Minister of Finance denies me the opportunity to speak, I would like to . . .

MR. CHERNIACK: No, I would never do that, I would only . . .

MR. BILTON: I'm pleading for the people that he thinks so much of.

MR. CHERNIACK: I would only think, Mr. Speaker, that the Honourable Member for Swan River would be the first to make sure that he did not abridge the rules of the House.

MR. BILTON: Well, I wonder why the Minister of Finance got up to doubt it in some way or other. I have no intentions of sitting down like the Honourable Member for Roblin, I can assure the Honourable Member of Finance. However, Mr. Speaker, if I may, I'd like to through you, Sir, direct my remarks to the Minister of Transport. I'm not going to endeavour to point out the intricate matters that I have in mind because I am sure he's aware of them, and I'm thinking of the Indian and the Half Breed or Metis people in Northern Manitoba who in this day and age are using snowmobiles or snow vehicles in their everyday life, and I'm sure he's aware as well as I am that the services they have for this equipment is very very expensive and it's imperative that some consideration be given to these people who require this mode of transport in their everyday livelihood. It's just as important to them as a canoe in the summer, and as I said a little earlier, it's just as important to them as the dogs in the past, and I would like to see the Minister give consideration to the elimination of such costs that may develop in the adoption of this bill to people in Northern Manitoba that require this mode of transportation in their livelihoods. I'm thinking of considerations that are being given to the farmer in his tractors and the various implements that he uses, and I would ask the same consideration for them.

I remember when we were developing the Northern Task Force, the First Minister was very prone to relate to me that consideration was being given to members north of 53 in the investigation of the problems in the north, and I would ask the Minister of Transportation in all sincerity to use that as a guideline if he will and eliminate the added cost that this bill may create on those people that do not have any roads and their main streets are just trails, and they do not have the privileges of using highways and they do not have the privileges of using the ditches which this bill requires that people must do.

I'm pleading their case, Mr. Speaker, because those people have nothing in the beginning and the Task Force has asked in many ways that they be given a place in the sun, and this to me, this consideration if the government in its wisdom would consider this, would be one more opportunity that we mean what we say when we're trying to help them. Again I appeal to the government in all sincerity — (Interjection) — I said north of 53, which is just beyond my constituency. But in the meantime, Mr. Premier, I think you know what I'm talking about and I think the Minister of Transportation knows what I am talking about. I mean it most sincerely, and if he doesn't do it, I'll move an amendment in committee and put it to the test. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West): Mr. Speaker, I have only a very few remarks and they're going to be really in the form of questions. The title of the Act attracts my attention. It's called The Snow Vehicles Act, but in the definition, so far as I can see, there is no definition of a snow vehicle; there is a definition of a snowmobile. I'm thinking back of perhaps a month or two ago when there was an account in the paper of the Minister of Transportation having ridden in a — they called it a Hovercraft — and reported rather enthusiastically about the possibilities for the future of this type of machine in Northern Manitoba.

Now a Hovercraft is more properly described, I'm told, as an air-cushioned vehicle and the Federal Department of Transport tell me that it is a vehicle and not an aircraft. I'm wondering if it could be classed as a snow vehicle then because it has the ability to travel over snow or water or muskeg and so forth. Now it does have a future, and if it is a snow vehicle perhaps within the meaning of this Act, I'm wondering if the Minister had any of the functions of this kind of vehicle in mind when he brought this legislation forward. I'm not suggesting that they would be regular users of the highways, but is it not possible that in communicating from one area of muskeg or water to another that it might be convenient to use a cleared right-of-way of the Transportation Department.

The definition of a snowmobile comes very close to including an air-cushioned vehicle because it is a vehicle other than one registered under the Highway Act and it is designed to be self-propelled. It's not equipped with wheels and it has a propellor. It is not in the strictest sense a toboggan, but it does come very close to being a snowmobile and perhaps we should include in the Act rather a definition of a snow vehicle. I think it's a fair question to ask the

(MR. MCGILL cont'd.) Minister whether or not he was giving some consideration to the future of the air-cushioned vehicle in Northern Manitoba and whether or not it might be possible, with minor amendments, to include this kind of a vehicle within the terms of Bill 79, The Snow Vehicles Act. I'd be very interested in hearing the Minister's comments and his summation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE (Roblin): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just have a few short comments with regard to this bill. I'm wondering how close this bill is related to the bill that was introduced into Saskatchewan and I think Alberta, if I understand it correctly, or did the Minister in fact use the draft legislation that was prepared in those provinces, because I ask the one question right away, what's going to happen between a snowmobile that's running between Manitoba and Saskatchewan, and maybe the Minister can give me the answers to that which — (Interjection) — I beg your pardon? — (Interjection) — No, I live right on the — my constituency shares the boundary of Saskatchewan and I think it's only fair that I have some clarification for those that I represent in that particular aspect.

The other thing I'd like to ask the Minister, in the insurance aspect of the bill, are we being again — is this contingent with the automobile, Bill 56? Is the government going to provide the insurance or has the industry been notified today that this is about to be passed in this House and they should start preparing rates. And then I asked, am I going to get the same consideration in my constituency which I get today by the insurance industry, where a farmer gets 40 percent off. It's as simple as that. Or I ask again, would the Minister consider north of 53 fifty percent off, even 75 percent off the rates that are prescribed in a highly congested area for the Greater Winnipeg area. I think the Minister should be very serious when he starts charging rates north of 53, which with vehicles may be a problem, but not with snowmobiles.

So I think that is only a fair question, Mr. Speaker, for me to ask of you and the House tonight. Would a 75 percent off the standard rate, which is if Bill 56 is going to be implemented; 75 off for north of 53; 40 percent off for the farmers which we enjoy today from the going rates with their farm trucks. Basically, a snowmobile is not too much different on a farm today from a farm truck, because in the winter it's handier and simpler for him to use his snowmobile than it is for him to use his farm truck.

MR. SCHREYER: Oh no.

MR. MCGILL: Well, the First Minister doesn't buy it. All right, I say come up and take a look, and it's something that deserves very serious consideration of the House. Again I ask, Mr. Speaker, if in fact the industry has been notified that this bill is on the table and they should be starting to prepare rates, or if the province or the government's putting this monopolistic system in and they're not going to be able to, you know, provide rates or get into the licensing of snowmobiles insofar as insurance is concerned, well then I say cool it, we don't need to deal with them at all. If in fact they're going to be given a chance, I think it's only fair for the First Minister and the Minister of Transportation to ask them to put some rates on the table.

And now let's move over to section — there's another section there, the careless section, Mr. Speaker, that . . .

MR. SCHREYER: May I ask a question? — (Interjection) — Well I ask it only because the Member for Roblin . . .

MR. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, I think this is something that we have to clarify in the House because this is where the Honourable Member for Swan River got hung, on a simple little question he raised, he made a little speech. Now if in fact that is breaking the rules, Mr. Speaker, where a member stands up opposite and asks a question and then makes a speech, is he being given a chance to speak again? You shall have to clear this up, because I felt so terrible for the Honourable Member for Swan River, most embarrassed, Mr. Speaker, who thought in good faith that he only stood up and asked a simple question, but the members opposite said he spoke. And this is what — in my remarks last night, Mr. Speaker, if you remember, I said we got a problem where members opposite always want to ask these innocent questions but they make speeches on it. It's as simple as that and I think you should some day, Mr. Speaker, take a look at it because it is a problem.

I'm wondering now about the gas in these snowmobiles. Can we buy, or can we burn purple gas? Can a farmer burn purple gas in his snowmobile? — (Interjection) — Well, is it legit? Well, I'd like to see it in the bill. — (Interjection) — Look, we're no different in the country than anybody else, we just like to have it down in black and white. Is it legit to

(MR. McKENZIE cont'd.) burn purple gas in a snowmobile?

And now the careless section here. I wonder if the Minister would explain that at some length - Section 24. I got lost when I tried to explain it to some of my colleagues, because that's a word that's very difficult to explain in common language as we understand it today.

There's the section of crossing the highways at a 90° angle, Mr. Speaker, and this concerns me because when I'm driving one of them snowmobiles I'm not sure if I'm going to hit it at 87° or 90°. Would it be not — (Interjection) — Yes. Do I have to have a surveyor with me or somebody doing radar, or would it be not simple to say "at right angles." Let's get out of the degrees because I don't think it's possible for us to, you know, put it down hard and cold. If you don't cross the highway at 90° you're breaking the law. I think at right angles would be a fairer statement in the bill and . . .

HON. JOSEPH P. BOROWSKI (Minister of Transportation) (Thompson): We're not drafting the rules for you.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Leader of the Liberal Party) (Portage la Prairie): Would the member permit a question? What is the difference . . .

MR. McKENZIE: Now, Mr. Speaker, let's clarify this, because this is a point that I raised earlier. Is this a speech or is it a question?

MR. SPEAKER: It's entirely up to the honourable member whether he wishes to have someone question him.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: I'm somewhat confused. Could the member tell me what the difference is between 90° and a right angle?

MR. McKENZIE: Well, I was never an honour student in mathematics although I did pass all the courses of course, but, you know, for the sake of going to court - and we're making laws here tonight, Mr. Speaker, we're putting it down in hard, cold facts, and here we're going to have the law measuring with a right-angle triangle to see whether it's 90 degrees or was he — let's be a little more realistic. We haven't got that kind of people in this province that are going to zoom up on a highway with a snowmobile and say, well here is 90 degrees. It's just not possible, Mr. Speaker, it's not. I think it's only fair that we be fair to the people of Manitoba when we - you know, how can you possibly police that type of legislation? I think it would be most difficult. It's not even fair to those that are trying to enforce the laws, so I would ask the Minister of Transportation to take another look at that section.

Then again, the other section is the one with the rules respecting the operation of snowmobiles and the regulations that will be — the municipalities or the jurisdictions, and I'm not clear on that. Possibly the Minister will help me to clarify my position on it and those that I represent because we are not clear on that section of the Bill, Section 34.

With those few remarks, Mr. Speaker, I think the Minister, in his wisdom, will give us some of the answers in this bill that we need before we can carry on with the debate, and I thank you for finally recognizing that there is a rule, Mr. Speaker, and they can't ask me all those questions all the time without making speeches.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Minister of Transportation.

MR. BOROWSKI: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I finally get an opportunity to answer all the questions, most of which I think are pretty sensible and straightforward. I think if the members that spoke had read the Bill, and I realize there's so many bills it's very difficult to read them and understand them all, particularly if they're given to the Legal Department, the lawyers, when they get through even I don't recognize it. That's probably why we have the problem with the right angle or 90 degrees. It's not the best type of terminology — I don't think I would put in as a working man, but you must remember it's not the working man that drafts the laws and when you go to court it's not the working man that interprets them, it's a fancy educated judge and lawyer that finally make the decisions, so I think we have to put the words that they understand.

MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): That's the point sponsored by the Chamber of Commerce.

MR. BOROWSKI: That's worse. I'd like to start off with the questions asked last week, or was it last week when the Member for Swan River made his first speech?

MR. BILTON: Mr. Speaker, I was accused of making — (Interjection) — I didn't make a first speech.

MR. BOROWSKI: I don't really mind. The fact is that there was a speech recorded and

(MR. BOROWSKI cont'd.) I did bring it to the attention of the Minister of Finance, and that's why he got up and interrupted because there was a speech recorded, but I don't think there's any harm done as long as we don't set a precedent.

MR. BILTON : He's another lawyer, Joe.

MR. BOROWSKI: The first question that was asked was about the plates. I think there's a lot of concern in the Chamber and outside the Chamber. The plates are going to be based and sold on a three-year licensing. This will do away with a lot of red tape, line-ups that we presently have with our vehicle plates. It'll be a tremendous bookkeeping saving for us. The price is going to be \$15.00 for three years, \$5.00 a year which is just about average or slightly below average of other jurisdictions. Saskatchewan is \$5.00 a year; Michigan I believe is \$10.00 - no, it's not a year, I think it's a two year registration. At any rate, the price is going to be \$5.00 per year based on three years. Should you sell the vehicle you will be entitled to a refund based on the same formula we apply to the car plates.

The second question had to do with age limits and of course if you drive on your farm, if you have a farm, or on private land there is no age restrictions. We think that if a person wants to put a six or seven or eight-year-old child on a vehicle -- I think it's wrong -- but I think the parent has some responsibility and this is fine with me. When they get out on the highway or on a street where there is vehicles -- (Interjection) -- Yes, on a highway. They can cross highways under this legislation. When they get out on highways or streets I think then we as legislators have a responsibility to pass rules and regulations not only for their protection but for the protection of other motorists. So the age limit will apply on public roads. As far as towns are concerned we, as I've indicated, are passing permissive legislation where they can pass their own by-laws. This includes travelling on sidewalks, streets, noise and other regulations that they may want to bring in.

As far as junior competition is concerned I think we'll have to give special dispensation as we give now. When there is racing meets they simply make an application to the Motor Transport Board and special dispensation is given for that particular race and kids under 16 can take part in the race and will not be violating the Act. But only under those conditions will 16-year-olds, or under 16 be allowed on public roads.

There's been some discussion about helmets and I notice that the Member for Charleswood is in favour of helmets. I think the problem with helmets is, it's very difficult to compare motorcycles to snowmobiles. Although there is more snowmobiles than there is motorcycles the fact is that snowmobiles are used in the winter; if you fall off first of all you're very close to the ground and if you fall off you usually fall into a snowbank. With a motorcycle it's in gravel which will tear your face and your knees or crack your head and there's speed, there's cars involved. I don't think you can honestly compare a rider on a motorcycle and a rider on a snowmobile. Furthermore, statistics indicate that there are many injuries on motorcycles, head injuries; on snowmobiles we have practically no statistics. But the few that we do have indicate that there is very few head injuries on snowmobiles. So as far as I'm concerned we are not going to make it compulsory and in a one-year period when we will have registration where accidents must be reported and we will be able to look at the statistics and if it shows that there is a need, then I think a year from now we can go ahead and say they must also wear helmets. However, if the members in the Opposition feel strong enough and want to bring in an amendment at Law Amendments I don't think I'm going to object very strenuously. I can't speak for my colleagues. I'm not going to object very strenuously and you have that opportunity to do this in Law Amendments.

There was the question of the definition of a ditch. Now that's a very difficult definition. In the Traffic Act now, and this comes from the Registrar's office and this is the way they define it, "that is the portion of a highway that is not used for the passage of vehicles." Now to me that's beautiful language for lawyers to spend hours arguing about because the fact of the matter is that people travel on the centre portion of the highway and usually highways have shoulders. Now is this classed under the Act as the portion that is normally travelled? I don't think it is, because people don't travel, they may park there, they may pull off there, but they don't normally travel. According to the definition that the Registrar gives me it would appear that they would be allowed to travel on that portion. So it would appear that they could and I don't think that's right. I think possibly again in Law Amendments maybe we could bring in an amendment to define the shoulder, and that is that point of the highway which starts dropping off at an angle, that's where the shoulder will end. So they can travel on that shoulder

(MR. BOROWSKI cont'd.) part and the ditch. Now, whether it stands up in court or not I don't know. I think it's something that will have to be tested.

Saskatchewan — another question about is there any problems in Saskatchewan with plates? I think the Member for Assiniboia asked this. They have their plates on the back of the machine and I find on checking with them that there is problems of identification because the track throws up snow and you can't see it and this is one of the reasons we insisted that the plates go one on each side because when the machine is in motion you simply can't see the plates. And the plates are going to be the same size as your car plates and they're going to be the reflectorized type which you can see for half a mile at night because they're reflectorized and of course you'll be able to see them clearly in the daytime.

Speed limits. On checking again with our Registrar we find that although we say in the Act that they must obey all traffic signs, that includes speed signs, the fact is that most of the vehicles don't have speedometers. Now again it's a problem. How do you deal with a problem that when the manufacturer built the machine he wasn't -- maybe he didn't think they'd ever get that popular; he never anticipated that one day Legislatures would deal with it and would have to pass laws against it. So we find although we put a clause in the Act dealing with speed, the fact of the matter is that the driver simply does not know how fast he's going, yet he is asked to obey all the signs on the highway. It's going to be a problem; we don't know how to resolve it. We have discussed this at length and we felt that the best way to do it is leave it as is, see how it works out and if at the end of the year we find we're having difficulties, we may have to rescind it or amend it.

Another item that was discussed here was travel on the highway. At the present time first of all it's illegal to travel in a ditch. Secondly, when they do travel, they travel in both directions. The Act states that you must travel in the same direction as the cars go so there will be no confusion where the driver on the highway is concerned about where that person is going. So if they want to travel in ditches they go the same way as the cars. They can cross over at 90 degrees and travel back down the other side. So it will be illegal to travel on the right side against traffic.

As far as spotting for planes - I think the Member for Riel mentioned - the plates are going to be mounted on a vehicle at an angle, about that type of angle which means you could spot them from the aircraft with no difficulty. Because of the size of the plates I don't think there will be any difficulty for our game people to spot these, to spot the number of the vehicle, and insofar as the abuse for animals is concerned I think we're all aware and concerned. The fact of the matter is that it's really up to the game people to pass legislation, I think tougher legislation. I think anybody that will chase an animal down whether it's a deer or a moose with a machine, play him out and then clobber them, deserves to be clobbered himself. I hope that the Minister of Mines and Resources passes good legislation that will look after this problem.

MR. BILTON: You bet.

MR. BOROWSKI: There was a discussion about farmers. They're subject to the same law as anyone else as far as purple gas is concerned. My understanding is that everybody uses purple gas. -- (Interjection) -- That's not true? Well, I am told this, that they use purple gas and I don't even know after passing this legislation whether they're allowed to use purple gas or not; I'm not sure. I'm sure we can find this thing out. When I asked the Registrar he wasn't sure; we'll have to find this thing out before we have final reading on it, whether they will be allowed to use it.

The Member for Swan River was very concerned about the North and of course he's being consistent and I'm glad that he made the speech that he did because we are going to exempt all isolated communities in the North -- (Interjection) -- Not Swan River, I'm sorry, that's too far south. Fishermen, trappers and there's one other category I just can't think of it for the moment. -- (Interjection) -- No, not newspapermen. But they will be exempt and there's two reasons for that. First is the reason he mentions, we don't supply them with any ditches, they really have no benefits so why should we charge them even though \$5.00 I don't think is very much. Nevertheless I don't think we have a moral right to charge them; we give them nothing in return.

The other problem will be of course, enforcement. Most of the communities don't have any police and I think it would be ridiculous to send police in to a community just to see if they got license plates and whether they're complying with the laws. And of course we would have a problem of how do we sell the licences, how do we register the vehicles? And in any event

(MR. BOROWSKI cont'd.) there is no problems in the north. The people there -- and when I say this I don't want southerners to get the wrong idea -- they're sensible, much more sensible people than some of those that I find in urban areas. We have no problems with the type of abuse that you find in urban areas. The people there, whether they're South Indian Lake, Nelson House or Norway House, if they have a snowmobile they use it for fishing in the wintertime, trapping, they even skid wood with it. They do many things but they don't run around at night past your door and wake up the kids and the whole family like some of those down south do. So I can see no problems and for these three reasons we are going to exempt snowmobiles in the isolated communities.

MR. BILTON: I wonder if I can interrupt the Honourable Minister. He said isolated communities. Would he rather not say remote communities?

MR. BOROWSKI: You want me to broaden the legislation?

MR. BILTON: No. No, remote.

A MEMBER: What's the difference?

MR. BOROWSKI: Remote. Well I don't know what remote means to the Member for St. John's who is living right in the middle of the city. To me remote means a place where there is no roads. In other words people in Thompson although they're far north should pay the fee. I think remote areas are Nelson -- any place where there's no road. -- (Interjection) -- All right, so I should say, I suppose, isolated. I think the best definition is any community that does not have a road to it. How does that sound? Then, Mr. Speaker, if there is any confusion, if there is any confusion I'm sure that the members opposite or somebody from this side could insert something in the bill that would spell it out a little clearer. When we drafted it up I had no question in my mind as to what I wanted done but there may be some confusion . . .

MR. J. DOUGLAS WATT (Arthur): Would the Minister permit a question?

MR. BOROWSKI: Yes, certainly.

MR. WATT: No, I didn't make a speech and I'm just asking a question. But I believe that I heard the Minister say that any area that had no roads would be considered a remote area? Isolated? Would that not pretty well apply to the whole of the province now?

MR. BOROWSKI: I take it the former Minister of Agriculture doesn't approve of my road policy.

A MEMBER: Your constituency has just been declared remote.

MR. BOROWSKI: Well, I had intended to get in a few truckloads of gravel for that constituency but I'm going to have another hard look at that now.

The Member for Brandon was concerned about hovercrafts and the fact is, Mr. Speaker, we are bringing in some legislation, quite meaningless I think, but we're bringing it in. Well that's not right either. Hovercrafts are under federal jurisdiction and we are bringing legislation in another section of the Act, not under the snowmobile. And we have checked with Ottawa, they have passed legislation which I think is meaningless and we're going to add to it -- I suppose that's the way I should have put it.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, would the Minister permit a question? I wonder if in view of his explanation he would explain now why he wouldn't call this act The Snowmobile Act so that in the event that subsequently other Acts are presented which have to do with a vehicle which could be called a snow vehicle that it might be more understandable.

MR. BOROWSKI: Well, Mr. Speaker, I can't tell you why it's called The Snow Vehicles Act. As you are aware we made a new bill on it. It was in another jurisdiction and we took it out and put it under the Criminal Code of Canada which put us in a different field and we could deal with it differently. One of the things it does, by making it a separate Act and putting it under the Criminal Code is that you can charge a person and you can suspend his licence. At the present time if you find a person that's drunk and I think there's been about three cases so far in Manitoba where people have been charged for drunken driving a snowmobile, they're simply given a \$50.00 fine. By putting it under the Criminal Code of Canada we could suspend his licence.

MR. WALTER WEIR (Leader of the Opposition) (Minnedosa): Is that under the title, Joe, or under the Act?

MR. BOROWSKI: Well titles mean nothing. You know some people have a great deal of faith in titles; I haven't. You know it's what's inside that counts. The Hovercraft -- I went on a trip on a Hovercraft down the river and I am convinced that it's the vehicle of the future,

(MR. BOROWSKI cont'd.) not just for the north but for the south. I think it's going to become so popular that it'll become a social problem like the snowmobile has and it's for this reason that we're putting a little bit into the Act elsewhere to let the people who manufacture and let the people who sell know that we intend to deal with hovercraft at some future date and I think we'll have to get some jurisdiction from Ottawa. At the moment, all I've said to the people who sell them that we think that you should be required to make a person have 10 hours of training before you can operate one of them. You can fly an aircraft after 30 hours, I believe, and the suggestion has been made that they should be required, every person who operates a hovercraft should have 10 hours of - not flying time - but I suppose the equivalent of flying time because they are a very dangerous vehicle. You're floating on a cushion of air at 60 miles an hour and a gust of wind can push you over and you'd be in collision before you knew what happened, and after being in that machine there at 40 miles an hour over ice and water, I'm convinced that it's a very dangerous machine if handled by a green operator. So in this section that we're dealing with the hovercraft, there is some mention made of it and when I say I think it's useless, I say this because I'm not sure that we have jurisdiction because waterways are the federal jurisdiction as boats are. They make the decisions and the licensing and what do you call the jackets? Life jackets. They make the decisions and they approve the standards for life jackets so the Federal Government has jurisdiction in this area and unfortunately until they relinquish that jurisdiction to us we are not going to be able to do too much but I think we should be concerned about it because if anybody's ever heard those within half a mile of his house, he'll realize what a nuisance this is; the noise I think is probably the equivalent of an aircraft or a Cat 7.

The Member for Roblin talked about insurance here and he was wondering if we consulted an insurance company; he was concerned about the rates. The fact is that the insurance companies have been selling insurance to snowmobile operators in Manitoba. I can't give you the statistics - there's about 20,000 vehicles. How many of them carry insurance we have no way of knowing and of course I don't think even insurance companies know unless they get together and look at the figures as a group. We do know what they charge, and we do know what's charged in Saskatchewan. I think you'll appreciate this one. When you were talking the other day, crying all over the place about the rates, about the fact that we're trying to sell a scheme and you wanted it on the table, I'll give you something on the table and see how you like it. In Saskatchewan they charge you \$5.00 for the plates and \$8.50 for your insurance. Here's the rates for Manitoba. Under 19, excluding passenger hazard, \$26.00; including passenger hazard \$39.00. Now that's your Socialist rates in Saskatchewan as compared to your parasite friends here in Manitoba who have been bleeding the public since Day One. Twenty-five and over excluding passenger hazard \$15.00; and including passenger hazard \$23.00, so you'll see there's a significant difference and I wish we could say this about Bill 56. Unfortunately, all we'll be able to give is a maximum of 20 to 25 percent. In this case there's a saving of two to three hundred percent but there is a difference and you living by the border, the Member for Roblin should know this and appreciate the difference and tell the House, tell the House what the Socialists are doing in Saskatchewan. -- (Interjection) -- Well those are the rates, those are the rates.

This is all the questions that I can find here. If I've missed any, I'd be very happy to get up again and answer them.

MR. SPEAKER: Those in favour please say Aye -- (Interjection) -- I believe the Honourable Minister had closed debate. That was my impression. We are not in Committee of the Whole. Are you ready for the question?

MR. MOUG: Mr. Speaker, he never said he was closing the debate.

MR. WATT: Would you answer a question?

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, if the rules permit, I have no objection to answering the question but the debate I know is closed because I waited for everybody to make their speech and then I got up and answered. However, if you allow me and if it doesn't violate the rules, I'd be very happy to answer the question.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it the wish of the House to allow questions? The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. WATT: Well, Mr. Speaker, would the Minister accept a question? I'd just like to know from the Minister how many farmers have been convicted for the illegal use of purple gasoline in snowmobiles?

MR. BOROWSKI: I can't tell you that. I can't even tell you how many accidents we've had and this is one of the problems we're faced with because the machines have never been registered, no one in the province really knows what's going on. Once it's registered, you ask me that question a year from now, if I'm still here, and I'll be able to answer it.

MR. WATT: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Did I not understand the Minister to say that he knew that farmers were using purple gas illegally in snowmobiles?

MR. BOROWSKI: Yes, I said that. I said my information is they're using it and if you say they're not using it and . . .

MR. WATT: No, Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege I did not say they weren't using it; it was the Minister that said they were and I asked him how many convictions had been registered.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Honourable Minister will permit a question. I believe there's a few areas that he has left unanswered that I posed to him when I made my remarks on the bill or contribution to the bill. One is, Is there any requirement for registration of the motor or snowmobiles when they are used exclusively on a farm because there's many farmers that have snowmobiles at the present time which they will not use anywhere in the road or in the ditches; they will be used no different than any power equipment such as tractors or you know, caterpillars on a farm.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you asking a question or repeating a speech?

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, this is a question.

MR. SPEAKER: I believe the House would appreciate granting the honourable member an opportunity to place questions and not to repeat speeches.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry if you felt that I repeated a speech because all I'm asking if the farmers will be required to register the motor vehicles or the snowmobiles just because the snowmobile to some farmers is the same as any other power equipment. I have another question I might as well pose all of them at the same time.

MR. DESJARDINS: Give the first one first.

MR. PATRICK: O.K. because I have three I might as well pose them all at the same time. The second one is I'm sure the Minister would - about the speedometer - he said that at the present time he saw no requirement for speedometers and I just wondered did he make any requisition for the manufacturers that they would equip every snowmobile with speedometers. The other one is also about insurance. When the farmers will not use these snowmobiles on, say, ditches or roads or highways, use it specifically on their highways, will they be required to register and have to carry insurance.

MR. BOROWSKI: Well, Mr. Speaker, first of all, I think the Member for Assiniboia wasn't here when I stated at the outset of my speech last week I guess, when I spoke, that the insurance section does not apply. I started drafting the bill last fall. At that time the committee, I'm not sure if the committee was even sitting on insurance. Now I had no idea what the insurance committee is going to recommend; as far as I was concerned I felt that it's important that these people be covered and I put in the clause that they must have insurance. However, since we're getting automobile insurance, I see no point in having it so we're going to delete it. It's going to be deleted so there'll be no requirement under this section.

Now as far as the farmers exemption - I've said this before and I think I was asked the question this spring whether we'd consider giving special overweight permits to farmers during spring restrictions and at that time I said where this government's concerned there's one law for the rich, the poor and the farmer, and I haven't changed my mind and the fact is the snowmobile, whether you like it or not, is really a pleasure vehicle like a boat unless you're in a remote area where you use it for fishing or unless you're a commercial fisherman and the few farmers who do use it outside or do use it for working, I don't know how you would be able to handle this thing, how would you, you know, who would make the decisions. The farmer would have to come in and swear an affidavit and bring witnesses to prove that he in fact uses that snow vehicle only for farm work or does he occasionally on weekends use it for pleasure and go out in the ditch? I think when you're talking about \$5.00, the problem's just not worth it and \$5.00, look it's less than a bottle of Scotch, much less. As far as speedometers are concerned, I don't know what the manufacturers are going to do but we did check on the mufflers before we agreed in Saskatchewan with the three western Ministers; the manufacturers assured us that if we passed legislation making it compulsory to have mufflers on a machine, that they can gear themselves in production that they could supply sufficient mufflers for all the vehicles that are

(MR. BOROWSKI cont'd.) on the road so there'll be no problems where mufflers are concerned; as far as speedometers, it's an unanswered question at the moment.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek. The Honourable Member for Assinibola.

MR. PATRICK: Would not the Minister find it pretty difficult to have the farmers licence their snowmobiles when it's used exclusively on their own property, on their own yards?

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the Honourable Minister of Transport this question - and he has stated the snowmobiles in emergency and what have you in the north, or where it may be concerned as far as rural areas are concerned - the age limit put upon the driver because of licensing being 16, do you feel that the age limit in this regard in the north or in rural areas is fair as far as operating a snowmobile is concerned?

MR. BOROWSKI: Well, Mr. Speaker, if the member had been listening he'd have realized what I was trying to say. There is a reason for having an age limit and we are saying that if you are on private property there is no age limit, but once you get on the highway - and this bill allows you to cross the highway at right angle - there is no highways up north, there is no car that can run you over. There's a big difference there. There's no problems of being run over and being involved in accidents because there simply is no road, so therefore it's not important to have that limit in a licence placed in the north.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question and I may not have been listening. Is the Minister saying that a family who is going out to enjoy a snowmobile, or whether it's for emergency and what have you or whatever it may be, can enjoy the snowmobile as long as they don't cross a highway at all ages?

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I said if they travel on provincial highways or municipal roads - unless the municipalities want to exempt them, that's their business - we are primarily concerned in this bill about our jurisdiction which is P.R. and P.T.H.'s. If they go on private land there is no restrictions. If the municipality or town - and we are giving them that permissive legislation - if they want to make an exemption to 12 years or not at all, that's their business, I'm not going to tell them how to run their affairs.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. MOUG: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister three questions. In regard to the International 500 that runs between Winnipeg, would you - I don't think you answered this before - would you necessitate that they have a licence and insurance? Secondly, would you give consideration to reflectors on the sides as motorcycles have and not lights; and would you consider that this bill not take effect north of the 53rd.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I think questions to a person who has made an address are supposed to be of a nature that clarify his address, and I'm sure that the questions that the honourable member has asked could be asked in committee. We are almost engaged in what I consider to be questions on the estimates, so I would request that the honourable member get his answers to those questions in committee when the bill will be discussed.

MR. MOUG: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, if I may, I asked these questions during my address to the debate and I think it's justified that I re-ask them owing to the fact that the Minister overlooked answers to the questions.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, with the greatest of respect, there's no point of order which requires the Minister to answer those questions, and I repeat questions following an address are intended to clarify content of the address. The Member will have an opportunity to get answers to his questions. I'm not saying that he shouldn't and I'm not even saying that the Minister shouldn't have answered them; what I'm suggesting is that we can't carry on a question period of the nature of the estimates after a debate has been closed.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order, if I may. The Minister indicated that if he had omitted any question that he would be happy to attempt to try and answer them and I think what is solicited is some questions that the Minister apparently inadvertently didn't answer, and I think it meets the criteria that was established by the Minister who has control essentially, Mr. Speaker, of the question that he is prepared to accept and reject, not the House Leader, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MOUG: Mr. Speaker, on that same point of order, the Minister of Transportation did say that if there's any other questions he'd be pleased to answer them, and I think that this

(MR. MOUG cont'd.) is probably an appropriate time in order to enlighten me how I'd want to vote on this bill.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I'm glad to hear the Leader of the Opposition saying I have jurisdiction of establishing rules here. If that is the case then I'm going to make a lot of changes. I did say that and of course I say that sincerely. I'm not aware of the rules of the House and sometimes when I make a statement it may be in conflict of the rules, as obviously I did in this case. I shouldn't have made that statement because it would be violating the rules. However, I may as well answer the question since I'm up and I hope that this is the last question. I'll be very happy to answer the rest then in committee and I think you can ask all kinds of questions. The only problem there is that it's not recorded in Hansard and there is some difficulty there. -- (Interjection) -- No, that's repetitious.

The first question you have is on the race, the 500 rally race to the States, and would they be required to be registered and insured. Well, as I said on the insurance, if Bill 56 is in, obviously they'll have to be. If it happens before Bill 56 comes into effect then we certainly aren't going to unless the rules of the race are that they must be insured, and the rules of the race usually say that you must have a helmet, I think. So if they want to make the rules that's again none of my business, they can do it. There's one other question you had and it just slipped my mind.

MR. MOUG: Amber lights in comparison to reflectors, and would you consider giving exception to this bill north of the 53.

MR. BOROWSKI: Well, the lights are clearly spelled out and I think they apply to all. As far as exceptions to the north of 53, I think I've clearly stated, or as clearly as I'm capable of stating, of where the rules apply and where they don't apply, and that is isolated communities.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Health and Social Services. The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. INEZ TRUEMAN (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, I've had an opportunity to examine Bill 86 and I've had some opinions on the Bill, and I'm of the opinion that it's essentially a very good Act. There are some minor suggestions which I would like to make concerning the specific clauses when the bill is before us on Law Amendments Committee, but we'd be prepared to see it proceed at this time.

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

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, my remarks will be very brief as well. I did have a couple of questions, one in connection with the discharge allowance. I think quite often we hear of reports through the press where certain people have been discharged from a correctional institute, and then not having enough funds on hand they get into trouble again. I would like to know just how much money, or how much are these inmates given when they are being discharged. I don't know whether the Attorney-General is listening — I wonder if the Attorney-General is listening. I was asking the question and I hope that I get an answer afterwards because I feel that this is important. I think as a result we have repeaters creating offences repeatedly because of this, that they have no way of getting by and as a result, because of the minor allowances that are being given these people, that as a result we find that they are in trouble repeatedly.

Then according to the Bill, I'm wondering whether correctional institute could also be a farm, because under the Act there are certain sections so that these people can be placed at different places. A correctional institute can be a place, and I was wondering whether farms could even qualify under this section.

There is another provision dealing with the matter of visitors, and I'm also interested as far as the clergy is concerned. How often can these people visit an institute? The matter is left up to the Superintendent as to the authorization as to when and what days these people can come to the institute and visit their people. I imagine much of this rests with the Superintendent, but has the Attorney-General or the party sponsoring the bill, can he tell us whether any of these people have been refused to see people just because of the Superintendent's ruling and that they were not allowed to see the people that they were intending to visit?

Then there is also another matter under the regulations part, under (d), also having to do with allowances or remuneration of inmates confined to these institutions but who apparently

(MR. FROESE cont'd.) will be getting remuneration. What has been the practice in the past? Is this a complete new regulation? Has this not been practised before, and if so, if it has been practised, just what remuneration has been given to some of these inmates under this part?

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. FROESE: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Could I not have some answers to the questions put?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, there's no point of order. The member's remarks will be on record and I take it that the Minister will look at them and have an opportunity of answering.

MR. SPEAKER: All those in favour, please say aye — the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, if I may with all due respect, it seems to me that the normal practice in the House has been that on second reading members on this side ask questions or bring up matters, and that the Minister normally in closing the debate on second reading answers the questions that have been raised from this side.

MR. GREEN: . . . because there's no point of order. I agree with what my honourable friend is saying, and I've indicated that the Minister is not here but the member's questions will be on record and the Minister will have a chance of dealing with them. He may deal with them in Committee or at another time.

HON. AL MACKLING, Q.C. (Attorney-General) (St. James): Mr. Speaker, perhaps some of the confusion arises by the Honourable Member for Rhineland thinking that I am responsible for this Bill. The Honourable Minister of Health and Social Development, who is unfortunately not here, but I'm sure will answer his questions in Committee.

MR. EARL MCKELLAR (Souris-Killarney): I'd like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Rock Lake, that debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Labour, Bill No. 92. The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this Bill, An Act to amend The Labour Relations Act. It has a few principles involved in it and I agree with some of them. I have some reservations in one area, and I believe that one of the most important things is where we have the logging operations or mining operations and where it is a private property where all the employees reside on and sometimes it's difficult for an employee representative to be able to visit the area in order to be able to present the union properly. In one of the principles in the bill it gives the right to the employee representative, and I think it's a real good point and I would certainly agree with that principle.

There's one, the determination of union membership, which I think is not a good thing. I think it is very sloppy legislation, Mr. Speaker, in this case where the Board is satisfied that a trade union has established a practice of admitting persons to membership without regard to the eligibility requirements of its charter. I think perhaps the Board could agree in this case until the charter is amended, instead of giving the right completely to the Board to allow. I think it would make for much better legislation, and this is the area that I am not too certain that this is good legislation. In my own estimation I would feel that it's sloppy legislation. I would have liked to have seen it the other way because I think it would make for much better legislation. I think it would be much better for the union to amend its charter instead of anything that would come up, to ask the board to allow. I think it would be much better in that respect.

MR. GREEN: . . . permit a question?

MR. PATRICK: Yes.

MR. GREEN: Does the honourable member know of any other circumstance where a third party, that is a party other than the organization itself, has the right to say who are members and who are not members of the organization.

MR. PATRICK: Perhaps I can be specific, Mr. Speaker, but I think it would be better for the Charter of a union to spell this out and I'm sure that — why shouldn't the organization amend its Charter to allow members, instead of getting permission, because this may occur quite often and why should every time this occurs that you should get a special permission from the board. I think it would be much better to amend its charter and be able to have all the members belong. I think it would be the proper course really.

(MR. PATRICK cont'd.)

The other point which I think is a very important factor and which I have taken part in the debates in the House and have spoken quite often on it, and you will find that during the debates in the labour estimates, and that is one of the principles involved that the majority of those voting have selected a trade union to be the bargaining agent on their behalf. In this case, it's the majority of those that are voting instead of all the people in the bargaining unit. I think that since I've been in this House I have talked on this point and this principle almost on every labour estimates, and I think it's a very good principle embodied in this bill which I would definitely support and I think it's a good point.

The other areas - I have gone through the bill and I see no other points that I would be opposed to. I think it's clarifying the legislation in many points and making it more clear, with exception of the one that I spell out. I still feel - the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources has not convinced me - I still think if you're not specific I think it may make, unless the Minister of Labour can convince me different - and I'm prepared to let the bill go into committee so we may have some representation and I perhaps will have a better understanding of that point - but at the present time I still think it makes sloppy legislation. But all in all, I would say the bill is a good one and I recommend it and I'm prepared to support it.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Government Services, Bill No. 94. The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, 94? Is that the Act?

MR. SPEAKER: I've called Bill No. 94.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Yes, Mr. Speaker, thank you very much. I apologize, Mr. Speaker, for I was in a discussion about something else in another area.

Personally, Mr. Speaker, after reading this Act over and discussions that I've had briefly with members on the other side, we feel that there's no problem with this Act; in fact we think it's a very good Act regarding expropriation. What this Act basically says is that you have to have meetings with the people that you're going to expropriate before proceedings take place. In other words, we're going to sit down and explain and talk to them about the expropriation before it takes place. Mr. Speaker, after going over this Act very thoroughly, we think it's a good move. The word "authority", I have some questions regarding the authority which I will take up in committee, but at the present time we feel it should go to committee and we have no opposition to it at this time.

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

MR. CY GONICK (Crescentwood): Mr. Speaker, I just have a very few remarks, in fact just one remark to make. I know there's a great deal of concern about this legislation among small property owners in the city, and I wonder if it would be possible once the bill is passed for the Minister to, in very simple perhaps question and answer form, prepare a pamphlet in simple English, question and answer form, which would widely distribute the main points of the legislation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose.

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Cultural Affairs, Bill No. 100. The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. PATRICK: Could I have this matter stand, Mr. Speaker? (Agreed)

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Youth and Education, Bill No. 105. The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: This is a good opportunity to wax wise, I guess, but I'm not going to, I'm going to make it very brief. I did have some concern about this particular bill because I didn't think it went far enough in some areas, but after discussing it in more detail with the Minister, I'm convinced that what he has in mind is a step in the right direction. It may be not a big enough step, but that's all I'm going to say at the present time and I will support the bill.

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

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, likewise I just have a question or two. Doing away with the Examination - Board, is it? - my question is, we used to have accredited schools. Only

(MR. FROESE cont'd.) those schools that met certain qualifications as far as the standard of their teachers or their teaching staff could get by with the provisions that we are including in this bill. I'm wondering, do all our schools presently, all our division schools and the schools that deal with these examinations that are mentioned in this bill, do they meet those standards that were set up at that time that qualified for accreditation?

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

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I intend to support the bill in going into second reading, and in general I support the principles behind the bill. I have been one of those who for some years have been unhappy with the examination system as it existed. I think we have to recognize a number of factors though when we remove examinations, and that is that we are placing a much greater onus on the principal and the teachers, and by the same token. I think on the staff of the Department of Education in the Inspectoral Division, because the parents now will have to depend on each school to really perform to the standards that the parents would hope that the school system will live up to. There will be no uniform procedure across the province, it will be up to each school itself to set its own standards.

Now the one advantage with the examination system, with all its weaknesses, was that at least there was some gauge by which hopefully parents could say, well our school measures up and my children are in a school where I can depend on having a standard up to provincial, at least, basis. This apparently will now be removed and I think there are many advantages in it. It will permit more experimentation probably; hopefully, a competitive system within the school system; but I repeat that it does mean that our principals, our teachers, and our staff in the Department of Education will have to be ever more vigilant to see to it that they do keep up to a very substantial standard. The parents will now have only the department in a sense, through the inspectoral staff, to depend on that there are standards kept up and I would urge on the Minister, not strict control from the Department of Education because I don't believe in centralized control, but we have to remember here that we have responsibility to the parents and to the students. Really, our greatest responsibility in the final analysis is to the students, that they do not go through a school, a school system that does not give them the very best that we are paying for in the Province of Manitoba.

One small item, and that's with regard to the scholarships and bursaries and grants, I wonder if we couldn't ask of the Minister, due to the fact that these are going to be authorized as they have been in the past, whether these could not be listed as well in the Annual Report of the Department of Education indicating who has received scholarships, grants and bursaries, the name of the individual, the address and the amount that has been granted. Due to the fact that these are being given, I think it is reasonable that the members should know who in fact has received these.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Minister will be closing debate?

HON. SAUL A. MILLER (Minister of Youth and Education) (Seven Oaks): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I will be.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, there were a number of questions put by a number of the speakers and I'll deal with them as they started this evening. Dealing first with the Member from Ste. Rose, the very last one, the thought or the suggestion that we might list the names of all recipients, it's quite a job I can tell you. It would be the size of the telephone book and I'm not sure that it should be that readily available to the public. I think this is the sort of information that perhaps I would want to give consideration, serious consideration before this information was made available through the public by distribution in the House. Now on the other hand, as I say, I'll give it consideration, but I do know it would be a lot of work and I do know the numbers are in the hundreds if not in the thousands.

The Member for Ste. Rose quite correctly points up one of the problems. I think it's not a problem, I think it's a challenge, that by eliminating the board examinations we are now in a sense putting the onus on the teachers, the principal, on the school division. I'd like to point out to him and remind him though that the only exams the High School Board was dealing with were the Grade 12 exams. Everything else has been eliminated up to now, and even there there were only three exams involved. We've eliminated those three but we are introducing the SACU tests. Those are the standard tests which are being used across the nation now - at least in many other jurisdictions across the nation. These tests will be given to all Grade 12

(MR. MILLER cont'd.) students some time in February and March of every year, and this certainly will be a measure, the kind of measure that perhaps the member had in mind when he suggested that parents won't know how their children are doing. There is also provision in the bill whereby examination can be set by the department and we would intend to do this, that they would be not specific exams, they'd be general exams just to evaluate the progress of the students so that we can compare across the province.

The Member for Rhineland asked the question with regard to accredited schools. I can't answer him this evening. I think that pretty well has gone by the board but I don't want to say definitely. I can get the information and in Law Amendments we can deal with it at that time.

The Member for Riel and the Member for Emerson asked a couple of questions and I think they would want the answer on the record, although they're not here this evening, they wanted to know, they were concerned about the deletion or the fact that there's no mention of the School Trustees Association and Teachers Association in the Discipline Committee. In fact they are not being dropped at all, it's just that the new group is being added to the old group and that new group is the Superintendents Association who are now becoming a recognized group unto themselves, and because it's the Discipline Committee that we're talking about, certainly we felt the superintendents should be on that sort of committee.

I believe this pretty well answers the questions posed, and if there are any further questions they could be dealt with in Law Amendments, at which time I'll certainly try to reply to the Member for Rhineland.

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

. continued on next page

MR. SPEAKER: Second Reading - Government Bill. Bill No. 110. The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. HOWARD R. PAWLEY (Minister of Municipal Affairs)(Selkirk) presented Bill No. 110, An Act to amend The Housing and Renewal Corporation Act, for second reading.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, Bill No. 110 has a number of amendments. The first amendment of substance is clause (a) of subsection (9) of Section 10, in that when this earlier provision in the Act was included, it was considered that any borrowings that would be obtained by the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation would be undertaken by way of first mortgages on land. Now, any monies that the corporation borrows is done by way of debentures and therefore the change is in order to reflect this change in obtaining money. If you note, the change is to the extent that the money set aside in a sinking fund, which is not to be less than one percent of the advances, borrowings and assumptions of indebtedness for which the corporation is liable, other than borrowings obtained by first mortgages on land, so this now is broadened to include debentures which is the usual method at the present time of the obtaining of monies by the Corporation from the Federal Government.

The amendment in reference to 21 (2) (c) in principle, dealing with the principle of that, permits the obtaining of a change insofar as the legislation is concerned involving municipalities. It permits us now to relieve municipalities from any responsibility financially and permits us in fact to enter into agreements with the municipalities, and those sums will be calculated by agreement that may or may not be required from the municipality. Earlier, in the former provisions of the Act, it was required that the municipality would put up an equal amount with the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation insofar as the public housing project would be concerned.

The third change of substance in the bill deals with the area of permitting the Manitoba Housing Renewal Corporation to appoint a board, not through the municipality, but to be able to appoint a housing authority to manage the units rather than through the municipality. The proposed change will permit the Minister to recommend persons to be named as a housing authority. This would be done in cases of for example sponsored housing, or in any other instance where the housing is not tied in with the municipal program within the area in question, but it would mainly relate to sponsored housing.

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

MR. BUD SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Morris, that debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Education, Bill No. 104. The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, I want to speak on Bill 104 in order that it might proceed as rapidly as possible. In general terms the bill makes the necessary administrative changes that are required from time to time by the government and by the Minister of Education. There are some changes required to adjust it to the Local Authorities Election Act changes and there are other changes which I believe might require some clarification. I know the Minister is outside of the Chamber for a moment and he will be back. I was hopeful that I might be able to make some general comments until he arrives.

Changes are made in the time allotted for religious exercises. Rather than being restricted to the latter half hour of the school day, the first half hour is also made optional at the discretion of the local school board, and if it serves a useful purpose for the appropriate school boards then it appears to be entirely in order.

The Minister has also asked for the sanction of the Legislature to allow the recommendations of the Local Government Boundaries Commission to be instituted at the discretion of Order-in-Council under a particular section of the bill. I know that this is a very controversial aspect of the changes requested in this bill, Mr. Speaker, but to be perfectly frank, I would have asked for the same powers a year ago. There's no point in me criticizing them unduly, but I would say to the Minister, in assuming these powers, that he also re-examine the recommendations of the Boundaries Commission Report because the ultimate decision is his, which he knows without this recommendation to him, but he will find I think that in many

(MR. CRAIK cont'd.) cases that they do not provide the last word in suiting local boundaries to the requirements of education in particular districts. I know that he will look at this. He will very likely have to call local meetings which are going to have to be done at his discretion, and as has been indicated in the House before, he can draw in the Board of Reference as required.

Now I suppose the point is debatable whether or not the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council should have the sole powers of instituting the recommendations of the Boundaries Commission, but I think in particular cases that this power should be designated to allow the flexibility, particularly in those divisions that have been under study for so long and have had so many meetings, that these powers should be available to the government and I have no criticism in their request for these powers.

Now in another section, some added powers are requested for the superintendents of particular school divisions. There has been an increasing pressure for this sort of thing and perhaps the Minister could indicate to us whether particular divisions are in mind in asking for these added powers. I don't believe these were covered in his comments; if they were I wasn't aware of them. So under that particular part of the bill, it would be helpful if he could indicate what school divisions the powers are being asked for. As you know, some of the larger divisions have more difficulties than the smaller ones in getting all the administrative work done and having so much of it go through the board itself.

Now I do want to make a further comment regarding one particular section of the bill that would require school divisions to ask for the permission of the Public Schools Finance Board in order to dispose of property; and secondly, the Public Schools Finance Board would be given the powers to take the money from the sale of property. Now I can see this, Mr. Speaker, in property that has been paid for solely by the public purse or by the central treasury, that is coming from the Public Schools Finance Board, but I think there is serious question as to whether or not these powers should be granted to the Public Schools Finance Board for properties which were purchased by a local school division many years ago when there was very little or very small contribution coming from the province. This particular section of this Act would actually require a school board, by the request of the Public Schools Finance Board, first of all to gain the right to sell the property; and secondly, once it was sold, the Public Schools Finance Board itself may regain 100 percent of the sale of the property. I think that this will require some further explanation by the Minister and would be most helpful at this time.

Now I think that it should also, Mr. Speaker, be pointed out at this time that a year ago the New Democratic Party out of hand disassociated itself with any of the points made in what was referred to as the White Paper of the former administration regarding the public schools, but in the very short period of one year, they've made pretty significant moves towards the control, financial control over the administration of the school boards, and the powers that are being requested under sections of this particular Act are one move in that direction. But probably the more significant move was made in one of the previous Acts that went through here at this session which gave the Public Schools Finance Board powers over bulk purchases of items such as buses and mobile school units, etc.

So essentially it shouldn't go without notice that the present government is actually moving pretty significantly and pretty rapidly to an area which was rejected out of hand by the same party before they were in power a year ago, and it might be worthwhile for them to point out, if they wish to do so, when they're going to make the other moves that were recommended at that time, because there's no question that moving to mass purchasing and now to control the school boards in the sale of their properties and take 100 percent of the money from it for the Public School Boards, from the boards to the government, goes just a step further than was even proposed by the former government, and under that particular section of the Act I suspect that the Minister may well find that he has some opposition coming from the many school boards in Manitoba who regard property that they have purchased under local debentures and so on as being the property of the citizens of that area and not within the powers of the Public Schools Finance Board.

With those few exceptions, Mr. Speaker, the bill does I think serve very many useful purposes, and those will be my few remarks.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate my remarks along with those

MR. MCKENZIE cont'd.) of my colleague who has just sat down and possibly draw to the Minister's attention Section 460 which concerns me at great length and concerns a lot of those people that I represent, whereby the Board of Trustees of a unitary division, by annual resolution passed by a favourable vote of two-thirds, may delegate to the superintendent of the division wide powers which I don't think, Mr. Speaker, in the wisdom of this House and the wisdom of education is not called for at this time. And I can speak, Mr. Speaker, on some of the divisions of this province are operating with only one superintendent. Some have a superintendent and an assistant superintendent. I would ask the Minister, Mr. Speaker, is this going to call for another superintendent to be involved in handling all those powers that's granted to them by this section?

I would also ask the Minister to take a look at that two-thirds of the members vote. I would think that that should be unanimous, not two-thirds, and I think the reasoning of this is quite simple, Mr. Speaker, because superintendents of school divisions are highly skilled, trained people today who have the ability to go around and influence board members before the meeting is ever held. I see decisions being carried on in division meetings which the board basically didn't know what had gone on, but in the meantime the superintendent had lobbied all afternoon and had his meeting all in order before he arrived.

So I say take another look at that, Mr. Minister, and make it unanimous instead of two-thirds and let the local people still have some control of their divisional system. Possibly if it doesn't work with the unanimous decision, maybe a year from now we could take another look at it. I think these powers are not necessary at this time because I stand up and defend the school divisions that I represent and I think they have the judgment to handle these powers that's now being granted to the superintendent. I think it's very unfair at this time, like Section (f), to request municipal councils to make improvements in roads ta da ta da. Who is going to pay for those costs and all those services where a superintendent by his own wisdom, after two-thirds of the board says build the road.

I would think, Mr. Speaker, in all fairness to the school divisions and to rural Manitoba - I can't speak for the urban society - but in the rural society I think those powers are not required at this time. I would ask the Minister to take another look at it before he grants all those privileges to the superintendent or the assistant superintendent or the deputy - I would think possibly the superintendents now will be writing for another deputy to help them - and the board I think can handle these duties without too much extra - it's one of the things that we elect them for, to try and control the cost and try and control some of the things that's going on within the divisional system - and let's not grant all that power to the superintendents.

So with those few remarks, Mr. Speaker, I would hope that the government would take another look and let's not move that fast, especially in rural Manitoba at this time. The system is working reasonably well, but let's not over-balance it any more than it is today and grant all those powers to the superintendents who are doing an excellent job. They are intelligent men and they're running a good system, but I don't think by loading all these powers on them and taking it away from the school divisions, elected members who represent the people, is fair at this time, Mr. Speaker.

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

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: Second Reading of Bill No. 98. The Honourable Minister of Health and Social Development.

HON. RENE E. TOUPIN (Minister of Health and Social Development)(Springfield) presented Bill No. 98, The Health Services Insurance Act, for second reading. (Recommended by His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor)

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, the principle of this bill is to bring together under one administration the Health Insurance Services of Manitoba, which are now under the Manitoba Hospital Commission, and the Manitoba Health Services Insurance Corporation. This integration has been recommended by and supported by both the Commission and the Corporation. Integration of the staff levels of the Commission and the Corporation is already well under way as a result of the policy decisions which were approved by both this government and by the previous government. The extension of this staff integration to the board level will enable the fullest coordination and integration of services and personnel.

MR. TOUPIN cont'd.)

Over the years the two separate boards, the Hospital Commission and the Medical Corporation, had been granted very important far-reaching powers. I would say that we - and by we I mean all members of this House and our predecessors - have been correct in our definition of these broad powers and in the extent to which the powers are granted. I would also say that we have been correct in vesting these powers in Crown corporation structures rather than under the structure of a traditional type of government department. Within these terms of reference, within the powers granted and under the administrative structure of a Crown corporation, the Manitoba Hospital Commission has been able to rise to its responsibilities and meet its objectives. In the 12 years of the Hospital Insurance Plan, hospital facilities, buildings, equipment and staff have been steadily and quickly upgraded to the point where patient care in Manitoba today can only be described as being far superior to that of 1958. The Health Insurance Program is a young program but we can see that within the existing terms of reference the objectives of this plan can be met.

The new board, Mr. Speaker, the new integrated authority will be called the Manitoba Health Services Commission. With only minor exceptions, which I will describe shortly, the powers of the new Crown corporation are basically the powers of the present Hospital Commission and Medical Corporation. The fundamental powers of the new corporation are to provide insurance for residents of Manitoba in respect of the cost of hospital services, medical services, and other health services; and to plan, organize and develop throughout the province a balanced and integrated system of hospitals and related health facilities and services, having the needs of the residents of the province in mind.

The changes from the existing legislation in the areas of the new legislation are:

(1) The new Commission will be composed of seven members, and there is no specific provision in the legislation for membership on the new commission from professional associations or groups. Members of this House may recall that the Manitoba Hospital Commission is composed of five members, none of whom represent outside associations or groups.

(2) For accounting purposes, this Act establishes one fund only which is called the Manitoba Health Services Insurance Fund rather than establish separate funds for hospital insurance, medical insurance and other health insurance. However, it is provided that this accounting system used will distinguish expenditures for purposes of financial statements, federal sharing and so on.

(3) The Commission is given the new power, subject to approval by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, to purchase, lease and hold, operate, dispose of hospitals or related health facilities. In the past the Manitoba Hospital Commission on occasion has had to assume this power, for example to make arrangement for the continued operation of a hospital upon the breakdown of its administrative or board structure.

(4) The new Commission is given the power, subject to approval by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, to plan, organize and develop medical or other health services in areas of need. This power is not provided for in existing legislation, but even in its relatively short history the Manitoba Health Services Insurance Corporation has found itself increasingly drawn into taking such action. An example is the development of a plan to provide medical service to the Churchill area.

As I have said, these are the more significant changes from existing legislation. These are realistic changes although they might be described as minor changes. Having gone to some length to say that this bill is not a significant deviation from the existing legislation, I would now say at the same time that this is extremely important legislation. It is of the utmost importance that this Manitoba Health Services Commission has powers equal to its responsibilities. Costs must be held in balance, and at the same time development and improvement of the hospital and health services cannot be allowed to stagnate. Pressures to expand services must be carefully watched and assessed in terms of need. The introduction of new services must be controlled and co-ordinated.

In the words of the Task Force on the cost of health services in Canada, ways must be found to restrain the growth of cost increases through better operation of the health services structure now in existence, and serious consideration must be given to a future major revamping of the entire system. This in large part will be the responsibility of the new Commission. The first task therefore of the new Commission will be to determine just what its approach will be to get those studies under way that will form the basis of the provision of an integrated and

(MR. TOUPIN cont'd.) balanced overall system of health care.

There are many important questions and needs to be resolved. Some of these are being asked by the Hunt Commission of enquiry to hospitals of admitting privileges. There is the question of how the program of the hospital and health insurance services can be better balanced and co-ordinated with the preventative health and other programs of the Department of Health and Social Development. There is the question of how the services of hospital can be better rationalized and balanced with the services of alternative care facilities such as nursing homes, with one service complementing the other.

The Manitoba Hospital Commission and the Manitoba Health Services Insurance Corporation have served this province well. Now is the time to take one more step into the establishment of a firm foundation for the delivery of health care. We have already seen the amalgamation of what was formerly the Department of Health and the Department of Welfare into what is now the Department of Health and Social Development. With the passing of this bill, Mr. Speaker, Manitoba will be the first province in Canada to have integrated hospital and health insurance services under one administrative agency. I commend this bill to the members of this House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. TRUEMAN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member from Brandon West, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the Law Amendments Committee is scheduled to be meeting now and I would therefore move, seconded by the Minister of Cultural Affairs, 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 9:30 a. m. Wednesday morning.