

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

8:00 o'clock, Thursday, April 20, 1967

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the First Minister.

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier) (Wolseley): Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to detain the House long because I think that the matter before us is one that is well understood and does not require much from me by way of further elucidation or explanation, but perhaps I might take advantage of the opportunity to comment on some of the speeches that were made in the course of this debate.

Let me say at once to the Honourable Member for Lakeside that I think the House as a whole appreciated the attitude in which he approached this problem, and appreciated as well the views that he brought to bear. I think perhaps he made the most useful and constructive contribution to this debate and I would like to pay my compliments to him in this respect.

I should like to say that we hope and believe that there is a strong possibility that the contributions of the members alone, without any matching contribution from the Consolidated Fund, may be enough to support this fund. I think there was some confusion on that point. I can't guarantee it because one never can tell what the fall-out of an election campaign will be from time to time and exactly who will draw pensions and when, but our best guess is that it is a possibility at any rate that the contributions of the members alone will keep the pension fund afloat, and if so, I'm sure we will all be very happy.

I also think that he was completely right in coming down on the side of those who think that it is just as well for us to settle this matter among ourselves here rather than to entrust it to any other body to review and recommend. There is an argument for that latter course that on balance I agree with my honourable friend that that is not the way to do it, that we had just as well settle the matter here. I must also say very frankly that his suggestion that these matters should be brought in subsequent to an election and made effective consequent on an election is a very appealing policy to consider, and if it were not that we are in the particular circumstance that we are, it perhaps might be given further consideration by this House.

I do suggest that it should be very firmly borne in mind the next time that we approach a painful problem of this kind, because undoubtedly in the course of time, although I trust not too soon, we will face this kind of question again, and I hope that those who are in the House when this matter again comes up for discussion will be reminded of my honourable friend's point of view because I think it has a great deal of merit and would make us feel a great deal better, I know, if we were able to follow that policy. I don't think we can follow it at the present time, but it is a suggestion that should not be forgotten and I would like to thank my honourable friend for expressing it as well as he did.

I next perhaps might make a comment on the speech of the Honourable Member for Selkirk, and my comment is that I am really rather glad that I wasn't here to listen to it, because if what I have heard about it is correct, it would have made me sadly disappointed in my honourable friend who usually brings a fair and enlightened view to bear on questions before the House and if the reports I received are correct, it seems to me that he fell far short of his usual standard of objectivity in dealing with this matter. I hope that the intimations that were made to me that perhaps there was some reflection cast on the motives of members of the House are not correct, because I would be very sad to think that a man who has been here as long as my honourable friend, whom I know so well, would have thought so poorly of some of us as to really maintain that point of view with any degree of conviction. As I say, I didn't hear the speech and I am glad I did not if the reports are correct.

I did hear some of the speech of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface. He gave us what we are well accustomed to expect from him, and I think probably that's all I need to say about his comments and contribution to this debate.

The Honourable Member for Gladstone also had some rather odd ideas as to the reasons that lie behind legislation of this kind, and all I can say to him is that if he thinks that the measure was forced for the reasons that he states, that he is completely inaccurate, and I must tell him that he need entertain no concern on that score because his suspicions are completely unfounded. If they were well-founded, it would certainly be a grave reflection on many of us here and I am happy to say that there is no foundation in them at all.

I think one of the strangest speeches was made by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition because he brought a number of reasons to bear as to why he didn't want to vote for this Bill. There are 13 of us in the House which if all goes according to plan will not

(MR. ROBLIN cont'd)... benefit by this bill, the 13 of course are the members of the Cabinet and the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. We will not benefit in any way by this bill because our position will remain unchanged. My honourable friend could not bring himself, however, to vote for this measure because of some views that he holds on wider issues. For example, he could not bring himself to vote for this measure because of the attitude that the government has taken on minimum wages. Well you know, the government is not against higher minimum wages but we are definitely against the political minimum wage. We think it should be an economic minimum wage. To show you the dangers of political minimum wages one has only to refer to the amendment of the Honourable Member representing the New Democratic Party which suggested \$1.50, and my honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition found this quite intolerable. He voted against that. That was no good. However, it shows you the escalation that takes place in political manoeuvres of this kind.

My honourable friend was quite happy to vote for his own resolution of \$1.25, and it may well be that that turns out to be the minimum wage. I hope the minimum wage will be increased. It has been increased steadily from about 70 cents since I had any responsibility for dealing with the matter to \$1.00 today. It is before the Minimum Wage Board and I would not be at all surprised, and I don't suppose anyone else would be either, if that minimum wage is increased. So to make that a basis for voting against the salary bill seems to me to be very captious indeed.

But my honourable friend did something else, because he seems determined to convince himself even if he convinced no one else, that the province is in a sad state economically, and because - if I can quote his words correctly - we are not keeping up with the Canadian nation, he feels that he can't vote for this bill. Well I don't know, Mr. Speaker just what his sources of information are in this respect but I had a very pleasant dinner hour reading the Winnipeg Free Press headline "INCO planning huge growth. 7,000 more jobs and \$20 million payroll bill." That doesn't sound too bad to me. I heard the announcement of the Federal Government and the Dominion Bureau of Statistics that for 1967 this province had the highest increase in capital investment of any province in the Dominion of Canada, and I don't think that's too bad. And I read in the morning press, and I daresay my honourable friend read too, the first findings of the Prairie Provinces Cost Study Commission that's looking into the cost of living in which they say that the incomes in Manitoba and Saskatchewan are increasing marginally more than the Canadian average as a whole, and that's what we've been maintaining and we can't get my honourable friend to believe us. Levels of personal income for persons in Manitoba and Saskatchewan have been just below the national average and have tended to gain slightly on the national figure. Now that's what we've been saying, right plumb in the center of the Canadian scale of economic values. Further you might be interested to know that price increases have been less rapid for the prairies than for the nation as a whole, while incomes have increased slightly more rapidly in Manitoba and Saskatchewan and only marginally less than Alberta. Therefore real income purchasing power has increased slightly more rapidly in the Prairie Provinces than in the nation - and note that they link Manitoba and Saskatchewan as increasing slightly more rapidly than the national figure.

Now that is not a description of a province that's at the bottom of the ladder; that's not a description of a depressed economy and it hardly forms any basis, in my opinion, for the judgment of my honourable friend that because of this state of affairs he finds that he can't go for a bill which places our salaries right in the middle of the Canadian range of salaries for Members of Legislative Assemblies. I wish my honourable friend would get over this attitude of thinking the worst about the Province of Manitoba. We've got plenty of problems here; I'm the last man to dispute that point, but we've got something going for us and we are making some headway. I think we ought to recognize it and be proud of it. Let's try and make more headway; there's no reason to be satisfied. But to make that the reason for failure to vote for this resolution that is before us now really surprises me because I do not think it can be substantiated by any rational approach to the facts that underline the economy of the Province of Manitoba.

MR. MOLGAT: ... the report of the Economic Consultative Board.

MR. ROBLIN: That will be down in due course and my honourable friend will probably be quite pleasantly surprised; he'll probably find himself agreeably surprised by what he reads in that report, I shouldn't be the least ...

MR. MOLGAT: After the House rises you can submit it.

MR. ROBLIN: Well, I think he'll be pleased whether he gets it before the House rises

(MR. ROBLIN cont'd) or after the House rises. After all the Economic Consultative Board are running their affairs; I'm not running it for them and they'll produce their report when they have it ready for us. But that is the fact that we are making progress in Manitoba and we've got no reason to hang our heads in gloom or despondency. We want to do better, we can do better, we will do better. But let's not sell ourselves short; it doesn't really pay anybody to do that.

So in concluding these few brief remarks, Mr. Speaker, I'm well aware that I'm not likely to convince anybody who opposes this bill to vote for it from what I have said. I myself still believe that it is a reasonable approach to a difficult problem that is before us. I appreciate the fact that some members have eschewed the opportunity to raise a little political clamour about it; I think that is a reasonable thing to have done and I myself appreciate it. I myself am not anxious either to make it the kind of an issue that would call into question the good faith or the bona fides of members of the House because I think that on no account could those charges be properly sustained.

So I merely say that I intend to support this bill; I hope a majority of the House will. My intention would be to refer it to the Committee of the Whole as we have done on previous occasions with bills of this kind and I will have one or two amendments to bring in that will iron out certain inconsistencies in the bill as it now stands. So I certainly intend to support this bill in the knowledge that in difficult circumstances of dealing with our own pay and allowances that this is something that I'm not ashamed to have presented to the House.

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

MR. MOLGAT: Ayes and Nays, please, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, may we have a recorded vote please.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the Members.

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

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

NAYS: Messrs: Barkman, Campbell, Dawson, Desjardins, Dow, Fox, Froese, Green, Hanuschak, Hillhouse, Johnston, Molgat, Patrick, Shoemaker.

MR. CLERK: Yeas 36; Nays 14.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion carried.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if you would now call Bill No. 68 and then carry on through the list of bills as they appear on the Order Paper, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debates on second readings. Bill No. 68. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I wasn't quite prepared at this moment, I have to get things organized a little but nevertheless this is the Medicare Bill. An Act respecting insurance of Residents of the Province in respect of the costs of Medical Services. --(Interjection)-- I was asked here to say that I was for it, but I'm sorry I will -- after I'm through. I think it will be understandably that I am not.

I don't see the urgency of bringing this bill forward at this particular time, at this session. I think we could have waited another year with bringing a measure of this type forward and I think it would have been to the benefit of the people of Manitoba to do so. I feel that they're jeopardizing our bargaining position in bringing it forward at this particular time and so early when it could have waited for another year. To me it seems that this whole medicare deal is not so much a matter of not affording to reject it as far as Manitoba is concerned but more a case of not affording to accept it. I feel that the costs once we go into this program will be rising year after year. For the present it appears that something like \$17.00 per capita will be required and I don't see that just because this money is offered to us that we should go into this program. I don't believe in accepting or going for expediency and losing out on principle.

I feel that the MMS as we presently have it in Manitoba is doing a good job and I see no reason to change the situation. I think many people are subscribing, and we know many people are subscribing to MMS in Manitoba. I for one am a subscriber and I'm sure most of the members of the House are, if not all, and the service we are getting is good. So that there is no reason at this particular time why we should go into medicare. But it seems to me,

(MR. FROESE cont'd). . . . Mr. Speaker, that because the Federal Government is continually going into more of the shared cost programs that we in Manitoba as well as the other provinces are following suit and going for them whether we can afford to do so or not. The carrot that is offered to us should be rejected. I think we have a good parallel here in Manitoba and have had one recently in the referendum. It's a simple matter of following along the same lines as what this government did to the people of Manitoba as we now find ourselves in a situation where the Federal Government is putting a proposition to us of accept it or else you will not get anything.

The people of Manitoba had the courage to reject such a proposition because they felt that the loss of control of schools, the rights and the autonomy that they would lose was more worth than what was offered to them in the way of the monetary proposition. I only wish that our government here in Manitoba had this courage and the stability to reject these Federal proposals that impose on us a burden - a growing burden, Mr. Speaker, because of the increased costs that will result and the many problems that will be brought in with it.

We find at the recent conference on medicare in Ottawa that a number of the other provinces had misgivings about this plan. Ontario for one did not feel that the proposition was so good as far as the 50 percent was concerned. They asked for 50 percent of their own costs, yet what is offered is the average, the Federal average and I might quote here from a newspaper article which says: "As the federal plan now stands, the Ottawa Government will pay 50 percent of the average of medicare costs in provinces qualifying for federal contributions." So that we might not receive 50 percent of the costs of the program in Manitoba but a lesser amount. In Ontario, they feel that they might only get 40 percent. Then too, I feel that this government is just paying lip service to free enterprise and at heart are going along with these socialists and eroding the powers of this province under the British North American Act and abdicating its rights and duties.

I think we have a good case in point with the number of shared cost programs already in existence. We have found and we see that the shared cost programs in Manitoba led to the denying of the people of the Interlake area a right to vote in the recent referendum. The people wanted their vote but were denied it. Let the government table the number of petitions received on this matter from the people living in the Interlake area. Let's find out. These people lost a freedom of choice, a very vital principle in the maintenance and retention of democracy in our country; and under our present administration I doubt whether it will be restored. In fact when we look at the legislation, the school legislation that has been brought in, I don't think it will.

Then too, Mr. Speaker, I do not agree with the principle put forward by the New Democratic Party that health is not a personal responsibility of the individual but a responsibility of society as they claim; and evidently our government is now subscribing to this principle otherwise they would not bring forward a bill on Medicare embodying this principle. I feel that Medicare is the responsibility of the individual. God has given the individual the faculties to think, reason and act so that he can take care of himself. If the individual wilfully destroys his health through neglect, drink or carelessness he will suffer for it. On the other hand, where a person is handicapped, disabled or suffers through no fault of his own or has not got the means for medical treatment society should step in and help, and this is what we are doing here in Manitoba presently. I think it is our duty to bring medical health within the reach of these people. This is what we're engaged in doing presently and should maintain through our department of government. I do not believe in creating a big monopoly such as proposed under the Federal Medicare legislation and to which we will be passing supplementary legislation here in Manitoba.

Things are happening under the cost-share programs that are frightening and not only frightening but in my estimation devastating. The whole program of cost-share programs is undermining our provincial autonomy as a province under the B.N.A. Act. These programs constantly seek to erode our powers through initiation and institution of programs that are the prerogative of the provinces, that the provinces actually cannot afford but are subjected to because of the Federal Government instituting them and I fear that they will eventually bankrupt our province. Further, as a result and by the passing of supplementary legislation we abdicate our rights as a province to the federal authorities, subjecting our people, our businesses, to so much red tape and restrictions that are then beyond our control. I need only refer to the bill that is presently brought into this House, The Deposit Insurance Bill. Well, we're passing supplementary legislation, yet once the businesses that will come under the plan, once

(MR. FROESE cont'd). . . . they are in it we will have no authority to change it. They will be guided by these federal programs.

We have the Canada Pension Plan, likewise; and just the other day the Minister of Urban Development and Municipal Affairs brought in a copy of a telegram that she sent to the federal authorities and I'd like to quote: "Mr. Mackasey should be informed that Provincial and Municipal Governments lack money not initiative to that failure of your government to recognize priorities in the public spending and to revise the tax structure accordingly is the cause." A little later on: "Provincial financial difficulties derive from rising health and education costs. Federal shared-cost programs for housing and urban renewal require financial commitments from Provincial and Municipal Governments. It is lack of funds not lack of initiative that concerns us." Mr. Speaker, this is the very fact I've been talking about. We've got one program after another brought in, initiated by the Federal Government and then we're going into these and after a while they withdraw and then we're stuck with it and we find ourselves in a position where we have to spend more and more money and our budgets are increasing as a result of these federal programs that we are going into jointly with them.

Medicare once instituted is not a federal but a provincial responsibility. I'm sure this will be brought out to bear because already we have had notices appear in the press and the federal authorities do not deny - in fact they admit that after a few years they will withdraw, and we will be having this saddled on us. I might go on -- yet the Federal Government make certain stipulations that are to be met if certain financial considerations are to be given. What is so wrong about the whole matter, this whole program is instigated and initiated by the Federal Government when it is the prerogative of the Provincial Government to start these programs.

Already we hear and read that the Federal Government will withdraw from this program within a few years and as a government of this province we are allowing ourselves to be coerced into a situation that we cannot afford; an intolerable position, putting us into a straightjacket, leading to financial bankruptcy and very serious difficulties. The situation should be reversed so that the federal authorities would adjust to the provinces' desires along the lines that the provinces can afford and not vice versa. The whole program of shared-costs programs is leading to a weakening of the provinces structurally and otherwise and in my opinion a scheme to bring in a strong federal authority when the time comes to rewrite the Constitution. To this I do not subscribe. I think it's time we stand up to be counted and opt out of these programs that reduce the pay cheque of the wage earner, worsen the cost-price squeeze of the farmers here in Manitoba and contain the seeds of state control and socialism.

Mr. Speaker, just the other day I read an article that came across my desk and these are excerpts from a speech that was made by the Premier of Saskatchewan, Mr. Ross Thatcher, in California, and this is dated Sunday, January 19th, 1967, and the headline is, "Americans Visit Saskatchewan to See What Socialism Can Do". Then it goes on, "Saskatchewan for twenty years, from 1944 to '64, had a socialist government about the only one in North American except Castro's. In 1944 the socialists said they would solve the unemployment problems by building government factories. They promised to use the profits to build highways, schools, hospitals and to finance better social welfare measures generally. Over the years they've set up 22 so-called Crown corporations. I wish the time permitted me to tell you of the fiasco that followed." Then he goes on to say: "By the time we had taken over" - this is the new Liberal administration I take it - "By the time we had taken over the government 12 of the Crown corporations had gone bankrupt or had been disposed of; others were kept operating by repeated and substantial government grants. During the whole period the socialists waged war against private business. The making of profits was condemned as an unforgivable sin. What was the result? Investors simply turned their backs on the socialists. Dozens of oil companies pulled up their stakes and moved out. Gas exploration ground to a complete halt. Prospecting in our vast North became almost non-existent. During the period Canada was experiencing the greatest economic boom in our history Saskatchewan received only a handful of new factories. After 18 years of Socialism there were fewer jobs in manufacturing than existed in 1945. This, despite the investment of 500 million in Crown corporations. The socialists promised a greatly expanded program of social welfare measures. There was to be free medical care, free hospitalization care, free drugs and so on. The money to finance these projects was to come from the profits of the Crown corporations. Of course in the over-all picture there were no profits. Rather there were colossal losses. Thus the welfare program had to be financed from taxation. During the period more than 600 completely new

(MR. FROESE cont'd).... taxes were introduced; 650 other taxes were increased. Per capita taxes in Saskatchewan were substantially out of line with our sister provinces; one more reason why industry located elsewhere. Twenty years ago the socialists promised to make Saskatchewan a mecca for the working man.

MR. SPEAKER: Order - order, please. I'm sure this discourse is very interesting but I must in all reasonableness bring the honourable member back to the bill we're discussing and that has to do with Insurance of the Residents in the Province in respect to the cost of Medical Services.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I think that he's certainly trying to demonstrate that the socialist plan in ...

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please. In my opinion he amply did that before he got to this discourse which I don't think has anything at all to do with the subject under discussion.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I recall other members speaking and when you discuss a certain philosophy, and this is what we're accepting through Medicare in Manitoba, I can't help but say these things ...

MR. SPEAKER: I'm sure the honourable member realizes that I have a responsibility too and that is in order that the business of the House might proceed in a reasonable pace. I think that the honourable member has taken sufficient time if I may say so to build his case to do with the Act that is under discussion and I would in all sincerity ask him to stay with that and argue his point in that respect.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I can't help but use some of these things in order to argue my point. What am I going to say if I'm not going to bring in ...

MR. SPEAKER: I think the point taken by the honourable member is well taken but I believe that I have given him considerable latitude in that respect to this point.

MR. FROESE: I have not quite completed what I had to say about Saskatchewan but I'll leave it at that. There were some very interesting summations in that particular report. I'm sure the members are missing out on something because they will not be able to hear it now.

I would like to briefly touch too on Britain -- "Britain going broke on welfare." We find the same thing happening there. This is what we're letting ourselves into in Manitoba, Mr. Speaker, in going into Medicare, a compulsory scheme to which all the people of Manitoba will have to subscribe to when their take-home pay is dwindling as it is. They will now be called on to support this program and no doubt in future many of the elections I take it will bring in and call for added programs to be brought in under Medicare. This is what increases the cost and in this way we will have an increasing burden placed on the people of Manitoba as a result of bringing in Medicare.

I would like to briefly touch on a few points in connection with Great Britain. The headline says here: "Britain going broke on welfare." "There may be a lesson for America of the future in what's happening in Britain. The idea of government trying to take care of everybody's needs started well but things have gotten out of hand. Social welfare programs cost more than the country can really afford. Even so they're inadequate, falling behind and the poor are still poor". Now there's a lot in these various other headings but I'll leave that for the time being and just touch on the "high price of health." (Interjection: What magazine is that?) This is U.S. News and World Report. "The system of comprehensive medical care provided free but partially supported by taxes paid by individuals is seen as additional evidence of welfare gone wrong. Government costs for the program rose 45 percent in the five years before 1964 from an annual rate of \$2 1/2 billion to nearly 3.7 billion. The total bill for this program that seeks to provide everything for everyone has shot up in the past five years by more than seven billions to a total of more than 18 billions a year. Despite this increase in spending Britain is unable to replace half of its hospitals built in the 19th century. It is estimated it will take 100 years to build the schools now required; about 60 percent of Britain children leave school semi-educated because of the lack of funds for education reform. Pensions for Britain's older people are still below subsistence level and are relatively the lowest in Europe. The controversy over the welfare program is shaping up now as probably the biggest issue in British politics."

There are very numerous other points in this particular newscast or the report but I might be dwelling on it too long if I bring out more of those points so I'll let it go at that.

Mr. Speaker, the costs of the Medicare in Saskatchewan isn't something that should be

(MR. FROESE cont'd).... just laughed off because the costs there are increasing too year by year and I could go on and bring in a number of statistics. They also have a premium plus a sales tax, income tax and a corporation tax - these are all needed to provide the medical care in Saskatchewan. So that if we adopt this plan, if we go into Medicare we can expect much greater budgets for the costs to pay for those programs, and I for one don't feel that we should go in for it.

First of all we have a voluntary plan in Manitoba that is operating efficiently in my estimation and we have a large number of people participating in it. Why not leave it at that? Why go in for these federal cost-sharing programs and then left on the hook, and I am sure this is going to happen. We've already had indications to that effect that the Federal Government will eventually withdraw. We find that the case in the school program; they're changing the programs from time and we won't be able to change this Medicare program just on the whims and on the wishes of the Federal Government. Once we've adopted it, once we've put it into practice it will have to stay; it cannot be removed from the books just like that. Therefore I think we should give much greater consideration to this whole matter. Why not shelve it for a year at least so that we have a better arguing position and in this way probably get a better deal if we have to go into it. On the other hand the Federal Government might eventually change some of their demands so that the scheme need not be compulsory and that it could be a voluntary one. Certainly the Province of Quebec on many occasions already has opted out of these federal cost-sharing programs and I feel that we would do well to take a good look at this and probably follow suit and do the programs ourselves.

Once more, I feel the whole thing is not so much a matter of being able to afford to reject it, but more a case of that we cannot afford to accept it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, it is my intention to adjourn debate, if the honourable member wishes to... Therefore, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Wellington, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 62. The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak on the Limitation of Actions Act may I first of all say at the outset that this Limitation of Actions Act has serious limitations, one of them being that it doesn't solve all the problems of the capitalistic system and therefore I think this is most serious limitation and something perhaps which the Member for Rhineland can correct. The other limitations are perhaps not of so much importance as the one that I've just mentioned.

I've looked at the bill, Mr. Speaker, and I think that in almost all respects it meets some of the standards that we raised in Committee when it was first suggested that the bill was going to be brought before the House and when the other bill was put regarding the relief of a particular individual in the Province of Manitoba. The point that I see that it doesn't deal with, and I realize that the Minister has a real problem on his hands with respect to that particular point, is the one which the Legislature has found that it hasn't been able to solve during the past five years and probably won't solve during the next five years. That is, Mr. Speaker, the problem of people seeking to have individual Acts passed to relieve them from the harsh effects that a Statute of Limitations sometimes imposes. Now there is one part of the bill that does give relief against a limitation but that's only where a set of facts remains undiscovered during the limitation period. The greater abundance of problems that have arisen with Limitation of Action Statutes have been those where a limitation period goes by either by accident or other reason which is not related to the reason that is mentioned in the statute itself and a person comes to the Legislature and seeks relief from the effects of the statute.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I realize that it's very difficult to deal with this type problem and I know that some people will say that there should be no relief and that is the solution to the problem. But the collective conscience of the people of the Province of Manitoba as demonstrated by past history, indicates that this is not a satisfactory answer, that there are occasions and have been occasions when the Legislature has opened the limitation period; and the problem that arises, Mr. Speaker, is that some people who are able to open the limitation period, either through one set of legislators being in office or another or either through being able to put their case to the legislators in a particular way, do get relief from the statute and

(MR. GREEN cont'd).... other people don't and therefore the law doesn't work equally. I would think that if the legislative conscience, or the collective conscience of the people of Manitoba as had been expressed over the years indicates that there should sometimes be relief from the harshness of the statute, that it would be better if that relief was contained in the statute and that the circumstances under which it could be exercised be tried by a judge rather than by a committee of the Legislature. I think that's a very unsatisfactory way of trying something, that is having a trial.

So we like the Bill as far as it goes; we note that the Minister has not been able to solve this problem; we don't criticize him harshly for not being able to solve it. It's a difficult problem but I think that it's one that has to be dealt with and I'm not satisfied that the only way of dealing with it is to deny petitions for relief. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 15. The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. LYON: Perhaps we could move along and hold that item open till the Honourable Member for Gladstone reappears.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 95. The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, perhaps we could just move along. I know both honourable members are here; they're just temporarily out of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 78. The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, if I would know that Bill 78 would solve our problems in the low rental housing and nursing home accommodation, halfway houses and so on, I would say this was probably one of the best pieces of legislation that we're going to introduce in this House this session. But I am not certain that this is what this bill is going to do because the only change that I see in this bill to what we have already in the province now is that public housing cannot be developed without urban renewal. This isn't the way it is at the present time. There has to be an urban renewal program to have public housing to get the financing. This bill allows us to have public housing included in this program without urban renewal; but this is just the only difference that I see.

I'm also concerned about the corporation that is going to be formed because to me it looked like it may delay some of the renewal programs and some of the housing because at the present time we have to deal with the province, with Metro in the planning, Metro Corporation, we have to deal with Ottawa, CMHC, so you have to go through about four different channels and if this corporation is just going to mean that we have to go through another channel, I'm just not certain this is going to help too much. I hope it doesn't delay any development because of going through this corporation, the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation, because the way I read the legislation, it doesn't matter what the corporation does, the composition of the corporation, which is going to be certain people on it - I don't know if they're going to be civil servants or public people on it - it still has to be okayed by the Minister; so it appears to me there's nothing else that this corporation is going to do than what the Minister has powers to do already. I wish the Honourable Minister would answer this, the composition of the Board, how it's going to be set up and if it's going to speed up the procedure or slow it down.

I would also like to know the purpose of setting up the corporation since it has to be okayed by the Minister. I am all for low rental housing. I think that there is a great demand in Manitoba and particularly in the City of Winnipeg for low rental housing. I think there's also extra accommodations that we require in the City of Winnipeg such as nursing home accommodations, and halfway homes that come under these programs. When you come to urban renewal, I think that urban renewal should be an orderly process of rebuilding a city or community to improve working and living conditions in a city or community, I think a renewal program must be an area of this government to be fully involved in this and to have full activity in it, because it involves redevelopment, rehabilitation and conservation used in combination in designated areas in the province. I feel this should be a continuing program rather than a series of unrelated projects directed at specific problem areas and the way it appears to me in this legislation, this is what we're going to have is unrelated specific projects because as you see the bill tells us the initiative is still left with the individual municipalities, the initiative for public housing and so on, or urban renewal. Now many of the municipalities in Greater Winnipeg have not staff in their municipalities, they haven't got probably the money to undertake these studies and surely I think it's the government that has the ability and probably the means to undertake this and I don't feel that it should be left to the individual municipalities to take the initiative.

(MR. PATRICK cont'd). . . .

I also notice that Metro Corporation is not included. I would like an explanation on that because I think to some extent Metro is doing this work already and I wonder if they would not be in a position to do a better study of Greater Winnipeg area as far as renewal and redevelopment is concerned, instead of some of the small municipalities.

I know that it still has to go to the Metro planning department because all the planning has to go to the Metro Corporation and we all know that there is nowadays multiple land uses in different cities when it comes to urban renewal programs. I don't say if you don't undertake an urban renewal program that you can have multiple land uses but you do today in many North American cities and in Canada already where you have a complete urban renewal, you have a complex in which you have stores, commercials and apartment blocks in one complex. For instance in Chicago, the John Hancock Centre is going to be one of the world's largest combination commercial and residential buildings in which some 8,000 people will be able to live and work, where you have commercial at the bottom part, offices above for about three or four floors, and then you have 30 or 40 stories of living accommodation which this type of redevelopment becomes a - the land becomes a multi-purpose use for urban redevelopment programs. So I feel that Metro would be more equipped to study this program in some of the smaller municipalities than the municipalities would be able to do themselves.

The other point that I would just like to ask the Honourable Minister what she meant when she did send a telegram to the Federal Minister about the provinces were not lacking initiative but were lacking money, because the way I understand the legislation I think it's the same for all the cities in Canada. I believe that CMHC at the present time is making loans up to 90 percent to provinces, municipalities or their agencies for provision of public housing. They also have introduced new legislation that will make loans up to 90 percent for a program of land acquisition servicing public housing. NHA will also provide 90 percent loans for non-profit companies for housing projects. The Federal Government also helps municipalities by paying as much as 75 percent of the city-wide urban renewal studies. So I just don't know what exactly the Minister wants when she says they don't lack the initiative except lack the money because the 90 percent program to me looks pretty - I'm not saying this is enough - but if this is the same for all the cities in Canada and 90 percent of all the money is, you know, allowed by the CMHC and the Federal Government, to me it looks like a fairly good program. I may be wrong. I wish the Minister would have made some recommendations when the Federal Minister was here in Winnipeg not too long ago and I would like to see what those recommendations were.

These were some of the points; in general I'm for the bill and as long as I know that this will help low rental housing and public housing in Winnipeg I think it's going to be a good piece of legislation, but if it's not going to do anything else, just set up another corporation with people on it so that any program has to be processed through another channel which it has to go through about four or five already, I don't think it's going to accomplish much, so I hope that the Honourable Minister will answer some of these questions.

MR. SAUL MILLER (Seven Oaks): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Kildonan, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 15. The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Speaker, I adjourned this debate for one or two reasons. I thought that this might be the time to express once again my concern over having no legislation at all in respect to snowmobiles, snow toboggans, skiddos, but apparently the Minister has not yet studied the situation in sufficient depth to come up with a solution to the problem. Mr. Speaker, there's no use of us hiding our heads in the sand on this one hoping that it will just go away. The indications are that with each ensuing year the sale of these toboggans and skidoos are going to increase. I have an article before me that says that already in the, what they call the snow areas of Canada, on each side, immediately on each side of the 49th parallel, there are now over 50,000 of them, 50,000 of them. In fact, my honourable friend -- I don't know whether he told the number that were in use by the various departments of government, but the government themselves own quite a number of them. Perhaps he could make a note of that and inform the House as to the number that we do, in fact, own. I mentioned some time ago that there had at least been two fatalities as recently as a year or so ago, and there would likely be more. The Minister told me he did not know how many injuries there were in fact from the use of snowmobiles and toboggans, nor did he know the amount of

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd).... property damage that has resulted from accidents arising out of the use of the now toboggans. So I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we've just got to do something about them. We just cannot bury our heads in the sand and hope that the situation will resolve itself. Things like this don't just happen that way.

Mr. Speaker, one of the other things that I have expressed real concern about certainly on more than one occasion, was the number of traffic accidents; the number No. 1, and No. 2, the number of those accidents where there has been convictions involving the use of liquor, that is, the number of accidents where there has been in fact a charge laid under Section 222 or 223, driving while impaired or intoxicated. And I think we're going to have to tighten up the legislation if we want to effectively deal with the situation. Now I think that someone put an Order for Return in recently, asking for the number of accidents for the last two or three years in which a charge of driving while impaired or intoxicated was laid and I believe that my honourable friend said he could not supply us with the information. However, Mr. Speaker, I do have from the Safety Division and the Driver Improvement Clinic Branch some statistics that are fairly up-to-date. They're for 1965 and they report that the total number of accidents in 1965 was 15,714 and there were 283 convictions under Section 222 or 223, driving while impaired or intoxicated arising out of an accident. Now the Department also broke down the accidents, the number of accidents, to show - this is for 1965 and I'm sure my honourable friend must have these statistics as well as myself - to show the number of fatal accidents, the number resulting in injury to persons, the number causing property damage, and the percent violations committed by all drivers involved, and in 1965 there were 105 killed by traffic accidents and, out of the 105, 29 drivers had been charged with driving while impaired or driving under the influence, according to the information I have here; 29 out of 105 were actually charged. Now, and heading the list out of the 105, there's 19; and it wouldn't take me long to read them out because I think it would be enlightening to the members of the Assembly: - Inattentive or careless driving, 11 - 11 charged with that. Following too closely - 2. Speed too fast for conditions - 10. Failure to grant the right-of-way - 3. Proceed from stop sign before safe to do so - 6. Driving while impaired - 19. Disregard to stop and go signal - 5. Improper or unsafe passing - 5. Unsafe backing up - 1. Disregard for stop sign - 7. Driving on the wrong side of the road - 13. Driving while under the influence - 10. Failing to remain or report an accident - 2. Exceeded the legal speed limit - 7. Failed to grant the right-of-way to pedestrians - 2. An improper start from parked position - 1; and disregard other traffic controls - 1, for a total of 105. But, as I said in 29 of the 105 there was liquor involved, and how many more? How many more of the other ones that they had been consuming liquor? That is the question.

Now true, these are 1965 figures, probably the most recent ones that are available from this government, but here is a more recent one from Chicago and I know that my honourable friend is not in possession of this little booklet because it's a brand new booklet that is put out by the Kemper Insurance Company - Insurance Group. Apparently they own a lot of insurance companies in the States. "The basic reason," they say, "for this booklet, is pinpointed by the following two quotations 20 years apart, from 'Accident Facts'" - that's a publication published by The National Safety Council in America. "The 1946 edition said, and there was expressed real concern then: The influence of alcohol according to state reports: nearly 18 percent of all drivers involved in fatal accidents had been drinking and 23 percent of all pedestrians killed had been drinking in 1946. In 1966, alcohol a leading factor in fatal accidents, drinking may be a factor in as many as one-half of all the fatal motor accidents in America." Fifty percent. It's gone from 18 percent in 1946 to 50 percent in 1966 in 20 years. And so this caused the amazing growth in driver-drinking habits in America, gave rise to this publication that has just come off the press, and I think, Mr. Speaker, that we've got to tighten up the legislation in this regard.

We hear a lot about Vietnam and the evils and the curse of war over there. Do you know there were ten times as many killed in American traffic accidents last year as there were in the Vietnam war last year? Ten times as many Americans killed on American roads as Americans killed in Vietnam. Well, isn't it about time then that we did something about this? I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that it is, and I'm disappointed that my honourable friends have not seen fit to clamp down on some of these "driving while impaired," "driving under the influence," and in all cases where it can be established that alcohol was the cause of an accident.

Another very current recommendation made by the Independent Insurance Agents for Western Manitoba at their March 31st meeting last - that's only three weeks ago - they

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd), passed a resolution: "Resolved that juvenile driving offences be tried in adult courts." I don't know whether my honourable friend has received this resolution from them as yet. This was only passed three weeks ago. Well, Mr. Speaker, I have all kinds of evidence here to show that something is going to have to be done in this regard but I don't intend to deal much more with it.

Another disturbing thing about the Minister's comments the other day on April 17th when he was speaking on this bill was, and I'm quoting on Page 2643: "The amendments which are before the members is that the amount set out in the statute, namely the \$20.00, and the amount which each person will have to pay, will be set by Order-in-Council." He's referring to the Driver Training program that was implemented just about two years ago, I believe - not quite two years ago I guess. The Driver Training program has actually only been in effect for less than a year, my guess is, but already apparently they intend to up the cost to the students, and I'm wondering if this will not hurt the program. This was a very worthwhile program but if it's going to cost too much to the individual then I fear that it will curb the program that has just got off the ground and this would be too bad, altogether too bad, because it has long since been established that drivers that have had training, even a very little bit of training, are much better drivers. The insurance companies recognize this and they give a rate reduction by reason of the fact that they had graduated from some of these student courses that are held, so even the insurance industry has recognized the value of them and let's not do anything to curb this very worthwhile program.

Mr. Speaker, there is not much else that I have to comment about at this particular time. I noticed "Under the Dome" where Ellen Simmons was concerned about changing gears while crossing on a railway track and I immediately looked up what the Minister did say because I thought that she must have been pulling his leg a bit, but apparently that is not so. "Failure to comply with traffic control signal, no minimum;" and "driving below the minimum speed limit, no minimum; changing gears while crossing railway, no minimum; failure to stop at stop signs, no minimum;" and so on and so on. Well, there's not too many of us that stop on railway tracks to look around so I guess that the Minister and myself will not likely be caught paying fines for infractions of this kind but it does seem to be a little antiquated to have that part of it in there.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I think that is all the comments that I want to make at this particular time but I certainly want to repeat what I started off by saying, that I am disappointed that my honourable friend does not see fit to deal more effectively with the drinking driver.

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

. continued on next page

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, I have one particular matter that I would like to raise with the Minister at this time and it deals with something that is not in the bill rather than something that is there, and I would like to once again make an appeal to the Minister when he is disengaged. I just can't do myself the compliment to imagine that my honourable friend would ever take the time to read what I say so I have to wait for him to (I wouldn't expect that) to address him directly. --(Interjection)--No, I'd be pretty black in the face, I think.

This is a matter that the former Minister and I had a somewhat lengthy and involved debate on last spring. Maybe my customary optimism got the better of me but I really thought that the Minister held out the hope to me at that time that, although he could not meet the request that I was making then, that he was favourably impressed and that the Department would give consideration to it, and I assumed, probably naively, that the result of that consideration would show up in this bill this year. Now I'm not going to debate it at length at this time but simply to raise it for the Honourable the Minister and he can look it up at his convenience. It's a question that I know some of the farmer members here will be familiar with, of the low-bed farm trailer, not a trailer in the ordinary sense but a low-bed long trailer that the farmer can pull behind a tractor or a truck for the conveyance of his implements of husbandry.

Now Mr. Speaker, you are aware, I'm sure, that the present Act makes provision for implements of husbandry being taken on the highways which are wider than the limits allowed for vehicles generally, and that being the case, it is a fact, Mr. Speaker, that with the growth of farms, these farms, and with the changes that there are in farm implements, and with so many of the implements now being on rubber tires, that these implements can be and are, in fact, taken considerable distances, and it is quite within the law that a farmer can now pull an implement, or in the case of a self-propelled one, drive an implement on the highway even though that implement in the case of a cultivator or seed-drill, or in some cases harrows, are 12 to 15 to 30 or even 35 feet wide. Now he's within the law in doing that now, and yet when the farmer goes to the expense and trouble (and yet it's a convenience for him, I admit) but when he purchases one of these long, narrow, low-bed farm trailers to put his implements on in a lengthwise position and then trail it, thereby reducing the width of the implement that he's taking onto the highway from 30 or 33 feet down to 11 feet, he is not allowed to take that implement on the highway under The Highway Traffic Act as we have it now.

Now as I argued at length last year, Mr. Speaker, this is much safer on the highway than the implement itself is. It's also a more convenient form of transportation for the farmer, and I would like to see the provision made for this type of a farm trailer whose sole purpose is to carry implements, to be exempted under the Act. This is not something that is a safety hazard; it is much safer than what is now allowed to happen, and last year I was unable, and I had the assistance of some of the other farmer members in this, and the question has come up again and we still do not have it covered in the Act, so I suggest to the Minister that he consult once again with his officials and see if we can't, at the committee stage, arrange to introduce an amendment that will permit this vehicle to be used.

There is a manufacturer in the rural parts - there may be more than one - who is making these low-bed trailers. One of them is in the constituency of my honourable friend the Member for Rhineland; there's another one of them made in Greater Winnipeg here, and for all I know there may be others, probably several others, but I assure you, Mr. Speaker, that the farmers who are acquainted with it realize that they're not only a convenience to the farmer but they are much safer for the travelling public, and these days, these days, with the growth in the size of farms, there are many farmers who are farming areas that are 8, 10 and even 20 miles apart, and the difference of running an implement lengthwise onto this machine and then pulling it is very very much better for the farmer and certainly adds to the safety on the highway, so I hope that some arrangements can be made to give the exemption to these vehicles as well.

Now I am aware that provision has been made for permits to be issued and I have no complaint on that fact because I know that permits have been issued and I know of some that have been issued already this year, but it's an inconvenience to farmers to get permits for only short periods and the longest that I know of up to date is three months. I know of another case where the farmer was unable from the department to be assured of a permit; he didn't succeed in getting one and consequently he cancelled his order for this low-bed farm trailer that he had already given an order for. So I suggest there is a problem here so far as the farmers are concerned. Perhaps it's not easy to cover in legislation but a need exists and this is not something that will in any way endanger safety on the highway; it will definitely add to the safety feature.

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd).....

So, I make the request of the Minister that he get his officials to work on it and see if we can't this year get something incorporated in the bill when it's in Law Amendments Committee or Committee of the Whole. If he'll do that, not for me but for a good many of the farmers in Manitoba, it'll be sincerely appreciated. To not do it will add to the inconvenience that exists now and it's one that's going to grow because the tendency is towards larger farms and they're spreading them out more all the time. One particular case that I'm very well acquainted with, the farms cover a distance of 20 miles and to be able to take these huge implements that they use these times, a 20 mile trip on a vehicle of this kind rather than trailing them with their full width, and some of them are, nowadays, 30 feet and more in width and even the harrows or the cultivators when they have two sides of them standing up are still 15 or 20 feet in some cases. So this will be a major step, I think, for a lot of the large-scale farmers of these days and I commend the suggestion to the Minister for consideration.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I just want to add support to what the Honourable Member for Lakeside has already said here tonight in connection with these implement trailers. I know we brought it to the attention of the Minister at the time the Act was brought in but he was reluctant to make the change at that time, but I do hope they are able to do something about it while we are amending the Act this year.

If I remember correctly too, it involved having an implement on that particular trailer both to and from, and this can involve embarrassment because if you take an implement to a certain place and come back without a load, you can be caught for not having an implement on to your trailer, and I think this should be taken into consideration as well.

I wish to thank the Minister for giving us such a complete outline of the bill on second reading. I have one other point that I thought I'd raise briefly and that is I think the last item in the bill having to do with antique cars. The fee increased from \$5.00 to \$25.00 - am I right on that? If that's the case I think it's too much. If we have some people, elderly people who are going on pensions and having a hobby of having an old car, I don't think that this is quite proper, having such a large fee in these cases and I think this particular fee should be reduced.

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

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Speaker, I'd be glad to make some comments about the various points that have been raised. With respect - and I'll just work in reverse order - with respect to the antique cars, I'm wondering if perhaps the Honourable the Member for Rhineland may have misunderstood me. An antique car, the registration of a car as an antique car, doesn't apply of course in the case where the car is used in the ordinary way that we use a car, in which case of course the person would pay the regular licence fee and all that goes with it. This is where an antique car is only maintained as a show piece or hobby and the charge is a "once only" charge, no matter how many years the person may have it, and the purpose of the \$20.00 is for payment into the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund as a once-only payment and to get away from the necessity of making annual payments to that fund in respect of such a vehicle, and I think that viewed in that light it is not a serious matter.

Now with respect to the low-bed farm trailer about which both the Honourable Member for Lakeside and the Honourable Member for Rhineland spoke, I would say that I am not able to give any commitment or make any announcement about it. I do have a recollection of the debate that took place last year on this matter, although perhaps I didn't pay as close attention at the time as I ought to have done - certainly if I had realized I might have some responsibility for The Highway Traffic Act later on - and I would think that this would be a matter that we could discuss in committee where we will have the experts available who would be able to advise us.

Dealing with the contribution of the Honourable the Member for Gladstone-Neepawa, he complains that there is no legislation about snowmobiles. I'm afraid I haven't yet made my point, that of course there is legislation about snowmobiles in the sense that their use is restricted by the provisions of The Highway Traffic Act, and if he is speaking about legislation he could only be speaking about legislation, I presume, which would allow the greater use on the public roads of snowmobiles, and the fact that there is no legislation here in this bill simply means that we do not consider that in the public interest it would be advisable to provide legislation for this purpose.

(MR. McLEAN cont'd).....

He speaks - and I share his concern - about the problem of accidents in which alcohol or liquor is involved, and I agree that it is certainly one of the most serious problems if not the most serious problem that we have in relation to our modern day society in which the use of the automobile is so common. I would remind him, however, that the provisions of the law in this respect are provisions in the Criminal Code which is federal legislation and not provisions in the Highway Traffic Act, and that if anything is required in the way of legislation dealing with this particular matter it would be my opinion that it would be amendment to The Criminal Code that would be required and that of course law enforcement, while that is a very proper subject of discussion, law enforcement even as it applies to the Highway Traffic Act is not something for which the Public Utilities Department is responsible; that is the responsibility of the Attorney-General and the Attorney-General's Department insofar as law enforcement itself is concerned.

I do not think that the Honourable Member for Neepawa-Gladstone can assume that, because of the change made with respect to driver training, that the costs are necessarily going to be increased to the students; indeed it might be the reverse. I acknowledge, of course, that it is a possibility that they could be increased but I do not think that that is a situation which can be assumed at the moment, and again I agree with him that it is a most worthwhile program and I am sure that I would be the last to suggest anything that would in any way curb that program; indeed our whole hope must surely be in extending to the widest possible extent the driver training as it applies to the boys and girls as they come of driving age. I have a very great interest in this program and we are hopeful that it will grow and expand in our high schools in the province and I know that it has been most worthwhile. As a matter of fact, members have been invited, I believe, to a luncheon on the 19th of May, if we're out of the House by that time, and we're going to have some of the top students there to receive recognition for their work in the program that has been carried out in the schools since last September.

The Honourable Member for Wellington spoke on the subject of the safe condition of cars, that is cars that are sold, and wanted to know about brand new cars. Well I would just say that the section, the provisions of the Highway Traffic Act with respect to the certification that must be given with the sale of a car applies equally to a new car as to a second-hand car; in other words, in selling a car the dealer is required to give a certificate that the car is in safe condition for driving on the highway and that applies, as I say, with respect to any vehicle and that must be done before that car may be driven on the highway.

He spoke also of the subject of funeral processions and the Honourable Member for Elmwood spoke on the same matter, and the suggestion that funeral processions should be discontinued. I'm not certain whether that is something that we would perhaps want to be too specific about. That is perhaps a matter on which there would be some strong opinions, I presume, with the general public. Just dealing, if I may, still with that subject of funeral processions, the Honourable Member for Elmwood spoke of the length of processions and the possibility of police escort. Certainly it would be advisable to have a police escort, especially in, say, the Metropolitan area of Winnipeg, but I'm informed that as a practical matter it is not possible to always have a police escort although efforts are made; if it is known that the procession is likely to be a lengthy one efforts are made to have a police escort but that is not always possible because of the number of personnel that would be required.

The Leader of the Liberal Party asked why not a mandatory for a light on top of a school bus, and I'm really not able to answer that question specifically except that it would be my impression that those concerned with school buses and the regulations that apply have not so far felt that the flashing light on the top of the school bus is necessary, but I have to confess that it's a matter that I personally had not thought of before and I would say that it is something that we'll certainly be glad to look at as to whether that would be important or not.

He spoke of the question of whether we had a report on the 15-mile zones in school zones and playgrounds. I was hoping that that topic would be forgotten; but in actual fact we have no report except the general impression that we have that there has been no increase in accidents or no problems arising from the discontinuance of the 15-mile per hour limitation. It is, as members may know, the opinion of the people in the Motor Vehicle Branch in the Highway Safety Division that the present law is a better law than the 15-mile per hour limit, because the present law really requires the driver to go only five miles an hour if that is the proper safe speed, so there are two sides to this argument and I'm not really qualified to express too

(MR. McLEAN cont'd)... firm an opinion except that we have no indication of anything untoward happening as the result of the change.

He asked about the lots on which wrecked cars are placed. That is another statute - I've forgotten just the name of it - which is under the jurisdiction of the Department of Highways and which I believe has not as yet been proclaimed, that is, the part that would require used car lots to be fenced or removed, and the situation is that while the legislation exists no action has been taken under it, but it is not part of the Highway Traffic Act nor is it a part of the Public Utilities Department or the Motor Vehicle Branch to look after.

He spoke of the matter of breathalyzer tests related to impaired and drunken driving. Here again it is our opinion that if any legislation with respect to the use of breathalyzers is to be brought in, it ought to come really by way of provision in the Criminal Code to make it uniform throughout Canada, and there is a bill presently before Parliament in which this matter is being considered, and if it's not before Parliament it's before one of the committees in Parliament in which it is being considered. I would just say that there are of course differences of opinion about the advisability of having breathalyzer tests and I have always tended to be rather doubtful about them. I think they have some disadvantages although perhaps I'm tending to come more to the point of view that it would be - all things considered - it would be a proper step to take, but I just put forward the point of view that that legislation I think is better to come by way of a provision in the Highway Traffic Act.

The Honourable Member for Kildonan had something to say about selling cars that are unroadworthy, and again I just say that we have provisions in the Act and in the amendments that deal with this subject and which are designed to prevent this happening. He is in favour of compulsory inspection and I am sure that we are all in favour. Section 296, I believe it is, of The Highway Traffic Act provides for compulsory inspection although that provision of the Act has never been proclaimed because up to this time we have not been able to provide the facilities that would be required to carry that out. I acknowledge, however, the force of the argument on that point.

He asked about a warning sign with respect to studded tires, and that was raised earlier in the session and we looked into that and came to the conclusion that it is not essential and we have no indication of accidents occurring as a result of a car with studded tires being able to stop more quickly than a car that might be immediately following it. It is the practice of some of the companies that sell studded tires to provide a sign that is used but that's purely voluntary and we have not thought that it was necessary to make it a provision of the law.

The Honourable the Member for Selkirk agreed with making it discretionary for the magistrate with respect to penalties and he thought that they should all be removed. We've made a move in that direction and there will be a difference of opinion. Unfortunately, or perhaps I shouldn't say unfortunately, but as a matter of fact not all cases are tried by magistrates and perhaps some view that while a number of cases are still dealt with by justices of the peace, that maybe it would be best to continue with some minimum penalties at least, but this is a matter which is under constant consideration and will no doubt receive further consideration in the years ahead.

The Honourable Member for Selkirk was also in favour of compulsory vehicle inspection and that we shouldn't waste any further time. Well, as I say, all I can report is that we have not been able to provide the facilities that would be required and for that reason have not been able to implement the provisions of The Highway Traffic Act.

With respect to reflectorized license plates, that matter is being examined with a view to considering whether this would be a good plan when we next renew the license plates, and I share with him the view which he has expressed that this is a good idea. I think perhaps from many points of view that there would hardly be any dissent. There might be some dissent from the cost that would be involved but even that is not -- we're looking at it and there may be some action with respect to it.

He advocates that the provisions with respect to gratuitous passengers should be removed, and it reminded me of the view that I had when I practised law to the same effect, and although I have some sympathy, a good deal of sympathy for the point of view expressed, I would be inclined to think that before just removing it from the provisions of The Highway Traffic Act we would have to consider that suggestion in context of the general civil law, as it has developed, and I wouldn't want to give an offhand opinion. I think it would be something that one would have to approach with some care, but it's a good point and we will be glad to look at it.

(MR. McLEAN cont'd).....

He also, the Honourable Member for Selkirk objected to reports under Section 151 being used as a basis for prosecution, and I again share his own views on it and I think that we'll be glad to look at the wording of that section to see if some appropriate change can be made to bring that point of view forward.

Well, Mr. Speaker, those are my observations on the points that have been raised, all of which - that is, the points raised - have been quite useful, and I'll be happy to have the support for the bill at this time.

MR. MOLGAT: May I ask the Minister a question? I noticed that in replying to my colleague the Member for Gladstone and myself, on the matter of impaired and drunken driving, he took the position that this is really a federal responsibility under the Criminal Code, but is it not correct that the Province of Saskatchewan has proceeded with the breathalyzer tests and is using them, and that this has been done under a Saskatchewan statute?

MR. McLEAN: That is correct and it could be done. I do not suggest that it could not be done provincially.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 95, the Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, Bill 95 is an Act respecting the Protection and Preservation of Historic Sites and Objects, and I think that this bill is rather long overdue in the sense that there have been attempts made in the past to carry out some of the intentions of this bill but they have not fared too well because the kind of objects that are dealt with in this Act are what might be called "valuable and non-renewable resources" - this is the way they are described by the Manitoba Archeological Society and I think that that is correct, that they are valuable in the sense of culturally; they are valuable in the sense of the tourist industry; and they certainly are non-renewable. Too many of them have been lost and they are simply not replaceable. So the object of this Act, I think, is most worthy of our consideration.

I would like to suggest to the Minister, and I'd be interested in hearing his comments on the kind of signs that are going to be erected by the Provincial Government. I think there's a need for a standard design and I think there's also a need for advance markers leading to the signs and to the sites, perhaps some distance in advance, not just one at the very spot but a number leading to it, and I also hope that they will take greater pains to promote the use of maps so that tourists and interested Manitobans may be able to find some of these places which are generally unknown.

The Act apparently has a section dealing with the finding of artifacts and the suggestion that they must be reported. I don't find this section very clear in a sense that there doesn't appear to be any provision for fines; there doesn't appear to be any suggestion that a reward will be made in the event of some great discovery or that perhaps an offer of purchase might be made by the Provincial Government for some valuable artifacts, it just suggests that the people should notify the government. This of course will have to be well publicized; otherwise a lot of these things will not be done.

One thing that greatly interests and concerns me is the amount of money that may be set aside for the purposes of carrying out this Act. I suppose this is rather like the chicken and the egg, in a sense of how much money do you need, then we'll see whether or not we'll give it to you. I think a better approach would be that we're going to allocate so many hundred thousand dollars to this and then the people who are going to administer the Act will have some idea of what they can do because it seems to me that when we look into some of the sites and objects that need to be preserved and maintained and guarded in our province that this will mount into the millions and that I think without putting a dollar figure, even an approximate dollar figure, tying it to the Act I think is bad and I hope the Minister will indicate the kinds of money that might be available, because otherwise it's going to be on the basis of "we would like so many thousand dollars to do this." I'm afraid that the resources that will be available to the administrators of the Act will be all too small.

One thing that I think has to be done in the early stages of the Act is to have a master development plan and I hope it is the intention of the Minister to see that such a plan is carried out, because here is where the question of priorities rings very strong. And then, if I read the Act correctly, there is no provision for something that I think must be done and this is to appoint a Provincial Archeologist. I don't know whether or not the Minister is considering this but if it is an omission from the Act then I think serious consideration should be given to it. The Manitoba Archeological Society suggests that this is a necessary inclusion and so do I.

(MR. DOERN cont'd)... If the cost of this cannot be borne by this Act alone then I think this person could at least be say, appointed to the University or appointed to the Museum and could combine duties, if it's felt for example this wouldn't be full-time. I think it is full-time and I think the amount of money needed to develop and preserve things mentioned in this Act will merit a full-time archeologist, a Provincial Archeologist to administer the program.

Now when we look around some of the attempts in the past that have been made by the government and by committees appointed by the government they have in effect failed because there was a committee appointed in 1947 I believe, and in the 20 years hence very little has been done, according to people who have fuller knowledge than I, and I hope that we will not find ourselves in the same position in the next few years.

I also wonder whether the Act could include moneys or whether this would come under another area to promote the use of pageantry to maintain historic interest at certain sites around the province. For example, we have our famous Lower Fort Garry and I think there's been some suggestions made there. I suppose the Federal Government has the primary responsibility but perhaps a military guard that does certain drills, etc., and provides some scenery with uniforms would increase the attractiveness of the area.

And I would also like to see certain funds allocated for special events. For example, the Seven Oaks Massacre, I believe the 150th anniversary occurred last year in June and to the best of my knowledge, other than a small ceremony attended by the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks and a few other dignitaries, there was very little done. I heard an excellent suggestion from a person with a good historical background at that particular time that a, in a sense, a re-enactment of the event, without the actual bloodshed, should have occurred. --(Interjection)--It might lack realism but I think that would be desirable. Well, I better not comment upon other possibilities in that direction. I was going to say perhaps the other side should win but I'd better not get into that.

I would also think that if we had had such an event that films and television could have followed it and that could have been preserved for all time, but in effect it wound up. I think the suggestion was made, it was carried through the Centennial Corporation and it was not proceeded with. So I think we need funds for that kind of thing. I don't know whether or not this Act can include it but if it's not this Act I'd like the Minister to comment on where this kind of thing could be done.

There's also a need for protection of our historic sites in the way of fencing and also there's a need for the co-operation of the police and the RCMP, I think, in surveying some of these sites and protecting them, especially where say fencing isn't possible or some ordinary surveyance isn't possible.

Mr. Speaker, I still have some 10 or 15 minutes of material. If you wish to call 10:00 o'clock I will stop at this time. Otherwise I'll proceed for another minute or two.

MR. LYON: The Honourable Member has not finished?

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

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House adjourned until 10:00 o'clock Friday morning.