

ELECTORAL DIVISION	NAME	ADDRESS
ARTHUR	J. D. Watt	Reston, Manitoba
ASSINIBOIA	Steve Patrick	189 Harris Blvd., Winnipeg 12
BIRTLE-RUSSELL	Hon. Robert G. Smellie, Q. C.	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
BRANDON	R. O. Lissaman	832 Eleventh St., Brandon, Man.
BROKENHEAD	E. R. Schreyer	2 - 1177 Henderson Hwy., Winnipeg 16
BURROWS	Mark G. Smerchanski	102 Handsart Blvd., Winnipeg 29
CARILLON	Leonard A. Barkman	Steinbach, Man.
CHURCHILL	Gordon W. Beard	Thompson, Man.
CYPRESS	Hon. Thelma Forbes	Rathwell, Man.
DAUPHIN	Hon. Stewart E. McLean, Q. C.	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
DUFFERIN	William Homer Hamilton	Sperling, Man.
ELMWOOD	S. Peters	225 Kimberly St., Winnipeg 15
EMERSON	John P. Tanchak	Ridgeville, Man.
ETHELBERT-PLAINS	M. N. Hryhorczuk, Q. C.	Ethelbert, Man.
FISHER	Emil Moeller	Teulon, Man.
FLIN FLON	Hon. Charles H. Witney	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
FORT GARRY	Hon. Sterling R. Lyon, Q. C.	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
FORT ROUGE	Hon. Gurney Evans	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
GIMLI	Hon. George Johnson	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
GLADSTONE	Nelson Shoemaker	Neepawa, Man.
HAMIOTA	B. P. Strickland	Hamiota, Man.
INKSTER	Morris A. Gray	406 - 365 Hargrave St., Winnipeg 2
KILDONAN	James T. Mills	142 Larchdale Crescent, Winnipeg 15
LAC DU BONNET	Oscar F. Bjornson	Lac du Bonnet, Man.
LAKESIDE	D. L. Campbell	326 Kelvin Blvd., Winnipeg 29
LA VERENDRYE	Albert Vielfaure	La Broquerie, Man.
LOGAN	Lemuel Harris	1109 Alexander Ave., Winnipeg 3
MINNEDOSA	Hon. Walter Weir	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
MORRIS	Harry P. Shewman	Morris, Man.
OSBORNE	Hon. Obie Baizley	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
PEMBINA	Mrs. Carolyne Morrison	Manitou, Man.
PORTAGE LA PRAIRIE	Gordon E. Johnston	7 Massey Drive, Portage la Prairie
RADISSON	Russell Paulley	435 Yale Ave. W., Transcona 25, Man.
RHINELAND	J. M. Froese	Winkler, Man.
RIVER HEIGHTS	Hon. Maitland B. Steinkopf, Q. C.	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
ROBLIN	Keith Alexander	Roblin, Man.
ROCK LAKE	Hon. Abram W. Harrison	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
ROCKWOOD-IBERVILLE	Hon. George Hutton	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
RUPERTSLAND	J. E. Jeannotte	Meadow Portage, Man.
ST. BONIFACE	Laurent Desjardins	138 Dollard Blvd., St. Boniface 6, Man.
ST. GEORGE	Elman Guttormson	Lundar, Man.
ST. JAMES	D. M. Stanes	381 Guildford St., St. James, Winnipeg 12
ST. JOHN'S	Saul Cherniack, Q. C.	333 St. John's Ave., Winnipeg 4
ST. MATTHEWS	W. G. Martin	924 Palmerston Ave., Winnipeg 10
ST. VITAL	Fred Groves	3 Kingston Row, St. Vital, Winnipeg 8
STE. ROSE	Gildas Molgat	Room 250, Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
SELKIRK	T. P. Hillhouse, Q. C.	Dominion Bank Bldg., Selkirk, Man.
SEVEN OAKS	Arthur E. Wright	168 Burrin Ave., Winnipeg 17
SOURIS-LANSDOWNE	M. E. McKellar	Nesbitt, Man.
SPRINGFIELD	Fred T. Klym	Beausejour, Man.
SWAN RIVER	James H. Bilton	Swan River, Man.
THE PAS	Hon. J. B. Carroll	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
TURTLE MOUNTAIN	P. J. McDonald	Killarney, Man.
VIRDEN	Donald Morris McGregor	Kenton, Man.
WELLINGTON	Richard Seaborn	594 Arlington St., Winnipeg 10
WINNIPEG CENTRE	James Cowan, Q. C.	412 Paris Bldg., Winnipeg 2
WOLSELEY	Hon. Duff Roblin	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
2:30 o'clock, Wednesday, March 18, 1964.

Opening Prayer by Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions
Reading and Receiving Petitions
Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees
Notices of Motions
Introduction of Bills

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN, Q.C. (Attorney-General) (Dauphin) introduced Bill No. 99, an Act to amend The Liquor Control Act; and Bill No. 101, an Act to amend The Devolution of Estate Act.

MADAM SPEAKER: Before the Orders of the Day, I would like to attract your attention to the gallery where there are seated some 160 Grade XI students from the Selkirk Collegiate. The students are under the direction of their teachers, Mr. Sigurjonsson and Mr. Purvis, Mr. Fisher and Mr. Friesen. This school is situated in the constituency of the Honourable the Member for Selkirk. We welcome you here this afternoon. We hope that all that you see and hear in this Legislative Assembly will be of help to you in your studies. May this visit be an inspiration to you and stimulate your interest in provincial affairs. Come back and visit us again.

Orders of the Day.

HON. MAITLAND B. STEINKOPF, Q.C. (Provincial Secretary) (River Heights): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I'd like to lay on the table of the House a Return for an Address for Papers on motion of the Honourable Member for St. George; and also a partial Return to an Order of the House No. 36 on motion of the Honourable Member for St. George; and a partial Return to an Order of the House No. 35 on motion of the Honourable Member from St. George.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I'd like to address a question to the Attorney-General. Was his department aware that Mr. Otto Boldt who had been held on a coroner's warrant for some period of time at Headingley Jail left Canada for Germany?

MR. McLEAN: Only through the newspapers, Madam Speaker.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, a subsequent question. In view of the events in this particular case, the fact that at the outset there were several days between the time that the death occurred and that the Attorney-General's department was advised apparently by the St. Vital police department; in view of the fact that subsequently Mr. Boldt was held at Headingley Jail at the Minister's admission longer than he should have been; and in view of the fact that Mr. Boldt has now left Canada under some odd circumstances in this particular case, is it the intention of the Attorney-General's department to conduct a complete investigation into this whole case?

MR. McLEAN: No further investigation, Madam Speaker, than has already been conducted.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party) (Radisson): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, may I direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Health. Is the honourable gentleman taking part in discussions which are going on according to press reports between the Government of Manitoba and the Government of Canada respecting the future disposition of the hospital facilities commonly known as the Veterans Hospital at Deer Lodge?

HON. CHARLES H. WITNEY (Minister of Health) (Flin Flon): Madam Speaker, during the discussion of the estimates that matter was explained, that the Hospital Commission and the people from the Federal Government are meeting at the present time about the hospital.

MR. PAULLEY: from that statement?

MR. WITNEY: That's right.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order for Return standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Assiniboia, that an Order of the House do issue for a

(Mr. Johnston, cont'd.) Return showing: 1. -- By the leave of the House, Madam Speaker, I'd like to insert the word "total" at this point, so it would read: The total number of persons charged with violations under The Game and Fisheries Act, RSM 1954, Chap. 94, and Amendments thereto, with respect to: (a) upland game birds; (b) waterfowl; (c) deer; (d) moose and elk; for each year for the past ten years, commencing 1953. 2. The number of convictions with regard to the aforesaid violations, for each year during the past ten years commencing 1953. 3. The number of hunting licences issued in Manitoba under the above act with respect to upland game birds, waterfowl, deer, moose and elk, for each year for the past ten years, commencing 1953.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q.C. (Minister of Mines and Natural Resources) (Fort Garry): Madam Speaker, the honourable member was good enough to hold this Order while we spoke, and I think there may be one minor area of misunderstanding between us yet. If the honourable member would agree to amend again the first paragraph of his Order striking out the words (a), (b), (c) and (d), that is upland birds, waterfowl, etc., etc., and ask us for the total number of persons charged with violations under The Game and Fish Act, because there may well be violations which don't refer to birds or animals at all. They may refer to guns and a vehicle, etc. If those could be left out, because we have no breakdown of those in any case.

MR. JOHNSTON: Agreed.

Madam Speaker put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. McLEAN: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Education, that Madam Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the bills as shown on the Order Paper.

Madam Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole with the Honourable Member for St. Matthews in the Chair.

Bills No. 44, 63, 69, 70, 71 and 72 were read section by section and passed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise and report. Call in the Speaker.

Madam Speaker, the Committee of the Whole House has considered the following bills: Nos. 44, 63, 69, 70, 71 and 72, directed me to report the same without amendments and ask leave to sit again.

MR. W. G. MARTIN (St. Matthews): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Springfield, that the report of the Committee be received.

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

Bills Nos. 44, 63, 69, 70, 71 and 72 were each read a third time and passed.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the second reading of Bill No. 50. The Honourable the Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Madam Speaker, I adjourned the debate for the Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

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

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Madam Speaker, I must say immediately that I am in favour of this bill. It's something that I have been advocating for a number of years. I'm certainly not in favour of the way this bill was brought in though.

First of all, I think that it is important to realize that there are two main components of this bill. Yes, there is the question of referendum for the rest of Manitoba, the question of local option, but there is also -- and I would say that this is the most important thing, this is the main reason why this was done, why this bill was brought in -- there is the question of allowing theatres, an exhibition of moving pictures and so on to be allowed, which is certainly something new. I think that this should be brought in, and also the fact that the time, something that we've discussed in the past at quite length, be extended from 5:30 to 12.

Now I would even say that I'm very surprised to see that it wasn't the Attorney-General that brought this bill. After all, this is an Act to provide a change in The Lord's Day Act and it was the Minister of Municipal Affairs -- well I shouldn't really say that I'm surprised, after the Attorney-General -- listening to him during the past few years, I don't think that he could possibly bring in such a bill and no doubt that if we read the speeches that he made last year and the year before and the year before he'll probably oppose this bill, so that's probably the reason

(Mr. Desjardins, cont'd.) . . . why they farmed this out to the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

Now I don't think there's anything wrong with people changing their minds. They may have principles, they might hear something, there might be some reason, but I think they should be honest and I think they should admit it and not try to hide like this government is doing so often, more and more every year, hide the way this has been done here. I don't think it was proper for the Honourable Minister that brought in this bill to explain -- this was the explanation on such a bill that was so important, and you can follow Hansard of last year or any other year to see all the words, everything that was said on this, and this is the explanation of the Honourable Minister. "Madam Speaker, this bill is introduced to allow other municipalities and the City of Winnipeg to pass by-laws to allow certain activities on Sunday which, but for this bill, would be prohibited by The Lord's Day Act, Canada. It provides a similar machinery to that in The Liquor Control Act, providing for a petition to the municipal council and for the matter to be presented to the electors of a municipality before the by-law is passed."

Well I'm not saying that the Honourable Minister should have read everything, but I mean when there's something so important, when you're changing the like this bill is doing and when you're allowing more, I certainly think that the least the Honourable Minister should have done is explain this -- explain this is why -- they start by explaining and then this is why they have a chance to close the debate after. I don't think that this was quite according to Hoyle. I don't think that this was the proper thing to do. He'll probably say, well what do you think you have the bills for -- you read them. Well if this is the case, why did he bother explaining? I don't think that this was fair at all. I don't know if he's asking me a question, he's not loud enough. If he wants to ask me a question that's fine, but he'll probably wait, as I say, when we can't answer back.

Oh, I see there's my friend the former Attorney-General is going to get into this again. There's one that certainly had a lot to say on this and changed from one side to the other. I wonder if he's going to give us a speech and explain why he's changed his mind, such as the now Attorney-General, and of course we had a terrific speech from the Honourable Member from St. Matthews. He was very clear but he didn't know what the heck he was talking about.

Now mind you I don't agree with the Honourable Member from Wellington but I admire him. The man has his principles and he was man enough to give his principles here. It is true it is a known fact that he's had to suffer because he held these principles. I think that he's lost his position, a good position, and I can only admire a man like this. -- (Interjection) -- You can ask two or three if you want.

MR. MARTIN: May I ask what the Member for St. Boniface suggests when he speaks of the Member for St. Matthews and his speech, and then says, concerning the Member for Wellington, "I admire him because he's a man that has a principle." Are you suggesting for one moment that the Member for St. Matthews hasn't got a principle? Or didn't you listen to the speech last week?

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, Madam Speaker, the honourable member will answer this himself. He'll answer this himself. On March 9th, 1964, this is what my honourable friend said: "I am in favour of the principle of the Bill, namely, dealing with this whole question on a local basis as the only fair and equitable way in which to deal with it. And in saying that, Madam Speaker, I'm just repeating the stand that I took in this debate, a similar debate last year, when we felt that it wasn't fair that one municipality should enjoy certain privileges."

It is true -- it is true that some members had stated that this should be done and I think that the Honourable Minister who was bringing in this Act stated this. I remember the Leader of the NDP, this was his main concern. Why should he accord this to Winnipeg and not to the rest of Manitoba? All right. I admit that this is what these people said at the time, but there are some here that they weren't too interested in this. They could see -- oh, this thing going out of hand and this was the end of The Lord's Day Act and everything, and my honourable friend who asked this question is one of them. What else does he say? "We brought in a Bill dealing with amateur sports, and we made so much of the fact that this was 'amateur' sport." You see he brought that in, then he also said: "Now if this Bill becomes law, and I'd like to be optimistic," -- he's for it but he doesn't want it -- "but I think it will become law, much as I may think otherwise." This was this year.

(Mr. Desjardins, con't.)

But now we'll talk about -- he wants this question answered, what I think of him.

MR. MARTIN: the honourable member was going to read the whole of my speech to see whether I had a principle or whether

MR. DESJARDINS: Is he making a speech or is he asking a question? -- (Interjection) -- Is he asking a question? All right. I'll make him answer himself. Right here. I'll quote him. May 2nd, 1963: "I rise to go on record because three years ago some of us spoke from this Chamber with reference to a Sunday Sports Bill, and we felt at that time that it was a mistake if the legislation passed. We said it was the thin edge of the wedge. It was putting the foot in the door." This was one of the things he said. I can't possibly read all this, it would take me all day because the honourable member spoke two or three times every year on this bill. -- (Interjection) -- You can read it. You'll have a chance to talk. You'll have a chance to talk. You'll have a chance to talk. Especially when your boss is not here, you can say all kinds of stupid things. "I talked" -- again I'm quoting my honourable friend -- "I talked to a number of men, men that are engaged in the movie industry. Not the big moguls who want to make the money -- that's back of all this -- but the man who has his weekly job there, and the answer that I've had from a number of them is, 'We don't want this. We want and we cherish our weekly day of rest. We want to preserve our Sunday.' And I say, Madam Speaker, we should resist strenuously the enticements of this legislation." Now this year he's in favour of this. What does the bill say? "Any exhibition of moving pictures, any theatrical performance, concert, recital, lectures and other performances."

Now if that wasn't enough we'll go to another speech that the honourable member made, and this is May 4th, 1963: "As the Honourable the Minister of Education suggested to the committee, for Heaven's sake, during the course of the years the city council may ask for everything, and quite unacceptable to the government, but because they ask for it that doesn't mean that our hands are tied and therefore we have to deal with it." This is what he thought last year; this year it's different. Of course they were embarrassed. Between sessions it was clear that, politically, that had been quite a boner that they had pulled.

Now again on May 6th, 1963. This is all your answer by the way. "I grant you one thing, Mr. Chairman -- I'm positive of this -- the vested interests are in favour of it; many organizations and groups that will benefit by direct and indirect profits or gain. They'd see no reason why we shouldn't pass this Act." This again was my honourable friend.

Do you think he's convinced? Well just in case. Then he's saying, "this is of such importance that we've got to rise above selfish interests, thinking in terms of profits or gain, or even pleasure; or, Mr. Chairman, even of political favour, as individual members of this Assembly." Well this question was

MR. MARTIN: May I ask the honourable member a question? Will you accept a question?

MR. DESJARDINS: Any one of them.

MR. MARTIN: All right. Having read that, would you mind reading the speech that I delivered this year?

MR. DESJARDINS: This is a question or a request? I mean this is a little -- I've a bad enough time reading those lines before starting all that junk again. No I certainly don't

MADAM SPEAKER: I think that the honourable member should avoid giving any alleged offence to what any member in this Legislature has said.

MR. DESJARDINS: Oh, Madam Speaker, I think I'm certainly entitled to read them. I would -- it's the best way to cover up -- I would like that too if I was stuck like you people from across the aisle there.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. DESJARDINS: What is the question? The question is, I should have read all of this. Is that what you want, Madam Speaker? Did you

MADAM SPEAKER: Would the honourable member continue please with his own speech.

MR. DESJARDINS: That was what I was trying to do without all this interference. Madam Speaker, this is what I'm doing and I think that I'm certainly in order to show -- (Interjection) -- What was that? -- (Interjection) -- I read it enough times. If that's not clear, I don't know why we spend our time listening to this then.

Madam Speaker, it was very clear that this Member from St. Matthews, the Attorney-

(Mr. Desjardins, cont'd.) . . . General and a few others, did not want -- did not want to see Sunday sports. We've debated the question of hours and we finally allowed 5:30. We debated this for days and I think that the Honourable Minister of Education remembers that in committee we discussed this theatre for quite a while. My case, as I say, it's not that anybody can bring in a bill. This is fine. And all of a sudden they're getting excited across the way. They're getting excited because they are being discovered for what they are. They've always trying to bring in a bill like this and couple it with something else. Politically, this was a mistake. They were to'd about it. All right, this is fine. They can come in and change their minds but we don't have to listen to their speech. But this honourable member for St. Matthews came in, talked about one way and then voted the other way. I don't think that this is right.

As I said before, we had two components in this bill. There is the question of local option of referendum and I admit, even the Minister what proposed this motion, even this Minister did suggest that if this was fair for Winnipeg we should give the same chances to the rest of Manitoba, I admit. But this wasn't the only thing and I suggest that he should have explained this at the start. I suggest that the Honourable Member from St. Matthews should at least say that he is changing his mind if that's what he's doing and not pretend that this is only a referendum and that the rest is fine. How can you say this and have read, after listening to what I have read of his speeches in the previous years. He has lots of friends out there, he has the Minister of Welfare. We can read all his speech if we want. I'm ready to listen. I'm ready to listen to all those speeches but I just think that I'd have to read much more than that to make the point, that all of a sudden all those different reasons why we shouldn't have had this does not exist because the people of Winnipeg want Sunday sport. This is the only point that I'm trying to make and I'm satisfied that it is a valid one and I think from now on that this government, if they want to do something, if they want to show the leadership that we hear so much about, well let's come clean. Let's not try to hide behind something else like we've had well this session more than ever.

MR. LYON: Would the honourable member permit a question? Would he mind telling us whether he's in favour of the bill or against it?

MR. DESJARDINS: Do you want me to read what I said last year or the year before? Do you want me to read the first sentence that I made, or were you away?

MADAM SPEAKER: Would you please answer the question.

MR. DESJARDINS: Isn't that answering the question, Madam Speaker? Am I supposed to say anything, or am I stopped at every time I open my mouth. All the questions are all right. He asked me if I was in favour and I asked him what he wanted me to read, because I stood up and I said that I was in favour of this bill. This was my first sentence.

MADAM SPEAKER: The honourable member has answered the question. The Honourable Member for Inkster -- the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MOLGAT: Did I understand you correctly, Madam Speaker, to order the member that he must answer the question?

MADAM SPEAKER: I asked him. The Honourable Member from Inkster.

MR. MORRIS A. GRAY (Inkster): Madam Speaker, if I would have an ounce of brains in my head I would not have got up to speak at all, because so far all parties have committed a very religious crime, and that is putting politics in religion. Religion, in my opinion, and that was how I was trained, trained in school, and trained by the Rabbis of the world, the statutes of Moses, and when people get up and try to mix in and try to create a feeling of loyalty to the Lord, I think it's wrong. There is one body that you cannot fool, and this is the religion and His Lordship. They know when you are sincere and honest and they know when you are playing politics. That compelled me to rise and say The Lord's Day Act, one way or the other, will not make any difference to the attendance of the church or the synagogue or any other religious institution.

If the time has come when you have to have entertainment, when you have to have publicity, when you have to have advertising for people to say "come to church and listen to the words of the Lord," they've failed; and any speech they make right here will not help a bit and will not solve the problem. You cannot compel a man to go to the church -- and when I say church I mean all denominations -- if he wants to go somewhere else, if he wants to watch a football game or any other game. If the church wants to accomplish their purpose, please go out and

(Mr. Gray, cont'd.) . . . tell the public, "Come to Church; listen to the Minister; listen to the gospel; and listen to words of wisdom, of intelligence; listen to the word of your Prophets, of your God, wherever the hierarchy could be." But not to fight around here. I think it is an insult to religion, an insult to the church -- and when I say church I mean all denominations.

So I say this, as far as I am personally concerned, I'm going to support the resolution without a single intention of hurting any religion. I am religious myself, I'm very religious, but I also know it is the individual ideas and hearts and souls is to go to the religion, and if he wants to go to a football game at the same time nothing will stop him, and you don't need that individual in church until he himself realizes that this is the best thing.

So I conclude with this statement, that I'm going to vote for it, not because I am religious and not because I've any idea or any intention of going to a football game or any other entertainment, but I feel that the individual is to have his liberty and not chain him to his idea. Go out and teach him; ask him to go to the church; ask him to try and get something higher than what he is getting today, something higher, but not compel him, because you cannot take a horse to the trough and compel him to drink.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

HON. ROBERT G. SMELLIE, Q.C. (Minister of Municipal Affairs) (Birtle-Russell): Madam Speaker, the Honourable Member for St. Boniface has criticized me for not having had more to say on the opening of this debate, but I notice that he didn't stay to see whether I had anything to say at this time or not on the closing of the debate, and I would deplore the actions of the Honourable Member of St. Boniface in questioning the principles of men like the Honourable Member for St. Matthews. He suggests that the government has been getting excited about this matter and I suggest to you, Madam Speaker, that if there's anybody in this House that knows what getting excited means, it's the Honourable Member for St. Boniface. He should surely be able to recognize the symptoms. I would suggest too, Madam Speaker, that although the explanation at the beginning of this bill was brief, that it was factual and that it did explain in brief terms the principles that were involved in this bill.

I would like to say too, Madam Speaker, that I have appreciated the remarks that came from the Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains, the Honourable Member for Wellington, and the Honourable Member for Inkster, among others, who spoke on this bill. In particular, I would like to comment on some of the remarks that were passed with great sincerity by the Honourable Member for Inkster when he suggested that The Lord's Day Act itself will not make any difference, that the responsibility for the morality of the people in our community really lies with our religious leaders and that it is the ideas that the individuals believe in that will have a determination of the morality of our communities.

Madam, this was not an easy decision for me to make, to bring in this bill. The Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains has suggested that he is old-fashioned. I would like to say, Madam, that he is no more old-fashioned than I, and that I personally deplore the fact that our communities appear to be moving in the direction of a wide-open Sunday. In that respect I too am old-fashioned, but I think that it behooves all of us to take a look at our changing world and to reassess in our own minds the action we must take in times such as this.

In order to explain what I mean, I would like to give you just a little bit of personal background. My great grandfather came to this country as a Presbyterian Minister and I've heard my father tell the story many times of how, when he was visiting at Kirk Hall near Fergus in Ontario with my great grandfather, that a group of the young people were in the orchard near the Kirk Hall one Sunday afternoon and they commenced to sing hymns. My great grandfather came out of his study and shouted to the people in the orchard, "Stop! You're singing for your own amusement and not for the glory of God!"

I remember very well my own grandfather. He was a man of whom we were all very proud in our family. He wore a beard much like the beard worn by King Edward and King George V, and he too had this same presbyterian background and Sunday to him was a very precious thing. He in fact closed his place of business early on Saturday nights, and in a rural community this was unusual. His was the only business in that town that closed early. And why did he close early? Well, among other things because he had to go home to shine his boots for Sunday, because one never shines boots on Sunday. One had to do all the necessary work on Saturday so that Sunday could be truly a day of rest. I can remember too how meals were

(Mr. Smellie, cont'd.) . . . prepared in my grandfather's house as much as possible on Saturday in preparation for Sunday. And I can remember too how, although he had a very fine automobile and enjoyed driving it, that he would never take that automobile out on Sunday until very near the end of his life, when he eventually agreed that there was no harm in going for a bit of a drive on Sunday afternoon.

And then my father, when I was a boy, insisted on much the same thing. The children in our family were not allowed to do many things on Sunday that other families were allowed to do, but eventually my father agreed that there really was nothing wrong if I cast a plug occasionally from the dock in front of the cabin at the lake, looking for a fish, or if I undertook some other activity of that nature on Sunday as long as I was not disturbing the Sunday rest of any other person.

Sunday, to me, Madam Speaker is still a very precious thing. On one occasion at least, in a discussion of our curling club as to whether or not we would have curling on Sunday in that club, I made the decision that I would not any longer belong to that club if we were going to have regular draws on Sunday, and to this day the curling club in my own town does not open on Sundays.

What I am trying to say, Madam Speaker, is that there has been a change over the period of years and as the generations go by, and I think that we must recognize that change. I think too that we must recognize other things, that we must recognize that different people have different standards of morality, and I would suggest that because I eat meat on Friday makes me no less a God-fearing man than the Honourable Member for St. Boniface. We have different standards and I must agree that he is entitled to his beliefs, but certainly I am entitled to mine. Similarly I think, Madam, we must agree that different communities have different standards and I think that it behooves us not to say that because someone's standards are different than those to which I adhere, or we adhere as a group, that they are wrong.

Sunday observance, Madam Speaker, is a matter of conscience. It's a matter which each community and which each individual must decide for himself. You cannot legislate the observance of Sunday any more than you could legislate temperance by prohibition.

I have introduced this bill, Madam Speaker, recognizing that there are others in the community of Manitoba who may have different views than I on the subject of Sunday observance and I believe that it is right that they should be able to determine their own standards in their own community, but I reserve the right, Madam Speaker, personally, as an individual, to resist any broadening of Sunday in my own community.

Madam Speaker put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. M. N. HRYHORCZUK, Q.C. (Ethelbert Plains): Yeas and Nays, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the members. The question before the House is the adjourned debate on the second reading of Bill No. 50.

A standing vote was taken, the result being as follows:

YEAS: Messrs. Alexander, Baizley, Beard, Bilton, Bjornson, Carroll, Cherniack, Cowan, Desjardins, Evans, Gray, Groves, Hamilton, Harrison, Hillhouse, Hutton, Jeannotte, Johnson (Gimli), Johnston, Klym, Lyon, McDonald, McGregor, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Mills, Molgat, Patrick, Peters, Shoemaker, Smellie, Smerchanski, Stanes, Steinkopf, Strickland, Tanchak, Vielfaure, Watt, Weir, Witney, Wright.

NAYS: Messrs. Barkman, Campbell, Froese, Hryhorczuk, Seaborn and Mrs. Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 42; Nays, 6.

MADAM SPEAKER: I declare the motion carried. The adjourned debate on the second reading of Bill No. 76. The Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. S. PETERS (Elmwood): Madam Speaker, in the absence of my leader, may we have this matter stand?

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed.

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Industry & Commerce) (Fort Rouge): Madam Speaker, would you be good enough now to call the motion on the Committee of Ways and Means.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the First Minister and the proposed amendment of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition, and the proposed amendment to the amendment by the Honourable the Member for Brokenhead. The Honourable the Member for Emerson.

MR. JOHN P. TANCHAK (Emerson): Madam Speaker, so much has been said from this side there is actually not too much to add to what the previous speakers said. But one thing I learned this week in this debate was that the word "Duffy" was unparliamentary, so I'll have to adhere to this ruling.

We are now considering ways and means of obtaining supply, supply to be granted to Her Majesty, and once the estimates are approved and ways and means concurred in, then I presume -- and we all know I guess that the government will be free to spend enormous sums of public money, money which comes from the pockets of all Manitobans. In this House, also in this Session, we heard the Premier and other Cabinet Ministers making comparisons of expenditure in 1964 as compared to a few years ago. These expenditures increased greatly they claim, and we know that. We can see that. They like to talk about spending enormous sums of money. This used to capture the imagination of the public, but I do not think that it does capture the imagination of the public as greatly as it used to in the past.

Now we would think that since the government is spending such enormous sums of money that there would be certain greater benefits derived. Now if we pick up the Manitoba Budget of 1964 written by the government, and turn to the page where it says, "Manitoba's Provincial Output." Now as I said before, when we pour money into the economy results should show, but if you look at this graph and go back to 1950 -- that's where it starts -- you'll notice that our buoyancy was on the rise right from 1950 on. And if you take a ruler across the top of this graph, across the top of these figures shown here, you will notice that our economy was constantly rising relatively at the same rate right from 1950, 1955, 1957, right up to 1959. But again this graph, which is a government graph, shows that in 1961 it didn't keep the same pace of growth as it did previously; 1962 didn't and 1963 didn't. If you project this line from 1950 to 1959 along the top, it should show \$1 billion if our rate of increase was constant. This one shows only \$900 million. Therefore, I would say that this enormous amount of money spent does not do all that we would like it to do. In other words, is the money spent in the best interests of the people of Manitoba?

In many departments, as has been proved by previous speakers, this government does not give people who pay the value for the money spent. That has been mentioned at least on two occasions. Majority of the important legislation in the last five years was pushed through in this House without proper investigation and proper planning. The result brings poor legislation and therefore a waste of public money due to poor planning on the part of the government benches. I contend that the amount of money this government has gone through in the last five years could have been spent more prudently with better planning, and I'm sure that most of the members would agree with me, but probably not the members opposite. The result would have been greater benefit to the people who subscribe to the sum.

The people of Manitoba now are beginning to ask questions and they are also beginning to complain. They are asking how is this money being spent? Is it doing what is in the best interest of all? They are also complaining. They are complaining of extortion in the way of taxation. They are complaining that the tax burden is becoming unbearable. They are afraid that the government is not through with dipping its fingers into their pockets. They're afraid that the Premier really means it when he threatens that hospital insurance premiums may be increased. They believe he really means that.

They are also afraid that the Premier, by hook or by crook, is bound to resort to a sales tax before the end of 1964. Most of the people feel that. And as I said, by hook or by crook, and there is some evidence that that is their intention. Of course it's my opinion -- intention of the government. They're afraid that they'll be asked to carry a greater burden in each successive year as long as this government is in power, and I would say that they have legitimate reasons for their fears and for their complaints, for they pay. Now who are "they" when we say they pay? I mean the consumer, the ordinary man on the street and the ordinary man on the farm. He is the one who pays the greatest part of all the taxes, because they are most numerous.

Now I would say that most of these people who are in numerical superiority are the ones who can least afford to pay such exorbitant taxes as we have in the Province of Manitoba. Now let us check this little pamphlet, "Details of Estimated Revenue for 1965." Who pays? Where does it come from? We'll notice in this one that the largest single item of provincial revenue

(Mr. Tanchak, cont'd.) . . . is the income tax, and then it says "individuals" -- paid by the individuals.

Now I'm not going to say that the government is responsible for all this taxation, but certainly you'll agree with me that in fact the provincial government is responsible, because it was this House and this government who increased this income tax or imposed the provincial income tax in the Province of Manitoba. I really think that this is a great hardship. It adds to the burden of taxation which the ordinary man on the street could not afford. He'll have to get along without some other ordinary necessities of life.

Now let us check another item, item No. 5. It's the second largest source of revenue. Item No. 5 -- gasoline tax. Of course it's a matter of choice, if one wishes to drive the car and motor out more often he'll buy more gasoline and therefore contribute more towards this revenue. But I would like to say, and I feel that this ordinary man on the street, the poorer man in Manitoba, is entitled to some wee little bit of pleasure which he derives from driving out when he's off work, on Sundays and so on, and he finds that this tax is also an added burden to his way of living.

Now those are the major items. There are other items I can go through but let's turn to this one here, the tobacco tax. And I note that -- I think it passed in this House unanimously. -- (Interjection)-- The tobacco tax. -- (Interjection) -- Maybe the odd one did not vote against it, and I'm not going into it whether it's advisable or not. But here's something that I think we should draw the attention of the government to. I notice that the revenue -- and maybe there is the time element in it too involved -- but I notice that the revenue, estimated revenue a year ago on this item was \$2-1/4 million. Now if you go to the opposite side you will notice that the revenue expected for this year is \$3,700,000. That's an increase of almost \$1-1/2 million. It seems to me that the government is a little bit optimistic here. In other words, maybe the government hopes that Manitobans will take to more smoking and thereby increase the revenues of the Province of Manitoba. They're anticipating greater returns on this, and I would say that I would like to have seen a substantial decrease in this item instead of an increase.

In regards this, I would have to say that the government is very conspicuous for lack of anti-smoking legislation which should have been introduced in this House as it was introduced in many states and provinces in the United States and also in Canada. The government does not see fit to do that and -- I don't know -- probably it's a matter of financial expediency because we all know that if we have some anti-smoking legislation, if we tried to educate the people, it's going to cut into the revenues of the province. I hope that's not the reason, but that item does suggest to me that it could be. It could be because I cannot see why we haven't in our estimates a certain sum allocated -- of course there is some hidden, some here and there -- but legislation which would really put teeth into this question of the bad habit of smoking, I would have to say.

I could point out other items in here which may be considered a tax although they're not listed here as tax. They're listed as fees. Those have been continually going up and up. I notice that liquor estimates are expected to rise -- liquor revenues I mean are expected to rise. That's another case where it is a matter of choice, and maybe our population increase would absolve this monetary increase.

Now there's one more, and that is in the Attorney-General's department, and I'm not trying to pick a quarrel with him -- I'm through quarrelling with him since he's not the Minister of Education any more -- but if you look at the first item, here the government is pessimistic, I would say, because the revenue in 1963, estimated revenue was \$493,000 while the estimated revenue for this year from fines and miscellaneous, and I presume most of them are fines, the government is anticipating \$165,000 increase. Does the government expect our society to become more criminally-minded and therefore there will be more revenue? -- (Interjection) -- Probably. As was suggested, maybe some users of the purple gas will misuse this privilege and they might be caught -- I don't know -- but that seems to me odd in here. Of course there could be a very definite explanation to that.

I don't think I should take any more time. I'd like to emphasize this, that we should take a good look at this, that it's time that the increase in taxation came to a halt, because as I said once before, they may be the straw that'll break the camel's back. We know that the government

(Mr. Tanchak, cont'd.) . . . has the power to tax, and that power also can destroy. So in conclusion I would like to say, let us be careful and not destroy the goose that lays the golden egg.

MR. GRAY: The voice in the wilderness.

A MEMBER: I'm right behind you Morris.

MR. GRAY: Madam Speaker, being selfish, I'm anxious as some of the honourable members of this House, and particularly at my advanced age, to place myself on record as having spoken on the budget speech of 1964. I shall only deal with two subjects, and I promise to be very brief as usual.

This may be a repetition but unfortunately it is still timely, and this is the high cost of living. The consumers are the ultimate sufferers in our society. They pay for everything. They pay for all wages and wage increases. They pay for all profits, for all dividends, for all social services, old age pensions, family allowances, they pay for all public works and all government expenditures. Each citizen is a consumer for the purchase of the things he needs. He provides the lifeblood of our economic system, but the consumer has the least protection of any group in the community. Workers have their trade union organizations; employers have their corporation organizations; but the poor average consumer has no organization and this is perhaps the reason why the consumers become the ultimate goats of the community. Everything they buy every year goes up in price. For instance, the consumer index using 1949 as a base of measurement has gone up from 49.69 in 1914 to 102 in January 1963, and nearly 135 at the beginning of this year. The dollar today is worth only 35¢ as compared with the dollar of 1914, and it is the consumer who pays.

One of the effects is that the million families in Canada have incomes which are below what is considered the required minimum. Who is getting the extra money? Not the producers. The farmer is getting a smaller share of the consumer dollars. Prices go up, but the farmer gets less for his product. On the price of a washing machine costing approximately \$300 to the consumer, the labour cost according to statistics is \$29.90.

Consumers are fooled with packaging. It is very difficult to make proper choice of goods in retail stores due to the variation in quality as well as in price, and it is extremely difficult for a consumer to judge quality. What is to be done? The consumer should have a voice in the wage negotiations -- labour management and consumer government. Standards of quality should be made public. Comparisons with respect to real value should be made available. Prices were fixed by the government during the last war. Should there not be a greater measure of price control? An organization of consumers should be set up on a national and regional basis. Enquiries should be made into the factors which go into the prices which are ultimately paid by the consumer. This should be a continuous process with results published monthly, just as the Consumer Price Index is published monthly. Action along these lines should result in a more stable economy, less liable to be affected by booms and slumps.

Madam Speaker, I realize that there are very many important matters that should receive the consideration of the public and the House at this session. The high cost of living, in my opinion, should take first consideration. Now, Madam Speaker, I realize that there are very many important matters to be dealt with, which I would leave to the members who are as interested in this subject as I am.

Now, Madam Speaker, I beg your indulgence if I take up a few more minutes of the valuable time of this Assembly to place on record a few facts of a personal nature. I have reached the age when judges and senators are retiring. I assume that I am not any different, except that they are provided a pension and do not need to worry about entering the Golden Age period. I too have no moral right to carry on the work of such importance as a law-maker when there are so many brilliant and trained young men who could easily follow after me and help to keep Canada operating under a democratic system, and particularly to make progress in our province politically, socially and economically.

As you are all aware, I came to Canada seeking a life of freedom which to me was and still is of paramount importance. Financially, I have not succeeded. However, our children have received the same education and have attained the same professions they have chosen as the children of many wealthy men. Their heritage now consists mostly of press clippings which will serve as a reminder that their father and grandfather has paid this debt to Canada

(Mr. Gray, cont'd.) . . . for the privilege of being an equal citizen of a great country with all the privileges. It wasn't easy to obtain the privileges. It has not been an easy task without financial security. Then and there I decided to repay society for the many happy days I have spent in this country and the opportunity of serving.

In the last half century I have served the people of Manitoba in communal capacity and for the past 38 years of this same period in public life. As you know, I was elected twice to the School Board, six times to City Council and have served 23 years in this House. While I do not claim full credit for it, spearheaded for my party matters such as in Old Age Pension improvement. When I came to the House it was \$20 per month. I was declared the "Man of the Year" by press in 1958 for the Old Age Pension efforts. I have advocated the need of a dental college for those students who could not afford to go outside of Winnipeg to study dentistry; a school for the deaf; the Bill of Rights; a Fair Employment Practices bill and other legislation which are now on the statute books. The team that scores should get the credit and not the one who carries the ball, for the credit is due to my Party which I have the honour to be a member.

In communal life I had the privilege of serving in many Jewish organizations: the community church; I'm a life member of the YMHA; for 50 years a member of the YMCA; chartered member of the Manitoba Travellers' Association; and the Masonic Lodge for over 50 years. I was born in 1889 and still going strong. I mention this only for the reason -- not to boost myself, I have no intention to run for the Legislature when this Parliament finishes its work -- I am doing it to be on record as a heritage to those immigrants who have come here the time that I came, that no one has become a public charge, everybody has contributed to the progress and development of our country and of the province, and particularly for my grandchildren who will perhaps reap the advantages.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. KEITH ALEXANDER (Roblin): Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Rupertsland, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. EVANS: Madam Speaker, I wonder if you would now call the adjourned debate on the proposed resolution by the Honourable Minister of Health.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned Debate on the proposed resolution by the Honourable the Minister of Health. The Honourable the Member for Rhineland.

MR. EVANS: In the absence of the honourable member, I am sure the House would be willing to allow the item to stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed.

. continued on next page

MR. EVANS: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Health, that Madam Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

Madam Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House resolved into a Committee of Supply with the Honourable Member for St. Matthews in the Chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Department VIII -- (b), Health Services. Item 2.

MR. PETERS: Environmental Sanitation, I believe.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. PETERS: I want to bring this to the attention of the Minister who will also deal with -- I will use it later to deal with my speech that I made on meat inspection. The former Minister of Health and the present Minister of Health are familiar with this situation. It's concerning or regarding the foundry in Elmwood. In 1953, the Municipal and Public Utility Board issued an Order No. 233/53 over-riding a zoning decision made by the City of Winnipeg, and this Order -- I'll read the part we'll all be interested in: "Mr. Diamond and Mr. Smith assured the Board that the foundry would be equipped with the most modern type of smokeless, fumeless and dustless chimney, with the result that there would be no adverse effect upon the houses of many adjacent property owners. According to the appellant the present foundry which is located immediately opposite proposed new buildings, has been in operation for about 50 years." This was in 1953, Mr. Chairman, where the solicitor and the manager or owner of the company had assured the Board that they would put in this equipment. These people fought this foundry for ten years, and got nowhere. The City of Winnipeg Health Department was aware of this situation. I was first notified or asked to deal with this problem in 1958 when I was first elected. I realized it was not a provincial matter and I brought it to the attention of the aldermen in Ward 3. I was assured by them that the City of Winnipeg Health Department had it under consideration and that everything was being done that could be done. For ten years these people tried to get action on this, and in this Order, Mr. Chairman -- this is what we have to remember, that they promised that they would put in this dustless and fumeless and odorless and smokeless equipment. They didn't do it till last summer. A delegation from Elmwood, where the foundry is situated, called on the former Minister of Health. I was there, if the Minister remembers. He received the delegation and he gave them every reason to believe that they would get action. And I must say, Mr. Chairman, that in due course they did get action, because although the Minister said they'd taken tests and they showed that they were spilling four times the amount of fly ash that was allowed by law, that they'd have to take new tests. The new tests were taken and I believe given to the City of Winnipeg Health Department. It took some two months after these conclusive tests that were taken for about the -- I don't know, the umpteenth time, before finally the foundry agreed to put in this equipment. They put in this equipment, Mr. Chairman, and they admit that they are catching from 2 to 2-1/2 tons of fly ash every day. Not a week, but every day. This went on for ten years, and it was brought to the attention of the City of Winnipeg Health Department at every instance that it could be, and the City of Winnipeg Health Department sat on this and didn't do very much about it, because for ten years this went on. Finally they got action.

Mr. Chairman, I want to point out now -- I don't know if the now Minister of Health knows they're not -- the people there are not satisfied. I've been phoned on numerous occasions that the stench coming from the foundry is enough to -- working in a packing house there's some pretty strong stench, and this one I can't stand. They're not satisfied, and this has been brought to the attention of the Health Department of the City of Winnipeg; and therefore, Mr. Chairman, I'm bringing this to the attention of the House, although part of it was done, it took ten years to get done, and yesterday when the Minister -- the now Minister of Health -- was speaking on my questions about the meat inspection, he has stated that the City of Winnipeg Health Department had this matter under control, that they tell him that they're under, or making inspections -- regular inspections. Now, Mr. Chairman, if this is the way the City of Winnipeg Health Department is operating in the meat inspection, the way they operated in this case, then I must say that I have no faith in the City of Winnipeg Health Department, and I urge the Minister -- and I talked to him in private today and he has agreed after the session is over to go with me and visit some of these plants, but in the meantime I think very serious consideration has to be given to this matter.

MR. FRED GROVES (St. Vital): Mr. Chairman, before we leave this item, last night we were talking about sewage lagoons, and it seems to me that the officials, particularly the sanitary officials of Metro and the officials in the Sanitary Department in the Minister's department that we're considering at the present time, seem to be pretty well sold on the matter of sewage lagoons and cesspools; and I think the story of their support of the sewage lagoons can almost be told in some of the clippings that have appeared in our papers over the past year or so in this connection. First of all, we have one: "The Charleswood Lagoon will be built this year and go into full production during 1964. It will be about 1966 before a firm decision is taken by Metro about what will be done in St. Vital." And this is a newspaper article on the council meeting -- Metro Council meeting -- that was taken, that took the decision to set back the construction of the St. Vital sewage lagoon for three years.

In that same evening's Tribune, Councillor Green is quoted as having said: "The recommendation" -- that is, the recommendation to postpone this project for three years -- "shows a lack of confidence in Metro's lagoon policy." And then he's quoted as saying: "The St. Vital lagoon should start in two years and will be dealt with at a later date after the matter is reviewed." Then, in a clipping that's fairly recent, entitled: "Sewer Man Hired," it says, "Metro has hired the head of Regina sewage treatment system." Then it says the starting salary which is not important, but the part that is important: "The expert on sewage lagoons, D. W. Van Hess, will work on construction of Metro's proposed sewage lagoon in Charleswood." Then last year, Mr. Speaker, on the Minister's estimates we had a debate on sewage lagoons. At that time, Health Minister George Johnson claimed that with 33 out of the province's 42 municipalities having lagoons instead of plants, their value was just about proven; and in the Tribune report of those same debates: "The use of sewage lagoons in Manitoba Tuesday was defended by Health Minister George Johnson against strong attacks in the provincial legislature from several Liberal members." And some further reports on the proposed, or the present lagoon that's being constructed in Charleswood -- there's some reading here that doesn't matter, and I'll start from this point, and it's entitled: "Sniffing Sojourns. This has prompted Metro and municipal officials, including Mayor Harry Collins of St. Vital, to take sniffing trips to other centres that have sewage lagoons in operation.

The latest trip was to Regina, where Councillors found a terrific odour from the sewage lagoon located seven miles from the downtown area of Regina." And again, here's an article entitled: "Angered West St. Paul Gets Metro Sludge Pond." And this is quoting from West St. Paul Reeve Christianson. He said, "There is a health hazard in putting the sewage ponds where Metro wants them because of many drinking wells in the municipality," and I would like to point out at this time, Mr. Chairman, that if it should happen, as it happened in Portage la Prairie, that the soil in the area where they propose to put a sewage lagoon in St. Vital -- if the soils are similar -- that we could run into this same problem, because in this area it's mostly farms where the people depend on wells for their drinking water; and in addition to that, there are many dairy farms in the surrounding area that depend heavily on their wells for the tremendous amounts of water that they use for cooling and cleaning purposes.

In this same article: "Councillor Taraska, who along with Councillor Green voted against the motion, said that ponds should be located next to Winnipeg's dump, which is further north from Metro's proposed site." Now, this is almost as bad, Mr. Chairman, because this puts this particular project in the constituency of the Honourable Member from Wellington, and I wonder what he might think of having a sewage lagoon situated in his constituency.

So I maintain that these clippings show that Metro has got sewage lagoons on the brain, that they have a sewage lagoon policy, that they've hired a sewage lagoon expert from Regina to come and see this policy put into effect; and despite the denials that are made, it seems to me that we're going to be faced in the not-too-distant future with a decision to put a lagoon in my constituency.

Then we have some proofs that the Department of Health also seems to have sewage lagoons on the brain, because they've prepared a booklet of about -- oh, I think it's 40 or 50 pages with graphs and illustrations, contending to point out that sewage lagoons in Manitoba are not objectionable, and this particular booklet is trying to sell the idea of sewage lagoons working in the winter-time, which appears to me anyway to be contrary to some of the other experiences that we've had in the Province of Manitoba. One of the reasons why these lagoons are objectionable and don't

(Mr. Groves, cont'd)... work seems to me is the fact that for most of the winter season they're covered with ice and there's no way of the oxygen from the air working on the surface of the water. The department also has a mimeographed leaflet suggesting standards for sewage lagoons for the use of consulting engineers submitting reports to the Manitoba Department of Health. So it seems to me that both the sanitary officials of Metro and the Department of Health Environmental Sanitation Division are pretty sold on the matter of sewage lagoons.

In addition to that, we had a speech not too long ago by the Honourable Member from Burrows, and I noticed that one of his colleagues, or one of his Party colleagues, took time on that occasion to write or give to the press a release in which he attacks Mr. Smerchanski, and it's Mr. Wolfe that's doing the attacking, on his speech on sewage lagoons. So here again we see evidence that Metro is pretty touchy when it comes to the matter of lagoons, touchy to the point where Mr. Wolfe takes the time to attack one of his own colleagues on this matter.

I was very impressed with the speech that the Honourable Member from Burrows made that evening, and I'd like to just quote a few of the things that he said: "The aerosol air pollution problem from open lagoons or aerobic waste treatment plants as they are known" -- then he goes on to say that "an aerosol is to find finely suspended particles in air. These particles emerge as a mist or droplets. These little droplets of air carry all sorts of viruses and possible diseases. You have a suspended piece of solid material in a small droplet which floats around in the air. From the liquids" -- I'm just quoting at random, Mr. Chairman, to emphasize what I have to say later on -- "the fog from the liquids of these open lagoons is very corrosive and most irritating to the respiratory system of the human being. Odours and gases are most obnoxious." He goes on to say, when he's talking about the effluent, that it is an absolute perfect culture within which to grow bacteria, and also informs us that it has sugar and phosphorus and nitrogen and other chemicals in it.

And then last night, Mr. Chairman, we had the Minister of Health reading presumably from a report from the officials from his department, making it seem as if these lagoons were pleasant little lakes that were necessary for the development of a community, and going on to state that they worked well, and that the only objection to them was the odour which occurred when the ice broke up in the springtime. Now, we all know, at least those of us who have been interested enough, and I have been interested enough to discuss this matter with the Honourable Member from Portage la Prairie. He, in addition to being that constituency's representative in the Legislature, he's also on the City Council and he's aware, and he's been kind enough to make me aware, of some of the serious problems that Portage la Prairie has had with their sewage lagoon. The effect of their lagoon, from what I understand, has been to make the whole surrounding area almost a swamp, and people, particularly people keeping cattle, are getting to the stage where they're no longer able to use their wells, and getting to the stage where they're going to have to get pontoons to put on the feet of their cattle if they're going to be able to get around in the area. So I think that we have to, when we're considering this matter of lagoons for this area, certainly take cognizance of what happened in Portage la Prairie. They're involved in at least one lawsuit that I know of, and probably over the next few months they're going to be involved in a number more.

I anticipate, Mr. Chairman, although I realize that soil conditions are probably a factor, but I anticipate that Metro is going to have the same problem in Charleswood with their lagoon. Again this is an area which in some cases they depend on wells for their water. This is going to create a nuisance in the way of odour for an area that's expanding pretty quickly in Metro Winnipeg, and if they go ahead with the lagoon in St. Vital in two or three years from now I anticipate that they are going to have exactly the same trouble, and I maintain that they should not do so until they've at least seriously gone into the problems particularly that have been encountered at Portage la Prairie. The next thing we know, Madam Speaker, if this campaign on the part of Metro's sewage officials and the people in the Department of Health is carried on, we're going to find them dumping antifreeze into these lagoons to give them a nice blue colour. They're going to be sprinkling white sands from Hawaii around the edges. They're going to be planting palm trees and importing exotic tropical birds in order to be able to sell these cesspools to the people of Greater Winnipeg. I don't know all of the scientific terms that the Honourable Member from Burrows used, nor do I really take serious the report which the Honourable Minister read because it was so kind towards sewage lagoons, but I want to say this, that regardless of

(Mr. Groves, cont'd)... what either of them say that I know what the solid matter is that's suspended in these droplets in the air, and I know what the corrosive material is in the effluence, and I want to go on record as saying that the City of St. Vital wants no part of it, and I feel that I can speak for certainly the City Council of St. Vital who has gone on record as being unanimously opposed to this lagoon in St. Vital, and I know that I speak for a large majority of the people in that city, and I want to say this to the Minister, that if his officials and Metro officials are going to carry on with their mutual admiration society insofar as lagoons are concerned, and if Metro, with or without their help, decides to go ahead with the installation of a large sewage lagoon in St. Vital, that they're going to have on their hands the darndest fight they've ever had.

MR. M. G. SMERCHANSKI (Burrows): Mr. Chairman, I'd like to add a little more to the subject of lagoons and I feel that possibly last night I was somewhat unfair to the Honourable Minister of Health in that I was trying to possibly interject some technical terms which possibly were unfair to him. However, I feel very strongly about this matter of lagoons, and I will, with your permission, Mr. Chairman, attempt to tell you why, because I think in most of our discussions we have always overlooked the absolute facts and the reason why we have these open lagoons, and then, is there another alternative? I also know that some members of the Legislature Assembly that sit on the other side make laughter of the matter of sewage and lagoons. This is their privilege. However, for my part it's a very serious matter, because it involves the expenditure of a great deal of public funds and I think that it is only proper that this be done under the proper studies and make sure that the right decisions are made.

One of the things that I was concerned about last night was the fact that there was a phrase which said "an opportunity or a chance to study the problem" -- something along that line; and to me this is the most dangerous type of a clause to put in when some major decisions have been made on the expenditure of a large sum of money, because not only this, this is to be an established way of disposing of sewage in Winnipeg. Now, I might ask, or you might ask yourselves, "Why is it not possible to build these large lagoons in cities like New York, Chicago, and other large cities?" the reason being that lagoons are not a new process of sewage disposal, but the size and function of this sewage lagoon bears a direct ratio on the size of the area that you're trying to service, and the larger the area and the larger the lagoon you build does not necessarily give you the proper functioning of that lagoon to perform the function that that same lagoon will perform on a smaller scale, and this is what I question most seriously, because as far as I am concerned this has never been brought out in any of the detailed studies concerning lagoons.

Now if these lagoons are such an effective way of disposing of sewage might it not be better to then take a hard look at the economic cost of present sewage disposal in Winnipeg? Let us consider the cost of sewage, the cost of sewers, the matter of pumping, the electrical power consumed by these pumps, the maintenance and service, and then it might be better to construct an open lagoon some place on the vicinity of Portage and Main, or maybe up in the west part of town. Let's have a series of these small little open lagoons. Why haven't we got them? Because they are not functional and because they are objectionable. If this is the answer then let's put in a program and have smaller lagoon units throughout all of Metropolitan Winnipeg. I also think that we should bear in mind that some of these larger cities who have given a great deal of study and research in this direction have got very capable technical know-how and technical advice that these are most unpractical in connection with large cities.

Now when we talk about aerobic and anaerobic, these are two very simple terms, if you understand what they mean. The aerobic means what goes on in, confined in an ordinary septic tank where you have the disintegration of the organic matter without the aid of oxygen. The anaerobic is where you have the disintegration of organic matter with the aid of oxygen, which takes place in an open lagoon, and all you do you simply bubble or introduce oxygen through the mixture and the oxygen oxidizes the organic material and in this matter of bubbling or boiling in the lagoon you are creating identically the same condition when you're boiling a kettle of water, where you are introducing droplets of water into the atmosphere, and this nobody can deny. Nobody. Even the best of specialists cannot deny this, and it's a known fact that in large lagoons this possibility is of definite hazard to the health of people in this area, and there's no question about it. Look at the chemistry of the disintegration of these organics. They are various -- nitrogen, potassium, phosphorus, calcium and other complex organic compounds, but the fact of the matter is that these chemicals are not completely digested in the open lagoon.

(Mr. Smerchanski, cont'd)... You have got certain residual sediments that have to be disposed of.

Now these sediments are being disposed of in forming a part of the effluent discharge from these open lagoons. Where does this go into? This goes into the Red River and the Assiniboine River. Then the question arises, what is the minimal flow that will carry the sediment and objectionable sewage contaminants into Lake Winnipeg? And to say that this effluent is crystal clear water, or imply that it is, I only would ask you this: would you like to have coffee made from this effluent, or would you like to have your cocktails mixed with this effluent? No, you wouldn't. Neither would I. So that it has got a direct bearing on the total load of solids or the load factor as it is commonly known, that is put into this open lagoon, and in the discharge of these sediments you are placing a heavier load on the water that has to carry this through the channels of the Red River and Assiniboine River.

Now, I also would like to bring to your attention, Madam Chairman -- as you were -- Mr. Chairman. I guess I'm thinking more of Madam Speaker -- but on March 19, 1962, on Hansard, Page 854 and 855, the then Minister of Health did line up or did quote what appeared to have been more or less the government policy, and the inference there was that as soon as the diversion Portage was completed, this would put us in a position to control the minimal amount of flow coming into the Red River and Assiniboine River in order to flush out this objectionable contamination of sediments or effluent that might come from open lagoons, and instead of having clearer rivers and instead of trying to remove the hazard or some additive that will contribute to the pollution of our streams, what are we having? We're having the dumping of more objectionable sediments and more objectionable effluent into the river.

Mr. Chairman, the reason I speak of this is that there are other ways to solve the sewage problem. This is not the only way to solve it. There are methods, as known, of the classification and thickening in the matter of sewage disposal, and then there are such things as fluid-solid systems whereby you take a very high water content material and you dry it with heat and steam that has been obtained from the eventual burning of the semi-dried material and you end up with a basic refuse of being ashes which are primarily either potassium or phosphorus salts and could be disposed of or used as a fertilizer and present no health hazard whatsoever. It is for this reason, Mr. Chairman, that I think that this government should look very, very carefully, and it is not enough to place this responsibility on Metro because that's exactly what has happened now. I don't think it's fair to the residents of Metropolitan Winnipeg to have to live with this matter of open lagoons because I believe that leadership should be given in the first instance by the senior authorities, which in this instance is the present day government, and it is their responsibility to make sure that the right decisions are being made, and I'm not so sure that the right decisions are being made. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

MR. J. M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Chairman, while we're on the subject I would like to make a few remarks. As the members well know, in rural Manitoba we have quite a number of these lagoons at the present time for smaller centres in the province and they have now been in existence for I don't know, probably five or six years, and so far they haven't worked out too bad, but I find that these lagoons were first made and then the hook-ups began. They hooked up a number of residents in the town and over the year more and more of the hook-ups were made, so that at the present time I feel that these lagoons are overloaded. I'm just wondering whether the government does any policing on this, because when the lagoons were first recommended the consultant engineers specified as to the area these lagoons should cover for a certain amount of population and I feel that this is not being looked after, that these lagoons are being overloaded and as a result they create stench at certain times of the year.

I too feel that lagoons in the adjacent area devalue the property that people might have, and especially when they propose a lagoon for the city or the suburban areas of Charleswood and, I understand, St. Vital, that this will have a tremendous effect on the real estate in those areas and it will be depreciated. I would venture probably 50 percent or more, because who wants to live close to a lagoon? I presently live some area from the Town of Winkler, about three miles, but even on spring days when the wind comes from that direction you can smell the stench, and this no doubt would also take place in the city here and the suburban areas where you create these lagoons.

I would like to know whether these lagoons that are being created here for the suburban area, are they being created on the government's recommendation? Do we have any say in this?

(Mr. Froese, cont'd)... Because I feel that this is the wrong thing to do. I think lagoons for larger centres are false economy and that centres such as the suburban centres of Winnipeg here should definitely not go into a system of lagoons. In this way I feel that the decisions that are made by council can devalue the property of individuals. I'm just wondering whether these can be charged under our laws at the present time. I wonder if the Minister would care to enlarge on some of these items.

MR. JOHNSTON: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, I'd like to direct a few remarks to the Honourable Minister and also end up with one question. In all the talk we have heard in the last day or two about the lagoon type sewage disposal there has not been -- I don't think -- in my estimation there hasn't been any leadership supplied by the government in advising smaller communities on matters such as location, types of soil to construct a lagoon in and matters that are generally beyond the ken of a person sitting on a council. This is something that only comes up probably once in a lifetime of any municipal person and certainly it's not a type of construction that is met in private types of construction, so I am suggesting that the Department of Health should set up an advisory board much as the water supply board does for supplying small communities in Manitoba, helping them in finding a water supply.

I know in our own experience in Portage we certainly would have valued advice like this a great deal. While I can't speak very freely about the experience we had at Portage la Prairie with our lagoon, as most honourable members here are aware, a lawsuit was recently concluded with the findings against Portage and in the particular lawsuit I think there was something around \$25,000 involved plus the threat of further lawsuits from three or four other people in the area.

Now since this matter is under appeal at the present time and properly cannot be discussed under the rules of the House, the matter being under appeal, I would like to ask the Honourable Minister if he is considering, or would he consider in a matter such as this where, through no fault of their own, having taken expert advice from consulting engineers, a municipality who have done their best to construct and act within all the laws that govern such a matter, if the Department of Health will stand by a community at a time like this and give them some assistance if this suit should be found against the City of Portage on the appeal. The direct question is then, will the Department of Health give assistance on a matter like this -- financial assistance that is?

MR. A. E. WRIGHT (Seven Oaks): Mr. Chairman, I just wish to say a few words on this matter of sewage lagoons. I agree with the honourable member that has just spoken that I don't think that the provincial government Department of Health have lived up to its responsibilities. For one thing we hear a lot of talk about sewage lagoons but nothing is mentioned of sludge beds, and there's a difference I find out. Why aren't we given information in the annual reports about these things, because communities all over Manitoba are now interested in this sort of thing. For instance at the North Main plant I understand they have a system of disposal of waste by sludge beds where the material is digested for 50 days in tanks and then placed out into these beds, and I understand that that's far more practical and sensible than the open lagoon.

These lagoons that we're talking about are called stabilization lagoons and the raw sewage is poured out into there with 90 percent water and it's allowed to stay in open pits for 120 days, but I'm amazed at the lack of knowledge of this sort of thing. Surely we have a department of provincial government that can advise small communities about the best way to take care of this, because this is a big problem. I know that we can't build sewage disposal plants all over the province because of the cost, but surely much more light could be thrown on a subject so important, Mr. Chairman.

MR. WITNEY: Dealing with this very interesting subject that we have before us now, I might say to the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks that through the Health Units and through the Environmental Sanitation advice is given to those people who ask for it about the various types of sewage disposal operations that may be used. I think the committee may be interested to know too that there have been a whole series of courses conducted over the years since 1955 for water-works and sewage plant operators schools. In 1963, those who were in first year, there were 33 of them; second year, 25; third year, 14; and for refresher courses there will be some 32; and these are to aid in the type of problem that the Honourable Member from Rhineland brings up in the operations of these various units. I might say to him too that the checking on the units is done by the Health Unit, and in the case where there is no Health Unit, by the engineers of

(Mr. Witney, cont'd)...the Environmental section of the Department of Health.

The members of the House may be interested to know too that there are considerable numbers of lagoons. There are lagoons at Altona, Beausejour, Birtle, at Boissevain, such places as Crystal City, Cypress River, Dauphin, Deloraine, Erickson, Emerson, such places as Gladstone, Glenboro, Hamiota, down to Morris, Neepawa, Roblin, St. Lazare, Swan Lake and a whole list of them in here, communities that are using lagoons. I must ask the honourable members who have been criticizing the lagoons, if it weren't for them would these people in these communities be able to enjoy the modern conveniences that we're able to enjoy here in the city? When also I hear the various experts here in this House speaking about sewage lagoons, I put my case on the record last night of what the experts in the Department of Health and experts outside of the Department of Health had to say about these sewage lagoons. It's been a very interesting debate and I can assure the House that since we had one man who is an engineer entering into this debate, that the whole of the debate will be analyzed and studied by the people in the Department of Health.

I would further like to say that last night I don't think I painted any pictures of lagoons being places where you put palm trees, nor did I paint any pictures of having gardens with girls -- he didn't mention bikini'd girls around these places -- but any such pictures did I paint, nor did I paint any picture of crystal clear water coming out of a sewage lagoon. I don't recall having said that at all at any time.

I think in respect to the Metro Winnipeg lagoon it might be of interest at this time to give the House some more information that I have here because there has been the implied criticism that these matters are not going to be healthy. I believe that the Department of Health and its engineers and its standards are quite convinced that there is no health hazard going to develop from the lagoons that are being constructed in the province, here in Metro or in any other areas at the present time.

I might say that the honourable member for Burrows mentioned such matters as various chemicals, and it is my understanding that the one that is being built here in the Metro area will be sewage mainly of domestic origin and that lagoon which is to go into service this year will provide treatment for waste originating in Charleswood, part of the Rural Municipality of Assiniboia and part of the City of St. James. The area is roughly 260 acres, of which 135 acres will be cells for primary treatment and 125 acres for secondary treatment, with the effluence being discharged through a massive pipe to the Assiniboine River. Because of the large water areas and to provide flexibility, the primary system consists of three 45-acre cells side by side; the two secondary cells each are 62-1/2 acres; and winter storage, mentioned by the Honourable Member for St. Vital, has been provided for in the design.

As ice forms on the surface in early December, the effectiveness of treatment will gradually diminish. As ice and snow blanket the cells, the effluent discharge will be stopped and provision has been made for 120 days of storage. In the spring, some of the accumulated material may be released when the river is in flood. A further holding period may then be established to allow the balance of the stored material to be restabilized, following which it is expected that normal continual discharge will take place during the summer months with maximum natural treatment afforded by the action in both primary and secondary cells.

Flexibility in operation has been incorporated into the design so that it may be possible to divert flows from one cell to another, feed a secondary cell with raw sewage if required, and try out artificial aeration as an experiment on one of the primary cells. The full capacity of the lagoon system will not be required for some years, hence the loading will be gradual and the development of sound operating procedures can be worked out as the amount of waste to be handled increases.

The Honourable Member for Burrows refers to a study, and I think I had better read very clearly just the study that I mentioned last night when I commented on this matter before the committee. It said: "It may be expected that the vapour from a sewage lagoon will be quite innocuous and not irritating. However, some noticeable odour may be present for a few weeks in the spring of the year. However, the lagoons at Charleswood will be brought up to load capacity quite slowly and this, I understand, will give the Metro sanitary officials a chance to study all aspects of odour control and provide counter measures if they are necessary."

Now I have been in the Department of Health for only three months and I'd better not try

(Mr. Witney, cont'd)...to debate technically the matter of lagoons except the position that I gave this House last night, that the engineers of the Department of Health and the Professor of Bacteriology all gave good sound reasons as to why sewage lagoons are quite an acceptable means for the treatment of sewage; and here this statement which I noted, that the multi-cell system of sewage lagoon treatment is generally conceded to be equivalent to the primary plus secondary stages of standard sewage treatment by mechanical means. The one that is being designed at the present time in the Metro area has been designed on the advice of consulting engineers, both here in Winnipeg and in Toronto, in Ontario.

With respect to the matters that were raised by the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie, financial assistance, as I understood him, to combat court cases on this matter, the answer would be "no," but I do believe that the municipality involved should have some recourse to the people who built it.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Mr. Chairman, the Minister seemed to be a little reluctant to discuss the last answer, the one that he just commented on immediately prior to sitting down, and I think this is one of the more important ones. I guess it is a fact that just every town in the province hires consulting engineers and pays them good money for their services; and, in addition, they get a lot of advice, some of it good and some of it not so good, from the government on many subjects; but on the subject of lagoons, I think a lot of the advice could maybe be classed in the "not so good" advice.

I know that Gladstone put in a lagoon, as he indicated, some four or five years ago, and they have had a problem there I think almost immediately that they put the water-works into operation. They came back at the consulting engineers and there just doesn't seem to be any way to get architects and engineers to patch up mistakes that they made. I think they are now advocating that they should have built the lagoon twice the size to start with. Well someone told them the size that they should have built it. They now find out that the composition of the soil is such that it will not take the quantities of effluent that is going into it, consequently it is running over, down the ditch, and flooding a bunch of land. They are recommending now that possibly another alternative would be to pump it over the railway tracks or underneath the railway tracks and get it into the river some way. Well all of these things cost a lot of money. Someone has given them advice, advice that was paid for, and now who has to pay for the errors? The people in Gladstone.

Now in Neepawa, when I was on the council some seven or eight or nine years ago, we built a lagoon and it worked fairly well. In fact I think it is still working fairly well. But I recall quite well the night that Swift Canadian met with Town Council to discuss the building of an eviscerating plant and I believe that we were told by the Department of Health then, "Well, you can't let blood from the eviscerating plant into the lagoon -- you're going to run into all kinds of trouble." Now we weren't told these things when we built the lagoon, and I think that the towns should be told what they will handle, because just every town in the Province of Manitoba are interested in attracting industry there, and if there are certain industries that cannot deposit their waste into lagoons then the town people should know about it. We have found these things out now -- it cost us money -- but I think that the government, if they're not sure on a lot of these things, if they're not certain -- and in light of what has been said by so many people here it seems to me that they're not certain just what is the right procedure and what lagoons are capable of handling -- I think, Mr. Chairman, that we will have to, if I'm allowed to use the word, "smarten up" in this particular field and be in a position to give the towns better advice on these subject matters than they've had to date.

Now I don't know, Mr. Chairman, whether it was by accident or design, but I was told that down at Boissevain, where they were dumping blood into the lagoon there, that they introduced fish into the lagoon, and my honourable friend from St. Vital was talking about these fishing pools and bathing pools and so on, and I happened to think of it when he was mentioning it that there was more truth than poetry in what he said because down at Boissevain they did introduce fish there and it solved the problem, I understand, because the fish broke up the blood formations and made it possible for it to work better. However, Mr. Chairman, I say once again that I think that the government should be prepared and must be prepared to give better advice on lagoons to the towns that are interested in putting them in.

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Education) (Gimli): Mr. Chairman, I would just

(Mr. Johnson, cont'd)...like to say a few words on lagoons from experience in the past in this field, because I come from a community who would not enjoy the many benefits of a modern plumbing system today if it weren't for the fact that the government of that day, led by the Honourable Member from Lakeside, didn't initiate studies into the lagoons with the people in North Dakota. I don't know where the Member from Neepawa was then, and I don't know why he doesn't get together with his friend from Burrows and come out to the people in Gladstone with their steam pressure plant and drying mechanism that will obviate the necessity for lagoons or any advice from the Department of Health. The Department of Health has tried to do -- have done over the years, kept up with all the latest research where lagoons were first introduced into the northern states under winter conditions, and this has all been repeated since the Honourable Member for Neepawa has been in the House, and of all the lagoons that have been built certainly nothing is perfect, and there have been difficulties. There have been difficulties with soils and in the manner in which some were constructed, but the department has never pretended to be the last resort or the last in knowledge in this field. They have kept up with the research into lagoons; they have done a tremendous amount of work themselves. We have a sanitary control commission on which the Chief Public Health Engineer of the province sits and is responsible to the Minister, and the sanitary control commission have, as part of their work, kept up research into the progress of the development of lagoons in North America and the very latest opinions from all over. I've heard all these arguments and have asked the very questions that have been posed by the Member from Burrows -- and incidentally, just to correct the record, I think he will note that he said anaerobic meant "in the presence of oxygen." Anaerobic -- you had it the wrong way around. Anaerobic is in the absence -- "a" means no in latin -- no aerobic, no oxygen. So the problem is that if it was cheaper and over a period of ten to twenty years, such as mentioned by the Honourable Member from Neepawa, to develop the kind of system recommended by the Member from Burrows, I think possibly the consulting engineers appointed by the City of Winnipeg, for example, to advise Metro, appointed by the city fathers to look into the possibilities and the kind of systems for Metropolitan Winnipeg, surely wouldn't have recommended a lagoon system.

The matter raised by the Member from Portage, of course, was a tremendous amount of concern to the department with respect to soils and permeability of cells at lagoons and so on. Fortunately, in the community I come from, we put our lagoon out in the swamp -- it used to be swamp. Right in the swamp. But fortunately there's clay there. It's made a very impermeable cell. That lagoon hasn't balked once since 1955 -- not once. It looks very pretty in the summer time. There are ducks on it! Now you obviously put them out a little bit out of town because you don't intend to have garden parties out there. This isn't the place you invite your friends to when they come to town. This is a place -- and certainly with respect to disease -- Lord Harry, if what the Member from Burrows has intimated in the House that viruses can come off that lagoon and go floating throughout Manitoba, what about the Sabin vaccine program where some of these viruses, where all the viruses of polio and so on that find their way into certain material would go, I can just imagine it; but obviously these things are understood by the people who should know -- that is, the bacteriologists and the scientists who advise government.

Now no government I'm sure in Canada, no public health engineer -- because like every other profession, I think the honourable members will know, the more you think you know the more -- the more you know the more, the less you know you know -- get what I mean -- and you become a little more humble as time goes on, and I don't think I've ever met a public health engineer who said he knew all the answers or thought the lagoons were here to stay, but by the Lord Harry it's revolutionized rural Manitoba, and surely, surely, if the kind of aeration and drying method and digestive chambers reported by the honourable member, the Pittsburgh method, whatever it is, if it had all these virtues -- and I have asked many engineers this question -- and could be built so economically, fine. But I was advised by these people that maybe a hundred million would clean up the rivers, and then, even then, the rivers, the major rivers for example in Metro, could never be abandoned 100 percent as carriers of a certain amount of effluent. So these are the arguments, and of course as an elected member of the Legislature and as a Minister of Health, how can a man become an expert and interpret this to this committee? I do think, though, that these full-time people do tend to do this.

On the practical side, out in these communities, certain lagoons are having difficulties,

(Mr. Johnson, cont'd)...there's no two ways about it, where they're being built too close to town. Some of them will have to be filled in and put further out, I imagine, in the course of time as development progresses, but they're not the cesspools in the light of present knowledge; they're not the cesspools that have been reported. They have made a new way of life possible in rural Manitoba. They have eliminated the house fly as king in small communities in many parts of the province, and Lord Harry, let's not just roundly condemn them. I think we're going to have to live with them for some time until these aeration methods and drying methods the Member from Burrows has mentioned become a reality and within reach of the public purse, but until that time I think we have to examine the opinion of those who are constantly working in this field. Now, I just couldn't help interjecting into this debate. I apologize to the House if I've been lengthy, Madam Speaker, but what prompted me were the remarks from the Member from Neepawa, who didn't think the advice and performance of the department over the past has been the best with respect to this matter.

MR. DOUGLAS L. CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Mr. Chairman, I think that the Honourable the former Minister's interjection was most timely because, as I caught the burden of his remarks, it was to the effect that the Department of Health was doing a better job back in 1955 than it has been more recently.

MR. SHOEMAKER: In regard to my honourable friend from Burrows...

MR. CHAIRMAN:if we can come to an end of this item before long. We seem to have covered the ground pretty thoroughly now.

MR. SHOEMAKER: I want to ask my honourable friend the Minister of Education a question -- the Minister of Education a question. Did I imply that I was supporting my honourable friend from Burrows in all his ideas about lagoons? I don't know a dashed thing about the type of sewage disposal system that my honourable friend from Burrows is talking about. I don't know anything about them so please don't think that I'm endorsing his method of disposing of sewage. I don't know anything at all about it.

MR. JOHNSON:get together.

MR. SMERCHANSKI: Mr. Chairman, I've some suggestions to the Honourable Minister of Education. At the offset he mentioned something about steam pressure plants for disposal of this material. I don't intend to press the point, but the fact of the matter is that the fluid-solid disposition of sewage is a known process, and it might be said that you can ask many engineers who never heard of the term and much less have seen one in operation; and I don't think it's a fair question to say that North Dakota has been using open lagoons and that somebody on the part of the present government initiated the study. Open lagoons are something that have been in existence since the 30's. Another thing is that, as mentioned in my remarks, the size and function of the lagoons has a lot to do with the performance of the lagoons, and out of town locations might be all right, but I don't think that Charleswood is an out of town location. It's far from it. It's right in the heart of metropolitan Winnipeg as far as the residents of St. Charles are concerned. I would also like to ask the now Honourable Minister of Education, give me the names of those cities in excess of 500,000 population that utilize the open lagoon method of treating their sewage. Are there any that you know of?

MR. JOHNSON: The only place I've heard of is Regina.

MR. SMERCHANSKI: Regina is in Canada, but I asked in the United States, because these are the people that have pioneered in the research and construction of open sewage lagoons.

MR. JOHNSON: I can just counteract my honourable friend. I'm not an expert in the field. I just say, what about the engineers picked by the City of Winnipeg, and Bill Hurst, a most knowledgeable man, chief of the Public Health Engineering Service for North America, president of the association a couple of years ago. They picked these associates who recommended the lagoons here. We know that this equipment is very very expensive. If my honourable friend knows of these and can recommend a specific place where the Minister might send the Chief Public Health Engineer for the province and some of the staff to look at the cost involved in the drying-out -- the kind of method, the method, whatever it is. I think that this is very worthwhile and certainly should be done, but the boys have looked into these aspects of it.

MR. SMERCHANSKI: Mr. Chairman, I am quite sure that the Honourable Minister should know better than to say that these engineers recommended this type of a thing. I would want to know how many of these engineers have actually seen a solid fluid operating plant in existence.

(Mr. Smerchanski, cont'd)...I have seen plenty of them, and I'd be glad to take him down, and I'm going to go on record that you'll come back and you'll sell yourself and them that this is the only practical way of disposing sewage, and I know what I'm talking about. I'll guarantee you that, and I'll be glad to go.

MR. JOHNSON: You take me down with. If the Honourable Member from Burrows invites me down with him to look at his plant, I'll go.

MR. SMERCHANSKI: Glad to.

MR. JOHNSON: But I don't think I'll be able to find viruses coming out of lagoons for him in return.

MR. FROESE: In the answer that the Minister gave, he more or less implied that I condemned lagoons. I have never done that, and I haven't done it today. I don't condemn lagoons for the rural areas and the smaller centres in rural Manitoba, but when I asked the questions whether the lagoons were overloaded, he mentioned that they had inspectors inspecting these lagoons from time to time, but he didn't tell us whether those inspectors condone overloading. He didn't say that they were not overloaded, and he also hasn't stated whether these inspectors don't condone this overloading, neither has he answered the other matter of the depreciating of properties adjacent to lagoons. This I think is a very important item, especially when you come into urban centres such as Charleswood and you place a lagoon in that area, you depreciate the area of surrounding real estate for miles I would say, and this is a very important matter that I feel should receive more consideration than it does.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (2) passed.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, to change the subject. I'm not going to discuss lagoons now. That'll please you, I believe. Yes, this is on sanitation. The question is, Mr. Chairman, in those areas of the province that are not enjoying the services of the various health units, what provision is made for inspecting restaurants, eating places, hotels, motels and so on?

MR. WITNEY: Mr. Chairman, that is provided for by the central staff of the Sanitation Department up here in the Norquay Building.

MR. SHOEMAKER: They also, I take it then, inspect nursing homes -- nursing homes and all licensed homes of one kind. I have before me, Mr. Chairman, a very recent article -- I think it's from the Tribune, March 7, '64 headed: "Nursing Home Conditions Horrifying." I wonder if they are "horrifying" or just why -- does this refer to ones outside of the province, because this is Ottawa? I wonder if my honourable friend could comment on the conditions of them in Manitoba.

MR. WITNEY: Mr. Chairman, to my understanding such things as nursing homes are inspected by the Department of Health and I believe that they are inspected by people from the Environmental Sanitation Section. As to the conditions of these homes, nothing has been drawn to my attention since I was Minister that there was anything untoward.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (2) passed. Item (3) passed. Item (4)....

MR. WRIGHT: May I ask a question under (3) (f), Manitoba Cancer Treatment and Research Foundation? I see that there is no amount shown in there. Do I take that there is no money put up by the province, but simply they're just using the Cancer Society funds? For instance, Mr. Chairman, I notice that, comparing the budgets of Saskatchewan and Manitoba, I notice they have put up \$1.6 million in Saskatchewan for cancer. I would expect to see something in the estimates of Manitoba for it, even though we don't have the same system.

MR. WITNEY: Mr. Chairman, by agreement with the federal government, arrangements are being made effective this April 1st to include all the services of the Cancer Foundation both in-patient and out-patient as eligible under the Hospital Insurance Plan, and thus the total budget of the Cancer Foundation will come under Shared Services with the federal government under the Hospital Insurance Plan. The Foundation will continue to be administered by its own board under its own Act.

MR. WRIGHT: May I ask would this be the reason then for the anticipated increase in the Hospital Services premium, because of acceptin -- in other words, I see no share here where I think it should be. Is this going to be all-inclusive into the Hospital Services Plan?

MR. WITNEY: The budget will be in the Hospital Services Plan, but there will be full shared services, actually increased shared services as a result of that now, because in the past there was only shared services on in-patient services, but it is now in-patient and out-patient.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (3), (4), (5), (6), (7) passed.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, is that the Hospital Service one we've reached? I'd like to know from the Minister, Mr. Chairman, what is the policy of the government with regard to prosecution and the collection of premiums by people who refuse to pay them? Not too long ago there was an item in the newspapers regarding an individual who was fined for this or given an alternative jail sentence. Is it the policy of the government to continue this practice of possibly jailing people for refusing to pay their premiums or their fines? It seems to me that we should possibly have another look at this procedure and that this should be considered simply in the same way as anyone else takes action to collect a bill. I don't think that any normal individual seeking the payment of a bill can force anyone in jail. This technique went out many years ago, and the present procedure is that you take civil action against an individual and if you get the court to agree with you then you have certain rights in which to collect the money, but not beyond that. I think the debtors' jails went out of practice a long time in the past. I'd like to know from the Minister because of this particular case. A number of cases have come to me. I have another one, where the Manitoba Hospital Commission is presently going after a woman for the payment of \$13.70, and this goes back over a period of many years, in fact back into the period of 1959. This lady tells me that she has been down to see the Hospital Commission, has discussed the matter with them, and they did not come to an understanding but at least she told them she didn't feel that she owed the money. Subsequently they sent, she tells me, detectives to her place of employment, two detectives came in and insisted on getting a statement from her there at her place of employment, and this was a good deal of embarrassment to her and certainly unpleasant for her employer. She has now either received a summons or a summons has been issued against her. She is very disturbed by all this and left her place of employment because of it and this whole thing relates back to what is the policy of the government in this regard.

MR. WITNEY: Mr. Chairman, the policy of the government would be to administer the Act under which the Manitoba Hospital Commission is established and there would be set out in that Act -- although at this moment I don't know what those terms are -- there will be set out in that Act certain punitive measures that would be taken by the Manitoba Hospital Commission and the Manitoba Hospital Commission would not step beyond the bounds of the power as provided in the Act.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, that's very fine but could the Minister indicate to me then, under the present situation a person can be jailed for not paying their premiums. Is that correct?

MR. WITNEY: Mr. Chairman, right at the moment I couldn't say just what the penalty section is as called for under The Hospital Insurances Act.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, my information is that this is so and apparently judging from these news reports this is the case because this -- I'm referring to an item in the Winnipeg Free Press in January '64: "A Winnipeg man sentenced to \$25.00 fine plus costs or 15 days in jail for not paying his hospital insurance premium said Tuesday in Winnipeg magistrate court that he'd rather go to jail than pay the fine," and it goes on "charged with failing to pay premiums between January '59 and December '63. He told the magistrate he feels that the compulsory hospital plan is undemocratic and that he would take the alternative jail term instead of paying the fine. Magistrate Dubiensi gave Kelso until Friday to decide finally about paying the fine or going to jail. Kelso was charged under The Manitoba Hospital Services Act with failing to pay \$90.30 in premiums." So, according to this, it's definite that if you don't pay your premiums you can go to jail and what this lady tells me she's presently being pursued for \$13.70. She has detectives come to see her at her place of business. Presumably if she doesn't pay this she's going to be threatened as well with being sent to jail for \$13.70. Now surely Mr. Chairman the Minister could review this system. I urge upon him that this isn't a proper technique. Let him have the same recourse as anyone else who has to collect a bill but let's not put people in jail for failure to pay \$13.70. Would the Minister be prepared to look into this matter?

MR. WITNEY: Mr. Chairman, I would imagine that The Hospital Services Act is written much the same as many other Acts are written in the Province of Manitoba whereas there is a penalty section and charges are laid and the charges go before the court of law and then the judge

(Mr. Witney cont'd) operates, or levies a penalty as per the penalty section of the Act, and in many cases the Acts call for a minimum and maximum fine or a period of jail, or it calls for perhaps both. Now just what the court would do in respect to the particular person that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition referred to I don't know, I would imagine that charges would be laid, it would go before the judge, the judge would have the penalty section and the judge would lay down the penalty and if the lady did not wish to pay whatever money fine was involved then she would elect to go to jail for the period of time that it involved. However, finally I would be prepared to take a look at that penalty section in the Act.

MR. PETERS: It has been brought to my attention by people that are not steadily employed at work, get laid off and fall behind in their hospital premium, when they start working again, the first thing that's deducted off their pay is the hospital premium. It doesn't matter if there's any money left for him to live on for the next week or in between paydays. The employers tell the employee that there's nothing that they can do about it, that that's the way it's laid down to them, that that's the very first thing they have to take off them. I think, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister should review this because after all a person is willing to pay their premium and they're not working, they can't pay it and they want to pay it, when they start working and the very first thing that happens if they're three or four months behind and their first pay might only be for two or three days, or maybe a week, the first thing that happens is that they get a pay with a great big deduction on it and they go to find out why it was all done at once and they are told by the employer that this is laid down by the Manitoba Hospital Commission, that this must be done. I think it's very unfair. I think once they fall in arrears with their premium and they start working again that they should be given an opportunity to pay it on a monthly basis or in three payments or four payments, but not all at one payment just on the first pay that they receive after being re-employed.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Minister has indicated to the Leader of the Opposition that the Act provides for this penalty and therefore it would be quite proper to serve this penalty or pay the fine. Now I'd like to ask the Honourable Minister this question. What if this lady does pay the fine and then when she required hospital she's told that she can't get in. What happens then? Who's going to pay that penalty? Herself. Because this is a case. This was mentioned last week and it is a case, maybe not too often but it is something that we will have to examine and the Honourable Minister hasn't said too much on this. I'm complaining, I'm criticizing the compulsory part of this plan when it is a case, it's a contract and we insist that they live up to their contract, even though it's compulsory. We ask the people to pay this. We're even ready to put them in jail. But then in certain conditions they require hospital and this is what they've contracted for and the government could not provide hospital facilities and I -- you'll have to come down -- there's an Honourable Minister that's dying to get up but he's not in his seat. I think he'd better come down. I'd like to get the answer from him or the Honourable Minister. But this is something -- it is wrong for the province to do that, for all of us to do that, and I think that if we're going to stay with this compulsory plan, if we're going to insist on this contract, and if we say to them, you must live with this contract and if you don't you will pay the consequences, you will be fined or go to jail -- we cannot say this and then once they pay if they require to go to the hospital, that we say, sorry, there's no room for you. I don't think that's quite fair. This is not blaming the Minister, it's not his fault. I'm not saying that we can provide beds; we're doing the best we can, I want to admit that right now, but the fact is still there that some people can't get in the hospital and if it's a compulsory plan well then we must be ready to live up to our part of the contract -- our part of the bargain.

MR. WRIGHT: Mr. Chairman, I rise to defend the compulsory part of the plan. I think this is absolutely necessary and I just want to tell the House how a civilized community handles this kind of thing. From the Seven Oaks area that I represent, when people on very limited pensions are finding difficulty in meeting the premiums of the Plan they don't just refuse stubbornly and have to get their name in the paper and be threatened with jail. They simply go to the municipal authorities in a straightforward manner and place their case and if there's any justification for the case the municipal authorities will pay the premium because the onus after all is on the municipal authorities should the person require hospitalization. I think this is the right way when people are placed in this position, but I do want to defend the compulsory part of it because I think we have to do that to ensure its success.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, I was out for a couple of minutes there. I just wonder whether the Honourable Minister had told us what the new premiums might be. Are we going to have an increase in premiums or are we not going to have an increase in premiums? The Manitoba Budget and Economic Review 1964 warned us that there could be. Now it would be kind of nice to know. Parkinson, as you know by recent newspaper clippings, has come up with his third law -- and no doubt my honourable friends know what it is -- but it is simply that Parkinson's third theory is that all nationalized industries tend to go bankrupt. I wonder if he was looking at this Plan that we have here when he devised that one.

Mr. Chairman, a great deal has been said on the estimates up to now, that is, the Health estimates, as to have we a shortage of hospital beds or have we not. And I think that this should be cleared up. I would like to know. I'm one of the fellows who has consistently maintained that if it was possible to get a lot of the long-stay patients out of these very valuable beds we wouldn't have a shortage of hospital beds at all. And I'm certain that the former Minister of Health agreed with me. He did one day anyway because I'm certain the first resolution that I had on the Order Paper in 1958, I think -- and I don't recall whether he was Minister of Health at the time or not -- but I believe that he went along with me on the one where I recommended that the Hospital Plan be changed to include the cost of care of patients in nursing homes. That was the one. Well he agreed that there was a lot of people occupying hospital beds that didn't need to be there, that could be just as well taken care of in other places. I would like to read my honourable friend the Minister of Education what he said, --(interjection) -- All right. On July 14th, 1959 -- (interjection) -- everybody can change their mind, as my honourable friend from St. Boniface said and he appreciates people that do change their mind and admits it. But here's what he said -- here's what my honourable friend the Minister of Education said: "There were waiting lists," he says, "last year." He's referring to the same waiting list that we're talking about now, "and I could say very broadly this, that with acute bed index of about 6, 1 per thousand of population we just are not too sure that it is acute hospital beds that are required. If we can provide -- relieve our acute hospitals of some of their long-term nursing home and domiciliary types of cases, and this is the real reason that I think the survey looking at this matter, at our acute bed situation and the provision of adequate alternative facilities to care for those who are sick and helpless and who need-- and whom I think we all feel should be under the plan." Now that's what he said five years ago. And I still agree with him. I still agree with what he said five years ago. What he is saying here, Mr. Chairman, is, he feels they should be under the plan, he said that then, maybe he's changed his mind. And he says he's not so sure that there's a shortage of beds if there was some way of looking after these people.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have a letter from a medical doctor here who has just returned from spending some time in England, a year and a half or so over there, but this was written before he went over there. I'm just going to quote one sentence. He said, "I would estimate that over 50 percent of the cases in our hospitals are beyond the age of 65 and could be just as well taken care of in alternative care institutions." I think that he's right. I suppose that my honourable friend has read from cover to cover the report of the 1962 annual meeting of the Associated Hospitals of Manitoba, and the proceedings of the nursing conference that was held in that day -- he was there and spoke to that group -- and I don't know whether he left after he spoke or whether he remained to hear the panel discussion on the crisis of our crowded hospitals. And it is very, very interesting to read what that panel had to say. The moderator was Dr. Scatliff and the participants, Miss A. Addie Thomas and Mr. T. A. J. Cunnings, Dr. Fletcher Baragar and Mrs. A. Courteau and they all point up, I think, in this panel -- the discussions that took place cover about 20 pages in this report -- and they point up that there are so many cases in our hospitals today who could be taken care of just as well in other alternative care institutions. I used to call them nursing homes but now I prefer to call them "alternative care" institutions as my honourable friend does, because that covers a lot of other types of care.

My next door neighbour that I talked about last year -- you will recall, Mr. Minister of Education, you will recall me talking about my next door neighbour last year -- well he's no longer with us I have to report to the House. But he spent, he spent 400 days in the hospital -- 400 days in the hospital, --(interjection) -- They certainly did. They looked after him real good. But the point is this that it cost the taxpayers of this province \$8,000 to look after him

(Mr. Shoemaker cont'd) for 400 days. I'm not objecting to it, but how many other people are there in exactly his same situation. There's an article that I have before me here, reprinted from the Toronto Globe and Mail: "The regional Hospital Planning. " My honourable friend will have this 20-page document I suppose?

MR. PAULLEY: Read it all.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We rise at 5:30.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Well I've got time to read one paragraph then, Mr. Chairman. And I quote from the first page, paragraph three, in the event that my honourable friend the Minister of Education -- you'll note that I'm directing all my remarks to the Minister of Education because I think by the way he's handling that pencil he intends to get up and reply to me after supper tomorrow night. --(interjection) -- That's right. And I quote, "The lack of integrated planning, " I think he's probably talking about Manitoba's plans, "and by that I mean planning for all types of care, active, convalescent, chronic and domiciliary, has resulted in the duplication of so many facilities and lack of others. When there is lack of such welfare facilities as homes for the aged with bed care and special care facilities, a domiciliary patient will occupy a bed in a chronic facility, the chronic and active treatment bed, and from this will appear an apparent shortage of active treatment beds. Bear in mind that an active treatment bed costs \$18,000 to build and \$8,000 a year to operate: a chronic bed \$12,000 to build and \$5,000 to operate; a domiciliary \$8,000 to build and \$2,000 annually to operate. " And this points up what I said before, that this late neighbour of mine, if we had facilities for him in the Town of Neepawa, if we had facilities for him and a lot of people like him in the Town of Neepawa where people could come in and visit with them daily, I'll bet he would still be with us. I'll bet he would still be with us. It's taking a lot of these people out of their environment, putting them in homes 100 miles removed, putting them in homes 100 miles removed, that results in an early death for a lot of people, or an earlier death than would otherwise be the case if they had a local institution. And I insist that I am right on this one. I insist that I'm right on this.

Now I believe that the situation is pretty well unchanged to what it was, that is the plan, back in the good old days, and yet -- Mr. Chairman I'm having a little trouble finding what I'm looking for here but it's sure worth reading when I do get it. Well let me ask my honourable friend this. Has there been a change in any of the information contained in the hospital coverage for Manitoba 1962. Has there been a new one out since 1962? Was there one published last year? Well then I take it that

MR. JOHNSON: If there was you would have it.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Well I should have it. My trouble is, Mr. Chairman that they publish so much stuff here that I need quite a large filing system.

MR. JOHNSON: Would my honourable friend permit a question? Is

MR. SHOEMAKER: Will I permit a question?

MR. JOHNSON: Yes. The question is, are you happy with the literature?

MR. SHOEMAKER: Pardon?

MR. JOHNSON: Did you want more literature?

MR. SHOEMAKER: I wouldn't mind having some more if it was up-to-date.

MR. JOHNSON: You won't accuse us of propagandizing if we do?

MR. SHOEMAKER: I didn't get the last remark, Mr. Chairman.

MR. JOHNSON: You wouldn't accuse the department of publishing propaganda

MR. SHOEMAKER: No, I didn't this is not one of the orange and green sheets that I have here. It's orange in colour but it doesn't emanate from the same propaganda department.

Now here's some more propaganda that doesn't emanate from the green and orange department either. This one, I must admit was likely paid for by the Conservative Party of Manitoba because this was back in the days when they were not in the government; so I imagine it was likely paid for by the Conservative Party. But, Mr. Chairman, here's what they said then. They put out a nine point program for greater Manitoba and they said what they were going to do in the field of education, and they said the people of Canada had just kicked out a government in Ottawa that deserved to be kicked out long ago, and they were going to follow John - you remember that, "those wonderful days. " Well here's what they said on their nine point program under health and welfare: "the hospital insurance program as presently envisaged

Mr. Shoemaker cont'd). . . . by the Campbell government -- and I don't know what the Campbell government envisaged but it must have been something terrible -- but "the hospital insurance program as presently envisaged by the Campbell government contains serious deficiencies and inequalities which we believe that a positive government leadership can and must correct." I would like my honourable friends to tell me what the inequalities and serious deficiencies were of that day -- (interjection) -- and what they have done to correct each and every one of them since they went into office.

A MEMBER: They're studying them.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Now, I know -- pardon?

MR. CHAIRMAN: That's the hospital services you are talking about.

MR. SHOEMAKER: That's exactly what I said here. "The hospital insurance program as presently envisaged by the Campbell government" -- well that's the subject matter we're on, is the hospital plan. My honourable friends on all sides are telling me that they are going to study it, and they have been studying it for five or six years. I know they have; I know they have -- (interjection)-- Yeah, Mr. Chairman, I'm getting some assistance from all sides here. I was talking about reports and studies. The Willard report you will recall -- I question whether you have read it from cover to cover. I know that -- (interjection) -- no, that isn't the -- that's just the condensed one. There's the Willard report. It was bigger than the COMEF report. -- (interjection) -- It was, the Willard report weighted more -- weighed more -- the COMEF report weighs about nine pounds, I think the Willard report weighs about eleven. And I noticed in the paper the other night, I noticed in the paper the other night, Mr. Chairman, that my honourable friend the Minister of Industry and Commerce uses the COMEF report for a pillow, or he sleeps with one under his pillow. I often wondered what I would do with mine and now I know. But if you want a little longer pillow you can use the Willard one for a mattress. But, Mr. Chairman, I would like to know, I would like to know just what this government has done to improve, improve this hospital plan that was envisaged by my honourable friend the Member for Lakeside. I'd like my honourable friend the Minister of Education to listen to what he had to say about a year ago when he was speaking out in -- The Gimli Doctor it calls him here -- he was speaking out in Elmwood. You remember the night he was out there? He was speaking out at -- (interjection) You were there? Pardon --(interjection) Well he said then that if there was some way of defeating this fellow from Elmwood there -- they didn't defeat him apparently though. At a nominating convention out there he described, the Gimli Doctor described the Manitob Hospital Plan as the greatest piece of legislation since Confederation. That's what he said. And. . . .

MR. JOHNSON: Social legislation.

MR. SHOEMAKER: It doesn't say that here, Mr. Chairman. It says the greatest piece of legislation. But, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask my honourable friend who put the legislation on the books? He admits that it's the greatest piece of legislation since

MR. EVANS: I trust my honourable friend would not think I was discourteous if I remind him that at 5:30 sharp it is necessary to adjourn the House. I wouldn't want to interrupt him unnecessarily. And if I may do so, Sir, I move the committee rise.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Madam Speaker, the Committee of Supply is considering a certain resolution, directed me to report progress and ask leave to sit again.

MR. MARTIN: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Dufferin the report of the committee be received.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: It is now 5:30. The House will now adjourn and stand adjourned until 2:30 o'clock Thursday afternoon.