

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
8:00 o'clock, Tuesday, May 23, 1972

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

MR. BARROW: Mr. Chairman, at 5:30 I wanted to quote a letter concerning a young man from Flin Flon, who answered a letter on welfare abuse in the local paper, and I'll quote: "This is in response to an article contained in a letter to the editor column of April 11th. The particular section that prompted this writing is where the author expounds on welfare and unemployment. I feel that this person has no idea of what he or she is talking about. Firstly, I challenge the person to give actual figures on how many able-bodied men are on welfare. Secondly, I challenge the person to give figures relating to unemployment payouts that are made unnecessarily. I will admit there are cases where both welfare and unemployment are taken advantage of but these incidences are soon discovered and taken care of. The author also stated that he or she had no trouble getting a job for as long as he or she was in the working force. From this statement I gather this person is either young and can get jobs easily or is an older person who has had no more than half a dozen jobs and the latest one this person has held for some time.

"The reason I surmise this is because the person speaks out of ignorance as far as welfare goes. The article tried to lead one to believe that welfare people are handing out cheques to anyone who will take it. This is just not so. I had something to do with welfare cases during a recent strike in this city and I can say from experience money was just not given away to the extent that this person wants readers to believe. Before one would be considered for welfare, the local welfare workers checked into the background of the particular case and determined to the best of their belief the validity of the case. One of the main points that are considered by the Department of Welfare is the person's financial background. The applicant must sign a document giving the Welfare Department permission to delve into one's financial background for five years previous to the application. Applicants are thoroughly investigated before they are accepted as recipients. I, as a taxpayer, who dealt with the Welfare Department, have seen firsthand the important work done by the Welfare Department in helping people who are less fortunate than ourselves, do not begrudge any tax money spent on behalf of these needy people. We know that there are always cases where someone has violated a trust but these are few and far between and when it happens it is ballooned to make it look worse than it really is.

"Regarding availability of jobs, would you work for the minimum wage and in many instances, even less? You must realize in these days of high cost a family needs a breadwinner to make more than a minimum wage in order that the family will be able to live in the style tuned to the 1970s. If the earning power is lower than needed to sustain a family then welfare must be brought into the picture. There are thousands of people working for a minimum wage and have no fringe benefits provided. In fact, there are people in this city who are working for less than the minimum wage. Why do they continue? Because they have no union protection and would find it difficult to get another job because of age. How do you think employment can be kept up when you have automation taking away thousands of jobs each year and thousands of young people entering the labour force each year with no jobs to go to? If you think your taxes are too high, how about getting big business to pay more taxes.

"I was glad to read not too long ago that taxes will be impressed on the big shots who had golf courses, yachts, and hunting lodges exempted from tax. With this kind of thing going on, we, the poor people have to pick up the slack. Huge business conglomerates have tax experts to figure all the angles whereby their company can get away with paying far less income tax than they should be paying. As a result, millions of dollars are lacking in the tax picture and as a result the working people must have their taxes increased. In a way, we the working people are subsidizing big business. The writer is obviously a hard-hearted individual for begrudging the natives of this country the things we enjoy. Here again, the author wants one to believe that excessive amounts are being spent on the natives. Have you ever been to Sandy Bay or Pelican Narrows? I have, and I see the conditions these people have to live under are not conditions that should be allowed in a country as wealthy as Canada and the age of super everything.

"Before you, Mr. or Madam author write another article to the editor I would like to see - first you quit your job and try to get a new one of equal pay and fringe benefits. Second, try to get a welfare cheque, the one you say is being handed out to anyone who will take it.

(MR. BARROW cont'd) Third, take a trip to Sandy Bay or Pelican Narrows, stay there for a few days and see the conditions children and grownups have to live with. After you've done the above things write another letter to the editor then give your opinions to them and only then will I be able to accept your views on the topics of welfare and unemployment. Signed, Joe Figura.

Mr. Chairman, this is from a working man who can't afford with his wages any output into welfare programs and this is his true feelings.

Mr. Chairman, I'd like to just delve a little while into CFI. I know it's a well-worn record but in my humble opinion it was \$92 million poured down the drain. As one magazine, a student magazine described it, the Rape of Manitoba, Northern Manitoba. And they say, you know, about rape, "if rape is inevitable, lay back and enjoy it. But let me tell you the people in my constituency are not enjoying this and my people will never forgive the former government for something much worse than welfare abuse.

Mr. Chairman, this afternoon I noticed the front bench and there was no one except the Member from Rhineland. We are on government business --(Interjection)-- Now if you are Opposition isn't this your job to be over there, to give opposition? Well I would say this in conclusion, Mr. Speaker. They are drawing money under false pretences - much worse than welfare. In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to answer the Member from Charleswood - I don't think he's here - --(Interjection)-- You don't want to listen to me?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Only one speaker at a time.

MR. BARROW: You'll get your turn later. The Member from Charleswood during the speech asked me - and I didn't get a chance to answer - he said the crook in charge of the union, the steel union, in Flin Flon what he drew, what he paid in income tax. Now, Mr. Chairman. . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. BILTON: Is the honourable gentleman talking to the Estimates or is he talking about unionism?

MR. CHAIRMAN: . . . on the Minister's salary.

A MEMBER: No, he's not. No, he's not.

MR. BARROW: Could I answer the question, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

MR. BARROW: The chairman of the steel, or the President of the Steel Union in Flin Flon, his name is Willis Ayers, I've known him since 1952, a more gentle fair man I have never met. His salary which he accuses of being exorbitant is \$25.00 a month or \$300.00 a year. His income tax I don't know but I think if the member got in touch with the Member for Arthur, they're cousins, he could find out all the detail. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. MCKENZIE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I had not intended to enter into debate at this time but I can't let the remarks of the Honourable Member for Flin Flon go unchallenged. First of all he criticized the Opposition because we didn't have any members on the front bench today, and if the Honourable Member for Flin Flon had been in his chair and taken a look at his front bench today, I would submit in all sincerity, Mr. Chairman, that at the most times, and I was in my chair all afternoon, and the most I saw over there was one and of course this is supposed to be the government of the province, we are the Opposition, and in all sincerity, Mr. Chairman, this is supposed to be the strong government of this province that's carrying us through the problems of today. And here on this debate where the taxpayers of this province are expected to approve some \$191 million we only have one Minister on the front bench on the desk today.

Mr. Chairman, in all sincerity, I feel sorry for the First Minister of this province. I really do. Here he's got a backbencher from Flin Flon on his back today which he hasn't had before. He's had the Honourable Member for Thompson on his back every day. Can you imagine the First Minister of this province going back home tonight and trying to have some rest with his own backbenchers reacting against him and tearing his government down? Mr. Chairman, we have said in the early days of this session that this government is crumbling on the shoulders of this First Minister and if you have never saw any more evidence than we saw today, there it is. Two backbenchers reacting, fighting against the Minister of Health and Development on this \$191 million. For what? Cause they're fed up with this government, just like we are, Mr. Chairman. Fed up with this kind of government. --(Interjection)--

The Honourable Member from Flin Flon doesn't make very many speeches in this House,

(MR. McKENZIE cont'd) Mr. Chairman, but when he stands up we listen and he stood up in this House and made a very fine speech today and I congratulate him for his efforts and the wisdom and the knowledge that he put into that speech. But here he is criticizing his own government and, Mr. Chairman, we have said that this government is crumbling. We saw evidence on the front bench today. The Attorney-General was here for a while then he left and the Honourable House Leader came along, so there was only one on the front bench and yet the Honourable Member for Flin Flon stands up and criticizes because we had only the Honourable Member for Swan River on our front bench.

Now if you want to be sincere, in all sincerity criticize your own government. We are the opposition --(Interjection)-- Criticize your own government. They are supposed to be the strong boys. They are supposed to be the ones that's leading us through the wisdom of this \$191 million that we're going to spend on these Estimates. And in all sincerity if this is the government -- and I many times think it isn't the government because I don't know who over there could help the First Minister. Maybe the Minister of Finance could but from there on, Mr. Chairman, I feel sorry for the First Minister of this province. I really do. He's a good friend of mine; he knows me real well and I do feel sorry for him. With the government that he's got over there while we debate \$191 million of Estimates and his own backbenchers are reacting. Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Thompson. And how long does this go on? Every day in this House we have a member sitting on that bench over there - not over here in opposition - attacking his own government, and he was a member of that government.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in all sincerity how long can we expect the Honourable Member for Thompson to be sincere? You're not sincere. No way. You are part of that government. If you want to come over and attack that government sit in one of those chairs over here and give the government a chance to react. But don't stand up behind the Honourable Attorney-General and start breathing down the back of his neck every day. And also if you are a man and if you are the Member for Thompson move over here in one of these backbench seats and sit as an Independent and criticize the government from the opposition level. I congratulate you for your speeches and your knowledge but you're being unfair to the taxpayers and the people of this province sitting in a government and attacking the government day after day after day. If you don't like that government get out.

Mr. Chairman, let's go back to the Estimates. Mr. Chairman, no doubt I will never get another chance to speak to these Estimates, same as the Estimates of the Minister of Industry and Commerce. I had a few comments -- because with the time limitation we don't all get a chance to speak. But I'd like to draw to the attention of the Minister the Reward Program for dope that has been tried in Atlanta and has been tried in London, Ontario with, I submit, a ringing success in those communities and Atlanta, Georgia, and London, Ontario, I have read the stories that have come out of there is the police's type of drug department sets up a hot line - and the Honourable Minister is likely well aware of those two programs, - that get 40 to 50, 60 calls a day regarding drug pushers ta da ta da in those various communities and rewards are paid for information as I understand it on heroin only. But in the early days of the program calls have turned up on marijuana, on the acids and even some of the hard drugs calls have infiltrated through those hot lines. The Atlanta program, as I understand it, was instituted last September and the one in London, Ontario, was instituted in the spring months of the year and they both commenced as I understand it with a budget of some \$50,000.00. The Atlanta program came about a fight between Mohammed Ali and Quarrie where they gave \$50,000 to the program and I believe the Ontario group are funded by a local initiative. Mr. Chairman, Reward, as I understand it have paid to the tipsters after convictions some sizable amounts of money. I think a thousand dollars is paid from two ounces to eight ounces of heroin; I think \$5,000 is paid from a half a pound to two pounds; I think \$10,000 is paid for anything over and above that. And all the names are kept confidential.

But the one that really turned me on, Mr. Chairman, was the two college students who I'm told recently phoned in information about a certain pusher in that area and asked that the reward go to the poor. Many today are criticizing our young people and I think a program of that nature -- and I'm sure all the members of the House will stand up and stand behind me tonight that there's a lot of good young people in our society today who on this particular occasion donated their funds to the poor. I would just in the Honourable Minister's remarks hope he could react and see if the province is prepared, or the taxpayers, various groups can contribute to try and create a fund of that nature. The drugs are a real serious problem in my

(MR. McKENZIE cont'd) constituency so when the Honourable Minister does reply I hope he would add some of his comments along those lines.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for St. Vital.

MR. JAMES WALDING (St. Vital): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I didn't intend to take up too much of the Committee's time. I had two matters I wanted to bring to the Minister's attention. Just before I go into them the opposition members have complained that they were here this afternoon but there was only one member on the government front bench. I'd like to suggest, Mr. Chairman, that with the sort of opposition we've been getting that one member is quite sufficient on the government front bench.

Mr. Chairman, the first matter I wish to bring forward concerned a pensioner in my constituency. This man had been retired for a few years and was a car owner. He needed it partly to transport his wife who was unable to walk, and he received notification from the Department of Highways due to a government policy that he was required to submit to a physical examination before he could renew his licence for that year. Now he did so and passed and got his driving licence, but shortly afterwards he received a bill for around \$12.00 from the medical clinic that he went to. Now he was a little annoyed about this. Since we'd brought in Medicare just a few years earlier he was of the opinion that this fee for a medical examination should have been covered by Medicare. I made a few inquiries on his behalf and it appears that where a medical examination is ordered by a third party either for in this instance or for insurance reasons or for employment reasons that it is not covered by Medicare. It was also suggested to me that the man could get around this by not saying anything to his doctor when he went for his physical checkup and then at the end of this he could then produce his form and ask the doctor if he would then just fill it in for him and that in this manner it could be charged against Medicare. Well, Mr. Chairman, I submit that this is bordering on encouraging duplicity to suggest that a pensioner or any patient should be required to go to these measures to have such an examination covered by Medicare.

Now it's one thing where a third party examination is optional, such as for insurance or for employment reasons but where the examination is required under provincial statute in order for him to get his licence surely it is only fair to the pensioner, and these are all pensioners, that it should be included under the government's Medicare scheme.

Now the second matter I wish to bring to the Minister's attention concerns aid to physically handicapped children. Now just over a year ago there were a group of parents, engineers and people concerned with services to physically handicapped children who gathered together in a rather informal group and they called themselves the Group for Improved Services to Physically Handicapped Children of Manitoba. It's rather a mouthful but it tells you exactly what they do. Now they were concerned with the duplication of facilities, the number of agencies providing services - and I'll just read parts of their brief I think puts it in a nutshell. It says: "It has been estimated that about 50 agencies are involved in one way or another in the treatment of handicapped children, whereas nearly all adults with a physical disability are treated at the Manitoba Rehabilitation Hospital. Unfortunately no such comprehensive facility exists for children and as a result duplication and inefficiency abound. But what is perhaps worse is that in this multiplicity of agencies none employs a total team approach consisting of doctors, therapists, teachers, engineers, technicians and social workers. This means that a parent seeking help with a crippled child often ends up being shunted around from agency to agency, from doctor to social worker to therapy to teacher and back and forth, etc. It is no wonder that many parents give up in frustration and either keep their child at home or sometimes will commit them to an institution where they become permanent wards."

Now, Mr. Speaker, this group had assembled through their own efforts some evidence to this effect back last year. They had received the co-operation of several different agencies including the Department of Health and Social Development and I would like to quote now from a Free Press clipping of August 31, 1971 where it says: "The Provincial Government is preparing to do a study of services for disabled children following reports of an inadequate service system in Manitoba. Dr. Tavener, Assistant Deputy Minister of Social Development, said plans for a review began after a group of professional orthopedic workers and parents asked for an investigation of gaps in the present service system. The Health Department official said a committee is now being set up to determine the scope of the review." And that was from last August; it goes on at some length with a few examples. "But since that time this group has applied to the Federal Government and has been given a grant of some \$22,000 under the

(MR. WALDING cont'd) Local Initiatives Program, where it carried out its program in two parts. First, was a more detailed study of the facilities available in the province and of those children who could benefit from them. And they found for example that there were approximately 2100 children that came under the label of physically handicapped, and according to their estimation 700 of these or approximately one third could be helped by some form of device." You know that does not include those who are presently being helped. That is fully one third of all the handicapped children in this province who are not receiving some of the help that could be supplied for them.

Now I have one more quote here from Doctor Colin McLaren, who is the Director of Rehabilitation Engineering at the Ontario Crippled Children's Centre, and he said in a recent interview in Winnipeg: "For every crippled Canadian child in need of a brace or artificial limb there are ten who cannot use either but must have special devices permitting them to make their lives meaningful to themselves and to others." Now last year the Department of Health and Social Development included the fitting of prosthetic and devices for the handicapped but that only includes such things as artificial limbs and braces. What we're speaking of here are a number of other devices many of them quite simple, which can be supplied; they mostly have to be designed and fitted individually to the child and at the moment there is a grave lack of this type of appliance available to children in Manitoba.

Now it was the second part of this group's LIP grant that they used to fabricate some of these devices and you might have seen accounts in the press recently; there was one brief shot on one of the television news channels of a very simple device that was specially built for a boy. This device enabled him to sit or to be propped up in an upright position and gave him far more mobility than he would have had otherwise. When I spoke with members of this group they showed me a number of photographs of examples of the type of appliance that they had made. Some of them were little more than a platform with four small wheels on it to enable two, three and four-year-old children to propel them around their own homes. One particularly touching case concerned a boy of probably in his early teens. Now this boy had suffered from muscular problems and his state was such that his parents had to keep him at home in bed with his hands bandaged and tied to the side of the bed to prevent him from biting his own hands. This group went to work and fitted him with a special brace that was fitted into a wheelchair with a removable table in front of him on which he could work, special rests for his arms and that boy is now able to use a typewriter - and the transformation is almost unbelievable.

Let me again congratulate the department then for including these prosthetic devices under Medicare. I suggest that the department look into covering further aids for the release of physically handicapped children. Let me also suggest respectfully to the Minister that he dig out the file again on this study that his department was prepared to do because the group with its LIP has shown that there is far more work to be done, something that should be done quickly. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. GORDON W. BEARD (Churchill): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We listen to members including myself from time to time who worry about the costs of Medicare and welfare and yet to date none of us have been able to offer a fair answer as to how we're going to cut down those costs. And I think this is the whole . . . of the problem that faces us today, not only in Manitoba but in Canada and probably in many parts of the - certainly the western world. And I think that we've got to approach this not only by researching history, because that's behind us and certainly we can't return to the living that was done in the past; we've got to look ahead - and in doing so I think we've got to watch, seek and find ways and means of coping with those additional costs. And I would hope that the government and particularly Cabinet can take a very strong hard look at the Minister's portfolio and reconsider their position in respect to Health and Social Development because it has grown to a position where it is too much for any one person. In fact - I don't think it's any secret, I can recall the Honourable George Johnson when he took a look at Health and Welfare many years ago before Medicare came in, brought in a recommendation to Cabinet that they should be divided; and they were divided, they were divided - and then they were brought back together again. I could never understand that, especially when Medicare was brought in and the impact of the different philosophies on welfare were being considered, then certainly that was no time to bring it under one department. I think that this is certainly a place where two members of a Cabinet or more could work together because it's one that maybe in many ways fits together but then if you looked at any work of

(MR. BEARD cont'd) government you could say that they dovetail together.

I think it's hard to look at welfare and anticipate that you're going to see less applications for welfare when Prime Minister Trudeau goes around and states that it should be the individual's right to choose whether he wants to work or not. He has made that statement and continues to make it. And not only does he say that it's the individual's right, should be the individual's right whether he should want to work or not, but he also states that government has a responsibility to support those people if they do not want to work.

A MEMBER: . . . do not want to work!

MR. BEARD: No, they do not. He says - to finish that statement, he says that there is not enough work for everybody so there'll have to be those that'll have to be paid for not working. I cannot accept that type of philosophy; I think that is a sick philosophy and I think it's a very weak one; I think it's a sick one; I think it's a very tired man that has to fall back on that type of thinking but that is my individual thought in respect to paying people not to work. I think that governments - I don't really think that governments can continually return to the taxpayer for more money because this in turn encourages the people, the public, to demand more public services; because they say we're getting more money deducted from our cheques so we want more for our tax dollar and then it goes on and on.

Now I haven't offered a solution. I'm no better off than the others that have stood before me or the others that have attacked this department but certainly the advice that has been given government today and yesterday, and I did in my Throne Speech - as one in which I felt that they are watering down the money that should be given to those that needed it by distributing, trying to distribute it to everybody that was going to apply for social assistance. And they've got to decide who really needs it and who doesn't; and they've got to learn to say "no". And "no" is an awful word to have to say when you're a politician particularly if you're in office; and "no" is one of the easier ones that I suppose we first learn when we come into this life. If we don't learn to say it ourselves we certainly hear it from our mothers or our fathers or whoever happens to be telling us not to do those things when we're very young. And I think that we must learn to say it over again now - "no" - and if we start to learn to say "no" to those that come for the type of assistance that would water down our programs and take away from the elderly and from those that cannot work then I think we'll be doing what is fair because this is certainly not - we haven't reached the economic peak where we can divide our wealth in Canada or any other part of the world so that half can work and half can live off the results of those that are not working.

And I will leave those things and go back to drugs. We talked a little about it - and I ran across something that I thought was rather devastating - but some of the doctors were telling me that there's approximately, there could be considered at least 300 on hard drugs in the City of Winnipeg, and that would be a conservative estimate. And if you took 300 people at the required five to six shots a day you would estimate it would cost them about \$150 each per day, and that comes to approximately \$45,000 a day these hard-core addicts would require. And since they need them every day of the year, then you don't take a day off for Christmas and that - they would require approximately \$16,425,000 a year to support this habit. And to support this habit they would have to steal but in stealing they usually as a rule of thumb figure that approximately one-third of what they steal, they would get the value of about one-third of what they have to steal. So it would mean that in the City of Winnipeg alone we could find a loss of about \$50 million a year to support 300 hard drug addicts. And I think this is something that the public are not aware of when they start telling us that we should be supporting marijuana, that we should be starting to give in to the soft drugs so that we could allow people to become part of a permissive society. I think we should dig our heels in and while some day we will maybe regret a decision saying such a thing, people will say we're old fashioned, I believe that at least for the time being we should take a hard line on this and decide that drugs are really to keep people well and not to support them on any basis in which they require it such as we do when we see the alcoholics that we have on the streets today.

There was at one time one of our members - I don't often disagree with him but I believe he had suggested that we should have a large prison in the north. I don't really agree with it. I had started to talk about it at one time and the Minister suggested I speak on it now. I believe more in minimum security because I haven't really seen any statistics to prove that we really need maximum security prisons in northern Manitoba as yet. I haven't really seen any reason for supplying the type of prison that would contain people that we would really be seriously

(MR. BEARD cont'd) concerned about in respect to protecting the public.

So I would like to see a minimum type of security program in which legislation was again passed some years ago, five or six years ago, and it was particularly slanted toward the north and it allowed for a program to be set up so that these people could go out and work during the daytime. They could in fact be with their families at dinner time at supper time, whatever it may be; they would return there at night and the money that they would earn would be first of all given - there would be an amount taken off to support them in their board, their own board and room in the minimum security - the rest of the money would be sent to support their family. So that this would cut off the costs of keeping prisons and would assure the government that their families would not have to go on welfare.

Now this would also assure us that prisoners would hopefully have a job, that they would be working, and some of them would be working steady for the first time for a long time. Maybe they would get used to working steady; maybe they would be able to learn a trade. But at least they would be doing something that was more in keeping with their living when they left the jail. I think they would be still in the community, or the surroundings that they're used to living in, and I believe that it would assist them so that they would see law enforcement in a more favourable light and probably help them to adjust more favourably to society. I think it is important because I think you're dealing with people in many many cases for the first time in meeting up with a white society, and this I believe is important. You have the chance to show them where they're wrong; you have a chance to help them, and not only that but you have a chance to teach them, and I don't think they should be -- nor do they want to be treated any better or any worse than anybody else.

I think the miner that's up there, or the individual that comes from some other area, can be treated just the same because there are many of those incidents up there that are really no different than what happens with the other people in northern Manitoba. The incident itself is not that serious; it's serious enough that they have to be punished in some way, shape or form, but to be taken right out of society altogether for two or three months does the government no good; it doesn't do the individual any good; he's not really punished after. When he comes out if he wants to he's going to do the same thing over again. It's just maybe if you have him under control for a couple of months while he's still carrying on with his job, maybe you'll have the advantage of teaching him, or getting through to him, and showing him that maybe the government is right and maybe he is wrong, and maybe he'll see the light. And with those words I'll let somebody else speak for a while.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON (Rock Lake): Mr. Chairman, I'd like to take a few minutes to deal with the department that is before us this evening. I had thought possibly we'd hear from the Minister long before this but I do want to say, Mr. Chairman, that in listening to all the comments this afternoon and this evening, I can't help but wonder and feel that the people of Manitoba, and probably the whole of Canada, must have come to realize that here we have an example where government becomes involved in something, the inevitable is bound to happen, and the criticisms that the Minister of Health and Social Development is receiving is, I think, in my opinion one of the basic reasons why we have the problems we have before us today.

I think it is worth repeating, Mr. Chairman, that the costs of health and social services to people in Manitoba has risen from 164, 900, 000 in 1972 to 191, 295, 000--some odd dollars in 1973. I think this is something that the people of Manitoba should know, and must know, because it's abundantly important when we talk about the costs of our health program.

One of the things that I want to ask him here - we have heard many statements and comments made, and the Minister said as I opened my remarks he's wanted to have the opportunity, but you know, Mr. Chairman, under normal situations, as I'm given to understand, and I know I spent three years on that side of the House, when the Minister introduced his Estimates it was normal that the Opposition members replied. And after the replies had been made the Minister would comment. But here we have another example, Mr. Chairman, such as we had in Industry and Commerce where his own colleagues seem to have to get in the fray. Why, Mr. Chairman? Because we have another weak Minister. We have another weak Minister, Mr. Chairman, and as far as I'm concerned they're trying to cover up for him. The Member for Thompson had to make his speech, and I couldn't help but wonder that I thought for a moment we were going to have a real three-way circus here for about a few minutes between the Honourable Member from Thompson, the Member for Crescentwood, and the Minister of

(MR. EINARSON cont'd) Labour, Mr. Chairman. I thought we were going to have a three-way circus here for a while because of the comments that the Member for Thompson had to make.

And I just want to reply, Mr. Chairman, that while the Member from Thompson made some comments about abortion and the Carmel Clinic, I took exception to some of the comments he did have to make. Some people might have thought he was sincere about it but he seemed to me, the impression I gathered, that he was hitting at a certain segment of our society as being more responsible than others. And he gave me the impression that he was that righteous individual, Mr. Chairman, and I took grave exception with him, and I don't think he is any more righteous than I am or any members on this side of the House. I don't feel that I'm any more righteous than he is but when he stands up and feels that he's the martyr for the people of this province, I think that's carrying it just a little bit too far.

One of the things I want to ask the Minister of Health and Social Development, Mr. Chairman - I'm given to understand, and he can deny it or confirm it, that the policy of his government in dealing with Community Health Centres, that he had on the plans for 20 Community Health Centres throughout the Province of Manitoba. Twenty Community Health Centres, Mr. Chairman. Is this a fact or is it not? Now, the thing is I think that when he started to feel his way around he run up against a little bit of opposition.

Mr. Chairman, I want to deal specifically with the area that I represent and particularly, pretty well the western part of the Province of Manitoba. The Honourable Member from Assiniboia mentioned it this afternoon but I feel that it's my duty to re-emphasize it again that he -- I'm given to understand that he is going to construct a laboratory and an X-ray branch in the City of Brandon which is going to be a cost of approximately \$1 million - and let me make it abundantly clear, Mr. Chairman, I have no opposition to anything going in to help the City of Brandon. But, Mr. Chairman, if it's going to be done at the expense of a large area or the rural part of the Province of Manitoba, then I am very very concerned, Mr. Chairman. And when I mention this, Sir, I'm concerned because I'm given to understand that he has not had any contact with the medical doctors who operate many rural hospitals.

Another question I want to ask, Mr. Chairman, is, if this is so what's going to happen to the services that we have in our hospitals, our X-ray machines? Our laboratory facilities such as they are, and they are performing a very worthwhile service in each community in which these hospitals find themselves. I think, Mr. Chairman, that these are very very important and should be of real concern to the Minister.

There's another matter that has been brought to my attention -- the Member is not here at the present time but I represented that area at one time and he did -- the Minister did stand up, I think it was over a year ago and made an announcement insofar as the sanatorium at Ninette was concerned. I don't know what's happening there, Mr. Chairman, but when he made the announcement he talked about a correctional institution for the Indian folks, and here again I want to make it abundantly clear that I'm all for the Indian people of this province and I want to see them succeed like all other citizens of this province, but because of the kind of facilities we have there, because of its location, and what have you, and because of the work that we have done and the co-operation we had with many doctors in a tremendously large area there, we talked about a care home for senior citizens. Is this, Mr. Chairman, gone by the wayside in the Town of Ninette which I think is very important to those people? Did the Minister make that announcement just over a year ago without consulting anyone out in that part of the Province of Manitoba? I am concerned about that as well.

I would like to also make mention of another experience, the counselor in one of the municipalities which I represent - this is dealing with a welfare case - and I, Mr. Chairman, want to make myself felt as though my comments are of a helpful nature to the Minister and not in a destructive way, but to assure him of the difficulties that he has, and it's up to him to decide whether he's being sincere about it or whether he is not. But from what I am given to understand he has many people working under him who are saying one thing, and he's coming out and saying another. I would just like to make mention of one particular situation where a member of a family who was on welfare and one of the sons of this family became of age and was seeking assistance and the counselor in question turned him down. He tried to get jobs because apparently this young fellow had been in some difficulty with the law and as a result of it was not able to get work. But the point, Mr. Chairman, I want to make is that this case came before the Appeal Board; they met in the Town of Notre Dame. Three members of that

(MR. EINARSON cont'd) Board drove from Brandon to Notre Dame; two drove from Portage to Notre Dame and one from Winnipeg to Notre Dame. And one of the things that struck me, Mr. Chairman, with great concern with the counselor being at the hearing, one of the members of this Board, and my colleague the Member for Pembina gave a classic example of a case this afternoon, and he did mention the names of some of the members on that board. And this is one of the things, Mr. Chairman, I think the Minister has a problem with. But during that hearing, Mr. Chairman, one of the members indicated to the counselor and to the hearing, that there's sufficient monies in this country to take care of everyone. I can't help but feel, Mr. Chairman, that is somewhat of an irresponsible statement. I don't have the facts documented, and maybe the Minister would like me to have that done but I'm not able to do it at the present time. I think I can take the work of my counselor and because of the predicament this young fellow had found himself over a year or two, another member of that Board accused this counselor of being responsible for the reason why this young fellow was in the difficult situation he found himself. And, Mr. Chairman, these are appointments made by this government, and the point I want to make, Sir, is that I think that when people are appointed to a Board they should have more responsible statements and more responsible contributions to make in the capacity in which they perform their duties. --(Interjection)-- The honourable member, he mentions the fact, from Inkster, there's enough to take care of everybody. Do I think there's enough to take care of everybody? He's asking me. Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member from Inkster is trying to drag out a debate that is strictly of a philosophical nature and not one of realism, and not one of realism at all. --(Interjection)-- I answered him, Sir.

This is the problem, Mr. Chairman, by which we and the people of this province find ourselves. Where do we draw the line when we talk about is there enough for everyone in the Province of Manitoba? There is enough for everyone, Mr. Chairman, if everyone who is capable of looking after himself and providing for himself that is capable.

Another area, Mr. Chairman, I'm wondering - because people are as they are and because the Minister of Health and Social Development has made comments since he became the Minister of that department, the kind of comments that have added to the encouragement of people trying to get something for nothing. Has he got anyone doing any investigation in the City of Winnipeg or any other city or any other area of the Province of Manitoba? And I can say to him, Sir, that when we were government - and the gentleman who was the Minister at that time did find out that there were families living in the City of Winnipeg, the wife claimed that her husband left her but to our amazement found out that he really hadn't left her, he was working up in say Thompson or Lynn Lake making a good salary and she was collecting welfare. I am wondering, Mr. Chairman, has the Minister found any cases to be like this, or similar to this kind?

As I said earlier, Mr. Chairman, I think the Minister of Health and Social Development has an extremely difficult portfolio to manage, but to manage it in the way that it is being done with the kind of philosophy - and I don't only blame him, I think every member on that side of the House has got to take the same responsibility - it's the kind of philosophy; and the same with the Member for Thompson, he's a part of that government and he must share that responsibility in the same light as the rest of his colleagues. While he may stand up in this House, and we witness an opposition within government, it's really amazing - and I can't help but wonder what the people of this province are thinking and wondering. While my colleague from Roblin indicated to the First Minister he felt sorry for him, I have somewhat of a different feeling, Mr. Chairman, I don't accept that attitude. I think that they were elected by the people to govern this province and I think they collectively have that responsibility. And I don't say that any one of them can segregate themselves from the rest of that party. I think they all have that responsibility collectively. And it's amazing to me, Mr. Chairman, that so many members on that side of the House have to rise and take up the time of what should be the Opposition to present their views and what have you to --(Interjection)--

So that we may hear from the Minister of Health and Social Development. --(Interjection) -- I hope, Mr. Chairman, that with the time that is left at the Minister's disposal that he will be able to give us some answers to the questions - and I think rightfully so, Mr. Chairman, - legitimate questions that have been posed from this side of the House, and I'm expressing sincere problems that I have been faced with in my constituency. Unfortunately the Minister wasn't in the House when I made mention of some of the people employed in his staff in the way

(MR. EINARSON cont'd) in which they conducted themselves - I know I went to him personally, he doesn't have it in writing for I had a problem and he had the thing cleared for me; I checked it out to find out later that he said it was negative. But I checked out from those people in my constituency who were concerned of this matter and said they never seen any one from the government to discuss this problem that I had taken to him. And to my disappointment, Mr. Chairman, I am left with no other alternative but to come to one conclusion, that some of the people who are employed within his department are so socialistically minded that they can do no wrong. So he really is not taking the matters seriously that are put before him. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hour being 9:00 o'clock, last hour every day is Private Members' Hour. Committee rise and report. Committee rise. Call in the Speaker please.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has directed me to report progress and asks leave to sit again.

IN SESSION

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. WILLIAM JENKINS (Logan): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose that the report of the Committee be received.

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

PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR - PRIVATE BILLS

MR. SPEAKER: Tuesday, first order of business on Private Members' Hour is private bills, second reading of private bills. Proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Inkster. The Honourable Member for Inkster - Bill No. 26.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN, Q. C. (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I ask the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Stand? (Agreed) So ordered. Proposed motion of the Honourable Member for St. Matthews. The Honourable Member for Minnedosa. Bill No. 33.

MR. DAVID R. BLAKE (Minnedosa): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have no reason to withhold passage of Bill 33, An Act to amend the Act to incorporate the Co-operative Credit Society of Manitoba Limited to committee stage; however I adjourned it last Tuesday as I was called away suddenly and didn't have time to make my few remarks at that time. But I just would like to add before the Bill goes to Committee that I am well aware of the service that the credit unions have provided to the various communities. I've had the privilege of working with them and competing with them in many areas in where I have served previously and I am well aware of the extension of their sphere of activities and their growth over the years and the valuable services they have provided to their members since their inception back in 1937. And I am well aware of the changes that they have undergone in the last number of years and the changes that have brought them to a near bank operation; and Bill 33 I know is intended to enlarge their powers and to enable them to continue to serve in a much greater capacity to the people of their community.

I would like to mention though at this time that with these increased powers that they are requesting also comes an increased responsibility; and as they become larger they come into the field of large corporations and in entering the field of the near banks or the trust companies operation that they will be faced with the same set of rules that large corporations are faced with; and I hope that they realize this and won't look for favours in the field of taxation and other areas where there may be some consideration given in the past in view of their service to their members.

I know that there will be some questions probably when the Bill gets into Committee that we may want some points clarified on, but as I say I have no hesitation in holding the Bill from passage to the Committee stage and in fact passing the Bill as it stands, because I realize the intent of it and I'm sure that it's designed to provide a greater service to the members of the credit unions and to the communities that they serve and there's no question about the service they have provided. But as I say my note of caution would be that this is a further step to creating a larger corporation out of the credit unions which were designed primarily to serve smaller communities - that it probably wasn't economical for possibly a charter bank or a trust company to establish in - and I hope that by becoming a larger corporation that they don't overlook the needs of the smaller communities. And the same responsibility goes with the

(MR. BLAKE cont'd) fact that if they become a large corporation and want to get in the financial field and compete with the rest of the organizations that are in there, that they will be faced I am sure with the same tax problems and the same rules and regulations that all the other financial institutions operate under. And I'm sure that they're well aware of this and have taken the step with due regard to the responsibilities that they assume by their increased powers. This is all I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, and I regret that I was called away last Tuesday and unable to make this before it came to a vote to pass it into Committee stage.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Matthews. He'll be closing debate.

MR. WALLY JOHANNSON (St. Matthews): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to thank the Honourable Member for Minnedosa for his comments. I don't pretend to be an expert on the credit union movement; I'm sure there are many in this House who know far more about it than I do and I think that those who are interested in the Bill will or can rely on the officers and the legal counsel of the Co-operative Credit Union Society at Committee stage to provide them with answers to any questions that they do have.

I'd just like to make a few comments in reply to some of the questions asked, some of the concerns raised by other members when they spoke on the Bill. I'd like to stress that this is a private members' bill, it's a private members' bill not a government bill and I am sponsoring the bill so that it may reach committee stage where you can question the officers of the Society on detail. I would like to also stress that the membership of the Society did approve these changes at their annual meeting on April 14th, so these are not simply changes recommended by the officers of the company, they are changes approved by the membership at their annual meeting this spring.

I had some misgivings about the bill when the Honourable Member for Roblin arose to express his fears about how this would affect the local credit unions. For a moment I had some misgivings about the bill when he expressed his concern about what happened to the Pool movement, the Wheat Pool movement. I also had some concern - and I thought it rather ironic though that his views on what happened to the Pool movement coincide almost exactly with the views of the assistant, the Executive Assistant to the Premier, who you're aware not only had his battles with Mr. Harkness but also had his battles with the Pool movement. --(Interjection) -- Pardon? Now the Honourable Member for - I don't think this bill will in any way affect the viability or the existence of the local credit unions, that is not the intent of the bill. The Honourable Member for Rhineland expressed some fears. He claimed that the bill, that my explanation of the bill really didn't convey what the bill was meant to do. He expressed some fears of a conspiracy; well I can assure him that there's no conspiracy. In my introduction to the bill I told you precisely what the bill was intended to achieve. The honourable member claimed that the bill gave power for the society to accept deposits from government. It doesn't. It gives power for the society to make loans to government or branches of government. He expressed fears about delegating provincial powers to Federal Government under deletion of -- well the concern there was with respect to the deletion of one of the sections of the bill -- and I can assure him that this doesn't involve any delegation of powers, it simply involves the Provincial Government allowing the credit union a bit more freedom, more flexibility.

The Honourable Member for Rhineland expressed concern that the bill would allow the Credit Society to become a partnership with banks. What the bill does is it gives permission within this Act for the Co-operative Credit Society to engage or to acquire shares in a banking enterprise. But the actual power to enter the banking field can only be conferred by the Federal Parliament and Federal legislation would have to be passed to allow this. This bill is simply permissive.

I also feel that the Honourable Member for Rhineland's fears about the deletion of Section 16, the section that deals with the disposition of surplus earnings, expresses a lack of trust in the credit union movement. I was very pleased with the words of the Honourable Member for Minnedosa which expressed a real trust in the members of the credit union movement. The Honourable Member for Rhineland doesn't seem to hold that same trust of the members of the Credit union movement. He seems to feel that they must be tied down by provincial legislation.

I might point out also that the by-laws of the Society do provide that reserve funds shall be maintained at not less than one and a half percent of the total loans and investments to the Society that are outstanding at the end of any fiscal year. This is allowable in the Income Tax

(MR. JOHANNSON cont'd) Act, the Federal Income Tax Act and it is, I understand a long standing practice of mortgage companies to have this sort of reserve.

The member also expressed concern that I didn't give more detail on the effect of the Federal Income Tax legislation upon the credit union movement. Well, I don't think that I'm really capable of doing it; I think that the honourable member would get far more information out of the counsel and the officers of the Society when they appear before the committee at committee stage. And also there is an intangible involved. I understand that the regulations under the Income Tax Act as they apply to the credit union movement haven't been published yet and this was the concern that was expressed to me.

I would just stress in conclusion that the government is not involved in any banking proposals of the credit union movement. If it does decide to become involved of course it would be answerable to the Legislature for this and at that time the Member for Rhineland would have full opportunity to attack the government in whatever manner he wishes.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Proposed motion of the Honourable for Assiniboia; the Honourable Member for Radisson. Bill No. 36. The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, actually the Honourable the Member for Radisson took the adjournment of this in order for us to have an opportunity of rechecking the bill as proposed by the Member for Assiniboia and for me as House Leader; and if it is agreed by the House I may indicate that we have no objections at all for Bill 36 being forwarded to Committee because actually it's a non-controversial bill. So if you would accept that, Mr. Speaker, and members, then we're prepared to have the Honourable Member for Assiniboia close debate or just forward it to the Committee.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Bill No. 37, the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia. The Honourable Member for Radisson again.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, again if the House is agreeable the Honourable Member for Radisson took the adjournment of this bill for the Attorney-General. Unfortunately he is absent this evening. If it meets --(Interjection)-- Yes. Yes, the Honourable Member for Radisson is absent this evening. The Attorney-General is here, and all I want, Mr. Speaker, if my honourable friends would just keep quiet for a moment, is the agreement of the House in the absence of the Honourable Member for Radisson for the Attorney-General to speak in his stead. That's all.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed? (Agreed) The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, the contents of this bill have been studied and it is noted that it is similar in intent to part of Bill No. 26 which still stands on the Order Paper. In effect it would make it possible for companies who had been incorporated under private Act of the Manitoba Legislature to make application for Federal incorporation under provisions of federal law and allow them to go extra-jurisdictionally or as it's called "trans-jurisdictionally".

Provisions of a bill to be brought forward later on that have been considered by my department, and that will be coming before the House shortly dealing with amendment to The Companies Act, will make provision among the particulars of that bill for an amendment to the existing Companies Act to make it possible for all companies who have been incorporated by private bill, private Act of this House to make such application. So we don't believe that the private Act being dealt with here under Bill No. 37, will be necessary, nor will the provisions, the bulk of the provisions of Bill No. 26 be necessary.

However we have no objection to this bill going to the Committee. However I hope that it won't be dealt with until I have introduced, and hopefully the House has accepted, amendments to The Companies Act which will obviate the necessity of a number of separate applications by way of private bill to do what this bill makes provision for.

So in short, Mr. Speaker, we have no objection to it being received and accepted by the House on second reading, subject to our being able later on to deal with all of these by the amendment to The Companies Act, which will hopefully pass this session.

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

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie. The Honourable Member for St. Vital. Bill No. 19.

MR. WALDING: Could we have this matter stand, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed? (Agreed)

On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre. The Honourable Member for Riel. Bill No. 30.

MR. SHERMAN: Stand, please, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed? (Agreed)

On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Rupertsland. The Honourable Member for Radisson. Bill No. 34.

MR. PAULLEY: Stand?

MR. SPEAKER: (Stand)

On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Rupertsland. The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose. Bill No. 41.

MR. PETER ADAM (Ste. Rose): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have perused this bill, Private Member's Bill, carefully and I find that I have to align myself with our little creatures of the wild who inhabit this earth with us. I also share the concern of the Member for Lakeside in his remarks on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I think to allow hunting on Sunday would have very dire ramifications in my opinion and it would be horrendous for our game. We find, Mr. Speaker, that because of the fact that over the past many years man has taken away the natural habitat of our wildlife that they are being constantly pushed further and further back and they have quite a difficulty of surviving under these conditions, let alone all the hunting that takes its toll. We have seen many species near extinction, and some have gone into extinction year after year. The man animal, which I believe is the scourge of the earth, has done his work well.

Not so long ago man used to kill his fellow man for food. In fact it's only in recent years they have discovered restaurants where the fare was human beings. When this was no longer allowed of course man turned his attention to wildlife. Some people will just kill just about anything, whether it's for useful purposes, for food, but some people will just shoot at anything. There was a lady today I heard on the radio that over the weekend they had gone out fishing and she was complaining that where they were there was fish laying all over the river in the sun not being used, just caught and thrown on the banks to rot. I think this is terrible, Mr. Speaker, the way people have debased themselves as far as our fellow creatures are concerned.

I know that there are some people in my constituency that have asked me to support hunting on Sunday, and I will probably lose some support by opposing this bill, but I cannot in all clear conscience support this type of a bill. I think it would be just terrible to see what would happen if this was wide open, unless we closed off three or four other days in the week to allow the animals a little bit of rest, I think it would be just terrible.

I support the hunting only to protect the animals themselves in case of shortage of food where the numbers increase because we have taken away their natural habitat, and where the numbers have increased to a point where there is not enough food to supply the existing herd. Only then do I think it is proper to shoot animals. And that's the only thing that I would support is - I think that we are prosecuting our wildlife for a few lousy bucks. This is my opinion. We put on trophy hunting; we encourage people to shoot the best specimens and leave the poorer specimens to keep the species going. Under no circumstances could I support this resolution.

On the other side of the coin I think that because of economics in our country I feel that the average worker living in the city does not have a fair shake as far as hunting is concerned. Many people cannot afford to leave their work, take off two or three days to go out hunting, and I think that this has become a rich man's game, and as I say, Mr. Speaker, I believe it's a rich man's game because the people who come and shoot here are primarily Americans. We've seen what happened in Saskatchewan last year when I believe some of the States closed down on hunting of deer there. Last year they invaded Saskatchewan by the hundreds and hundreds, and I think this is just terrible. There's no way that I can support this piece of legislation. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. J. R. FERGUSON (Gladstone): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill No. 41, and I can certainly agree with the Member for Rupertsland, with his thoughts. I can't agree with the bill, but I certainly can go along with the idea that probably in the area that he's talking about, north

(MR. FERGUSON cont'd.) of the 53rd parallel, that there may be a little bit of pressure, or the fact that people are coming into this area, they're hunting, and I think primarily his bringing in this bill was to do with the hunting of big game animals, and possibly there may not be this much fault to find with it.

In my own particular area we are dealing with an altogether different type of hunting. We're dealing with big game; we're dealing with upland game birds, and we're dealing with migratory game birds. Consequently in all cases you're dealing with private landholdings; you're dealing with the fact that there's going to be an influx of hunting on the weekends that just can't be tolerated in the rural areas, in the settled areas. You're dealing with the fact that, especially with the migratory game birds, that they definitely have got to have a rest period, and you can say well it could be a Tuesday or a Wednesday whatever the case may be, but I don't think that this argument holds up at all because of the fact that in most cases the hunting pressure that is coming in our area is coming from the City of Winnipeg, or from Brandon, or from Camp Shilo, as the case may be, but these people are quite welcome to come and hunt but there's no way that ducks and geese have got to have a little bit of time to settle down. I have hunted all my life and I know that even one day gives them a chance to settle down in lots of cases in the big grass marsh. If a flock of geese leaves the marsh there may be ten cars follow it and regardless of what the hunting laws may be, there'll be two or three of those occupants of the cars will try to flush the birds, scare them, and they don't get any opportunity to settle down to feed and, as I said again, here again we have a resource that is to be harvested.

I can't altogether go along with the Member for Ste. Rose that the fact is here we have an organization by the name of Ducks Unlimited that are putting considerable funds into the raising of wild fowl in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta and they are putting their money into it; they are supporting a cause, and I think that they're getting very good value for their money. In the majority of cases we're finding that the birds in Manitoba are not mature until the early part of November and I don't feel that the game birds especially, or the upland game birds, will stand the pressure that could be brought to bear if you're going to have seven-day hunting. The fact also remains that most of the land south of the 53rd parallel is controlled by private individuals. They will not tolerate the fact that someone is coming fooling out there on Sunday morning, and shooting at the birds, and shooting at the deer, and whatever the case may be. They may be holding a picnic, have a family gathering, or whatever the case may be, but it just won't fit.

And I do go along with the Member from Rupertsland - he's not here tonight - but I do go along with the fact that what he has in mind is big game hunting north of the 53rd parallel and I wouldn't altogether go along and disagree with him. If this is what the people want up there, if this is what the guides want, and it will be tolerated, I certainly have no objection to it whatever. But I do feel that in this part of Manitoba that all you're going to do is establish again a feeling amongst the people that do own the land that they're not going to be bothered by somebody coming in there at 6:00 o'clock, or 5:00 o'clock, on Sunday morning and saying, can we hunt out in your field. It's just not going to work.

Again we have the Member from Rupertsland saying that fishing was allowed, which is an altogether different thing. When you're out on the rivers fishing you're not disturbing anyone. You are enjoying yourself, if you want to catch a fish fine, if you want to drive down the river with your boat and keep your line in the boat it's still quite all right. But again, Mr. Speaker, I don't think that south of the 53rd parallel that there is no way that I feel that I could support this bill and I'm quite sure that in my area which is a very heavily hunted area that it would do anything except stir up the animosity of the landholders against the general public. And I think that the status quo as it stands would certainly do much more than this bill would, and consequently, Mr. Speaker, I see no way that I could support this bill. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. PHILIP M. PETURSSON (Wellington): Mr. Speaker, I would like to join in briefly on this debate because I, like the last speaker, am opposed to Sunday hunting, particularly in the southern part of the province. There seems to be an inclination on the part of some to show far too much consideration to hunters, extend to them privileges that they themselves may seek, and ignore the well-being of other people who are not hunting over whose properties they go. I was talking to a man up in the constituency of the honourable member who proposes the bill on more than one occasion - he has a farm up there. He is strongly opposed to the opening up of game hunting or any kind of hunting on Sundays. And he was pointing out to me that that whole stretch of lake between Highway No. 59 and Lake Winnipeg is pretty much cottage country where

(MR. PETURSSON cont'd.) people come to enjoy the pleasures of being down there in the lake and in an area that is very near to being, in some places, being wilderness. If that part of the country for instance is to be invaded by hunters then the peace and quiet that many of the people enjoy on a weekend will be destroyed.

This past weekend as an instance at the place known as Sunset Beach, there were men, or boys, or young adults, out with rifles shooting squirrels and that was in a built-up area, built-up summer area.

This man suggested to me further - he says that hunting should not only be banned in such areas as that but the regulations against hunting in the Grand Beach Park area should be extended all the way on down to Beaconia or Patricia Beach, as an indication of what beaches are there if there should be any here who are not familiar with that part of the lake, there's Patricia Beach, there's Beaconia, there's Island Lake, there's Alamel's Cove, there's Lakeshore Heights, the Balsam Bay, Sunset Beach and Grand Marais. There are two roads that run almost parallel to one another, the road that follows the shoreline connecting these beaches, and Highway No. 59, and they are separated by about two miles. There's a regulation I understand that is already written into legislation even now that there be no firing of guns nearer to a highway than one mile, or that no firing of guns within a mile of a highway. These roads, Highway No. 59 and the road that connects these summer resorts, are separated by two miles and this man said jokingly, he said that if any man were to stand at a point one mile from the Highway No. 59 he would also be approximately a mile from the other road and the only direction he could shoot would be straight up into the air.

Hunters have not always shown themselves to be too considerate of other people. And I have had some experience of that. I have a cottage just across the section line from Sunset Beach, I have a --(Interjection)-- Pardon? Plutocrat, is right. It's a beautiful cottage. --(Interjection)-- I like it. It's nothing elaborate, but I like it. I have a small 12 foot aluminum boat and I leave the thing out there turned over and chained to a tree. It's been stolen twice, but I've managed to recover it each time, but it not only has been stolen but gunshot holes bullets have been fired into that canoe, into that boat rather, of course calling for repairs. Guns have also been fired whether by design or by accident into a tank that I have on a stand to collect rainwater, and also in a drum standing on the ground, also to collect rain water. --(Interjection)-- I can't hear him. How far is what? I'm sorry I can't hear you. --(Interjection)-- Oh, yes! So you have suffered the same difficulties. And I take it for granted that these men going around with guns must have been hunters. What other reason would there be walking around through the woods with a gun. That adds to my lack of sympathy for them. On one occasion my cottage was broken into and among other things a pair of hip waders were taken away, and I imagine that they would have - whoever took them would have been wanting to use them in tramping through the marshes retrieving ducks or geese, or any other water game that they may have shot down.

These are some of the things which encourage me to wish to vote against the bill and have it turned back, or turned down, or defeated entirely and just written off. I have little sympathy for hunters until the time comes that they can discipline themselves and show that they are worthy of being given the kind of consideration that there is being asked for in this bill.

There's a humorous record played at one time - oh, probably it still is about - well there were a number of humorous songs and one of them was about hunters and the description of the bag that he managed to get on one hunting expedition. It consisted of seven hunters, two game wardens and a cow, and that's approximately what many hunters are capable of doing not recognizing game when they see it, or of mistaking any movement among the trees or reeds for something that they should shoot at. They kill one another, and I wouldn't want to be accessory to that kind of mayhem, you might call it, or that kind of murder. They call it fun; I find for myself personally little fun in it, and I know that there are many others who take the same position.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I will not be long. I will just take a few minutes. While I have not any strong convictions one way or the other, I do support the bill. I think it does have some - I believe it has some merit. Perhaps not in southern Manitoba, but it certainly has in northern Manitoba. The Member for Ste. Rose talked about not too many Manitobans hunting up north, and he may be correct, because not too many perhaps can afford to fly in, or take the time to go by train, or travel for a couple of days because it is expensive. While on the other hand we do find if you talk to people in The Pas, you talk to many people that are hunting moose

(MR. PATRICK cont'd.) or elk further north, you'll find that almost 90 percent of the hunters in that area are from out of the province or from the United States. So in my opinion this would perhaps to some extent make it more favourable for our local people to take the advantage of the time.

The second point I was somewhat concerned with, the honourable member that just spoke, he said that many hunters, or some hunters were, I think he said many hunters were inconsiderate. I disagree with that completely. I've talked to some people while on the committee hearings in respect to - that we travelled this last winter, and I talked to some people and I asked where did the problem come from the hunters, and the answers that I got were - many of them were local, they were not people travelling from the city. But as far as the game itself is concerned, I would say that the members from the Game and Fish Association, from the Wildlife Associations, from the Skeet Shoot Clubs, I think have done more, have done much more for preservation of wildlife animals, of wildlife as such, than perhaps any government has done in Canada. I think they have done a tremendous amount for conservation; they have fought continually for habitat; they have called for protection of certain species, and eventually the governments would take action and prevent such species. These are the people that are concerned. They do take an active part and they're concerned for the wildlife and the wild animals as well. I know that the Ducks Unlimited have been doing a tremendous job as well as many of their wildlife associations. So I disagree that the hunters are to blame for much of the damages done. It's probably done by some young people going out the first time on a hunt --(Interjection)--

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I said by some young people and --(Interjection)-- I don't believe that anyone 50 years of age would shoot at a boat that's tied up to a tree, not even a moveable object. But I know that in the State of South Dakota, where there is probably the greatest influx of hunters in the whole United States, into that State around Aberdeen which is the capital pheasant country, and they have Sunday hunting, and I've talked to many farmers and they don't object to Sunday hunting at all. However, I will say that under no conditions any hunter can enter anyone's property because it's private property, and this should be observed. I think every hunter should not go on anyone's property without a permission. So I think this would perhaps answer many of the objections that we have, or hear, let anyone indiscriminately enter somebody's property and hunts, I don't think even if the property is not fenced, he should not go in that property unless he gets permission. I know that some of the members, some of the members will say that the person doesn't live there, he lives perhaps three or four or five miles away from the property that he farms in conjunction with the other land that he's got. Well my answer to him would be then he has to travel ten miles, or five, and request permission before he enters any property.

So as I say, Mr. Speaker, I have not any strong convictions one or the other way, however, I do favour it. I think it has merit in northern Manitoba. Furthermore, I would like to see the bill go to Law Amendments Committee where we can hear perhaps the Manitoba Beef Producers, the Farm Union people, and as well as many - the Manitoba Federation, or the members from the Game and Fish Associations as well and I'm sure that we would be able to get some good information from these people. I repeat again, Mr. Speaker, that the members of many of our life, wildlife associations, and I would say that perhaps the majority of the hunters belong to such associations, really take conservation seriously, take habitat very seriously, take certain species, and as well are most concerned about other men's property, the farmers' property. You will always find I suppose a rotten apple in the box but this is the same with everything else. But, Mr. Speaker, it would be interesting to see the bill go into Law Amendments where we can hear representations.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West. The Honourable Member for Ste. Rose on a question.

MR. ADAM: I was wondering, Mr. Speaker, if the last Member for Assiniboia had any statistics to prove that the young people are poorer hunters than older people.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia. Order.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I can answer it. Perhaps the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose wasn't doing his homework and wasn't listening while I was speaking. I said there may be some - there may be some young people, there may be some older people, that do abuse the rights and privileges but when we were on the committee, municipal committee this winter I made it a point of asking as many people as I could at every hearing where the problem arises,

(MR. PATRICK cont'd.) where do the hunters come from. And I know in northern Manitoba and in, I believe, in the eastern part of Manitoba, I was told that it wasn't people from the City of Winnipeg and I was told that it was locally where the people got on the farms and broke the fences, so I hope that answers the honourable member's question.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, I'll be very brief. I think though a few remarks are in order, particularly in view of the comments of the Member from Assiniboia who wasn't quite clear on his main point. He mentioned various hunting organizations but he gave the impression that hunters generally were in favour of a change in the law that would permit Sunday hunting, at least that is what I took from his remarks. Mr. Speaker, I think it would be very appropriate then at this stage to put on the record the experience and the decisions of the Manitoba Wildlife Federation in this connection.

The Manitoba Wildlife Federation has a membership of 15,000 hunters, about 8,000 of the members live in the City of Winnipeg, so it's roughly a 50/50 split. Now, Mr. Speaker, this resolution in a variety of forms has been coming to the annual meeting of the Manitoba Wildlife Federation for a number of years. It has been placed before the membership for approval in many forms and guises in a variety of ways substituting various days for Sunday as a day of rest and so on. But, Mr. Speaker, I am told that not only has the objection by the hunters themselves to this proposal been consistent, but that it has grown over the years, and a recent vote at an annual meeting was 150 against the resolution to have Sunday hunting, 10 for. So I think that on the - if we are to consider the hunters who are members of these organizations in Manitoba, who are very interested in game conservation, in proper game harvesting regulations, we must consider the views that have been expressed annually by the Manitoba Wildlife Federation and they are very definitely against Sunday hunting and the objection and the voting against this resolution has grown over the years rather than decrease. So, Mr. Speaker, I think if we are to consider the feelings and the views of hunters in Manitoba, then we can accept this as indicative of the fact that they are not in favour of a bill which would permit hunting on Sunday in Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker. --(Interjection)-- Well I've only had ten minutes, Steve. No, I . . . take the floor.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Would the member permit a question? Would he agree that almost less than one percent of the vote of all the hunters that voted, wouldn't be a good representation as to, you know, if they were in favour or not, of the 15,000.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, I was told by a spokesman of the Manitoba Wildlife Federation that they were 99 percent against Sunday hunting.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Chairman, I am happy to echo the remarks of the Member from Brandon West. I happen to be one of those, and the Honourable Member from Assiniboia himself is one who loves to indulge in the vocation of hunting. --(Interjection)-- I'm hearing representations from behind, Mr. Speaker. But you know there's a strange ambivalence on the part of those who hunt and who fish and who enjoy nature and exploit nature. The strange idiosyncrasy of man, that although they love to harvest and to hunt it's somehow akin to the kindred native spirit to hunt. Nevertheless there is a respect and appreciation that is deep and abiding in respect to the bounty that we inherit. And I concur with the remarks that the Honourable Member from Assiniboia made when he indicated that many of those who enjoy the outdoors and hunt form the basis for the greatest of the efforts to conserve our wildlife heritage. And there are many in this province and many throughout North America who hunt, who exercise their privileges with care. And it's true, it's a paradox and it's an idiosyncrasy of man and how many hunters, how many hunters are thrilled by the bugle of the geese as they head north and they look forward with anticipation to the chance when they can go hunting those same birds. And yet they cherish and love those birds and it is - it is an idiosyncrasy that some who do not participate in the outdoors, who do not cherish the outdoors fail to understand. --(Interjection)-- Yes, some of them say they still go hunting. Some go hunting for other things besides four legged deer in the outdoors.

But, Mr. Speaker, those people who belong to the Wildlife Federation, the Game and Fish Association - and I'm one of them - believe in conservation. There are some in this province

(MR. MACKLING cont'd.) who have spent many many hours, many hundreds of dollars in trying to develop much greater habitat, trying to produce new species of outdoor wild-fowl. For example I'm hearing some rather obscene remarks from behind and I would like to just jokingly ignore them, Mr. Speaker, but I will turn in wrath upon them if they persist.

There are people, Mr. Speaker, who have spent countless hours in developing a return to wildfowl that we haven't seen in this province in many years, and I refer to the Wild Gobblers Association. As a matter of fact the sound of those wild gobblers is much greater music to the ears of real conservationists than the gobbling I hear from behind me. And I'll tell you, Mr. Speaker, that the efforts that are made by genuine sportsmen to maintain, preserve and increase the stock of wildlife in our province is a tribute to the finest sportsmen that we have. There is a genuine concern for the maintenance of our wildlife heritage and those who are really concerned about it have indicated their attitude in votes that have been taken at Game and Fish Association meetings for many many years, and they are not - as indicated by the Honourable Member from Assiniboia - in favour of an extension of hunting to Sunday. There's always been a minority of sportsmen who have advocated this, but overwhelmingly a majority of sportsmen represented in organized game and fish associations have opposed extension of hunting into Sunday and they subscribe to the views of the honourable members who have spoken that the animals and the wildfowl need a rest. If the hunting pressure is maintained the wildfowl will not rest in Manitoba, they will head as quickly as they can to the safety of the south. And the same thing can be true, the same thing can be said of other species of wildlife, if they can't find any rest during the week then they are going to be harassed to the point where they will not be able to be hunted with the same degree of surety as they have been in the past.

So --(Interjection)-- Well, there's the Honourable Member for Morris talking about the taxpayers. Well the Honourable Member from Morris will have his opportunity to participate in this debate and shoot with his little pipsqueek gun at any of the taxpayers that he wants. But he is a conservationist I'm sure, and will certainly echo the sentiments of those of us who really do not believe that it is in the interests of those who believe in conservation of our wildlife heritage that there should be any extension of hunting.

Now the argument that is addressed by the Honourable Member from Rupertsland on this question is rather intriguing. He says after all it can be confined to the remote areas where, you know, the hunting pressure is not nearly as great and people go long distances to hunt and so on; and they would have to return to the cities and towns and so on, and have to go back again if they don't get their wildlife harvested in accordance with the season that's appropriate to them. Well, that may be very attractive but even in some of these so-called remote areas the sportsmen who belong to sports associations have rejected those arguments in the past; and really it would be the thin edge of a wedge on the part of those who would then want this same extension of hunting throughout the whole of the province.

So for all of these reasons, Mr. Speaker, and the issue has been debated at great length; has been pointed out in various sporting associations, I, too, am opposed to any extension of hunting as indicated in the proposed bill.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. BILTON: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Arthur, that debate be adjourned.

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

MR. PAULLEY: I wonder, Mr. Speaker, whether it would be convenient to call it 10:00 o'clock.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed? (Agreed) The hour being 10:00 o'clock, the hour of adjournment having arrived the House is accordingly adjourned and will stand adjourned until 2:30 Wednesday afternoon.