



Legislative Assembly Of Manitoba

DEBATES and PROCEEDINGS

Speaker

The Honourable A. W. Harrison



Vol. VII No. 12 8:00 p.m. Tuesday, February 27, 1962. 5th Session, 26th Legislature

Printed by R. S. Evans, Queen's Printer for the Province of Manitoba, Winnipeg

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
8:00 P.M. Tuesday, February 27, 1962

MR. SPEAKER: The question before the House, the motion proposed by the honourable member for Osborne. The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. D. L. CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, I am in a very interesting position for myself on this occasion and a very happy one for the other members of the House, because for the first time in my membership in this House, I am under the constraint of speaking for only forty minutes, so I shall dispense with the majority of the compliments that are customary at this time in order to save some time and not burden you with those compliments that have been pretty well exhausted up-to-date anyway. However, I would not want to let the occasion pass without extending my good wishes to the two new ministers. I think I do not need to say very much in connection with them; I need to make only one statement in order to have the House realize that they are outstanding men, that is, they both come from the Portage la Prairie district.

One other compliment that I would be inclined to extend, however, would be to the Honourable Member for Logan. I am sorry that he is not in the House at the moment but I think that one portion of his speech should be commented on. He was the one man that I have heard up-to-date -- I may have missed someone -- who took the occasion to make a major part of his speech deal with the European Common Market and implications that such a market, particularly if Britain enters it, may have for Canada and for Manitoba. I don't agree with all of his conclusions; I don't agree with the pessimistic statements with which he introduced the subject by saying that our trade pattern would be shattered, by saying that in the early days of such an arrangement Manitoba would suffer greatly, I don't think that those are quite the case, but I do agree with his conclusion where, after examining the situation rather carefully and critically, he came to the conclusion that after all this would be in the interest of Manitoba to see Britain join the Common Market and for Canada to take advantage of that situation, rather than to see that disadvantage thereby, and I certainly did agree with his closing remarks regarding the necessity of management and labour getting and keeping closer together because we would have to, under those circumstances, realize that we were entering into a new field of competition. I shall say no more on this question at the moment because, according to the Speech from the Throne, we are going to have an opportunity to debate it later on. Of course we would have that in any case. But I notice that the Speech from the Throne says that "the policy of this Government will be brought before this House". Well now that's interesting, and I'll be glad to hear the policy of this Government with regard to it, but let me point out in passing, Mr. Speaker, the policy of the Government that matters in this connection, rather than this one, is the Federal Government, and up-to-date I think that we can't take very great encouragement from the attitude that the Federal Government has shown. I hope that that situation will be remedied as time goes on, but up-to-date we do not have very much to go on.

And then, like my Leader, I do not intend to say a great deal about agriculture at the present time, leaving my remarks for the time when the estimates are before the House, but I certainly agree with the Minister of Agriculture, when he emphasized last evening that the cost price squeeze is what is the number one problem of the farmer today. That's right. I think that's correct. What we need is more dollars in the farmer's pocket. Now there is agreement I think on that in all sections of the House, but there was certainly serious disagreement as to how that was to be accomplished and how we were going to get parity rather than charity, and so a lot of us, I am sure, listened yesterday afternoon and last evening to the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture, and I must say that although he talked for a considerable length of time, I was unable to discern the policy of this government in connection with agriculture. I found out a lot of things that he didn't agree with, at great length, but I didn't find out much about the things that this government proposes to do for agriculture. Yes, it's true that we did hear a lot about palliatives; we did hear a lot about stop-gap assistance and there was quite a bit made of the fact that Ottawa has given acreage payments and that it has managed to sell some grain, that it's done this and that, and things about what this government has done on credit and with regard to crop insurance and these things, but these do not touch the cost price squeeze

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd) that the Minister of Agriculture admits -- and I certainly agree with him -- is the main problem, and what are we doing about that? The Minister spent a lot of time explaining certain things that wouldn't work; told us where he was not aware of the definitions; he doesn't know what parity means, parity price, but he never did get around to telling us what the policy of this government is toward implementing the things that this government said it was going to do, and that's what we would like to know.

A few years ago when my friends and I had the privilege of occupying the Treasury benches, it was the common practice for the then Leader of the Opposition and his supporters to stand in their place and berate the government of the day on the fact that they had an insufficient agricultural policy and that they continued to maintain that the Federal Government had the responsibility and the authority in the fields that were of most concern to agriculture.

They used to talk long and loudly on that subject, and they said that when they got in there things were going to be different; they were going to do something for agriculture and not just leave it to the Federal Government or somebody else. They blamed us for always trying to shuck our responsibilities off on to the Federal Government. Well, Mr. Speaker, it wasn't very long after the present First Minister and his supporters occupied the Treasury benches until they were saying exactly the same thing. If you will recall the Speech from the Throne in 1959, immediately after they had taken office they said quite blandly that the main fields of responsibility and most important affairs of markets and prices lay with the Federal Government. Exactly what we had been telling them all the time and which they criticized greatly. But, even then they weren't content at that and they kept on telling us that they were going to take some steps, beyond the extension of credit and crop insurance and research and these matters, they were going to do something about this cost price squeeze, and I would like to put on the record one or two of those statements by the spokesman for the present government, because this is the heart of the matter. We all agree that there's a cost price squeeze; the question is what are we going to do about it? The first quotation that I would like to call to the Honourable Member's mind was one by the Honourable the First Minister when he was -- this is the transcript of his statement made on March 16, 1959 when he made a statement before the Orders of the Day here, I believe it was, to tell us about the things that were going to be done for agriculture. Here is a direct quotation from his statement: "The factors bearing on the cost price squeeze in our agricultural economy may well require protracted investigation and debate if they are to be clearly identified and properly eliminated. But the effects of the cost price squeeze on the farmer's well-being crystallized as they are in declining net farm income cannot be left to protracted discussion". The cost price squeeze was recognized then and in '59 it couldn't be left to protracted discussions. It was admitted by this government they were going to do something about it. Even from the budget speech of the Honourable the First Minister just a year ago -- less than a year ago, in 1961, the Honourable the First Minister again admits -- and here's a direct quote from his speech: "But we must emphasize our concern for the unsatisfactory state of net farm income. While production has held well net farm income continues to lag behind the net income of the economy as a whole". Then, missing a couple of sentences that do not change the sense; "However, we must continue to press those measures which will give to the farmer a more substantial share in our economic benefits".

Well now, this is one, two, three, going on the fourth year, and these are the statements that we continue to receive with regard to agriculture, and we continue to have the admission that the cost price squeeze is the problem that they're going to do something about it. Surely it's been identified now. What is being done about it and what are the results that have been obtained? I've asked those questions regularly; I ask them once again because we do not see any concrete evidence of this government having a policy at all or of them being able to get anything from the Federal Government except the palliatives that I have already mentioned. Then, once again, a statement by the First Minister: "A greater measure of equality between agriculture and other sectors of the economy is our constant goal". Greater measure of equality -- well that's a fine sentiment; that's a fine policy; that's a great goal, but it that's their goal, Mr. Speaker, they haven't been netting the puck very often or they haven't shot very many baskets or they haven't made many touchdowns. They're a long way from the goal and the situation is not only as before, it's worse and what is proposed? As the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture told us yesterday I failed to hear the solutions that they have in mind. Where are the

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd) . . . programs? Mr. Speaker, where are the programs that we've been hearing about?

Mr. Speaker, the Speech from the Throne promises a measure in connection with major water control and conservation policies. Well, I'll be glad to see the measure. I think it's a good idea to have it brought before the House for review because these major water control and conservation projects are important. I think they should be discussed here. We'll be anxious to take part in them and I think still, as I have said many times in this House that conservation is still more important, the more important of the two, though flood control is very important also, and a good debate on that subject will certainly be of advantage. In that debate I shall follow the example of some others who have spoken here, and try and get to the bottom of this difference of opinion between the federal member and the present administration with regard to the Portage la Prairie Diversion, and I think maybe that, like my honourable friend from Gladstone, I shall have something to say on that question.

And then, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that you will not be astonished at all if I say to the House that I am going to mention the subject of debt. There's been some other people talking about that within the last few days. Debt and taxes, I think it's a subject that we should keep before this House and I am sorry only that the time limit compels me to be very brief in my references at this time, but there again we'll have a little opportunity to go into a more full discussion later on. We have to face now the dismal prospect that I predicted a year and a half ago, two years ago, that we now have a debt of more than half a billion dollars. Well that's something for the Province of Manitoba. More than a half a billion and much more to come, and certainly one thing we have got to give the Honourable the First Minister credit for is that he's not a bit backward about mentioning that there is more to come. He seemed to glory in it when he was talking about it last evening. We have to face the fact that our per capita debt now is four times what it was when this government went into office. And then, because the First Minister is fond of trying to blame the former government for the fact that this debt is so large, because he said there were so many things left undone, I would like to correct a couple of the impressions he has tried to leave, mainly the one where he would like to have the people believe that he was advocating larger expenditures in the years when we were in office. I don't very often accuse the Honourable the First Minister of being like the Russians. It isn't an imputation that I would make about many of his actions, but in this one he does resemble some of their authority because they, too, try to re-write history, and that's what the Honourable the First Minister tries to do when he suggests that he's been a long-time advocate of spending programs such as those in which he's engaged now, and I want to call to mind, as I have done on other occasions -- because I believe this should be put on the record -- some of the facts of the position that the Honourable the First Minister took when he was sitting in the position of Leader of the Opposition here. He pretends recently that he was against our debt retirement program. Actually he endorsed it, and the record can be given as March 25, 1955, he made it quite plain that he and his party were wholeheartedly behind the debt retirement program that we had at that time, as late as 1955. He pretends that he's been advocating a larger road program for some years. The fact is that for years on end while he sat on this side of the House he said not one word about a larger road program being needed, and in 1953 he actually suggested a million dollar decrease in the road program which at that time was \$16 million in round figures. And that also can be produced and I'll be happy to give the quotation at any time. I'd rather not tonight because of the fact that I am talking against the time limit. He would like us to believe with regard to debt that he had been urging greater expenditures even though they might cause debt back in those years. That is not correct, and I'd like to read in that connection very briefly from his quotation in that regard. Oh no, I mustn't take the time to read this, Mr. Speaker, because this is the one that I've already put on the record a couple of times, where he gave the definition of debt, and it's on the record already, where he was warning us against debt. Warning us against debt when it was at a \$158 million level or something of that kind, and ending up with the fact that -- "there's a funny thing about debt, Mr. Speaker; no matter what you call it, you still have to pay it back, and I say that we should regard this steady increase in the gross total of the debt of this province with some concern". And he actually, Mr. Speaker, he actually moved a resolution, an amendment to the budget speech, a want of confidence in our administration based on the rise in debt, which is quite a remarkable situation in light of the present. Here are the legislative

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd) journals for the year 1952, and on page 185 we find that an amendment was moved by Mr. Roblin, and here's the purport of the amendment: "This House regrets that the government has failed to propose measures adequate to reverse our adverse population trend and has failed to display that economy, economy in internal administration that they preach to the municipalities while at the same time are increasing the provincial debt of Manitoba to an all time high of \$175 million as estimated by the Provincial Treasurer as of March 31, 1953". And he had to go a year ahead, he had to take the present estimates -- that year's estimates -- add them to the present debt in order to get \$175 million and he moved a vote of want of confidence in our government based on that situation. And that's the man who's been trying to pretend that he was advocating that we should borrow more in order to keep up with the works. And that's the man, that's the man, who has led this government to the position of where our total debt is now well over \$500 million, and he can't blame it on the past administration so far as failing to realize the necessity for spending, because he was urging us to hold that down. When we're talking about debt and taxes don't forget, Mr. Speaker -- I'm sure none of us will forget and it was mentioned by the Honourable the Member for Ethelbert Plains this afternoon -- that there are four other large-spending spheres of government in this debt and taxation picture now as well: the Federal Government, the municipalities, Metro and the school boards, and they're all increasing -- not every individual of them, but in total -- their debt, their taxes and their spending. So we have good reason, I think, Mr. Speaker, to pay some attention to it.

Now a favorite phrase of my honourable friend, the Leader of the Government -- and I'm sorry that he didn't stay in the House because I know that some of these things would interest him greatly. The next one that I'm going to mention would amuse him because he likes to talk about some particular ones of -- and I'm sure he means especially the Honourable Member for Carillon and myself -- being dragged, kicking and screaming, into the second half of the 20th century. Well now, I think that would make a good cartoon. We should get Kuch to picture the boy scout dragging the Honourable Member for Carillon and me, kicking and screaming, into the second half of the 20th century. But I've read to you what he was advocating right at the beginning of the second half of the twentieth century. That's what he was saying -- our debt was too high; he was worried about it, and he moved a want of confidence motion. But, I'll tell you somebody who has a right to kick and scream -- they're starting to do it, and they'll be doing it more pretty soon -- and that's the taxpayer. That's the fellow who should be kicking and screaming, and many of them are, and especially the home owner and the real estate owner -- the property owner in general. And, Mr. Speaker, one thing that I've been saying up to date is something that I'm sure you all say is pretty characteristic of me, but one thing you don't expect me to do is go on and advocate some still further expenditure for the government, but I prophesy this: that it is becoming the fact that we will have to -- and I say "we" meaning the province and the Federal Government -- we'll have to move quickly and definitely to relieve the property owner, especially the home owner, from these onerous taxes. What's the one that we should take off of him? Education, because we've already lifted through policies of the present government, which they copied from the former government -- we've already lifted welfare off the home owner directly to quite an extent -- of course he still pays as a provincial taxpayer -- and we've lifted health off of him to quite an extent as far as his municipal taxes are concerned, but I think this other social service, education, will have to be lifted off of him and transferred to the provincial government and they in turn will have to get still greater assistance from the federal government in regard to education.

Now this subject of debt and taxes is characteristic, you will say, with me, but in this case we've got some new allies. Talk about people joining other parties these times. You would expect that the Honourable Member for Rhineland and myself would be talking about debt and taxes. But who would have ever guessed that members of the New Democratic Party are starting to talk about it too? The people who for years have stood up in this House and have said -- and my honourable friend, my desk mate, although not my colleague -- my desk mate to the left here, has always been honest enough to say quite frankly "I don't care about the debt; I don't care about the taxes". He said it quite frankly and although the other members of the party have not said it so frankly, their actions have said it, if their words didn't; their resolutions, their whole philosophy has said it. But what about this year? The Honourable Member for Kildonan, right off the bat on his speech, he started saying that the taxes were too high.

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd) He was concerned about it. And that was deflection enough, I should think. But lo and behold on the TV, on a very interesting interview, didn't the Honourable the Leader, in outlining his conception of the duties of an opposition, he gave three main points that the opposition should perform and what do you think he started off with of all things -- the financial structure -- safeguard the financial structure and the financial position of the province. Well, wonders will never cease I guess because here we have with these allies also talking about debt and taxes. But it's time we did, it's time we did, Mr. Speaker, because the load is getting very onerous.

Then, because I'm sure you are beginning to think . . . (Interjection) -- Yes, let posterity pay for it -- that's a good argument. And I would be all in favour of that if we could be sure we pushed it all along to posterity but I imagine if posterity acts like we have acted, as the posterity of earlier generations, that posterity will think up enough ways of spending money for themselves, without having our debts to look after as well. It's still a nice theory just the same.

And then, like the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture, I don't want the honourable members, Mr. Speaker, to think that I'm thin-skinned. He made it plain last night that he wasn't, and I must say that I don't like to be thought to be thin-skinned either, but once in a while I do feel it incumbent upon me to say a word in reply to those people who continue to try to say to this group that when you were in office you didn't do anything. So I'm going to once again place a few of those things on the record that this government did. There's a pretty long list and I'm not going to try to get over all of them because I would like to set an example of keeping within my time limit.

I suggest to this government that they have done nothing up to date and will do nothing, judging by present appearances, that will in any way be comparable to the Rural Activation Program. I might say more about that if I have time later on, but in the meantime I would say that that was the most imaginative scheme; that was the most progressive scheme; that was the most forward-looking scheme, that was ever undertaken in this province up to date, and it qualifies for that same description so far as Canada as a whole is concerned. And when you're talking about agriculture I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that that did more directly for agriculture, both economically and socially, than all the measures that my honourable friends have put in during the time that they're here. And it hasn't cost Manitoba very much money at all because the people have used the electricity and they have made great use of it and they carry practically the whole load.

And then, my honourable friend the First Minister -- I'm sorry that he isn't here because I would like to say this in his presence -- sometimes he gives us just a wee modicum of credit for something that happened, but when he's been expounding upon his power grid that he talks about, he hasn't mentioned the fact that we are the people who first mentioned the power grid across this country; we're the people who first suggested there should be a program in that regard; and we suggested it to the federal government. And now it's a case of the federal government coming back and suggesting it to the province, but we suggested it to them some years ago and it is a good idea, but this is not new and the stories that my honourable friend has been telling about it are not original because this has been discussed by us and recommended by us to the federal government some years ago. Then as to something that we did -- what about the power reorganization in the Greater Winnipeg and Manitoba area in general? Following on the heels of rural electrification the power reorganization by which we bought out the private company was another major stroke and it took a lot of money and it was done against the opposition of one of the newspapers of this province, the determined opposition, opposition to the extent that the first vote on it was defeated, but the program went through, not as good a one for the City of Winnipeg as it would have been if the famous Plan B had been accepted, but a reorganization, nevertheless, which has worked very well and which paved the way for these other matters that have come later. And when somebody mentioned the other day the fact that the inter-connections with Ontario and Saskatchewan had been of such great benefit, we did that, too, as part of the power reorganization.

What about the liquor laws? What about the coarse grains legislation? Mr. Speaker, if there were ever three controversial issues to come before this Legislature in my time, there were three of them -- power reorganization, the liquor laws and the coarse grains. Some of you were here at that time and you remember how controversial they were, but we didn't sit on

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd) . . . them just because they were controversial, we did them.

And what about federal-provincial financial arrangements? Who started those? The Province of Manitoba. Who led the way forward on federal-provincial fiscal arrangements? We did, the Province of Manitoba, and who led the way backwards? Who started the trail backward? The federal government, Mr. Diefenbaker's government, and this government knuckled under to it.

Then because you will think, Mr. Speaker, I am sure, that I think only of the material things, that I am concerned only about the economic and the political affairs. I want to say to you that's not the case and I have proven it over the years and our party has proven it because I believe, I honestly believe, that the matters of the very greatest importance that we deal with here, that the Province of Manitoba or any other Legislature or Parliament deals with, the very greatest things are those that concern the rights of the individual and the freedom of the people and assuring that the laws that they pass and the policies that they endorse and the enforcement of the laws and the putting into effect of those policies are fair to everybody and administered in that way. Because I believe that. What did we do in that field? And these aren't material perhaps, they haven't got the economic connotations of these other things I'm mentioning, but they're important and we did them and in the most of them we led the way in Canada.

What about the re-distribution. There was something that was done that not many provinces -- no province has tackled in the way we did, and I'm not suggesting that it's perfect yet, but we made a start and we ironed out a lot of the inequities. What about the independent commission to draw the boundary lines of constituencies? Metro copied that -- the legislation here accepted our suggestion that they copy that.

What about the rights to sue the Crown? The divine right of kings had been held to protect government and governmental emanations for years here and a lot of people were pretty frightened when we said that we were going to do away with that legislation. It was a major step. We were the first people in Canada to do it -- giving the individual the right to sue the Crown and its emanations. What about the provision that we made for a permanent speaker, Mr. Speaker? That's forward-looking legislation and a forward-looking policy in another way, and I'd like to have the opportunity to say a little bit more about that, because the Honourable the Member for Roblin seems to be sort of challenging us to talk about that and some people have said here that they think that you should be the first permanent speaker, and I'd like, and I ask anybody to ask me the question when we get to the estimates, and I'll be glad to discuss it, how it is that the First Minister, by his action, deprived you of the opportunity to have a right to claim that position, Mr. Speaker. And I'd like to discuss that and I'll be glad to discuss that when we come to the estimates.

And now, Mr. Speaker, I've come to the end of my time and I'm very, very happy to live within the rules in this as in other regards. I thank the honourable members for their attention. I will have something to say on the estimates later on.

MR. L. DESJARDINS (ST BONIFACE) Mr. Speaker, during the last two weeks most of the members rising to speak congratulated you on the way you handled your very difficult job. I was one of them and I was most sincere, but, Sir, yesterday evening I was sorry to see the way in which either the Minister of Agriculture and the Leader of this House, or both, chose to break the rules that they themselves had insisted should be changed just a year ago. Sir, they have placed you in a very embarrassing position and that is why we refer to them so often about their dictatorial ways. I think this is another good example -- (Interjection) -- I beg your pardon? Did he want to make a speech? Well, he usually knows it all. I thought he was going to.

Sir, last week I made a speech -- I talked about the government; I talked about my views on socialism, liberal-minded people. I also gave some of my dreams, some of the things that I thought should be incorporated on the platform of all liberal-minded people. I did speak about the lack of leadership of the Leader of this House. I gave examples but I did not make any speech -- I didn't intend it to be a speech on aid to private schools. But we all know that this is quite a controversial subject and I did give an example of lack of leadership in that field and it was more or less classified by the newspaper as a statement on aid to private schools. Now I would like very much to be able to quote from Hansard -- last night's speech of the Honourable the First Minister, but unfortunately Hansard isn't here. So I would like to read this short article on today's Free Press. "Premier Duff Roblin Monday commended the Liberal Party

(Mr. Desjardins, cont'd.) . . . for its stands on government aid to separate schools. It coincided he said, exactly with his own position. Mr. Roblin read the statement adopted at the Liberal Party's leadership convention last spring which called for the party to be impartial on the issue" -- and so on. He finishes, "The Premier was replying to an attack made Friday by Larry Desjardins, Liberal, St. Boniface. Mr. Roblin said that he was distressed by what I took to be a rather uncharitable criticism of the Progressive Conservative Party and myself. He also wanted to know what my Party would do if it were in power. Well, Sir, he won't have much news for his diary today because I don't intend to congratulate him. He doesn't appreciate it in any way. He's not used to it. He can't see that you can criticize a man one day and then admire him when he does something that you think is right. He's not used to that. I hope that I can keep on to be able to judge things like that -- criticize when it's time to and acknowledge the good points of other people. I should maybe congratulate him because at least he did talk a little bit about this question that he had evaded for so long but it was only to beg to be left alone; only to cry; only to ask for charity. Poor little fellow Lord Fauntleroy; these big meanies from this side of the House. Why didn't they leave him alone? He just wanted to play his own horn. He'd like to know what the Liberal Party would do if they were in power. Well, the Liberal Party is not in power and I'm not the Leader of the Liberal Party. But I can say this -- I can say that if I was the Leader of any party in power that I certainly would not accept, and especially ask, for one part of a report of a royal commission and then take the parts that are politically, and could be profitable politically, rush into a program before an election, and then later when this other point came out to say, you will know the policy of the government in due course. Three years ago and we're waiting for due course. That's the man that's going ahead. I would say that if I was the Leader of the party that was in power, we would bring this matter in caucus. We would study it and then we would act to bring some recommendation on this report. We might say this is right -- we will do it; this is wrong -- we won't do it; this partly right -- all right; or we will not do anything for two years, but we'd say something. I am not trying to force him into doing something he doesn't want to do; I just want him to give us leadership. The Honourable Member for Assiniboia said this today that -- what is it again -- that I should wash the dust of political science from my eyes. Well, if that is leadership, I'd like to know what he thinks about this leadership again.

Now, Sir, it is true, it is true that at the leadership convention there was a motion, somebody said, that the Liberal Association, the Liberal Party, should not take a stand on this. It certainly was true because I moved the motion myself, Sir. Yes, I did say that the Liberal Association, the Liberal Party, didn't have to tell Roblin what to do. I did also acknowledge the fact that the New Party Association didn't have to take a stand on this; that the Conservative Party didn't have to take a stand on this. I did say that and I repeat it. But the government -- that's a different thing. The government -- the man chose this job and now he can't do anything about it. He doesn't want to do anything about it. He's asking for charity. He's not talking about charity for those people that have been seeing their rights denied them for years. He's not talking about that. He wants charity until he's ready to move to Ottawa and leave the mess for somebody else. That's the kind of a leader he is. Yes, no party has to take a stand on this but a government has to take a stand on this. If the Royal Commission paid by the government is asked to bring in a report, the report should not be acknowledged -- it should not be ignored especially when the Leader himself in a speech, in the Throne Speech, said that we will tell you in due course. That is lack of courage; that is lack of leadership on his part and on the part of the Minister of Health -- the Minister of Education who stands up and tells us that he will tell us his policy on education. When is he going to tell us? Isn't there a policy for everybody? A certain group doesn't count apparently. Oh, don't talk about this. This is touchy. Don't talk about this; you're not here for that. Let us brag; let us say all kinds of things about ourselves but don't say the things that embarrass us. Let's get together on this. That is their attitude. Well they won't shut me up, Sir, not like that. And I certainly would not -- (Interjection) -- What was that? Was there any other smart remark from the Attorney-General? He's good at that. Another political phooey that talks and when he's quoted, he can't do anything about it. -- (Interjection) -- Sir, I would not -- if he wants to make a speech I'll let him get up and I'll get up after, Sir.

MR. LYON: You'll get yours in due course, don't worry.

MR. DESJARDINS: I'll get mine in due course. We'll see who gets theirs in due course, you'll see. I would not have made any official, that is true, but I would not have made promises like the Leader of this House did, and I certainly would not have secretly blamed the Liberal Party for something they could do. They won't play ball with me; they'll attack me. That was his responsibility. I would have felt if I was a leader of a party that was in power when this happened -- I would have felt that it was cruel to keep a large portion of our population in suspense for three years. The Premier accused me of being inflammatory because I deplored his lack of leadership in this and in other matters. I guess he doesn't remember the one speech that I made on this aid to private schools, when I stood up and said that I was speaking to every member of this House. I wasn't inflammatory that day; I said that I wanted to speak as an independent. I spoke to my colleagues as well as anybody else in this House. I told them where I stood; I told them why I stood like that. And whenever I talk about the question itself, not on something else, not giving that as a lack of leadership, not asking for questions, I will be restrained and I will talk in the same way. How long can a person wait when you're asking questions and they just look down and they ignore you? Am I supposed to represent the people in my constituency, the people that want an answer to that? Do you think nobody wants an answer to that? Is that true? Does he know? He also stated, the Honourable the First Minister, he also stated that they said, that some of them, I think he mentioned Mr. O'Sullivan, said: "Don't get Duff mad. Don't scold Duff. Let the boy scout alone". Well, he said this because he knows that the Premier cannot take any criticism -- that he cannot. If you criticize him too long and too often, he'll stand up and do something stupid the same as when he said: "We'll go it alone", when our boys here try to kid him about this big problem of helping us -- saving us from this flood, he will do it alone. Something that he'll regret; something that will cost the citizens of Manitoba many dollars. And that's why they're afraid. And I'll admit that I've got my fingers crossed now because he's liable to get mad tomorrow and say something that he would regret; something that would hurt the people that I represent; something that would make innocent people suffer. But this has gone far enough. If he wants to say he's not going to tell the people, the public -- "if they don't leave us alone, watch out it will be dangerous for you". Let him face the responsibility. If he wants to queer this thing; if he wants to be unfair -- and his colleague who's smiling at me right now -- let them take the full responsibility but it won't be my fault because I stood here and I asked him to do something. I asked him to show leadership on something that is very vital to me and my people -- very much. And furthermore that we believe is honest and we believe that it belongs to us. Yes, we are afraid to contradict the Honourable the Leader of this House. We are afraid of his irresponsibility and his vindictiveness. But, Sir, I don't think that his conscience would permit him to switch this blame so easy -- and I hope he has a conscience. He is intelligent enough, in fact he is very intelligent, and he knows, and he knows, he should know that I am only doing my duty by fighting for what I believe, by fighting for what all the members of this House know that it is the right of the people that I represent. He tried the same thing when I talked about Metro. He tried to ridicule me. I wasn't fit to represent St. Boniface. He thought that he'd bully me and I'd crawl in my hole. Well, I won't, I can't and I'm not going to do it. In a few minutes I'm going to read a few things that I said on Metro and we will see then who was wrong -- who was doing the wrong thing.

Sir, I said many times that I recognize my responsibility; that I also recognize the responsibility of the Premier. I realize that it is hard, that it is a difficult job, but nobody is forcing him to stay there. We will play ball with him. Sure, we will help him. We do. But we get tired of this crowing and his beating his chest and blowing his horn all the time and telling us how wonderful he is. He tells me that I don't know how to conduct myself here. I can be a gentleman. I can be tolerant with "Buck" and the Minister of Health, of Labour, Public Works, the Member from Brandon, the Member from Seven Oaks -- no not you Red, not you. But I can treat them the same way; I can treat them the same way. If they want to stand up -- and those two, this little pipsqueak and his boss, if they want to get up and say because they're good speakers and tell us how wonderful they are and throw sarcasm at us, I'll do the same thing. They can choose their weapon, they can declare any time they want to fight, I can take my gloves off and fight any time they want. I can play their game . . . and I will. -- (Interjection) What was that? Let Wally take care of yours; I'll take care of those on this side.

(Mr. Desjardins, cont'd.) . . .

Sir, this has been pretty tough language, and I meant every word I said. But I feel that any person should not have any hate in his heart, that nobody should feel that he is bigger than his fellowman; and I feel that we should help each other; that we should forgive each other and try to work together. Now if this government can be a little less arrogant we will respect them more; we will play ball with them, if it is going to help the people of Manitoba. Duff has many qualities. As I said, he is very intelligent; he was given much talent and he can do an awful lot for this province. But he has to take a different attitude. I'm ready to bury the hatchet. I'm ready to go across when he comes back and shake hands with him and start all over again -- but if he wants to do it. Well there's a funny one now. There's a bump on a log; there's a real bump on a log that can't even say he thinks that is really funny. What are you going to do when you're lost? You can't ask them what you're going to do, this party's not here. Are you going to tell us about your policy on education? Are you? Well don't laugh too much; don't be so sarcastic either, and listen to these words. Let him drive home. Duff's not here. You won't get a cabinet post either. Just take your time.

Sir, now I'd like to discuss this question of Metro. You can rest easier. I'll be much milder in this thing. It is a known fact that I opposed Metro. I felt that it wasn't at all necessary and that certain boards such as the Public Utility Board could be given much more power and could do the job. I felt that the Metropolitan Zoning Commission, the transit system, the Greater Winnipeg Water District, Sanitary District, could do the job, and on this Sir -- and I'd like to read from Hansard of February 25, 1960: "Let me first of all warn this House that because other areas might enjoy some measure of success with a system of Metro, this is not a true guarantee that it will work the same for Greater Winnipeg. We all realize that some improvement, some changes were inevitable and I would say that we have three alternatives; total amalgamation, a system of Metro as could be brought in by this Act for the setting up of an inter-municipal committee that would administer the services of inter-municipal character. The citizens of St. Boniface, Mr. Speaker, believe that the third alternative is the best and the most democratic one. It would have jurisdiction over the services decided by this government. It would be a council composed of representatives of different municipalities. It would be proportional representation. Each branch, each service, sanitary district, water district would have a director. It could have a chairman of course, it would have a chairman, elected, chosen or named by the government. The council could be under the Municipal Utility Board and the Municipal Commissioner would be the final arbitrator. Mr. Speaker, I will not elaborate on the different services or phase of government that would come under this council, and so on. I acknowledge then, that for example, St. Boniface should share in the cost of keeping Assiniboine Park zoo; East Kildonan and other municipalities should share on the cost of the Disraeli bridge". Then, I did mention, I did talk about the views of the City of Winnipeg. I said that I felt that they were representing Winnipeg and if they felt that total amalgamation was better for Winnipeg that they should try to get total amalgamation. I did say those things. And on the matter of referendum, I notice that the Attorney-General speaking for a part of Greater Winnipeg at the time, and also the Honourable Member from River Heights said that not one single person in their district wanted a referendum, and I said that the government should ask for a referendum also. I agree with my new leader before imposing such a radical change especially when the government intends to have this Metro pass money by-laws without going to the ratepayers.

Now I said a lot of things on Metro, Sir, and I was opposed to it but I also said this -- this is why, Mr. Chairman, I again warn that this Bill is not fair to St. Boniface and in the long run will hurt it. I hope, I sincerely hope, that I will be proven wrong, and when Bill 62 is passed, I and all the constituents of St. Boniface, I am sure, will do our best to make it work. We do not intend to be rebels. It is our privilege, it is our right, however, and our duty to oppose it if our conscience so dictates. Until the Bill is read a third time and passed, this is all we have tried to do. And I say here, I would like to go on record as saying, Mr. Chairman, that I oppose this Bill in principle. I'm afraid that it will lead to total amalgamation, which in this case would be detrimental to my constituency. I would like to go on record as saying that when -- that only when this Bill is passed -- I will do everything in my power to help make it a success. I accept this democratic way of doing things. I'm the one that's not supposed to be reasonable, and you know how much I fought against this Bill of Metro. And didn't I keep my

(Mr. Desjardins, cont'd.) promise? Did you ever hear me say one word against Metro? Didn't the people of St. Boniface--everybody was surprised. St. Boniface was trying to give Metro a fair chance. Ask the Chairman what he thinks. Did we give him a fair chance? I was the first one to say: "all right, this is it". It's not the fault of those people that were elected. They didn't create Metro, and I felt that the City of Winnipeg and that Mayor Juba should give them the same courtesy. That he should go ahead and say to them; "all right, we'll give you a chance", and if he wasn't satisfied with that, his fight was right here to this government, to the members of this House, not to those people, not to Metro. I haven't changed my mind; I still think that I was right when I opposed Metro. Now it's a different thing, because I don't think that they should be kicked. We've got Metro and we've got to give it a chance. I think that it is our duty to watch that Metro doesn't get too much power, but I think that we should give it a chance--help it get along without hurting them. Not do with this lack of leadership again. Right now they don't know what they're going to do. Well they never know what they're going to do; They've got to wait for the great leader to tell them. But he doesn't know what he wants to do. He has the tiger by the tail and he's waiting to see what's going to happen to be on the safe side. Well he doesn't have to be afraid. We won't play politics on this. This is something too important. This is something that concerns the people of Manitoba, a great portion of the people of Manitoba, and he will remember, and he will notice that most people of this House are not too bad. We can bail him out sometimes, if he is just a little more humble, and if he treats every man in this House like having a right to speak, like having a little bit of brains--not as much as him but having the right to speak and speaking for his constituents.

MR. FRED GROVES (St. Vital): Mr. Speaker, at the outset I would like to extend to you the usual courtesy of members that rise for the first time in the Throne Speech debate, to express the wish that you will be with us for many years to come, and perhaps we may yet see you lay claim to being the first permanent Speaker of this Legislature. I would like also although I have done so before in a more intimate way than one can do in this House, extend my congratulations to the two new Ministers and to welcome the Honourable, the Acting Minister of Municipal Affairs back to his duties from a serious illness. I would also like to congratulate the Honourable Member from Churchill for the excellent job which he did in outlining the achievements of the government and in outlining to the members of this House the problems of the vast northern area of this province which he represents. I would like, finally, to congratulate the Honourable Member from Osborne for the job which he did in moving the Throne Speech, and I was glad to hear the honourable member put his oar in for his profession, because, Mr. Speaker, in the the very near future I believe, this House is going to have to look at the whole field of the healing art as they are today in the Province of Manitoba. All of these are going to have to bear the close scrutiny of the members of this House and the University of Manitoba are going to have to take a much more active part and show us much more leadership than they have in the past in settling this problem that almost perennially clutters up--if that's the right word to use--the debates of this House. And even this year, Mr. Speaker, if we believe what we read in the papers, that the dental profession in this province are going to use the Legislation that was given to them by this Legislature two years ago, to close up places of business which people are patronizing for repairs and work on dentures. If they're going to use this power to close these places of business up and leave many thousands of people of this province with no place to go for this type of service, then something is radically wrong, and I hope, Mr. Speaker, that we can resolve not only this problem but the many other problems in connection with the healing arts that have been plaguing us for these many years.

I would also like to welcome the Honourable Member for Osborne--and I'm sorry that he's not in his seat--to the club, and also the Honourable Member from Rhineland. I'm sure that they both know what I mean--and if there are any other members who don't, I'll be glad to explain to them after we rise this evening.

I have listened these past two years with a great deal of interest to what the Honourable Member from St. Boniface has had to say on the subject of aid to private schools, I believe, and I'm sure that all of the members of this House believe that he is sincere in the things that he said and that he really believes that he is doing the best that he can for the people that he represents. But I wonder if it has ever occurred to the Honourable Member from St. Boniface that there are people in this House, there are many thousands of people in this province, who don't have the

(Mr. Groves, cont'd.) definite views, either one way or the other, that the Honourable Member from St. Boniface has, and I wonder if under those circumstances, the honourable member may, in the long run, be doing his cause more harm than good.

As a member of this House from a suburban area in Winnipeg I feel that, and I will, devote most of my remarks this evening to the subject of Metro. I would like to read, first of all, two paragraphs from the report and recommendations of the Greater Winnipeg Investigation Commission. Starting on page 76. "In 1883 the provincial government introduced legislation providing for the compulsory division of the province into counties. The whole province was divided into 26 counties each being of convenient size and having a common interest. Each county was to include up to 7 municipalities and its council was to consist of the Reeves of municipalities and Mayors of towns and cities within its perimeter. The council was to arrange for inter-municipal works and was empowered to levy on member municipalities in accordance with their assessment, and it was to appoint county officials including a secretary-treasurer, auditor and assessor. This new county system aroused widespread opposition throughout the province. Municipal councils felt that they constituted an unnecessary level of government and that the province was too sparsely settled to support an elaborate organization of government composed of municipalities, counties and the provincial government. Twenty-nine municipalities presented petitions to the Legislature at the opening of its 1884 session, requesting abolition of the county councils and the Legislature complied".

Then, under the heading of inter-municipal organization--"The provincial government made one further attempt to arrange for a level of government which would be responsible for inter-municipal affairs. For judicial purposes the province had been divided in 1881 into three judicial districts. Following the abolition of the county councils in 1884 an attempt was made to have the judicial districts assume responsibility for some of their functions. Provision was made again for the appointment of officials in each district, including a secretary-treasurer, auditor, assessor, engineer and health officer. The judicial district boards aroused even more widespread hostility than did the county councils. Opposition was based on the same ground--the boards were considered to be too remote from the people, too elaborate and too expensive a machinery of government. Fifty-five municipal petitions presented at the 1885 session of the legislature, demanded their abolition and this was accomplished in the following year. With the abolition of the judicial district boards in 1886 no further attempt was made in Manitoba to group municipalities into a level of government intermediate between the provincial government and individual municipalities".

These criticisms, Mr. Speaker, of 1883 and '84 and '85, are the same criticisms that we are hearing today about metropolitan government in Greater Winnipeg. And when one listens to the complaints and the criticisms of the area municipalities and their councils, and they aroused opposition of the general public in the Greater Winnipeg area, we think perhaps that history may be in the process of repeating itself insofar as this level of government is concerned. And if this is so we might have been better off in the beginning to leave the matter alone.

A few days ago I reread my copy of the Metro Act, and when I was through reading it I still thought that it was a pretty good Act. Some concept of Metro--some inter-municipal authority in the Greater Winnipeg area is necessary. Those things that I disagreed with at the time that the Metro Bill was passed I still disagree with; but if I had to do it again I would still vote for the Metro Bill with the same reservation. But, on the other hand, if I had known then, if I had had any idea what a schmozzle Metro would be in within a year, primarily because of the irresponsibility--Irresponsibility I think, Mr. Speaker, is not the right word--perhaps arrogance would be better of Metro officials, Metro council and the downright stupidity of its public relations people, I would not have voted for this Bill, even although at the time and now, I think that this was a good Act. What has gone wrong, Mr. Speaker? Why has Metro, with the possible exception of the 1950 flood, become one of the most unpopular and most feared things in the Greater Winnipeg area? The animosity that the Metro council has attracted to itself in so short a time is a terrible thing to behold. Last year I was privileged, on four different occasions, to represent the province at functions in the Greater Winnipeg area, which were also attended by the Mayor of Winnipeg representing that city. It was a sight to behold, Mr. Speaker, that every time Mr. Mayor got on his feet and had some barb to direct in the direction of Metro he received almost a standing ovation. This, Mr. Speaker, in addition to the many other things that we

(Mr. Groves, cont'd.) have seen, is a clear indication of Metro's gross unpopularity in this area.

I have made an analysis of what I consider Metro's unpopularity--if that's the word--and I break it down as follows: The Metro Public Relations Department is responsible for 50%; Metro officials are responsible, in my opinion, for 25%; the Metro Council for 23% and other causes 2%. In this day of the image public relations has a very important part to play in practically all of the departments of our life, and in every organization, and this is no doubt why, Mr. Speaker, one of the first acts of Mr. Bonnycastle after he was appointed Chairman of Metro, appointed a press officer, or a public relations officer. Political parties, labour unions, large industrial organizations--even the smallest of social clubs these days deem it necessary and important to have someone act on their behalf in the public relations field. If the mass of material that we receive in the course of a year from many of these organizations, is any indication of the effect which these people are having, then I think that they are doing an admirable job. But why can't Metro function public relationswise? One of the reasons, Mr. Speaker, is that the Metro public relations officer is one of these people that's always right. He tries to pound the merits and the good points of Metro into peoples heads. He won't listen; he won't reason; he won't tolerate criticism because he has it imbedded in his mind that his baby Metro can do no wrong. One can well imagine, Mr. Speaker, the reaction--in fact we can see it--the reaction to this public relations department in places where it is doing Metro a great deal of harm. I understand on good authority--and I'm not prepared to name this person tonight because I haven't heard this from his own lips--that a high official of the City of Winnipeg feels not only that the Metro public relations department has insulted his office, but has insulted him as a person. What a tremendous boost, Mr. Speaker, this type of thing is doing for the image of Metro in the eyes of the residents of Greater Winnipeg. I question the wisdom, Mr. Speaker, of Metro spending taxpayers' money on full page advertisements in the daily papers to tell the general public what good fellows they are. What an outcry there would be if our provincial government were to take full page advertisements in the daily and weekly papers of this province to tell the story to the people of Manitoba, out of the consolidated revenue fund, what a good job they were doing.

I, Mr. Speaker, like the Honourable Member from Rhineland, question the wisdom of Mr. Bonnycastle's banquet. I wasn't there but those of you who were no doubt heard of all the great things that Metro has done and all the great things that they propose to do; but you didn't hear of Metro's great failure--and that is their failure to sell their program to the people of the metropolitan area. Metro's public relations department is cranking out press releases that are scaring the dickens out of the people of this area. Six hundred and twenty-one million dollar subway; 21st century designed bridges and road systems; astronomical amounts of contemplated expenditures in all their fields of responsibility. These things, Mr. Speaker, many of which aren't planned for the immediate future--they're long-range projects, many of which will never maybe be accomplished. Why, then, fill the news columns of our daily papers with these grandiose schemes at a time when the public is watching and carefully testing this new level of government. These blunders of public relations have done more than anything else in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, to destroy the confidence of many municipal people and many thousands of the general public in this area.

I understand, Mr. Speaker, that they are now manufacturing Metrecal in liquid form as a nose spray for fat heads and I would suggest that the Metro Council try some of this in their public relations department.

And what, have the Metro officials done to endear themselves and their Council to the general public? The charge has been laid, and I agree with it, that Metro has gone too far and too fast; and I lay a large share of the blame for this on the Metro officials. Most of these men were hired within a short time of the advent of Metro, and at a time when Metro had only the organizational functions that were given them under the Act. And let us remember, Mr. Speaker, that we gave to the Metro Council a four-year term in order to give them sufficient time to take over these services gradually and not to take them over holus bolus and scare the wits out of the people in the area. However, these high-salaried people were hired and they had to have something to do; and in order for them to have something to do they had to take over more services; and within a few months--(interjection)--I'm going to come to that--I already did deal

(Mr. Groves, cont'd.) with that--and within a few months, Mr. Speaker, they had taken over almost all of the services which were listed in the Metro Act. This speed with which Metro took over these services in itself frightened even the most optimistic of Metro's supporters. We had in the early stages of Metro, the spectacle of the Executive Director going about making speeches on policy, creating a clear and unmistakable image of who was running the show on Main Street, and thank goodness, Mr. Speaker, somebody had the foresight to stop this. And to the high officials of Metro, of this new level of government, to these high officials this new level of government is like a new toy--an opportunity to try out on something brand new their theories of government, management, administration and control, and these men, like many of their counterparts in other levels of government in this country, have to be told in no uncertain terms that it's John Q. Public that pays the shot and to whom, in the final analysis, we must all account. And if Metro Council, Mr. Speaker, isn't prepared to do this, then it's our responsibility as members of this House, to see that the message gets through. How many Metro councillors, Mr. Speaker, were here last year when their bill was going through committee? Not one, unless there was one of them whom I may not have known sitting in the back of the room. But the hierarchy were here. Mr. Bonnycastle was here; Mr. Boles was here; Mr. Bubbis was here; they were all here, making their deals, doing their lobbying, for what they wanted from this legislature. This approach, Mr. Speaker, won't work and it hasn't worked. Metro has got to receive some leadership and I repeat again what I have said on earlier occasions--they need the type of leadership that is sensitive to the interests of the taxpayers--

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): Tell your leader--tell your leader.

MR. GROVES: a leader who must account, in the final analysis, for his actions and for his stewardship at the polls. In this respect, the present Metro Chairman, despite his acknowledged abilities, is at a very serious disadvantage. Members in this debate have mentioned persons making political capital out of criticism of Metro. They mentioned no names but I think I know--and I'm not afraid to mention who I think they were referring to--and they were thinking of the Mayor of the City of Winnipeg, and whether he's making political capital or not, Mr. Speaker, and although at the moment I don't subscribe to his views on total amalgamation, he's doing a good job of warning the people of the Greater Winnipeg area of the dangers of this new level of government and its conduct to date.

In respect to the Metro Council's share of responsibility for this bad publicity that has practically led to the failure of Metro, I am sorry that in this instance I must pick on one councillor, mainly because he seems to be the only one that has much to say, and I do so, Mr. Speaker--and I want to emphasize this--I use this gentleman's words only to illustrate my charge that the Metro Council itself has not done much to obtain from the area municipalities of this Greater Winnipeg, nor from the general public in this area, the co-operation and support which they want, and indeed, Mr. Speaker, which they need in order to make this thing work.

Mr. Speaker, we must keep in mind that this concept of Metro, in addition to being important, is new, and when we're breaking new ground, particularly where so many people are involved, we have to tread carefully and slowly. Let's look at the record, and again I want to emphasize that I'm using Councillor Wolfe's words as an example because his were easy to track down.--(interjection)--In what connection?

MR. PAULLEY: You were going to name somebody and you never named him.

MR. GROVES: Oh, yes, I'm sorry. This, however, doesn't excuse the other Metro councillors who, although on a lesser and more quiet scale, are equally guilty. This brings to mind, Mr. Speaker, a picture which I saw on the front page of a Winnipeg newspaper last summer, of Councillor Fisher in front of the Winnipeg City Hall, with his arms folded, boldly proclaiming that the City of Winnipeg would build a City Hall on that location only over his dead body. In March of 1961, in a speech to the Winnipeg Schoolmasters' Club, Councillor Wolfe accused the Honourable Member from Lakeside of "ox-cart thinking" in his approach to Metro, and of making political capital at the expense of Greater Winnipeg.

MR. CAMPBELL: not the only one.

MR. GROVES: The Honourable Member from Lakeside is entitled and has the right to his opinions on Metro, and to somebody like the honourable member, who holds such strong views on the place which the municipalities hold in this province, it can be expected that he would not

(Mr. Groves, cont'd.) take too lightly to this new level of government, but we respect his opinions and so do a great many other people in the Greater Winnipeg area, and accusing him of ox-cart thinking in his approach to Metro won't do much to help the cause of Metro's image in the public eye.

This month Mr. Wolfe charged the Premier of the province with being politically irresponsible. He stated that the Premier would not implement the Blake-Goldenberg report, that he would pacify the Greater Winnipeg mayors, and that he would break under pressure, and that Metro was not given moral or financial support by its parents, the province. He further criticized, at the same time, Winnipeg aldermen, for scurrilous and incorrect charges. He accused the municipalities of blaming Metro for tax increases; he has criticized Mayor Juba and other city officials; and perhaps in some of these instances he was right, but how much good has he done for the cause in which he has been so vocal in his support? Mr. Speaker, Metro people have, in my opinion, botched the job of trying to bring order out of chaos in Greater Winnipeg. They have failed to sell their program to the people, and if enough of these people that Mr. Bonnycastle accused of being Social Credit supporters--and I say this with apology to the Honourable Member from Rhineland because I know the charge is not true--but if enough of these people get enough signatures on their petition then the people of this area might yet get a chance at Metro through the ballot box. And the tragedy of it all, Mr. Speaker, is that Metro is trying to pawn off on the provincial government, under the guise of lack of financial help, the responsibility for their own weaknesses. We in this House have a responsibility to see that this thing works, and we may, Mr. Speaker, have to do some major surgery but we have to at this session, and the Throne Speech tells us that we're going to have an opportunity to make whatever changes are necessary, unpalatable as they may appear to the Metro higher brass, to restore harmony and good relations between Metro and the area municipalities and to assure the people in this area that this octopus--as it was called by a supporter of mine at a recent meeting--will not be allowed to ride roughshod over their rights.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. PAULLEY: I wonder, Mr. Speaker, whether that is proper. The Liberal Party has had a spokesman this evening; the Conservatives had; and I was wondering whether or not, in the order of precedence in this House, whether we should not however, I have no objection to my honourable friend speaking.

MR. SPEAKER: I base my thoughts on the fact that the Honourable Member for La Verendrye was standing when the Honourable Member for St. Vital was--

..... Continued on next page.

MR. STAN ROBERTS (La Verendrye): Thank you, Mr. Speaker -- it's quite true that the Leader of the NDP has had several opportunities to speak tonight and did not take them. I rose to speak when the Honourable Member from St. Vital rose and tried to get the floor at that time. However, he has introduced an entirely new subject and one that's very interesting, I am sure, to us all. -- (Interjection) -- Well, yes, but there are a lot of irrelevant things brought in during the Speech from the Throne debate.

I would like to read back to the Honourable Member from St. Vital, some words of wisdom delivered by his Leader on February 22nd referring to this particular subject. He says, "It may be" - this is the Premier of Manitoba speaking on February 22nd -- "It may be rather naive of me to say this, but some of the issues, perhaps I may say, some of the issues that we discuss here really are not political issues in the sense in which some of us sometimes approach them -- they're provincial issues, and our job is to rise above the temptation to take the quick trick, to rise above the temptation that makes the quick advantage or the quick come-back, or be one man up as we see in some circles in connection with Metro. It's a test of character to see whether sometimes we can remember that we are here in the interests of the people of our province and not in the interests of our parties and these issues -- some of which are of great importance, will be put before you at this occasion."

I might point out to the Honourable Member from St. Vital that perhaps he was being guilty of some of the things the First Minister was suggesting we should not do, and that is to take advantage, take the temptation to make the quick trick. Knocking Metro is a popular thing right at the moment and surely not a very wise thing to do. They have enough people in the City of Winnipeg unjustifiably knocking them at the present time. They deserve, I am sure, plenty of criticism. If they held in their sessions of council meetings the type of debate that we hold here where you have an opposition facing you and able to argue with you at the time, the subjects which are at point, I think they would stand in much better stead with the people at the present time. Metro happens to be in the unfortunate position of being formed of ten council members who are attempting to do a specific job and in their own council chamber is not in a position at the time to criticize their activities. What is forming the opposition to Metro at the present time are various groups led by certain municipal people who feel that it is to their gain to knock Metro, and they knock them through the media of the press, through the media of hitting them when they're not looking and occasionally a member such as the Member from St. Vital holding a fairly high position in the Legislative Chamber, knocks them from the vantage point of his position in the Chamber -- (Interjection) -- you better join the party over here with this gentleman if you're circulating the petition, I understand. Don't ever place me in the position of defending Metro. I have never been in this position. I don't want to be in it now. I only want to see a square deal to the people who are trying to do a job. They have made plenty of mistakes. They will make lots more mistakes. They are learning, I think, as they go along. I think it's fair to criticize them when they deserve criticizing, but sniping at them surely isn't quite cricket. I would suggest to the Honourable Member for St. Vital that he read over the remarks made by his leader only a couple of nights ago and take them to heart.

Metro has a big job to do. It can only do it if it has the support of the people and the support of the Government of Manitoba. They will not have the support of the people of Winnipeg, of Greater Winnipeg, as long as all the municipal councillors keep sniping at them, or a large number of them. They will not have the support of the Government of Manitoba if the Government of Manitoba continues to maintain its sort of divorced policy from Metro. The Government of Manitoba has created Metro -- we have discussed this in the House during the past week -- has created Metro but it has failed to provide it with a financial base on which to operate. By failing to provide it with this base it has left Metro in an extremely unfortunate position where it is having to operate by demanding from councils through their tax base a portion of their money. This puts them in an extremely difficult position, a position that makes it awkward for them to operate. So I find that, at least in my view, the philosophy of Metro as metropolitan government itself, appears quite sound, appears quite good. But, as long as you have a provincial government which created it, then refused to give it the means with which to work; and at the same time you've got a situation where municipal people tend to snipe at it; and then you find members of the Legislature which formed this Metro, and who voted for it, only within a year, are sniping at it below the belt, then I think that Metro does deserve a little bit of

(Mr. Roberts, cont'd.) defense at this time. I do hope that before the session of this Legislature is over with, that the Government of Manitoba will accept the responsibility which it has undertaken and provide for Metro a more stable base on which to operate. And I do hope at the same time, as you have said and I agree with you on this, that Metro itself, will show a little more maturity as a metropolitan government and tend to ignore some of the sniping that is being done at it; perhaps become a little wiser in their actions -- that this is part of a new government and this is part of the process of developing it.

And so with these remarks, I would like to move on to the subject of agriculture. I'm sorry the Honourable Minister of Agriculture is not in his seat tonight. I would have liked to continue the remarks I made the other night on the agriculture policy. I think that one of the most remarkable things about the Speech from the Throne is the fact that agriculture is referred to only briefly and then at the end of the Speech from the Throne. They refer to the drought which has affected the farmers of Manitoba in the Speech from the Throne. They refer to the fact that the Government of Manitoba has taken swift action, as they call it, to ward off great difficulties which might have been incurred by the drought. I think that the government has abdicated a responsibility here, because surely they must be aware of the fact that the effects of the drought are not yet fully felt. The drought itself, last summer, created a situation where the most recent, this week's Dominion Bureau of Statistics releases states: "There has been a 50% cut in the farm income in Manitoba in 1961." So this has been a serious blow to the farmers of Manitoba. But the full effect of this drought has not yet been felt. We have in the whole of Manitoba a situation where the water table is low; where the likelihood of producing a good crop during 1962 is slim; we have a situation where there is an extreme shortage of seed; we have a situation where there is an extreme shortage of cash for the buying of seed, for the buying of fuel and the operations of the farm for the coming year; and yet in the Speech from the Throne, not one word is said as to how the government intends to help the farmer during the coming year. Surely the Minister does not feel that the effect of the drought has been felt already, is over with. Surely he does not feel that the seed situation in Manitoba is good. There must be policies which he should be introducing at this time, policies which have been introduced in other years of drought, where provincial governments have assisted in the providing of seed to the farmers of Manitoba. Surely there must be some basis on which the farmers can be loaned money to purchase fuel for this coming year, fuel and other costs of operating their farm. Certainly not through the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation which takes a year to get a loan, so this is going to be no help in 1962. Surely there must be some way in which the Government of Manitoba can make the moves to release some of the load off the taxpayers, the realty taxes to the farmers in Manitoba for this coming year. These are things which I would like to have seen in the Speech from the Throne if the Minister of Agriculture and this government were truly desirous of providing a policy which would deal with the problems which are pressing us most greatly at the present time, Mr. Speaker. -- (Interjection) -- Well, this is exactly what you were saying earlier.

The Minister of Agriculture during his long discourse the other night spent a great deal of time saying what we shouldn't be doing, and what other people were doing wrong, and how wonderful he thought the Government at Ottawa was -- but absolutely nothing about what the policy of the Government of Manitoba was concerning agriculture in Manitoba. So I call on the Minister of Agriculture at the present time to take that action, the action that is necessary to help the farmers of Manitoba produce a crop in 1962; action to get seed into the province from other provinces -- I understand there is a good supply of seed oats in Alberta. There is an extreme shortage of seed oats in Manitoba. This is where government assistance can be useful and this is where this government should be moving, helping to get their stocks into this province. I hope that the Government of Manitoba will also provide a measure of financial assistance through loans or some other method so that the farmers of Manitoba can obtain -- those who were most severely struck by the drought last year -- can obtain money for fuel and other operating costs for the coming year.

I would like to see the Minister of Agriculture press his government, the Minister of Education in particular and the Provincial Treasurer, to see if there isn't some way in which the tax costs, the cost of this new education plan can be broadened -- the basis for the raising of taxes can be broadened and the load taken off the realty taxpayer. As these costs go up and

(Mr. Roberts, cont'd.) up each year, spiralling, as this load increases year by year despite the assurance only two years ago by the Minister of Education that they would not increase, the increases are falling right on the man who owns property. The tax base in the country is the farm owner, the realty tax, and this is an unfair tax at this time, because the farmer is each year coming out with a little lower net income than he did the year before, and in 1961 took a very heavy cut, and yet, once again, in 1962 the taxes on his realty are going up. This is true, this is true, the home owner in all cases is the one who is being overloaded on this. There must be a way of broadening this base. There must be a way of providing greater funds for the educational cost without increasing, as has been done each year, increasing the taxes to the home owner and to the land owner.

This province as has been explained by the Honourable Member for Lakeside a few minutes ago, was the province which led the way on rural electrification for the whole world. Now this is an opportunity for the Province of Manitoba to move into a new field. A field which the Honourable Minister of Agriculture introduced to us a year ago -- two years ago, I think it was, perhaps -- the field of farm waterworks. He introduced it, we read it in the Throne Speech at that time we thought, "Ah, it's come". The province which led the way towards rural electrification was now leading the way towards rural waterworks; running water for every home in Manitoba. And when we found the program in the estimates turned out to be a \$5,000 program, or that if you happened to be able to make your way to Brandon on a certain week of the year, you could learn how to put pipes together and perhaps if you could get a well somewhere you could have your own water. This is the opportunity, this is the opportunity for Manitoba to lead the way. This is the opportunity to provide for the people of rural Manitoba a way of life which is comparable, a way of life which is at a par, a way of life which is as fair and equitable as those who live in the urban centres. I hope that the Government of Manitoba will look at this situation, will look at the possibility of waterworks for the farm -- and look at it more seriously without the usual jokes about the flushing -- but look at it as a means of providing to the farm home, a way of life which is as up to date, as comfortable as any urban home in Manitoba.

The other day I encouraged the Government of Manitoba, the Honourable Minister of Agriculture to introduce a wild oat control program in Manitoba. I'm not quite certain why the Minister turned it down; why he spoke so disparagingly of it; because surely this is the greatest single problem towards the production of grain in Manitoba at the present time, and that is the scourge of the wild oat. And yet what is the Government of Manitoba doing? Well, the University of Manitoba are doing a little testing with some new chemicals towards the controlling of wild oats and that's the extent of it. And yet we have through the efforts of various universities, through the efforts of various chemical companies, we have arrived, we have found a chemical which will control wild oats, the one which the average farmer cannot afford to use on his farm because of its extreme cost. It averages five to six dollars per acre to treat your land for wild oats as I understand it -- this is what it cost me. So I think that this is a whole field in which this government could provide a service to the farmer by making available to the farmers of Manitoba this chemical which will control wild oats, control the very weed which is doing the greatest amount of damage to crops in Manitoba of any weed that we have, and through this facet provide a means whereby the farmer of Manitoba can increase his income. I hope that the Government of Manitoba, I hope the Minister of Agriculture will not pass it off so lightly, will not treat it as a wild idea because it is not one. It is an idea which is sound; is an idea which can be helpful and it is an idea which will through efficiency, through lowering costs increase the net income of the farmer, and this is after all what we are after. The Honourable Minister of Agriculture speaks freely -- or criticized the NDP quite freely for being in favour of parity. -- (Interjection) -- Would you like to make your position clear on that?

HON. GEORGE HUTTON (Minister of Agriculture and Conservation) (Rockwood-Iberville): I criticized him for trying to achieve parity by merely increasing prices.

MR. ROBERTS: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture made quite a point at being in favour of charity and against parity. He said that the best possible thing that has happened to the farmers for years was the dollar an acre handout made by the Government at Ottawa; and that the worst possible thing that could happen to the farmers of Canada would be to achieve

(Mr. Roberts, cont'd) . . . parity prices. Now is this not true? This is exactly what you said yesterday.

MR. HUTTON: That isn't what I said. That isn't what I said.

MR. ROBERTS: Did you not say that the best possible thing that could happen to the farmers would be to receive this dollar an acre handout from the Government at Ottawa? Didn't you say this was the best possible help?

MR. HUTTON: No, I did not.

MR. ROBERTS: And it's charity, nothing more. You can't possibly attach a policy to it. Where would you attach the policy? Would you attach it to the grain end of farming, to the cattle end of farming, to the livestock, the poultry end of farming? Where do you attach the policy to a dollar an acre handout?

MR. HUTTON: That's where. . . .

MR. ROBERTS: . . . pure charity. We're in favour of it the Honourable Minister of Agriculture says; and he's against parity because he ridiculed for some 20 minutes the NDP for their stand on parity.

MR. HUTTON: Mr. Speaker, I did not, on the point of privilege, I did not speak against parity for the farmers. I spoke against the means by which this party advocated achieving it.

MR. ROBERTS: There's a pretty narrow point here. I think somewhere along the line the Honourable Minister of Agriculture said that if we brought all the rest of the prices in Canada down low enough and kept the prices of agriculture at a level the farmers would have parity. I think perhaps this is true, is it? But he certainly wasn't in favour of increasing the farm prices to a point where they would receive this parity which most of us are asking. Perhaps it would be interesting to know, because the Honourable Minister of Agriculture made such a fuss about parity, and what is parity, it would be interesting to know what the cost of production is, because once again this is a subject that the government can make all the fun of they like, that is the cost of production — in other words, your cost of production of raising hogs is different than my cost of production of raising hogs, it sums up, and the Honourable Member for Fisher's cost of production of raising hogs. But there must be -- (Interjection) -- Right -- there must be an average for the Province of Manitoba. We must be able to take 200 farmers at random who raise pigs for instance, or who raise wheat for instance, or who produce eggs for instance, and through this arrive at a cost of production of eggs in Manitoba, or pigs in Manitoba or wheat in Manitoba. And surely through doing this economic research, we can be of service to the farmers of Manitoba. We can be of service to the Government of Canada when they attempt to work out a policy for western Canada on prices. We can be of service to the Government of Manitoba when they attempt to work out policies which they may wish to institute for agriculture, and we can certainly be of great service to the farmer himself by working this out. You know we have for every economist working on the efficiency of production, we have ten economists working on efficiency of production, probably we have twenty, for every one working on the marketing research and the social economic research, the sociological effects of the farm. And I think that the sooner we have economists working in the fields of improving farm life to the extent that we have them working in the fields of increasing efficiency, then the sooner we will arrive at a policy which will be of use to the farmers of Manitoba.

The Honourable Minister of Agriculture spent considerable time talking about his conservation plan. And once again I have difficulty seeing where running water as quickly as possible out of the grain country into the lakes is conservation. My idea of conservation is to go into the source of all this water supply, and at the source of it, at the creeks, at the beginning, building dams and along the way once again building dams. Dams which will hold the water back in the spring and let it come through as the year goes on. Dams which will prevent flooding in the spring but will give you water later on in the year when you need it. And do you find in the plans introduced in the Speech from the Throne this kind of conservation? Do you find in the Red River Valley any semblance of a conservation program? Just the bigger the ditch and the faster you get it to the lake, is this conservation? Do you find in this diversion ditch from the Assiniboine to Lake Manitoba a conservation feature? Surely conservation consists of preserving this water supply which is so plentiful in the spring of the year when we need it not, and so short later in the year when we need it so greatly. I think the sooner that the

(Mr. Roberts, cont'd.) Province of Manitoba look at this whole field of flooding and of drainage on a true conservation viewpoint, that of holding the water back in the spring at its source, the sooner we will arrive at a program which will be acceptable and which will be of long-term benefit to the farmers of Manitoba.

We have an interesting report-- I guess it's past the experimental stage in Saskatchewan at the present time -- an agricultural machinery testing program, and I would like to see, I'd like to hear from the Minister of Agriculture, perhaps I've missed it in some of his remarks, any reference to Manitoba entering into this program. As I understand it, in Saskatchewan at the present time the government is assisting in a program which tests all the machinery which farmers are about to use, or will use or can use, and by doing this they are assisting the farmer in planning his purchases of machinery. And I hope that the Government of Manitoba will give a lot of consideration, Mr. Speaker, to entering into this program either with the Province of Saskatchewan or by doing it on a program of our own. I hope the Minister of Agriculture will announce to us that he intends to do so, because I feel that this is -- from all reports from Saskatchewan, this is a very worthwhile project and I think that it would be extremely valuable to the farmers of Manitoba. We have in the Province of Manitoba, purely within the jurisdiction or largely within the jurisdiction of the Government of Manitoba, some very serious problems in the marketing of our produce. We have a situation in the Province of Manitoba at the present time where as I see it the large supermarkets, the buyers are exerting a great deal of pressure, pressure which is being put on them by the consumer, and they, at the same time, are finding it quite easy to extend this pressure onto the farmers. In other words, the farmers themselves in the marketing of their produce are finding that their bargaining power is very, very small and very, very limited. And in almost all the products which are marketed in Manitoba, the Government of Manitoba has means with which to assist the farmers marketing their products. They can assist the farmers by orderly marketing. They can assist the farmers by helping them set up co-operatives. They can assist the farmers by helping them set up marketing boards. They can assist the farmers by helping the farmer create for himself through unified action a bargaining power which could be as strong as the bargaining power which is exerted by the purchaser and by the super markets. By doing this we would tend to equalize or balance the problem of a fair price to the farmers. Because as long as the farmer is in a weak position, in a weak bargaining position and is able to be pushed over by those who are buying from him, then he is always selling from a weak position. But if he is organized in selling from a strong position then he is able to narrow this margin between he and the consumer. So I encourage the Government of Manitoba to look at this field of orderly marketing very seriously, and the sooner the better.

There is once again, and there are many fields which fall in the jurisdiction of the Government of Canada for which the Government of Manitoba can accept a great deal of responsibility. For one, they unfortunately, or fortunately, hold the same political stripe and therefore have a great deal of influence. But secondly, as a government of a western agricultural province, they owe to the farmers of Manitoba the responsibility that they will speak up for the farmers of Manitoba to the Government of Canada. We have a very unfortunate situation where all 14 of the Manitoba members of Parliament in Ottawa are the same party as the government in power. We have no spokesman for Manitoba in that Parliament. -- (Interjection) -- Name one. Name one. -- (Interjection) --

There is the field of unemployment insurance for farm workers. How long has it been since the Government of Manitoba has sent an urgent request to the Government of Canada that they institute unemployment insurance for farm workers? This is a responsibility of the Government of Manitoba -- to ask for these things -- to speak for the farmers of Manitoba. How about the federal government policy on deficiency payments for eggs and for pork? A deficiency payment plan which is set up on a national basis, on a national weighted average basis, whereby the farmers of eastern Canada, where the heavy production is, receive a fair-sized deficiency payment if eggs or pork drop low enough, and the farmers from western Canada receive far less. When was the last time this government sent representation to Ottawa, asking that the deficiency payment plan be set up in regional zones so that we here in this area receive our fair portion of these deficiency payments? Where is the Government of Manitoba's voice here? Surely we haven't heard it from the 14 MPs; but could we not hear it from the

(Mr. Roberts, cont'd.) Government of Manitoba? You have not, surely, the same responsibility to the Federal Minister of Agriculture or to the Federal Prime Minister. How about the situation of crop insurance in Manitoba, whereby we have a program that is developed with a very small contribution by the Government of Canada, and no guarantee from the Government of Canada that they will underwrite any huge losses by this province. Surely by instituting -- I don't know what position you're at in your debates or arguments with Ottawa on this, if any at all -- but if your proposals are to extend the crop insurance program to the whole of the Province of Manitoba, surely you are abdicating your duties to the taxpayers of Manitoba by taking the chance that one year a huge crop loss would take place and the Province of Manitoba would be stuck with the whole loss -- a loss that this province just cannot afford.

I would like to hear from the Minister of Agriculture on subjects like this. This is the type of subject he could have been talking to us about yesterday instead of so negatively attacking those who might have suggestions to offer. This is a suggestion. Why doesn't the Government of Canada pay for the administration costs of this crop insurance plan? They pay the administrative costs of the Prairie Farm Assistance Act. Why doesn't the Government of Canada pay a larger portion of the premium? Why doesn't the Government of Canada underwrite the costs of the losses incurred in crop insurance? Because this crop insurance plan is set up on an actuarial basis, supposedly, and over a period of 35 years shall we say, is supposed to level out so that nobody made any money or nobody lost any money on it. But supposing we have another big crop loss and the whole of Manitoba is under a crop insurance plan. Where will the provincial treasury be? -- (Interjection) -- You have found some fault with the Government at Ottawa then have you? Because we never heard anything

MR. HUTTON: Well, you've been reading the newspapers -- you should know.

MR. ROBERTS: We have in Manitoba a Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation, which is just as slow as it ever was about getting loans out. Surely if this plan was out to do the job that it was set up to do, and was introduced to do, they should operate as efficiently as the federal plan does, or operate as efficiently as a trust company could operate, or operate as efficiently as a bank operates. Surely it doesn't take a year to get a loan from any other source, but it takes a year to get a loan from the Agricultural Credit Corporation. Is there a reason for this, or is it a deliberate slow-up process? The farmers of my constituency -- the constituency which I represent -- apply for a loan -- he is told, "Well, in six months we will come and look at your land" and then they come and look at it and they say: "Well, you don't look like a very good risk anyway, why don't you apply somewhere else?" So he does. Is this the kind of plan it was set up to be? The Minister of Agriculture made long, long speeches here yesterday about the rich get rich and the poor get poorer -- well, this Agricultural Credit Plan is just set up exactly on that basis, as near as I can see. Because the only person who can get a loan is the man who has got all kinds of securities and can afford the money -- can get it anywhere -- but he can get it at this source at 5 1/2%, so why not? But the poor fellow, who happens to be just starting up, or happens to have had a couple of bad years -- can he borrow money under the plan? Not that I know of. There's no credit given for his honesty, his character, his background, for his willingness to work -- these aren't things that count. What seems to count in the Act is how much land have you got to put up for security. This is what counts -- and its valuable land too.

How about the ranchers who want to get into cattle? We need more cattle, this is one thing we do need in Manitoba. How about the people on poor land? How do they borrow money under the Agricultural Credit Corporation when 60% of their security must come from land? No possibility for them because the security must come from land, and your land's worth a dollar an acre -- even if you've got \$10,000 worth of cattle you can't borrow very much money under this plan. And yet I would say, and I think the Minister would agree with me, that cattle is one of our commodities that we should be increasing our production of.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to refer now to the Department of Industry and Commerce -- Department of Propaganda -- I wasn't going to refer to that part of it particularly. -- (Interjection) --

MR. SPEAKER: Four minutes left.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, on a Point of Order, it seems to me that the rule was established here last night that the rule of 40 minutes

(Mr. Molgat, cont'd.) no longer applies in this House. To begin with, point number one. Point number two, I would like to point out that I am designating the member to speak in my stead in this debate, he's allowed -- (Interjection) -- I did not speak over my allotted time, I spoke within my allotted time. My colleague from Lakeside who spoke this evening also spoke within his allotted time. We are allowed to have one member over the allotted time.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to refer briefly to the great need for secondary industries in Manitoba. I think that the possibilities to the Department of Industry and Commerce for creating new employment for Manitobans is unlimited, and I think that all plaudits and encouragement should go to the Department of Industry and Commerce for the work which it is doing, and all encouragement should go for the work that it still can do. I hope that they will never look back in this department, because I think that the future of the employment of many of our agricultural people in Manitoba, and certainly many, many of our urban people, depends on the development of new businesses of secondary industries of processing our own primary products right here in the Province of Manitoba.

The Department of the Attorney-General made -- there was some reference the other day to the need for public defenders in Manitoba. I would hope that the Honourable Attorney-General would spend considerable time explaining to this House why he does not approve of the public defender system for the Province of Manitoba. -- (Interjection) --

I have heard a great deal of it during this past few weeks -- since my remarks the other night in the House concerning the used car dealers, and certain used car dealers who are operating what I call shady practices in the City -- I have had many, many calls from people -- letters, calls, contacts from people who have been badly treated, who have lost their cars -- many whose cars were their only possessions. I have a letter here which I received just tonight from a gentleman here in Winnipeg who put his car -- a 1957 big model automobile -- on a used car lot in Winnipeg on a consignment basis. -- (Interjection) -- There were many cases where the public defender could have been of a great deal of value This particular car was placed on a used car lot on a consignment basis; the car disappeared off the lot; the used car dealer cannot be found and the man is out his car, and out several hundreds of dollars. I am quite aware of the fact that the public defender has not a purpose in cases such as this, but there have been many contacts made to me where the public defender would be of great help and assistance to the people of Manitoba. If those who require legal defence are able to get it whenever they require it, then we have no need for a public defender system -- this I will agree to. But we continually get reports in the press when they are not getting it when they require it, in places particularly other than Winnipeg. We get reports that one or two or three lawyers are having to handle all of this work and it isn't being distributed as it should be distributed. So I do hope that when the Attorney-General speaks he will speak on this subject and will tell us exactly what the situation is at the present time.

I don't know whether the remarks made by the Honourable Member for Brokenhead and the Honourable the First Minister concerning the Omsbudman fall under the Department of the Attorney-General or which department he would fall under, but it is I think no surprise to the House that I am completely in favour of the practice of having this type of legislative officer in our province. I have been, no doubt, influenced on this by my wife who was raised in Scandinavian countries and who speaks very highly of the work that these people do in these countries. In a small country such as Denmark, which is far smaller than the Province of Manitoba, and where the Cabinet is approachable by the people, as approachable as it is here, where even the King of the country can be contacted by the common man any time, the omsbudman still has a very strong and very large role to play. And I would hope that the government will give a great deal of consideration to the possibility of developing or including this kind of a development in its programs. This is a real opportunity to provide to every citizen the opportunity to be heard when he has something which he wishes to say.

With reference to the Department of Mines and Natural Resources, I would like to make a few references to problems which exist in my constituency concerning the problem of cutting fireguards, the problem of cutting trails, the problem of getting the cut wood out of the woods, and the people who are out of work in the constituency. We have a very serious problem with hundreds of people laid off, out of work, people who normally or often are employed by the Department of Mines and Natural Resources. At the same time there is a great deal of work

(Mr. Roberts, cont'd.) which needs doing in the woods, and as near as I can gather there is just not the money with which to do it in the appropriation. I feel that this is a mistake. I feel that the work, the saving, the conservation that can be carried out by a staff of local citizens cutting fireguards, saving this country from burning when bad seasons come, thinning, clearing, all the work which must be done and should be done -- I think an investment of this sort is a worthwhile investment. And I hope the Minister of Mines and Resources will place every bit of argument he can at his disposal towards the Treasurer so that he can get the funds required to do this work. Surely he can get an ally from the Minister of Welfare in this because hundreds and hundreds of these people are receiving welfare weekly and monthly. Yes, hundreds. These people are receiving either -- yes, there are hundreds receiving welfare -- and they normally would be employed in the woods, doing the work and receiving approximately the same pay as they are receiving in welfare. Surely this can be no burden to the Provincial Treasury. Surely the conservation saving of cutting these fireguards, the saving of these hundreds of thousands of dollars worth of trees, of thinning, of clearing, of preparing for planting, work at the nursery station, all these things can be done to the advantage of the province and not having that whole area sitting on its hands this winter. Because the only people that are employed in the area are the permanent employees -- in other words, the rangers and so forth, of the Department of Mines and Resources. There's all sorts of programs -- yes, there's winter works programs that all these things can be conducted under. For instance at the Falcon Lake site where the government has built a very remarkable tourist development, that there are on the same lake a number of private owners located on private beaches and resorts where work needs to be done, where docks need to be built, where clearings need to be made and where employees, once again, of the Department of Mines and Resources, could be doing the work that needs so badly doing. There is this whole area from the north and south, from that area right down to the United States border which needs to be cleared out for the Mississippi Parkway, this whole area which needs to have a road running north and south through it -- and yet as I say, once again, these hundreds of people are receiving welfare payments when they should be working. And as I pointed out just the other day, the Department of Attorney-General through its training camps has succeeded in putting, as I see it, some extra people out of work. -- (Interjection) -- Oh, I have witnesses and proof. This isn't the point. I am in favour of the training camps. I think the training camps are doing good things for these men, but you introduced this plan and you announced it to the public as a plan which will not put any local citizens out of work, it will do work which would otherwise not be done. When you lay off people at the Falcon Lake ski run -- building the Falcon Lake ski run -- lay off local citizens in order to put trainees to work; and when you use trainees to cut fireguards around the borders of the Whiteshell Forest Reserve, between the Forest Reserve and the Crown Land, work that is done by the Department of Mines and Natural Resources with local employees, then you are putting local people out of work, and you are not introducing the plan on which it should be done, and your friend, the Minister of Welfare should speak to you about that because he's paying welfare to the people you put out of work with your trainees.

Mr. Speaker, we had a considerable discussion the other day from the usual motion from the Honourable Member from Inkster concerning pensions, and there was considerable debate took place about taking the politics out of old age pensions, or I guess it's conversely taking old age pensions out of politics. I think that the time has come, and I hope the time has come, when this situation can be improved; when the situation can be handled in a manner more statesmanly so that the whole question of old age pensions can be based on a national contributory plan. Let us put retirement pensions on a self-supporting plan. Certainly we have to have a base, certainly we have to have a constructive and practical basis on which to set up this plan, but let us establish a base of the lowest amount in which old age persons can comfortably live, and from then on any increase, base it on contributions to a portable contributory plan. I hope that this government will go on record too, of supporting a contributory pension plan, to stop this "buying" of the old age vote, will set up, will encourage in every way it can the Government of Canada to set up this portable plan, this contributory pension plan whereby those who contribute to the plan may justly receive greater benefits from it, but that all who do contribute or who don't contribute, who haven't contributed in the past, will receive a fair share of this old age security. I think that the plan which has been introduced

(Mr. Roberts, cont'd.) by the Liberal Party of Canada is one which is sound and one which is fair. Basing a \$75.00 pension plan to all individuals, and in addition to that any further contributions will come from the contributory plan. I hope that this government and this House will take the stand of being in favour of this full scale retirement plan. It has the extreme advantage in addition of being portable, a plan which is being portable making it economically sound in many other respects. Being portable means that you do not have to remain in a certain location because of the advantages which are offered to you under a pension plan. Being portable means that you can choose the employment to which you are best suited -- you do not have to remain at a particular job. I hope that the advantages of a portable plan will help to sell this plan to the people of Canada because this is something which we have long required.

The Department of Education. The Honourable the First Minister was referring to not bricks and mortar, but children. I think this is extremely important because we have throughout Manitoba a wonderful array of new schools, and yet we have those who assume because there are new schools that there will be better education within the province. We have in the Seine River Division in which I live, five wonderful new schools -- large schools, impressive schools, schools which will be of extreme assistance in the development of education within the province. -- (Interjection) --

MR. SPEAKER: Order. The motion before the House is the motion moved by the Honourable Member for Osborne, seconded by the Honourable Member for Churchill that a humble address be presented to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor as follows: To His Honour Errick F. Willis, Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of Manitoba, we, Her Majesty's dutiful and loyal subjects, the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba in session assembled, humbly thank Your Honour for the gracious speech which Your Honour has been pleased to address to us at the opening of the present session.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion and following a voice vote declared the motion carried.

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier) (Wolseley): Mr. Speaker, now that the motion is carried, I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce that the Address to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor be engrossed and presented to His Honour by such of this House as are of the Executive Council and the mover and seconder of the Address.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. EDMOND PREFONTAINE (Carillon): what's the meaning of the word "engrossed", and whether it costs them money to have it engrossed?

MR. ROBLIN: I really can't believe that is a serious question, Your Honour, but if my honourable friend asked it, I'll be glad to answer him. I find it extraordinary that being one of the senior members of the House that he, having heard this motion moved by his leaders for so many years, I find it incredible to think that he doesn't know what he's been voting for and against all this time. But engrossed simply means written out with a fair, round hand.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, on that matter, I would like to ask the Honourable the First Minister if he has changed the procedure any in recent years from what it was before. I'm not aware of any change that's been made, but it is a fact that in at least one province of this country that the presentation of the Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne is a very formal ceremony. As a matter of fact there is a state procession that goes from the Legislative Building to the official residence of the Lieutenant-Governor. I don't know whether the Ministers don their court garb or not, but they certainly do have a state procession. Now I'm not suggesting that be done here, but I'm just asking the Honourable the Leader of the House, does he even have the Address engrossed and does he actually present it to the Lieutenant-Governor?

MR. ROBLIN: I'm quite sure that this is irregular that I should be answering questions on this point, but the temper of the House, Sir, may permit me to reply, to say that I don't know what on earth my honourable friend did when he was Leader of the House, I'm sure, but I can tell him what we do. We have it engrossed and we have it tied up with a blue ribbon as official documents of this sort are, and then the mover and the seconder with some members of the Executive Council will, at the pleasure of His Honour or His Honour the Administrator, as the case may be, proceed to his office at some suitable time after the engrossing has been

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd.) done, and present the Address in Reply in that fashion.

MR. CAMPBELL: follow your predecessors.

MR. ROBLIN: I never heard that my honourable friend did that.

MR. SPEAKER: I might say that for the information of the House that I have presented the motion to His Honour in company with the mover and seconder since I've been Speaker of the Legislature.

Are you ready for the question?

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

MR. ROBLIN: I'm glad of that testimony that we do things in the right way on this side.

I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Education that this House will at its next sitting resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be Granted to Her Majesty.

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

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Attorney-General that this House will at its next sitting resolve itself into a Committee to consider Ways and Means for raising of the Supply to be Granted to Her Majesty.

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

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I have a message from His Honour the Administrator.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable C. C. Miller, Administrator of the Province of Manitoba transmits to the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba Estimates of sums required for the services of the Province for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1963, and recommends these estimates to the Legislative Assembly.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Health, that the message of His Honour the Administrator, together with the estimates accompanying the same, be referred to the Committee of Supply.

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

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Labour, that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House adjourned until 2:30 Wednesday afternoon.