



Legislative Assembly Of Manitoba

DEBATES and PROCEEDINGS

Speaker

The Honourable A. W. Harrison



THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

8:00 o'clock, Monday, April 30th, 1962.

Prayer by Mr. Speaker:

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions
Reading and Receiving Petitions
Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees
Notice of Motion
Introduction of Bills

The proposed motion of the Honourable the Leader of the House.

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Industry & Commerce)(Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, I am wondering if -- were you proposing to call the Orders of the Day?

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. EVANS: Before the Orders of the Day, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to lay on the table a Return to an Order of the House No. 34 in the name of the Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. S. PETERS (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I'd like to direct -- Go ahead.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition)(Ste. Rose): Does the First Minister know how many Orders for Return are still to come? And what disposition was made of them?

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier)(Wolseley): Mr. Speaker, I think that all the Orders for Return are in, with the exception of the inquiries about the Mississippi Parkway. Now in that instance we have had to write to the State of Minnesota to get their concurrence with respect to correspondence as a matter of courtesy. We have not heard from them and it seems unlikely that we shall; but I suggest that perhaps next time we meet the same order could be placed on the paper and we'll be able to give the information at that time. That's the only one I know of that's outstanding.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, would it be possible when the reply arrives, if it could be sent to the member who requested the information?

MR. ROBLIN: I have no objection to that Mr. Speaker, so long as I make it clear that this is not a precedent because usually, in fact always when the House prorogues the orders die; but as a matter of courtesy to the gentleman concerned we would not object to sending it along to him.

MR. PETERS: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Labour and I'm sorry that I didn't ask him sooner. If he wants to take this as notice he can tell me in private if he likes. I wonder if he could tell me if the Minimum Wage Board has met yet and if they have, where they have met? If he wants to tell me in private it's okay too.

HON. J. B. CARROLL (Minister of Labour)(The Pas): Mr. Speaker, I can't tell my honourable friend whether they have met. They have been instructed though to meet and to conduct their hearings and presumably if they haven't met, they will be shortly.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. Adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the First Minister that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of Ways and Means for Raising of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty. The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): to say that I asked for the adjournment for my colleague the Honourable Member from La Verendrye.

MR. STAN ROBERTS (La Verendrye): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to make a few very short comments on the Budget Speech. This I'm sure is not time for long speeches to be popular, but I think this opportunity should not be passed by.

Referring to the government of the day, I'd like to point out that I was elected to this Legislature in 1958 at the same time as this government was, and for some time after the government was elected there was a wave of favourable impression left by this government, probably a wave of favourable impression towards the new broom attitude of the government. Fortunately, I think that this new broom attitude, this impression of a government going busily

(Mr. Roberts, cont'd.) . . . about its way doing good work has gone by. I think the government has lost its spark and I suggest that the Honourable the First Minister in his challenge this afternoon to call an election should carry it out, because it's obvious that this is apparently the way for the province to get good government. There's no doubt that there was a great deal of activity from the provincial government following the 1958 and '59 elections, but now we have come into a period of stagnation, a period where the government regularly throughout this session has been seeking out ways and means of avoiding making decisions on important issues of the day.

In the field of agriculture in particular, we have I think, one of a more progressive Minister's of this Cabinet; but I think he too at this time is being somewhat hesitant in stepping out, meeting the challenge of the changing times. We have great problems in Manitoba with the farm population, net income is way down this year. There are many things that a provincial government can do to help them out. The greatest role of course is the role of trying to keep the costs of production as low as they can, of narrowing that cost-price squeeze. There are many ways in which provincial governments can help cut costs. For instance there is the problem which the Farmers' Union and the farm groups have been asking the provincial government to do for many years, a very simple thing, but its something that they have been avoiding doing, and that is the lowering of the registration fees, the license fees of trucks which are used only occasionally -- of elderly trucks only used occasionally for hauling grain in the fall. This is only one move, but there are many moves like this the provincial government could make towards keeping the costs down to the farmer. There are other ways in which the provincial government can help the farmers of Manitoba in improving their income. One way of course is in the assistance towards the orderly marketing of their produce. We've had orderly marketing of grain for some years in Western Canada; we still haven't any orderly marketing method of handling our livestock produce and vegetables and I think the provincial government could show a great deal of help, leadership in this field and by the same token, improve the income of the farmer, and improve by that method the net income of the farmer.

There is for instance -- has been -- a survey done of the southeast Manitoba, what is the future of this area? There's a real problem. This is an area which has a problem very much its own, a problem of many uneconomic farm units and an area in which this government set about busily to survey, and yet what do we see as a result of this survey. We have not had a report. We do not see any tangible evidence of programs under way. It all goes to add up to what I started out with a dandy new broom idea and gradually each year since then has slowed down in its activities and many of its pet projects have just petered out. Because the southeast Manitoba has a big problem. The farmers of this area have a big problem. The farm problem is to develop as many economic farm units as you can out of the farms that are located in these areas. And what is this government doing to help? -- Well nothing. They set up a crop insurance plan, but doesn't include this area. They put a farm credit plan into being, an Agricultural Credit Plan in the Province of Manitoba, but money will not be lent into this area from this agriculture credit corporation because the value of the land is not high enough in order to provide security for this kind of loan. They've refused to go on with the testing of tobacco through the area; a possibility. They haven't made any particular effort to grow trees; something that can be grown through this area. Other new crops that could be grown in the southeast they've made no attempt to experiment with. There's a world of potential down through this southeast, potential of grazing livestock, of raising all sorts of special crops. This kind of program requires public assistance to get rolling. It requires experimental work being done by provincial governments as well as federal government, and it requires the help of a Minister of a department which is interested in helping out this area. Unfortunately, federally the Government of Canada has no more far-reaching policy than has the provincial government. The policy towards agriculture by the Government of Canada for the past four years has been one of patchwork, one of plugging holes, one of expediency. Wherever there was trouble, plug the hole; wherever there was a jam, let's do something about it. Without a single policy; without any long-term projects; without any projects that will have a long-term benefit for the area. I don't think there's anymore specific or perfect example of a type of policy, or something that's called a policy, to help the farmers of western Canada than the acreage payment. A payment made to farmers with no purpose, no

(Mr. Roberts, cont'd.) . . . policy, no program; a payment which is made purely on the basis of a handout and a charity and something which in the long-term has no benefit to the farmer and in the short-term has very little either.

For instance, I read the papers today and listen to what the federal politicians are saying about what the federal government has done for the farmers of western Canada and I read that they take credit for the wheat sales, the great wheat sales that this government has made. They take credit for the wheat prices. Well, I think we can all get copies of the Canadian Wheat Board Review and read what's happened; to find that the wheat prices were higher in five out of ten years of the past years of the Liberal Government than they have been this year. We find in the 1957 crop to the '61 crop -- and this is all in here -- that the Nation of Canada has provided 23.3% of the world exports of wheat. Whereas in the same five-year period before '57 it provided 26.6% of the world exports of wheat. We have a government now apparently running around the country trying for re-election, claiming credit for things that The Wheat Board has done and claiming credit for the effects of a drought; taking credit for a drought and a famine in China; taking credit for a deal made by The Wheat Board to China in which the Minister of Agriculture wasn't even present or involved. I think that these sort of things, these stop-gap measures need all to be replaced by policies which have a long-term effect; policies which over the long run will help the farmers and not just keep those who don't belong on the farm just that much longer.

For instance the Honourable Leader of the NDP today made a very interesting remark concerning the federal government now promoting the growing of wheat. For instance last year, he said, they were promoting the growing of beef and the year before that they were promoting the growing of pork -- Oh, no they were trying to stop you from raising pork, that was it, while the provincial government was promoting the raising of pork. This is the type of thing to do, just promote something that we don't happen to be producing at the moment; just try and stay one step ahead of the farmer and keep him thoroughly confused as to the future markets; thoroughly confused as to what his potential is and what his possibilities are. I hope that the government of this province, the Government of Canada, will in the future look for policies which have associated with them the possibility for each farmer, the opportunity to make for himself an income to which he's entitled, and not provide charity, stop-gaps, floods, but provide security in the form of a long-term project; provide crop insurance to the whole province of Manitoba as well as the other western Prairie Provinces; provide agricultural credit, not just to those people who happen to have high price land for security. Agricultural credit, not just for the good risk, but for those who want to farm and have ability to farm and wish to produce the very products which we should be producing in many parts of Manitoba, such as the southeast of Manitoba -- cattle, poultry, hogs, without the security of high priced land to put up as the main base.

The government of Manitoba has suggested or has introduced into the House this year a plan to send a mission to Europe to help trade -- to help Manitoba trade -- to help find outlets for our products that we are now producing and outlets for products which we hope to produce in the future. And I can only commend them for this. This must not be a half-hearted mission. I hope it will be as successful as those who are promoting it intend it to be. I hope that this mission to Europe will have many far-reaching effects for the industry and the business of Manitoba, because there are many possibilities of producing items, products in Manitoba which can be marketed in Europe, marketed at a profit in Europe; marketed in competition with European products, and these can only be located and searched out and found and consummated by our business going over there -- businessmen going over there and establishing themselves as exporters. I hope that this mission in Europe while there will present the kind of an image that we want presented from the Canadian people. This is one of the very unfortunate things that exist, is that we have an image in Europe at the present time as a Canadian nation -- as a nation which is niggling; as a nation which is picayune; as a nation which is busily needling other nations of Europe; a nation which has no long-range policy; a nation which is short-sighted. I hope that the Government of Manitoba which is introducing this mission to Europe idea, will go over there and explain to the people of Europe that we are not that kind of people; that basically we in Canada want to trade; that we want to trade with European nations; that we want to trade with Britain and the European common market and the

(Mr. Roberts, cont'd.) . . . outer seven. That we are not the kind of nation that has been painted for us by Mr. Fleming and Mr. Diefenbaker and Mr. Hees, but we are the kind of nation which wishes an economic — (Interjection) --. I have more trouble with my friends than I do with my enemies -- (Interjection) -- I hope that when this mission goes to Europe it will explain that the people of western Canada at least want to get along with Europe and we want to trade with them. We want to trade, we want to buy and we want to sell, and we want Britain to join the common market if this is best for them. We want to join in a North-Atlantic community; we want to join in an economic block forming the whole North-Atlantic area and I hope that this mission will always keep this in mind while there and try and offset some of the bad publicity which has been created for us by the other people speaking for Canada during the past three or four years.

I would like to congratulate the government once again -- (Interjection) -- I'd like to congratulate them on their presentation to the medical -- strange these press releases usually have all this sort of thing right on top -- the Minister's name is right near -- Premier Duff Roblin, the first three words -- "Royal commission on Health. Roblin urges voluntary medical insurance plan", says the press release from the Information Services. I want to congratulate the First Minister on this presentation to the Royal Commission on Health. I want to assure him that he has my support and I think most of the support of the people over here. Just because Saskatchewan has bungled their efforts into a medical plan doesn't mean that Manitoba need do likewise, because Manitoba can lead the way on a medical plan which will serve the people's purpose and will be acceptable to the Medical Association of this province and of Canada; because a medical plan such as that which is promoted here would be acceptable to the medical people and I think it would be of a great deal of benefit to the people of Manitoba. I hope that this proposal does not end here. I hope it does not end with a recommendation to the Royal Commission on Health Services. I hope it will be followed up by some action by this government, because a medical plan offering the opportunity to the best of medical care to every citizen of the province, offering that opportunity, has everything to commend it and something that we in a nation as affluent as Manitoba is -- a province as affluent -- should make the move in as soon as possible.

I'm taking a bit of exception now to remarks made by the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce the other night concerning my remarks on urban renewal and slum clearance and his proposal re same. I don't think it's foolhardy to suggest that a commission set up by this province to study urban renewal and slum clearance should not look into projects. I hope that the commission which he is setting up, I still hope it will search out projects; will help to co-ordinate all the different people who are involved in slum clearance and urban renewal here in Winnipeg and other urban centres in the Province of Manitoba. To say that it is not the role of provincial government I think is passing responsibility on to someone else; but if those who as you say the responsibility belongs to make no move on it, can you keep your eyes closed and say, "well just because the municipalities aren't working in the speed, in which they should work", then we're not going to have urban renewal and slum clearance in Manitoba and we're going to have all these slums and all these people living in filth and in areas that require services which costs the taxpayers of Manitoba a great deal of money; and in areas that produce the delinquents and produce the offenders and produce many of the fire-traps and the problems of the province. Surely just because somebody once said that it is the responsibility of the municipality to do urban renewal and slum clearance then the provincial government has no responsibility for the same. I think that the opportunity exists, not of imposing your will on anyone, but only of leading the way, of acting as the mediary and acting as the one who promotes, encourages, pushes along and co-ordinates the activities between the federal government and the municipality. This role can be fulfilled by that commission which you propose to set up, and I hope that it will do just that.

We talk of initiative by this government in the way it started out being a new broom and has since lost much of its punch. We talk of daylight saving time and uniformity of time throughout Manitoba. I've just returned not half an hour ago from Steinbach where a great state of confusion existed as to what time the meeting was supposed to be today and what time the meeting will be somewhere else in Winnipeg tomorrow. Steinbach is arguing as to whether or not the schools and which schools will go on daylight saving time and is arguing as to

(Mr. Roberts, cont'd.) . . . whether the town next door -- the Hanover municipalities are arguing with the town council and the Chamber of Commerce is on another side -- all because this province has not the courage of its convictions to suggest to the people of Manitoba that they all go on one uniform time.

And then we heard so much remember in 1958 and 1959 from the Minister of Public Works about how the building of roads was going to be such a different thing in Manitoba from now on. We were going to let the contracts in the fall; I think this is why we had to vote so much money so far ahead; why we've actually got over \$40 million more voted ahead now. And where are the contracts being let? Why this is the first day of May -- well tomorrow is the first day of May -- I don't know any contractors in Manitoba working. I don't even know very many contractors that have got a thing to start on. This is the government that was going to introduce this thing; it accuses the former government year after year of being slow of introducing the road contracts; the tenders. When was this going to start, they said? Why wait till May before you let the contracts? They were going to let them in the fall -- in November -- and they had to have money voted ahead; and now we find that here it is only 1962, only four years later, things are worse than ever at their worst possible time before. Some over \$40 millions voted ahead and not a contract let. There was considerable discussion of who got what roads by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition -- and I'm not very happy about the situation myself, because I didn't get any roads either -- but I think there are quite a few people sitting over there in the backbenches that perhaps should be a little bit upset about this too, because Metropolitan Winnipeg, the area of Metropolitan Winnipeg, has over 50% of the population of Manitoba. Did they get 10% of the expropriations of this department? I think that when the Honourable the First Minister was talking about all the things he's doing for Metro Winnipeg -- and he's doing too much already he says -- that he should consider how much money he's putting into roads into rural parts and how little he's putting into the expenditures of Metropolitan Winnipeg towards public works projects; because this is only fair, the people who pay their share of the taxes should get their share of the roads project as well.

I think probably one of the most disappointing things to those who are interested in the activities of the members of the legislature, about what this government has done or hasn't done during the four years it's been in office, is this terrible rush of business that takes place the last week of the legislature. I can remember when I was interested in politics and would sit in the gallery and would watch the government operate and the Leader of the Opposition sitting over at this side, berating the government because they were bringing so many things in the last week. Well I'll bet you, never in the history of the Province of Manitoba has so many things been brought in in the last week as they have this past seven days. And this is after the government, the Leader of the House, each week of this year has said "We're going to bring it in regularly; we're going to have something come in every week, so we don't have to rush it all through the last day." And how many intelligent remarks were made the other day when the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre brought in a series, a long series of amendments to the Metropolitan Winnipeg Act -- (Interjection) -- Sorry, got the wrong man -- St. James. I was there, I'm sorry, quite right. How many people passed intelligent remarks on them? Because not a soul in that Law Amendments Committee knew what they were about. And here's a bill brought in on Thursday, voted on on Friday, second reading, passed on Saturday through Law Amendments, and a whole bunch of new amendments brought in on Saturday in the Law Amendments, in which we had no idea what they've done to the Metropolitan Winnipeg Act -- none whatsoever. I defy -- (Interjection) -- 50 out of 57 -- (Interjection) -- well I did ask and nobody had the time, rush right through. And this is the way the business of the House is done.

And how about this business of the interest rates that was introduced this past week, and was caucussed only night before last by the Conservative Government to decide what they were going to do about it -- after 11 weeks of session. What would happen if it had been an eight-week session? Wouldn't we have had to have this stuff ready three weeks ago? So it couldn't be impossible that it could be ready three weeks ago. Were these bills not printed? We even passed a bill this year -- now this really takes the cake -- we passed a bill which amended a bill we hadn't even seen yet -- and this is the Department of Agriculture, the Minister of Agriculture, which had something to do with drilling wells -- and we passed the changing of the wording of a bill which hasn't even been brought into the House yet. -- (Interjection) --

(Mr. Roberts, cont'd.)

MR. DESJARDINS: What the heck do you think he's doing now? Playing a tune on a violin or something. Get up your tree again and we'll pull you by the tail.

MR. ROBERTS: And then we go on and talk about all the things this wonderful government has done. This wonderful government has done to the people of Manitoba -- well it's introduced two new levels of government, Metropolitan Winnipeg and the School Division Board for the rural people, and made no changes whatsoever to the people whom they were supposed to have replaced, or the work which they were supposed to be doing. If we had an authority jungle before, we have got twice as bad an authority jungle now; because we have people at every level duplicated; we have people at the municipal level duplicated; we have people at the school level duplicated. And why? Because the government wanted to bring in a few new levels. In addition to that, of course, they introduced a perfect tax jungle. And this is simply by instituting a level of government known as Metropolitan government -- a level which can only raise its money through the facilities of another level, which is the municipalities. Provided them with no tax base of their own; provided them with no provincial money raised from any other source than real estate; but set them up so the only one way they could raise money was through the facilities of the municipalities. And this, of course, can only cause one thing -- the very hardship that it has caused, the very hard feelings, and the very bickering and continual niggling that goes on. Because as long as one level of government raises its money through another level of government there's going to be this same continual haggling. You cannot avoid it.

The Honourable the First Minister speaking the other night made quite a good deal of reference to this. He said he liked to see his tax money all on one bill. He thought it was a good thing that the school money, and the municipal money, and the metropolitan money should all appear on the one tax bill. I don't agree. I don't think that it is proper or right. You cannot set levels of government one over top of the other one, each raising their money through the same taxpayer, without trouble. Schools of course, -- school divisions -- you can raise money that way because schools are a different principle entirely. But you don't raise municipal money one level over top the other without causing the kind of trouble you've got right now. You've got your municipal people all through the City of Winnipeg and the 19 municipalities all poking at Metro and saying: "Look, you're the reason our tax rate has gone up." And Metro, what do they do but fight back; and what have you got but nothing but a complete picture of disorganization and unhappiness. So what does the government do about it? Well they set up a commission, I suppose. They certainly didn't face the situation; they certainly didn't recognize the fact that what was wrong was that they were having one level of government raise its money through the other, therefore there was fighting. They didn't give Metro its own tax base which they should have given. They set up a commission. And who's spoken up from the government benches protecting Metro? Which one over there besides the First Minister who sort of rides that offence line pretty close? Who over there has said Metro was a good thing? Who has defended Metro? Who has put in a good word for Metro? Which one of you members who represents City of Winnipeg ridings have said: "Metro belongs. I voted for Metro and I'll stand by it. Metro belongs. It's got a job to do." Which one said it? The Member for St. Vital? The Member for Winnipeg Centre? Which one?

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q.C. (Attorney-General)(Fort Garry): St. Boniface.

MR. ROBERTS: St. Boniface?

MR. DESJARDINS: Yes, he did.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, but he didn't vote for Metro you see. He didn't vote for Metro but he's been defending it. You see, this is the difference. There's honour here -- (Interjection) -- because he was part of this Legislature -- he was part of this Legislature which introduced Metro and therefore he stands by Metro, and he says they've got a job to do and the way for them to get it done is for us to help them do it. Well what do we hear over there? Not a word. Not a word. Let them go down the drain just so long as they don't take me with them. Isn't that right? -- (Interjection) -- Just not get caught in the swing behind Metro or you're liable to lose your seat in the next election -- this is what we're saying to ourselves over there. -- (Interjection) -- Well who's defending Metro? You are right. -- (Interjection) -- Who's defending Metro? Who's on Metro's side? Who stood up in this House and said Metro was a good

(Mr. Roberts, cont'd.) . . . thing and we need it in this city? Metro has made mistakes but we need them. -- (Interjections) --

MR. JAMES COWAN, Q.C. (Winnipeg Centre): I think Metro is a good idea but their council isn't set up properly and it isn't carrying out its job properly. It's a good idea. -- (Interjections) --

MR. ROBERTS: I wasn't in favour of a referendum when the time for a referendum was discussed in this House regarding Metro, but perhaps I should have been for this one reason, because Metro requires more than anything else a public understanding of it and its functions and they are not getting it from this government, the public isn't; because this government won't stand behind Metro. -- (Interjection) -- Paid advertisements won't do it. I think a referendum might have done it. This is where a referendum would have been of value; this is probably the only place because there are many decisions which have to be made by the members of the legislature in my opinion, and this was probably one of them. But I don't think there has ever been any subject in Winnipeg in recent years which has been of greater public interest. I wasn't in favour, you know, of the commission which has been set up by this government to review Metro this year, but I do hope that now that the commission has been set up that they will do a good job of it.

First of all I hope they will hold their hearings in public. I hope that the press will cover it well -- and I think they will -- because there is work to be done in the selling of Metro and the explaining of it. If there are complaints against Metro I think they should be made in public; and if there are no complaints I think that should be advised to the public too. I think the actual tax base of Metro should be one of the most important subjects discussed by this commission -- Where does Metro get its money and where does it get it without along the way arousing the ire of the municipal people? I think they should have their own tax base and I think this commission could probably be the group who find it for them. And lastly of course, this commission I hope will be made up very carefully of choice personnel, because this is a big job they have to do. They have to start without any preconceived ideas; they have to be impartial; and I presume in order to arrive at all this they should be at least headed by an out-of-province person. But I hope that this government will start soon giving some moral support to Metro.

The Honourable the First Minister speaking this afternoon made quite an issue about the fact that this government had brought in revisions to the curriculum -- he was discussing education. He made great show of the fact that it was this government that had brought in a general course in the high schools of our province. I don't think anybody knows it better than he does how obviously bringing in this general course has pointed out that our whole curriculum needs revising; because the curriculum set out for the general course, which was to be a middle of the road course, has turned out to be, in my opinion, a heck of a lot better program than the present matriculation course offered by the Government of Manitoba and the Province of Manitoba. It's a good course; but surely if we're striking a middle of the road general course and strike up a curriculum for it, and it proves to be a better course than our matriculation course, doesn't this prove that there's something wrong with our matriculation course -- that it needs revising? Five years ago, four years ago, the Royal Commissioner on Education brought in a recommendation that our curriculum should be revised. Well I think it's about time it was, because this government that operates so quickly, does things pronto; doesn't back away from its responsibilities; isn't afraid of anything, should start moving again; and I suggest that perhaps if the only way to get them rolling again is another election, then perhaps that's what they should call.

MR. MORRIS E. GRAY (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I have witnesses to prove I had no intention to speak on the Budget at all, expecting that the House may prorogue tonight. But the last speaker prompted me to say a word or two which I'm sure will not penetrate and as I always mention the same term all the time "A voice in the wilderness"; but I thought perhaps not expecting to make too many speeches in this House, I would like to take a few minutes to express my opinion in brief in connection with the Budget.

I'm sending the Hansards to my children to get an education of public life and the last letter I had is that all the speeches are perfect except yours. But I'd rather have a poor speech than have the Hansard not mentioning my name. That applies to the press as well.

The last speaker has paid attention to the taxes and I, not being an scientific individual

(Mr. Gray, cont'd.) cannot understand how you could save food at home and not be hungry. How can you get along without -- or the taxpayer without taxes when in one way they demand service. They demand the streets to be cleaned -- and by the way they've never been cleaned as good for the last 50 years as they are now. I'm not giving any bouquet to the Metro; my only defence about Metro is give them an opportunity to show whether they can do anything or not. I was even opposed to the First Minister to shorten the years which they have to be -- (Interjection) -- Sure I vote for it -- (Interjection) -- I have voted for it period. -- (Interjection) -- I'm not against it.

MR. DESJARDINS: Oh, okay that's fine.

MR. GRAY: I'm definitely not against, I'm just telling that to prove it they have to have a longer period to prove it -- and I never deny what I do, wrongly or rightly -- mostly wrongly.

I think that the last speech of the honourable member is a very good one as far as his training at the expense of the legislature for a speech in the Federal House. I didn't say he'll be elected. I said his practising his speech at our expense. People demand the garbage be removed every week and when the City Council removed it every ten days it was a crime. Well somebody has to remove it; there's an expense; somebody has to pay for the service they're giving them. They cannot have both; it's impossible. Dollars don't grow on trees. If they want this service they have to pay for it and they are paying; and I don't say that anyone is paying too much because he's paying for these services. If you take the average homeowner of the working man. It's true that the assessments were increased and taxes will be increased, but at the same time they want this service and they are getting it. They are getting fire protection. They are getting police protection. They are getting clean streets, the garbage is being removed. They are getting cheap electricity. They are getting cheap power. They are being looked after. They've got to contribute whether they can or not. Those that cannot have to go down and ask for help. But you cannot buy a bottle of beer and not pay for it.

Now, I have really enjoyed all the speech from the Premier, the Budget Speech, it was an education to me. And I do want to pay a high compliment to the Leader of the Opposition for his speech, and particularly I did not expect that my own Leader will be so sober and to make such an intellectual, intelligent attack on the government.

MR. D. L. CAMPBELL: (Lakeside): It really is unusual. That's right. Very unusual.

MR. GRAY: You could interpret any way you like. I love my leader; I follow him. And don't you ever charge me with less loyalty to my party, to my group, and to my leaders -- and I've had several -- and I don't think the present Leader will accuse me of anything otherwise. And if you want to make fun of it you're perfectly all right. There's no amusement tax for you to make fun of another speaker, although the amusement tax also has been reduced. So let's forget about it. We have a shrine, we have a parliament, we are discussing it, and the very fact that we were right all the time, you could find on the statute books where there are many, many pieces of legislation which we have advocated for years and they're now in the statute books by the government that be, and they have introduced it. I could mention quite a few things by this government and by the previous government when they have refused a better life for the people of Manitoba and a year or two later, at their wisdom, they introduced it themselves. I'm not going to enumerate them now, but I say that our efforts and our aim is not going to waste. Anything we ask this year and they refuse to give it to us, we'll probably get it next year. And particularly I refer now to the Minister of Education when he has not even seriously considered the new idea of guidance in education. And of course everybody can prove they're always right, and if you analyze the speeches of the Leader of the government when he was in opposition and analyze the Leaders of the Liberal group now, you'll find it's the same message and the same speech. The only difference as far as I am concerned personally, within the Liberal group here and the Conservative group down there is where they sit. They are both against public ownership, although they have included it. They are both against more benefits to the working men. They are against minimum wage. They're against everything and the same thing applies to both of them. So if we have to choose one or the other, I'll probably put a coin in the air and find if it's head or tails. There's no other way of doing it.

A MEMBER: Whichever turns up is wrong.

MR. GRAY: Whatever turns up is wrong. I agree with you. The main criticism I have against the Budget Speech is that the First Minister has not found it necessary to say one single

(Mr. Gray, cont'd.) . . . word in connection with world conditions. He's still of the old school. In my opinion, he's still trying to build a fence around Manitoba and the whole world. He has not shown -- at least in the Budget Speech unless I don't read good English -- it doesn't show a word about the world's condition affecting Manitoba and Manitoba affecting the world. He didn't say a word. He didn't say a word about increasing our agricultural development in order to feed the rest of the world -- half of it, if not more, are going to bed every night hungry. I think that this was -- he missed it -- he discussed all kinds of figures, but figures can be read in the Budget Speech. But he did not go out for one moment outside of Manitoba which I personally regretted and I mentioned it to my colleagues, there's something which he missed, whether it is intentionally or he has it otherwise, I do not know. I think that we now must consider that anything that happens in Moscow, Bagdad or in Washington does affect us; whether they're atom bombs or whether they're nuclear developments, it doesn't matter which, we here cannot escape it a moment today. When you could have your breakfast in Winnipeg and your lunch in London and your dinner in Czechoslovakia, we cannot isolate ourselves. I thought perhaps this is the only criticism -- not the only one of course, but time is getting on -- but this is the main criticism as far as I'm personally concerned. We are on the eve of prorogation; we have made all the suggestions to the government, the administration. Until they have the power, I don't think that they should ignore every word uttered here by the Opposition. After all the Opposition is criticizing not entirely for their own political benefit, but they also do it because they are just as interested in seeing a satisfied Manitoba; in seeing a progressive Manitoba and in seeing that each and every one in our province should have their reward for the labour they render to the people of the province.

I have another quite a few but I think perhaps if I speak long, the other one will speak longer, so I better retire.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I'm like my honourable friend who spoke just ahead of me, I had no intention at all of participating in this debate, and I can perhaps call some witnesses, maybe the same ones as my honourable friend from Inkster to testify to that fact; but unlike my honourable friend from La Verendrye, I'm not going to say that I'm going to take just a few minutes and then take three-quarters of an hour. I'm going to say that I'm going to take a few minutes and I hope that that is all that it will require to pass a few comments upon some of the remarks that we have heard in connection with this debate.

My honourable friend from La Verendrye, I suppose, could be said tonight to be giving his "swan song" to the Manitoba Legislature as this is probably the last occasion that this or any other legislature for the foreseeable future will have to hear him. He's embarked now on a career, he hopes, in federal politics -- And I think that the Honourable Member from Inkster was quite right in saying that he was, perhaps, giving us the benefit of one of his training speeches here tonight. He started off by talking about a wave of favourable impression that had surrounded this government at one stage, and which he felt now was rather waning away. Well of course, Mr. Speaker, we all know that this wave of favourable impression is still lapping over the hulk of the Liberal Party in Manitoba, shipwrecked on some forgotten shore somewhere looking as they did last year for a new captain which they found, but still floundering I'm afraid on this far forgotten shore. The government, he says, has lost its spark. This is very interesting: This is a recurring theme that we're hearing now from my honourable friends opposite. I really don't know what evidence they call in support of this proposition but I suppose they can adopt the tactics that others have from time to time and suggest that if you tell a story often enough, be it right or wrong, or slightly off base or on base, people are going to start to believe it. That's an old propaganda technique and, I suppose, now having heard this from the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition and the Member from La Verendrye that we can expect to hear a bit more about this in the future.

But you know, Mr. Speaker, I've got a much greater impression, a much greater faith in the intelligence of the people of Manitoba than to believe that sort of nonsense; because the people of Manitoba know what sort of a government they have. They have been able to see over the past few years what this government has been able to accomplish -- sometimes over the bodies of the members of the Liberal Opposition -- but nonetheless they are able to see the roads, they're able to see the schools, they're able to see the new school division plan, and we could go on through all the items which I'm sure the people of Manitoba know much better than

(Mr. Lyon, cont'd.) . . . my honourable friend. But I merely want to assure them that the people of Manitoba are not going to forget these things quite as rapidly as perhaps you hope they would because they're going to be around for many years. Many of the changes that have been made are going to be with us for generations to come and they're going to stand as, I suppose, a sort of testament to what good government, progressive government can do in this province. All of the talk that we hear about there being no spark left in the government and so on, is going to be treated I'm afraid as just so much eyewash when the day of reckoning comes, as I'm sure it's going to come. How soon or how late one doesn't know yet, but it's going to come one of these days.

My honourable friend from La Verendrye called for the election. He said, "Let's have it." He's a great one to call for the election because he's not going to be here to suffer the defeat that we know he'd get. But he calls for it on behalf of his other colleagues in any case. His election is coming up on June 18th; he's going to have a lot of free time on his hands after that time. So if my honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition wants to whisper to us quietly, "don't pay any attention to him he doesn't know what he's talking about" we'll listen. I remember the Member from Ethelbert Plains standing up this session and saying, what a great Leader he had and he had faith in him and so on. These were good words coming from that member. But he said, and I remember these words, "Give us another year. He needs a little more time to get things going." Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that we can all say that having watched the Liberal Opposition in operation this session, we believe that the words of the Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains are quite true. I think they do need a little time. I think, as a matter of fact that they need more than a year. I think probably the public of Manitoba will give them five, ten, fifteen or twenty years for that matter, to get things organized and to come back as a live rejuvenated party under what leadership or under what captain, I don't know at that time.

He said that the province is now going through a period of stagnation. Well if this is stagnation, I think the people of Manitoba will want to stagnate for quite a while, because, again, without enumerating all of the policies one can see that progress has been and is being made at the present time. He purported and I venture now into a subject which, of course, is not germane to the office of Attorney-General, but he purported to say that the actions of the present government, as I recall and as I have a note here, during the drought last summer were something less than what might have been expected from a government that was on its toes. Well, Mr. Speaker, if there's one thing that I've heard in connection with the action taken by the government and particular by the Minister of Agriculture last year, it was that Manitoba led the way among all agricultural provinces in devising and in implementing those programs and policies best designed to meet this great condition which struck our agricultural areas; best designed to give immediate help, preserve the livestock herds that we have in Manitoba and so on; to preserve as much as we could from the situation that confronted us at that time. My honourable friend from La Verendrye doesn't have to believe me. All he has to do is to look at the annual brief that was presented by the Manitoba Farmers Union to this government to get some indication of the feeling of the farmers of Manitoba toward the policies carried on by the government during the drought period last year. But I mention these not to pat us on the back particularly but only to point out to my honourable friend from La Verendrye that for a government that is stagnating and for a government that has lost its spark, we're still able to do the odd thing, the odd thing, that meets with the general approval of the people of Manitoba even including the farm community which he professes to speak about from time to time. He, of course, is going on to where the big decisions are made. I believe that that was the quotation that was attributed to him when he accepted the Liberal nomination for the federal constituency of Provencher. I must say tonight, Mr. Speaker, that we're quite happy that he has seen fit to give us the benefit of his opinion upon some of the small decisions that we have to deal with from time to time in this House. I only regret, of course, that he will never have the opportunity to participate in those big decisions. I see my honourable friend coming in; I'm happy he's here. He will have never the opportunity to participate in those big decisions, but I hope that from time to time after the 18th of June when he has more time on his hands that he will permit us to call upon him from time to time to help us with some of these small decisions that we're still going to be struggling with in this House and in this Legislature.

(Mr. Lyon, cont'd.)

But, Mr. Speaker, he went on to talk about federal policies in agriculture. Well, we've heard the Minister of Agriculture -- today I think we heard the Minister of Agriculture dealing with a farm resolution presently on the Order Paper dealing with federal policies in agriculture so I don't intend to intrude any further in that particular field. I only say to my honourable friend from La Verendrye that I hope during the course of the present campaign that he uses those same words out on the hustings and tells the farmers that things have never been worse and tells the farmers that the Wheat Board of Canada is only selling 23% of the export market in grain now whereas it was 26% some six years ago. I'm sure they're going to be pleased with those statistics when my honourable friend tells them about them. I'm sure though that they will remember as well that they're selling more bushels of wheat today than they ever sold before; and I don't know that the impression he attempts to create by percentages is really going to get across. I don't know when he tries to tell them that the Wheat Board has not been doing such a good job, or the government, I should say, has not been doing such a good job over the past five years, that they're going to believe him when they look at the world price of wheat, when they look at the Canadian wheat market as it presently is today. And may I say when they pick up tonight's paper -- the evening paper tonight, and they see the Minister of Agriculture of Canada able to say to the farmers of Canada, "plant more wheat this year." Now my honourable friend is free, free, of course, to campaign as he wishes. But from one who is an equal of his in terms of years spent in politics, I would say to him just as a friend, I wouldn't advance that argument too much in the hustings, because the number of votes that he is bound to get or that he is going to get will be diminished even further, and I would really hate to see my honourable friend lose the \$200 deposit along with the election which we are sure he is going to lose in any case.

There was some talk about crop insurance, agricultural credit. You know we've heard these arguments so often in the House, Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that the typists in Hansard and the members of the press gallery could give them to you backwards in Pakistani if they wanted to, so I don't intend to labour them anymore. It's very interesting though to hear my honourable friends now supporting crop insurance; to hear them supporting agricultural credit and saying, "it's no good because it doesn't do enough." My honourable friend from La Verendrye was in the House when the six-month hoist was put on this Agricultural Credit Bill. I remember I spoke on it. And I remember the motion being moved at the time. I'm not sure if it wasn't the present Leader of the Opposition. If I'm wrong, he can correct me. But there was a six-months' hoist moved on the bill, if my memory serves me. These same people who today are telling us that we're not going fast enough or far enough in agricultural credit and wanted to kill it when it started out.

Crop insurance, oh well, there's a subject one could wax eloquently upon. There's a subject I'm sure that they're trying to get onto the right side of now because everybody in Manitoba realizes that this is a good program. Crop insurance is something that is needed. And I don't blame them. I welcome their support now. I welcome their support because this is something that all Manitobans in the farm community are going to have to have as years come by. We note with considerable interest only, this rather rapid change in view of my honourable friends opposite.

The initiative of the government he talks about has been lost. He talks about that very pregnant issue of daylight saving time. Well, I always remember when I come to that subject, Mr. Speaker, that my honourable friends had, how many years? -- 10, 12, 14, 20, 40, you name it, to clean up daylight saving time, had they seen fit to do so. Our argument on this matter is fairly clear. We don't believe and I don't think that they really believe in their heart, the powers that are accorded to municipalities should be robbed away from them without consulting the municipalities. But that's not an issue of Manitoba that is anything new or that has anything new or anything exciting about it at all. But this is the type of picayune, small, niggling, weaseling type of comment that we have been getting from the members of the opposition, particularly the members of the Liberal Opposition. I am waiting -- and here we are within 24 hours of the end of this session, approximately, we hope -- I'm waiting to hear the Liberal Party of Manitoba come out on some broad theme of policy and tell the people of Manitoba what they stand for. Let it be on Metro; let it be on the floodway; let it be on taxation; the budget;

(Mr. Lyon, cont'd.) services that we're providing; whatever; let it be on roads, let it be on any major facet of government policy but let them come out and talk. Tell us what their program is. -- (Interjection) --

My honourable friend from La Verendrye had the temerity to suggest that we were sitting on the fence over here on Metro. I hasten to assure him that we are not, Mr. Speaker. We are not. Because, Mr. Speaker, there's no room left on that fence, there's so many grits astride of it right now there's no room left for anybody else -- (Interjection) -- So when he wants to talk about initiative I say to him, let's see some of the initiative from the opposition on some of these broad policies that means something to the people of Manitoba. What about school divisions. What do you think about them now? Let's hear about that. Let's hear about school division plans. Let's hear about how you would develop a new curriculum for Manitoba. Let's hear about some of these things instead of the niggling criticism we get all the time on the little back-loggers and so on that really don't affect the public life of this province.

Well there are many other things that he went on to talk about. Oh, the one I got the particular enjoyment out of though, was that great crushing debate on the question of rushing of business during the last week of the session. That's a priceless one. I hope he uses that one in Provencher; there'll be a lot of mileage in that one. Well, Mr. Speaker, I haven't been in the House any longer than my honourable friend from La Verendrye. We both came in at the same time -- fortunately we're not both going to leave at the same time -- but I want to tell him that from what passing experience and what passing familiarity I have with the House that the practice was time-honoured in all legislatures under the former government as I recall that there was always a rush near the end. But my honourable friend from Lakeside has been at pains I know each year as the situation comes about, and I have appreciated it, and I think the younger members of the House have appreciated it, when he stands up and says occasionally that now members of the public and members of the press and new members of the House shouldn't get the idea that this stuff is going through without any proper debate and so on, and I think particularly he was talking about concurrence and estimates. And the same applies of course with respect to legislation. The bills about which my honourable friend saw fit to complain tonight -- even though he wasn't here most of the time when they were introduced or debated -- the bills about which he saw fit to complain have been on the Order Paper -- some of them for two or three weeks and have been there for criticism and for study and for improvement by all members of the House including the members of the government side. So I don't really think that that is a well-founded argument. In fact I wonder why it's even brought in. I read some comment about something to this effect in one of the newspapers recently, but surely we're entitled to something a bit more original. Something that my honourable friend might have thought of himself. But, as I say it's such a picayune and niggling subject, I don't wish to dwell anymore upon it because again I think that experienced members of the House and members of the public will treat it in accordance with the weight that should be attached to it.

And then finally he went on to the subject of the tax jungle in Metro. He said that it was a terrible thing for Metro or for the government to have set up a new level of government and asked this new level to collect its taxes through the municipalities. But I couldn't follow his logic when he said that this is not a bad thing when it's done by school divisions sending their same bills up to municipalities and asking them to collect. Now he said he had some reason for the imbalance between these two propositions. I'd like to know what it is because the principle is much the same in both cases. He said that we have set up Metro with no tax base. That's not the fact. Metro has a tax base; he knows what it is as well as I do -- tax base of realty; the tax base of business tax in all of the municipalities in Greater Winnipeg. He said that Metro is set up with no provincial money. When he drives down south on a portion of Pembina Highway that runs through my constituency I can tell him he's driving on a 40% Metro road now. And I can tell him as well that the contributions that we are making toward Metro roads and toward Metro bridges -- Does he forget about the St. James bridge? Does he forget about all of these things conveniently when it suits his purpose? I hope not, because again, let me remind him -- and I'm not speaking to him as any great expert in the field of politics -- but I mention again, we've both been in it the same length of time. I think the essential difference is that I've got a little more faith in the intelligence of the people than my honourable friend and I merely say to him that the people will not forget these things. They don't forget them, and he can talk about

(Mr. Lyon, cont'd.) . . . no tax base and no provincial money to Metro all he wants, but the people of Greater Winnipeg are driving on Metro roads that are paid for -- some of them in whole and some of them in part by the Province of Manitoba. They're going to be driving on new bridges that are going to be built in toto the river crossings by the Province of Manitoba -- three of them. And these things all stand I suggest as, not as monuments -- these things all stand as testaments to progressive government, a government that is trying to work in co-operation with all levels of municipal governments whether they be Metro; whether they be municipal.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have no other notes. I have attempted to confine myself to just a few passing remarks in response to those made by my honourable friend from La Verendrye. In conclusion, tonight, may I take this opportunity to thank him for his "swan song" speech. It was nice to hear from him again. We're going to miss him in this legislature. He's an attractive, intelligent member. His politics are wrong of course, but he brings other personal qualities to this House which are going to be missed from this House. And as I said at the outset, when he wasn't here, I conclude on the same note, I'm sorry that all legislatures in Canada are going to miss this young man from our midst, because he's not going to the federal House, unfortunately; and as I said before, I hope that on the 18th of June -- (Interjection) -- on the 18th of June when he has, and subsequently, when he has more time on his hands, I hope he will come to call on us occasionally to give us the benefit of his advice on some of these small decisions that the rest of us here are going to stay around and try to make over the next few years.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, just on a correction on the member's speech, if I may. I did not move a six months' hoist on the Agricultural Credit Bill. I did move -- no one did -- but I did move an amendment suggesting that the rate of interest should not be more than 5% per annum. There was no six months' hoist.

MR. LYON: I defer to my honourable friend's recollection.

MR. MOLGAT: I'll refer you to the journals.

MR. LYON: I accept.

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

MR. ROBLIN: The motion is then passed Sir. We're not calling for yeas and nays here unless somebody else wants them. There may be some yeas and nays on other votes. This one, I think, is pretty well resolved by now. I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce, that the resolutions reported from the Committee of Ways and Means be now read a second time and concurred in.

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

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I'm afraid I gave you the wrong motion there. What I should have done is to ask you to put the resolution that the Speaker leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of Ways and Means. It's after that stage that we propose concurrence. I regret my slip in that respect.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Ways and Means for raising of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty, with the Honourable Member for St. Matthews in the Chair.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, we'd better hold up proceedings for a second -- (Interjection) -- Fine, thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolved that towards making good the sums of money granted to Her Majesty for the public service of the Province for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1962, the sum of \$112,015,213.00 be granted out of Consolidated Fund.

Mr. Chairman presented the question and after a voice vote declared the motion passed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolved that towards making good certain monies for various capital purposes the sum of \$57,683,375.00 be granted out of Consolidated Fund. Resolution be passed? Committee rise and report. Call in the Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Ways and Means has adopted certain resolutions and directed me to report the same and ask leave to sit again.

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

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 Minister of Industry and Commerce that the resolutions reported in the Committee of Ways and Means be now read a second time and concurred in.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion.

MR. CLERK: Resolved that towards making good the sums of money granted to Her Majesty for the service of the province for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1962, that the sum of \$112,015,213.00 be granted out of Consolidated Fund. Resolved that towards making good certain monies for various capital purposes the sum of \$57,683,375.00 be granted out of Consolidated Fund.

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

MR. ROBLIN introduced Bill No. 40, an Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the public service of the province for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1963.

MR. ROBLIN introduced Bill No. 98, an Act to authorize the expenditure of money for various capital purposes and to authorize the borrowing of the same (1).

MR. ROBLIN introduced Bill No. 31, an Act to authorize the expenditure of monies for various capital purposes and to authorize the borrowing of the same (2).

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, before I move the second reading may I suggest to the House that we give second reading and follow through the procedure on these three bills by leave. I think that the subject matter of the bills are proforma, in that we are all thoroughly familiar with the contents having debated this for the last six or eight weeks, and I ask for leave to proceed in that way. And if there's no objection to that, I will move with leave that Bill No. 40, an Act for granting to Her Majesty certain sums of money for the public service to the province for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1963, be now read a second time and referred to the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. Speaker put the question.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I presume it's the intention to proceed on the three bills to the second reading stage tonight and leave third reading for tomorrow. Is that correct?

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, if there's no objection to them, I would like to put them to the Committee of the Whole tonight and we could proceed with the whole formula for passing these bills. I think members will find that the bills on the current supply merely consist a summary of the items that we've already discussed in Committee of Supply; and the capital bills merely repeat the schedules that we have repeated in the capital when we considered the capital bills in Committee of Supply. The wording that goes with them is the ordinary wording that we have had over these many years and there are no changes in that wording. It is the same formula that we've always used. So naturally if there's any objection, we won't do it, but it seemed to us that we might very well proceed with them all now.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I'm not rising to object, but more to find out what the procedure is going to be. We have the understanding that any of the resolutions on the Order Paper will be discussed and providing we're operating on that understanding, I have no objection to proceeding.

MR. ROBLIN: I see my honourable friend's point. I assure him we'll be meeting at 9:30 tomorrow morning.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party)(Radisson): if I may, Mr. Speaker, I have no objections for them going to Committee of the Whole tonight but I would like the opportunity of checking them to make amply sure. And may I suggest to the First Minister that in granting leave for these to go into the Committee of the Whole House that formal third reading be given tomorrow morning when we meet. Would that be agreeable?

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, if honourable members wish that, I have no objection to it at all. I would like to proceed as far as reporting from the Committee of Supply, but we will leave the motion for third readings until tomorrow morning if that is the desire of the House.

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

MR. ROBLIN presented Bill No. 98, an Act to authorize the expenditure of monies for various capital purposes and to authorize the borrowing of the same (1), for second reading.

MR. ROBLIN presented Bill No. 131, an Act to authorize the expenditure of monies for various capital purposes and to authorize the borrowing of the same (2), for second reading.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Public Works that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the three bills to which second reading has just been granted.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bill No. 40.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, before proceeding with any of the bills -- the wording in all of these is similar to the wording in the same bills in previous years? There's no change in policy; no change in drafting?

MR. ROBLIN: There are no changes at all that I'm aware of, Mr. Speaker. I'm sure they would have been brought to my attention if there were any and none have.

Bills Nos. 40, 98 and 131 were read section by section and schedules and passed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has considered certain bills and directed me to report the same without amendment. Bills No. 40, 98 and 131; and directed me to report the same and ask leave to sit again.

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

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

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I think that we should now proceed with the resolutions on the Order Paper and I suppose the first thing to be looked at would be the amendment proposed this afternoon by the Honourable Minister of Agriculture to the resolution on trade. I think you undertook to advise us whether it was in order or not.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if before you make your ruling -- because, of course, your ruling is not debatable once you have made it -- whether you've had an opportunity of looking at Section 202, Subsection 12, I believe it is, on Page 170 of the fourth edition of Beauchesne. I draw this to your attention, Sir, because I've looked up Beauchesne and it appears to me that according to this particular subsection the amendment as proposed by the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture could be construed as being not in order and I respectfully suggest, Mr. Speaker, that if you have not looked at this particular rule that you may do so. --(interjection) -- Pardon? On Page 170; it is Subsection 12 of citation No. 202 if memory serves me correctly.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, on the same point, and I have read the amendment as carefully as I could and compared it to the original amendment, it seems to me that the wording to which we would object is the taking out of the word "negative" and substituting therefor the word "constructive." These strike us as being a direct negative. I might add further that under Item No. 14 of the same citation which says that: "an amendment which would produce the same result as if the original motion were simply negative is out of order", it seems to me that the proposed sub-amendment actually contradicts completely the original amendment, and if that is the wish of the mover then we should simply vote against the original amendment.

HON. GEO. HUTTON (Minister of Agriculture and Conservation)(Rockwood-Iberville): Mr. Speaker, might I say a word, since I moved this amendment? I would like to point out that this is not in the "resolved", the wording that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition and the Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party are objecting to. In the first place, it's not in the resolved section, in the operative section, of the resolution. It's in the preamble. And secondly, I would like to point out that the word I used was "constructive".

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, it doesn't matter. The point is there is another rule and I haven't got my finger on it at the present time -- a rule I'm sure that you're well aware of that where any portion of an amendment is out of order, then it strikes out the whole amendment, and I merely rise, Mr. Speaker, to draw these points to your attention before a ruling is made. But there's no argument afterwards.

MR. ROBLIN: suggested Sir, that if you're not prepared to rule on it tonight, we could discuss it tomorrow morning. On the other hand, if you are prepared, that's all right.

MR. SPEAKER: would be the proper thing to do. I could read out the sense of the motion to the House if they wish me to. I have copied it out in the manner in which it is amended. I might say that I have put the motion together as the amendment to the amendment

(Mr. Speaker, cont'd) proposes, if the House would like to hear it. It might give them a little better idea of what it's all about. The motion, as amended by the amendment would read:

Whereas new trading patterns appear to be developing which may closely affect the vital agricultural, extractive and manufacturing industries of the Province of Manitoba,

And Whereas wider and freer trading patterns of a multilateral, non-discriminatory kind are in the best interests of the people of Manitoba,

And whereas the six countries of the European Common Market are Canada's friends and allies and Canada has extensive trade relations with the Common Market as evidenced by the fact that Canada's exports thereto have quadrupled in the last ten years,

And whereas the possible entry of the United Kingdom into the Common Market and the economic policies now being advocated by President Kennedy of the United States are of a fundamental importance to this province,

And whereas the Government of Manitoba is encouraging the expansion and development of agriculture, the extractive industries and manufacturing for sale at home and abroad,

And whereas the Government of Manitoba sought and obtained the co-operation of the Government of Canada in holding the Manitoba Export Trade Conference in 1961 and the Government of Manitoba has been assured of the continuing co-operation of the Federal Government and its Trade Commissioner Service in its activities to expand the export trade of the Province of Manitoba;

Whereas the success of a Manitoba Trade Commission is to a considerable extent dependent on the actions of the Government of Canada in the field of trade and tariff arrangements;

And whereas the Government of Canada is responsible for trade and tariffs;

And whereas the Government of Canada has taken a constructive attitude towards the European Common Market and the entry of the United Kingdom into that association:

Therefore be it resolved that this House encourage the Government of Canada to continue to extend to the United Kingdom co-operation in this venture;

And further be it resolved that this House request the Government of Canada to continue to support enlightened policies of freer trade and to investigate actively all possibilities of developing larger areas of free trade. " That's what the motion means -- the amendment to the amendment.

MR. PAULLEY: Your Honour, that that in itself, in my opinion at least, is tantamount to a direct negative of the amendment as proposed by the Honourable the Leader of the Liberal Party, and I think it's in that context you should consider the amendment as proposed by the Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. SPEAKER: I'll take it under consideration. My opinion at the moment is that maybe that's not exactly right. Adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Minister of Health. The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Mr. Speaker, I adjourned the debate for the Honourable Leader of our group.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, if I may then proceed, I have a brief few comments to make on this resolution. The resolution proposed by the Minister of Health is one of general terms. I don't really know why he brought it into the House but he apparently wanted some recommendations for some of the things he had said to the Commission on Health Services. And I must say, Mr. Chairman, that by and large what he says here is not too far from the position that our own party had taken on the subject. I can refer him to the working paper which he may not have had -- possibly he did have it -- (interjection) -- of our leadership convention of last year at which time the committee that was investigating, or had been investigating this particularly, stated the following: "Liberal philosophy would have no Manitobans suffering from the want of adequate health care because of economic or financial reasons. A basic Liberal relief is that the freedom of the individual in our society should be carefully protected and should only be controlled where the controls provide greater real freedom for all members of society. On these principles we therefore conclude that comprehensive health care should be available to all and should not be substantially dependent upon the financial circumstances of the individual."

In addition to that -- of course this, as I say, is a year ago; a little over a year ago now -- in addition to that, the federal party had passed a resolution some three or four months prior to that embodying the same principles with some variations in detail, but the principle basically

(Mr. Molgat, cont'd) was the same, and I judge from what my honourable friend says here that it's roughly the same approach. I do have, though, two or three points of detail, Mr. Chairman, on which I would like to comment. The first one is the principle of ability to pay. Now I think it could be said that in a sense this is involved in the second portion -- second statement there -- that it be a stipulated premium within the range of the great majority of the citizens of Manitoba, but this would presumably mean a flat premium and no possibilities of rebates or anything like that. It seems to me that it would be desirable to clearly state the ability to pay principle in this proposition, and that is one thing I would suggest to the government. The second one is that the resolution appears -- although it starts off by talking about health services -- it appears in its operative part to be coming down to the point of only speaking of medical services, and I wondered at this, Mr. Speaker, when you consider the resolution or the brief that the Minister presented in the first place to the Health Services Commission, because there he speaks about many other things. He has a great number of sections -- it's quite a long brief -- brings in dental, for example, and makes some specific recommendations on the dental matter on page 39. He suggests, for example, the federal government provide a grant of 50¢ per capita for the provision of dental services in Manitoba; and it made me wonder when reading this whether he had intended to have free dental services in the province or have some expanded services in this line, and I'm rather surprised that this would not become then part of this resolution.

Further on, on page 48, the Minister speaks -- or starting page 47 -- speaks about drugs, and has quite a great deal of information here about the cost of drugs to the province itself which is the only factor which he can adequately have some records on, but if we can judge by the costs to the provincial government for its various hospitals, then we can easily conclude that the cost to the Province of Manitoba as a whole to the residents is very many times higher than this. Now in spite of this, the Minister does not include this in his resolution, and there's one particular comment I would make there, Mr. Chairman, that the table No. 25, on page 48, the Minister illustrates the variation in drug prices. He has drug (a) for example, running from a low from one company of \$140.00 to the same drug quoted by eight companies, and the eighth company being \$828.00. In other words, a range of 491 percent. And he goes on like this and lists a number of examples showing tremendous variation in the prices that the drug companies have been quoting to the government, presumably, for drugs. And yet he apparently is doing nothing about this. I don't know if he had intended that Manitoba should do something about this or simply that the federal government should, but it seems to me that this information, Mr. Chairman, would cause the Minister to be most anxious to do something to protect the citizens of the province, because surely, if the same drug can be sold by one firm for \$140.00 and by another firm for \$828.00 then there's something drastically wrong, and I'm sure that's why the Minister included this in his brief, and I would say to the Minister, well, there is a serious problem here; we've got to get at the problem within the responsibilities of the Province of Manitoba first, and secondly, of course, urging the federal government to do whatever is required in the circumstances. I'm not suggesting that we should control the prices of drugs but I think that we should make certain that either some standardization exist in names or that the public at least be informed that these various drugs that they're buying are the same thing and then they can judge for themselves what price they want to pay. But certainly this leaves open the field for serious consideration, and yet the Minister apparently is not intending to cover any of this by his resolution because he speaks only of medical insurance, so I would suggest there that there should be an expansion in the term medical. It should be changed and we should use the term "health" instead, which would cover more of the services required and would permit then an expansion of the program as conditions warranted.

The last point I want to make, Mr. Speaker, on the stipulations of the Minister -- and it's a point I made when his resolution, or his brief, was first presented, and I was questioned about it then by the newspapers and I said that it seemed to me that there should be one public principle embodied, and this one I think would commend itself to the Minister himself considering his profession, and that is that we be very careful to retain in the plan that personal relationship of doctor to patient. The free choice of doctor and patient. Now this, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me is essential. The Minister can speak much better than I on this particular field, but it seems to me that there's much more to medicine than just the fact of going to see some doctor

(Mr. Molgat, cont'd) and getting a diagnosis and recommendation. I think that faith in the doctor, that close relationship to a doctor, that belief on the part of the patient that he has a good doctor, that the doctor knows him, knows his problems intimately, is vital, and that we would lose a great deal in the field of health and medical services if the relationship between patient and doctor was simply that which may exist between the seller of any product and the customer. I think there's a great deal more, and that this should be embodied as a basic principle in establishing our plan. When we look at the Province of Saskatchewan and the troubles that they're having right now, I think it's evident that this must be retained, because it's only in that way that the plan will work properly.

So in the light of those comments, Mr. Speaker, I will move an amendment. Now I know the government isn't anxious to accept amendments from the Opposition. They've shown some reluctance on these matters. But I would recommend strongly to the Minister that he study this one carefully before deciding to vote against it, because really it does not, in any way, negate his resolution. It adds these points which I have mentioned, which I think are important and which I trust that he himself would agree with. So I beg to move, Mr. Speaker, seconded by the Member for Lakeside that the motion be amended by striking out the word "medical" in the 22nd line and substituting therefor the word "health", and that the motion be further amended by adding the following words after the word "Manitoba" in the last line: "with provision being made to incorporate the principle of ability to pay and retaining the free choice of patient and doctor."

Mr. Speaker presented the motion.

MR. D. ORLIKOW (St. John's): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture. The Honourable the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I don't want to hold up the work of the House at all but I have a couple of other resolutions later on that I will be speaking on. If it meets with the approval of the House, I would appreciate it if this would stand till tomorrow morning. I have no objection to any others speaking.

MR. SPEAKER: Stand?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, if there are no other members prepared to speak then I would agree that this item stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Attorney-General. The Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

MR. PETER WAGNER (Fisher): Mr. Speaker, the member is away. I would ask the House's indulgence to have this matter stand. However, if anybody wants to speak that would be all right.

MR. SPEAKER: Anybody wish to speak? Proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Attorney-General. Order stand?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I was hoping that the Attorney-General would be back momentarily and I don't know how long I can in propriety just stand here speaking as slowing as possible hoping that he will join us at any moment. I think that probably I could scarcely do the subject justice. I think in that event, Mr. Speaker, that we would proceed with the adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Selkirk which I understand is standing in the name of -- well now I wonder if it would be acceptable now, Mr. Speaker, if the Attorney-General were to propose his resolution now that he's here.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, Resolved that this House doth concur in the Report of the Standing Committee on Regulations and Orders hereinafter called "the committee" made to the House on the 16th day of February, 1962, and also the recommendations made therein; be it further resolved that the regulations hereinafter mentioned be dealt with as hereinafter provided: Regulation 52/61; Sections 3 and 6 are required to be repealed. Regulation 45/60; being spent, is required to be repealed. Regulations 46/60; as soon as the substance of this regulation has been enacted by statute (which is recommended), this regulation is required to be repealed. Regulation 51/60; this regulation is required to be amended as set out in the report. Regulation

(Mr. Lyon, cont'd) 52/60; this regulation is required to be repealed and re-enacted as set out in the report of the committee. Regulation 54/60; there being no authority for section 1 of this regulation, it is required to be repealed. Sections 4 and 5 of Regulation 64/58, as enacted by section 2 of Regulation 54/60, are redundant and are required to be repealed. Regulation 55/60; there being no authority for section 2A of Regulation 38/60, enacted by section 2 of Regulation 55/60, it is required to be repealed unless The Fruit and Vegetable Sales Act is amended to give the necessary authority for the section 2A aforesaid. Regulations 66/60 and 63/60; subsection 2 of section 1 and also section 2 of each of these regulations are required to be repealed for the reasons stated in the report of the committee. Regulation 9/61; this regulation is required to be repealed for the reasons stated in the report of the committee.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion.

MR. LYON: It is not my intention to make any extended remarks on this resolution but I do think I should call attention to the House to the fact that this is the implementation of the first report of your Standing Committee on Regulations and Orders -- the committee that was established a year and a half ago. I think this is a matter of no little significance because here for the first time in the history of our province we have the Legislature of Manitoba directing the Executive Branch of Government as a result of recommendations made by a committee of this Legislature to repeal or to remedy in some way regulations which have been passed by the Executive Branch of Government. This was the full intention, of course, when this committee was established in order to permit the Legislature to have a higher degree of control, so to speak, over delegated legislation. And here we see the first manifestation of this control by the committee bringing forth a resolution such as you have before you and asking for the House's support of it, and thereafter for the members of the Executive Council being under onus placed by the House to effect the changes set forth in this resolution. I think this is a singular occasion in the life of this legislature, Mr. Speaker, because it is the only legislature in Canada that has conferred this power over delegated legislation. Certainly I know that it will receive approval on all sides of the House. I merely make these few remarks to indicate to the Legislature -- to the members of the House -- that this is rather a hallmark, a benchmark in the life of our Legislature, and certainly one that I'm sure will be followed in other legislatures across the country as years go by. Again, I think Manitoba can take pride in the fact that we have led the way in Canada in this particular field, and I commend this resolution to the House for its consideration and approval.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q. C. (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, as a member of the committee, I'd like to join with the Honourable the Attorney-General in recommending to the House that this resolution be unanimously passed. At the same time though, I'd like to make this suggestion, that at the time this committee was set up, the First Minister listed the principles which should guide us in our deliberations. Now I feel that these principles that were so listed were good principles and these were the principles which we followed during our sittings. And I would suggest to the House, particularly to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, that the rules of this House be amended by incorporating into these rules the principles which should guide all future committees on statutory regulations and orders.

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

..... continued on next page

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Selkirk. Second reading of Bill No. 125, An Act to amend The Child Welfare Act. The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q. C. (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, the opposition to this bill has not been very voluble. In fact, the only one who has expressed opposition is the Honourable Minister of Health -- Welfare -- (Interjection) -- No, I never heard him.

Regarding the comments made by the Honourable Member of Health, I would like to say this, that his objection to the bill seems to fall into two main objections. First, that he doesn't like lawyers -- (Interjection) -- No, I realize that -- and secondly, he thinks that this bill takes away from a mother the right to determine the religion in which a child shall be brought up. With regard to the second objection, I think the House should understand that there are two methods by which children may be adopted under The Child Welfare Act. First, there is the voluntary method where the unwed mother or the parents decides or decide to give up a child for adoption. In that case, the unwed mother has the right to choose the adopting family, and by reason of the fact that she has that right, I don't think that it can be said that we are taking away from her the right of determining the religion in which that child shall be brought up. The second type deals with those children who are wards of the director or of Children's Aid Societies. And in that case, the director or the Children's Aid Society is, in what is commonly called, in loco parentis to that child, the mother or the parents of that child has lost all legal rights of guardianship and control over the child. It seems to me that when the director or a Children's Aid Society is placed in the position of being in loco parentis to a child, that it should, and they should be able to exercise all the functions that the natural mother or the natural parents can exercise in respect of the child.

So for these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I do not think that the objections raised by the Honourable Minister of Health are completely valid. As previously stated when I introduced this bill, I feel that the welfare of the child should be the matter of paramount consideration. I'm not going to go into the legal aspects of Section 131 of the Act. I think I have made it clear that, insofar as religion is a factor in that section, it is only a factor in respect of the two main faiths in Canada. It is not a factor in respect of any of the other faiths, nor is it a factor nor does it prevent an atheist or a person having no religion whatsoever from adopting a child of either of the two main faiths. Furthermore, it does not prevent adoptions by people of other faiths of children of these other faiths. In other words, there's nothing in that Act to prevent a Mohammedan from adopting a Buddhist and vice versa and, to that extent, I don't think that section can be considered a religious section at all and if it is a religious section, I submit it discriminates against the people of faiths other than the two main faiths in Canada.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to urge upon this House that they look upon this matter strictly on a welfare basis and consider what is in the best interests of the child and what steps we should take to clear up a situation in Manitoba which is worsening from year to year.

Mr. Speaker put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion lost.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members. Before I call the motion, I would like to call attention to the members of the House that they shouldn't talk together in such a loud voice as it's hard to hear the score when we take the vote.

The motion before the House is second reading of Bill No. 125 proposed by the Honourable Member for Selkirk, An Act to amend The Child Welfare Act.

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

YEAS: Messrs. Campbell, Dow, Gray, Guttormson, Harris, Hillhouse, Orlikow, Peters, Shoemaker, Wagner and Wright.

NAYS: Messrs. Alexander, Baizley, Bjornson, Carroll, Christianson, Corbett, Cowan, Desjardins, Evans, Froese, Groves, Hamilton, Hutton, Ingebrigtsen, Jeannotte, Johnson (Assiniboia), Johnson (Gimli), Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Molgat, Paultley, Prefontaine, Roblin, Roberts, Scarth, Shewman, Smellie, Stanes, Strickland, Watt, Weir, Witney, Mrs. Forbes and Mrs. Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas 11; Nays 38.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost. Adjourned debate on the proposed resolution proposed by the Honourable Member for Fisher and the proposed amendment thereto proposed by the Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne. The Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Brokenhead is not here this evening. My colleague the Honourable Member for Fisher is ready to speak on this resolution if it's agreeable to the House to let him proceed, and any other member of the House, and then the adjournment stand in the name of the Honourable Member for Brokenhead. As far as we're concerned, that would be quite satisfactory.

MR. WAGNER: Mr. Speaker, I don't get a chance to speak and they want me to sit down. Mr. Speaker, since I'm a member in this Legislature I didn't hear as many federal politics going on since last week, and naturally I was accused when I brought this resolution, particularly by the Honourable Member from Springfield -- Oh, I'm sorry he's not in his seat -- that this is a federal matter. For one moment I did not have any intention that the provincial government can give parity prices or stabilize the economy, but this government can call upon their cohorts in Ottawa, and they can do that.

However, the Member for Springfield, he kind of touched me where I don't very well like it and he quotes -- and I want to quote him in the Hansard of March 13th, '62, page 665. I'm not going to read too much because I want to expedite this session as fast as possible, but it seems to me that I'm holding my feet and the honourable members are getting ahead and I think I should have a say too. When he was speaking that this is a federal matter and I shouldn't be bringing this resolution to the provincial House, so I quote: "He seemed to have been in reverse gear trying to go ahead. He stated in his resolution that the three main farm grains are far too low in price and so forth, but to my observation and I think to everybody in this House, the Federalization Act" -- no doubt it's a misprint, it should be Stabilization Act -- "and the machinery of it does not control prices or anything of that type as far as the grains are concerned. The grain is controlled by the machinery of the Canadian Wheat Board. Therefore, I think there's a great big misconception of the whole thing on the part of the member who spoke on that the other day."

Mr. Speaker, I'm a little bit disappointed and surprised from the Member of Springfield. He has been well educated, in my opinion. He has taught school for quite a while and surely he understands that I didn't say that the Stabilization Bill 237 has to do anything with grain. Surely I understand and everybody else knows that it's under the Wheat Board jurisdiction. And again I must be fair to my Honourable Member from Springfield that I think he either forgot himself or he just wanted to make a little bit of noise.

A MEMBER: That's all he ever does.

MR. WAGNER: Mr. Speaker, when I mention this noise stuff, it reminds me of a story that three hermits were sitting in a cave and they made a deal -- that's why they were in the cave because it was too much noise out elsewhere -- so they were not on speaking terms. So one day a white horse passed by and one hermit said to the other: "My gosh, that's a nice horse." Two years later another hermit said: "Yes, it was a beautiful white horse." Three years later the third hermit said: "I move out because it's too much noise in this place." However, it seems to me that that's the only way I can refer to the Honourable Member from Springfield. He wanted to blow steam and I'm pretty sure that he's well relaxed now.

However, referring back to the federal items that we are speaking -- as I said from the outset, that we have been talking nothing else for the last week only federal issues, even European trade missions and Common Market and what not we have -- the Colombo Plan. So I don't think it's such a great sin to speak on the agricultural stabilization resolution.

However, the Honourable Member for Springfield wants to state that the government should take all the credit because the ten cent price increase in grain and all the money that the farmers receive, that it came from the government. However, I would like to remind the member that it came from the Wheat Board. This is our money; this is farmers' money; and we sell our grain in three stages. The first stage is initial, then interim, then final payment. The Wheat Board is our agent -- salesman, which I have high regard for the Wheat Board. I was one of those that had campaigned through the Interlake area when the plebiscite was held that the Wheat Board should be maintained. Now, Mr. Speaker, if I can refer again, if we would have such members in federal and in the provincial House as the Member for Springfield, we wouldn't have a Wheat Board. Oh no, we wouldn't have a Wheat Board, because already you start the thin edge of the wedge by reducing the feed mills, giving them the authority -- jurisdiction to buy their grain elsewhere; so therefore, Mr. Speaker, I resent some of those

(Mr. Wagner, cont'd.) statements that are stated against the Wheat Board.

Getting back, Mr. Speaker, to the resolution -- parity prices, cost of production or a fair share of the national income, it seems to me it's the very words that nobody likes to hear in this House. I don't know why, and I can refer myself to the Member from Souris-Lansdowne when he stated that I want state control and that the state owes us a living. I would quote the Member from Souis-Lansdowne on Page 1137, March 27, 1962 and I quote: "I think that he is trying to say" -- meaning me -- "in the latter part of his resolution, is that the state owes a living to every farmer in Western Canada, a standard of living, as he mentions in the last part of the resolution. I disagree very much with the honourable member for that reason. I think that that is one of the main differences between his Party and our Party, and may I say when I include our Party, I mean the Liberal Party too," -- well he speaks for the both parties -- "because we think in our opinion, that we should leave initiative and the desire with the individual to gain better results rather than to have the government interfere in any way with production costs and price controls." It says "freight controls" but I am sure he means "price controls."

Mr. Speaker, the farmers don't say that the state owes them a living -- a standard living. The farmers want a fair share of the national income. What is requested by them, they are entitled to. I would like to refer the Member for Souris Lansdowne, when the Prime Minister of that day, 1956, when he was the Leader of the Conservative Party of that day, that he too thinks that the state owes the farmers a living when he said "parity, not charity." Did he think at that time that the state owes a living to the farmers? Mr. Speaker, the farmers demand what is rightly theirs and it can be argued back and forth as you may, but we have to arrive at some settlement, some agreement, and we also refer all of these to a family farm. I have here a paper clipping. It's headed by "The Family Farm, Voice of the Farmer, U.S. Secretary of Agriculture." -- Orville Freeman reads the speech. He states what is meant by a family farm. "To me, the family farm is a unit of agricultural production characterized by the fact that the owner or operator who manages the farm is the farmer himself, and the farmer himself has the incentive to do a good job because he will be rewarded accordingly. Of course, he may hire some labor. But the family farm is distinct from a huge corporation farm operating entirely by hired labor. It is different from a state-owned collective farm. Its distinguishing feature is the incentive and enterprise that comes with individual ownership." I wonder whether this means something to the honourable member.

Now as far as parity prices, I've heard the Attorney-General refer even to the Farmers Union brief on drought conditions. I want to refer to a resolution that was passed by the Farmers Union on December 5, 6, 7, 1961, and I'll just read a paragraph of it and it states: "Whereas acreage payments, deficiency payments, subsidies to railways, converting poor lands to forests, etc., have not succeeded in alleviating the cost-price squeeze in agriculture; and whereas agriculture is the main industry in any stable economy; therefore be it resolved that the federal government institute parity prices for all farm commodities consumed in Canada." Now I would ask the Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne and the Member for Springfield whether they agree or they disagree with this resolution; whether they agree or disagree with the farmers, that they presented this resolution? I have here, Mr. Speaker, what I picked up, an excerpt from Economic Analyst, December '61, Page 122: "How the prices have declined on farm products. Farm prices of Agricultural" -- and it has the index from 1935 to 1939 equals 100 -- "In 1951, the farm prices of agricultural products, the index was 296.8 and in 1960, January, 240.9, a drop of 55.9; and that's exclusive of living costs. Well, it isn't fair for the farmers to ask for parity prices.

However, I would like to quote the cost of production of wheat on summer-fallow, and it comes from the Federal Government Illustration Stations Division on Progress Report 1954-1958, Experimental Farm Service, Canada Department of Agriculture, and it tells on Page 27 and 28: "A study was made in 1957 of costs of producing wheat on fallow at 80 locations in the three prairie provinces. The data are given in Table II and classified by location in three sub-geographic zones according to soil group. On a basis of costs per acre, the differences between these three groups are highly significant. It should be noted that these data pertain only to 80 widely separated locations. However, they indicate that significant differences in production costs per acre for spring wheat on fallow exist between regions but, because of compensating differences in yields, the costs per bushel are relatively uniform." Well Table II, it has Soil

(Mr. Wagner, cont'd.) Group -- Black and Gray Black; Number of Locations -- 28; cost per acre in 1957 was \$21.15 to grow on summer fallow the wheat. Shallow Black and Dark Brown, 30 locations, \$19.94 was the cost; and Brown was 22 locations, \$17.38 an acre. All groups, you average them -- 80 locations -- the average cost per acre was to produce from summerfallow the wheat, \$19.66. So we have already an experiment on the cost of production of wheat. A little bit elbow room, a little bit more energy, we can arrive to the stability the parity prices of cost of production.

Furthermore, that same report states: "Costs of field operations in the prairies were studied at 71 locations. For self-propelled grain combines, the 1957 data on costs per acre of operating them on 40 illustration stations are given in Table 12. As the size of the machine increases, as measured by table width, the cost per acre decreases." And the 10-foot combine, which I believe is mostly used -- and this is based on 122 hours per combine -- "operating costs included interest on investment, allowance for depreciation and repairs, fuel oil, grease and labor for operating the combine. Interest was charged at 6% on average investment; depreciation and repairs were based on probably life estimates of 2,000 hours, repairs being charged at 150% of machine value. Fuel, oil and grease charges were based on current prices. Labor was charged at \$1.05 per hour." Now 10-foot combine -- with tests of six machines -- an average per acre was \$4.62; the 12-foot was \$3.16; so on the average it costs \$5.51 to operate a combine per acre. Naturally when the machine is bigger you have less, but however I just point out the 10-foot and 12-foot combine because it's mostly used. So there we have the operating costs of the combines.

Now naturally we understand that the price of machinery even went up in '62. The farmers are not only receiving less for their produce but their living standard costs went up; the machinery went up; so where is the farmer? Naturally we had the budget -- the Honourable Minister of Finance, Mr. Fleming, he presented the budget in Ottawa -- we know what kind but there is one item -- I would like to refer in Free Press April 11th. While some people like to say that it's a budget of great help -- but to who? I don't want to refer to nobody as some of our members want to cover up themselves with the Farmers' Union brief, and I would like to say what the President of the Farmers' Union had to say on the budget. The headline is: "Budget is no Help -- Usick. Rudy Usick, President of the Manitoba Farmers' Union said Tuesday, One big disappointment to drought-stricken farmers here in the west is the omission from Mr. Fleming's budget of any special drought assistance." Naturally we have the \$40 million that we are expecting to have assistance for 1962. However, it's being construed that it's going to alleviate the situation of two-price system so, in other words, we did not receive nothing from the federal government due to the drought. He goes on further: "We in the farm union had been expecting a decision to be made by the government before spring seeding, as we had been promised by the Prime Minister the matter has been receiving serious consideration since mid-summer last. This omission in the budget means that we farmers will need to send a special delegation" -- and yes they did. They have been promised, as in the past. They sent a delegation -- ten of the farm organization -- as I stated under the Agriculture estimates -- "Farmers plead for Aid from Ottawa."

Now the farmers lost, in round figures, \$500 million. We want to take pride stating that we are good salesmen, selling wheat to other countries; we open the quota. My reasoning is this, that five years ago these markets were there; ten years ago these markets were there; but due to the results -- yes, I blame the both governments -- oh sure, the one in the past and the one at present. The one in Ottawa is electioneering now so that's out of the question to give some results now. However, we had these markets but for unknown reason to me we wouldn't practice them. The farmers lost \$500 million due to drought last year. Now we pride ourselves with an open quota. If the farmers would have had a 500 million bushel crop there would be no open quota -- No.

Now as far as the 50 members, I wonder if they pay any attention to what is the Wheat Board. And I will just refer a little bit to the Wheat Board that the farmers, through the Wheat Board, employ 650 people. How do these 650 people get paid? Through the sales of farmers' grain, and whatever is left afterwards, the farmer gets his equal share on his delivery quota. So let's not have no misconception on this.

The Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne was stating that he would rather stay on

(Mr. Wagner, cont'd.) the same level as his father was on the farm -- supply and demand should take its part. It reminds me of a story when two fellows, Harry and Pete, parted when they were 21 years of age and then they met 20 years after. Harry was married and Pete was not married, and Harry asked him: "Why didn't you marry Pete?" And Pete said: "You know what? My great-grandfather was a bachelor; my father was a bachelor; and I am a bachelor." So Mr. Speaker, I don't intend to stay where my father was or grandfather was. We cannot afford to stay and we shouldn't stay. We should get along; we should go ahead.

Now, Mr. Speaker, turning back to Bill 237, it was supposed to do wonders, and it is a good bill if it would be implemented right. Oh yes. I want to quote from the Farmers' Union resolution under Stabilization Bill. "Whereas Bill 237 was a decisive factor in the 1958 Federal election in its promise to bring price stability and a fair share of the national income to agriculture; and whereas this bill has dismally failed in its objectives; therefore be it resolved that the Manitoba Farmers' Union strongly request the federal government to make the necessary changes to bring about the implementation of the promises of the Bill." This bill was supposed to stabilize the prices. The Member for Souris-Lansdowne said it does not stabilize the prices. We had a little argument. I read here tonight in the Tribune, April 30th, where our assistant Agricultural Secretary, Warner Jorgenson said: "Saturday he accepted the nomination with the request that the Conservative government be allowed to carry on with the job it was doing for Canadians. For agriculture, he said, the government had brought in a price stabilization scheme." According to this Hansard of the Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne, that was not supposed to stabilize the price.

I want to quote, Mr. Speaker, from the Act, and it's a very short quotation. I took excerpts from the Statutes of Canada, '57-58, Chapter 22 in the Act to Provide for the Stabilization of Prices of Agricultural Commodities -- stabilizing prices -- "Whereas it is expedient to enact a measure for the purpose of stabilizing the price of agricultural commodities in order to assist the industry of agriculture to realize fair returns for its labour and investment, and to maintain a fair relationship between prices received by farmers and the costs of the goods and services that they buy; thus to provide farmers with a fair share of the national income; therefore Her Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and House of Commons of Canada, enacts as follows:" Then it says: "Agricultural Stabilization Board shall be nominated." Then it has an Advisory Committee. "The Advisory Committee established under subsection (1) shall meet at least twice a year and shall advise the Minister and the Board with respect to such matters relating to the stabilization of prices of agricultural commodities under this Act as are referred to it by the Minister or the Board." We are arguing here that the Bill 237 was not meant to stabilize prices, when the Act reads it so plainly. "The duties of the Board"-- it says: "The Board shall from time to time in accordance with this Act take such action as is necessary to stabilize the prices of agricultural commodities at their respective prescribed prices, and shall take such action and make such recommendations as are necessary to ensure that the prescribed prices for an agricultural commodity in effect from time to time shall bear a fair relationship to the cost of production of such commodity." Now, have we got that? "The expenditures of the Board -- there shall be established in the Consolidated Revenue Fund an account to be known as the Agricultural Commodities Stabilization Account, in this section called the "Account"." How much money per year does the account hold? The government can have \$250 million a year. The gentlemen opposite, I don't argue with their figures. I didn't go into statistics, but they claim that something over \$200 million was spent -- assisted by the government to the western farmer through the whole years since the Diefenbaker government came into power. Here the Act says \$250 million a year. "The Agricultural Stabilization Board has at its disposal a revolving fund of \$250 million which is \$50 million higher than that made available to its predecessor. This fund is maintained at that amount by annual appropriations by Parliament to cover any loss that may take place during the year, and if there should be any surplus to the Board's account, it is to be turned over each year to the general Consolidated Revenue Fund."

Mr. Speaker, where is our drought assistance for 1961? The government has that authority. The Stabilization Bill allows that, but what's happened? Oh no, those big promises that were made that they were going to stabilize the prices; that they were going to give parity, not charity; the cost of production; and I heard the Minister of Agriculture saying: "One vote from

(Mr. Wagner, cont'd.) the West for Diefenbaker government" -- well it sounded something like that -- I cannot quote him, what he said this afternoon. I believe, Mr. Speaker, in this election if the farmers will protest with every vote, then we shall get places; not giving him a mandate full strength saying yes, you're doing very well. This is the protest.

MR. EDMOND PREFONTAINE (Carillon): Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say a few words on this resolution. The members will recall that for four years we have had practically the same resolution emanating from the same corner and we have had the same amendment emanating from the same side of the House also, or just about a similar resolution and a similar amendment. Now for two years, Mr. Speaker, I have brought in a sub-amendment to a resolution of this kind. I had been impressed by a speech made by the First Minister at a banquet in Winnipeg when he was speaking to a group of businessmen, in which he had praised the Atlantic provinces for having an Atlantic Provinces Economic Council to discuss their common problems and he had suggested that we should have in Western Canada the same type of a council, and he called it the Prairie Provinces Economic Council; and I moved a sub-amendment in 1960 to a similar resolution and it got the approval of the House. Similarly, in 1961, I made the same sub-amendment to the same type of resolution and the same type of an amendment and, if I'm correct, again it was supported by the House unanimously. But last year there was a difference on the part of the government. Last year apparently there was a change of heart. We had had a committee here called by the Government of Manitoba, not of the western provinces but of the whole of Canada. It seemed that our First Minister had his eyes on larger fields than western Canada and that he wanted to have representatives of the whole of Canada to discuss agricultural problems; that to try and solve them on the basis of western Canada alone was not sufficient; and although I quoted again from his famous speech to the businessmen of Winnipeg, it had no effect on him that time and my resolution in the form of a sub-amendment didn't get to first base.

Well I had a notion to bring another one this year but there has not been time. It is too late now and I know that it would not achieve results because the First Minister has his eyes more and more on the national field rather than the western Canada field, and the resolution here mentions western Canada time and time again -- special problems for us in western Canada -- but this does not appeal to the First Minister. His eyes are somewhere else and, before long, I suppose he will be in that other field of activity and not the western Canada field. So it's no use, I will not bring such a resolution, but I don't like, in general, this form of an amendment. The resolution was a kind of a criticism. It was in the state of criticizing the federal government for not having done enough, and the amendment negates that to quite an extent. I wonder sometimes, Mr. Speaker, if it's not against the rules, because it praises rather than criticizes the federal government -- the amendment does. It's contrary, and if I could use common language I would say the one is a kick in the pants and the other one is a pat on the back, so it's somewhat negative.

But I don't feel like supporting this amendment at all. In other words, it doesn't mean very much, but there is something missing, I believe, and something that I would like to bring to the attention of the members of the House. I think it says at the bottom of Page 10 -- the last "whereas" at the bottom of page 10. It reads like this: "And whereas although the price of cereal grains today is substantially higher than in recent years, farmers are still in financial difficulty because of drastically reduced yields." That's not all, Mr. Speaker. They are, the farmers, in financial difficulty, not especially because of the yields but because the price of what they buy has increased out of proportion with the price that they get for what they sell. That's the source of the trouble. That's the squeeze that the farmers are in. They're in this squeeze because of the policies of the federal government. Prices are increasing. The dollar is not worth half of what it was and the farmers are those who suffer the most because of this squeeze, because a dollar doesn't go far; because the price of machinery is up; the price of everything that they buy is up; and because this is, to my mind, the greatest omission in the amendment as proposed by the Member for Souris-Lansdowne, I feel that I cannot support it. There's something good in it -- it's a kind of a weasely amendment that doesn't mean very much, but I think it has been on the Order Paper now and adding so much work -- verbiage there for so long -- we should get rid of it and we should go back to the resolution moved by the CCF Party, which I believe is a good one.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I think we have an understanding that we will allow this amendment to stand in the name of the Honourable Member for Brokenhead if no one else cares to speak tonight.

MR. SPEAKER: Order stand. I might say that I have prepared a ruling on the next one. It's almost 11:00 o'clock, so possibly we should skip that one until tomorrow.

MR. ROBLIN: that would probably be agreeable, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, and the amendment thereto by the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell. The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, in view of this late hour, if it was permissible I'd sooner have this motion stand. I think there's only about ten minutes and if we're going to adjourn at 11:00 o'clock, I don't think there's -- it was your wish, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, if the honourable gentleman is willing to proceed, then I think we should hear him, but I leave it to him.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, Mr. Speaker, first of all I might say that I'm very disappointed in the amendment that the Honourable Member from Birtle-Russell made quite awhile ago on this motion. There was only one speech on this; it was delayed for quite awhile, and now it looks like it's being rushed. I hope that next year, next session, the members, especially the members on the government side, will remember what the Honourable the Leader of this House said today that he hopes that we won't just adjourn and adjourn and ask these resolutions stand. I think that this has been the case in this resolution. I think it's been another one of these resolutions -- wishy-washy resolutions -- that doesn't mean anything. In fact, it certainly is my feeling that this amendment was out of order. I should not be surprised, Mr. Speaker, in view of some of the incidents that happened in this House, especially in the last few weeks, where some of the government members have seemed to use the rules to suit themselves, but nevertheless --

MR. SPEAKER: I don't think that your remarks are well taken. I take it from that, that you were practically saying that the government members influenced my decisions.

MR. DESJARDINS: I didn't say that, Mr. Speaker. I said that I should not be surprised, in view of the ways and the incidents that happened and in the way that some of the members of the Opposition have tried to use -- of the government-- have tried to use the rules of this House to suit themselves -- (Interjection) -- Well it's exactly what I mean. I said they've tried to use this; they've tried; and if they would like to have a few incidents I'm ready to name them, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: I think that the statements you are making are not very fair to the Speaker of the Legislature.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well have you noticed the word "tried"? I said they've tried. Now after that, Mr. Speaker, you or anybody else can take their interpretation of my words and I think I can prove accusations. As I've said, they've tried, because the Honourable the First Minister spoke longer than 5:30 when he was reminded that it was past 5:30. Isn't that trying to use the rules to suit himself?

MR. SPEAKER: I did look up the rule book when the Honourable the First Minister was speaking overtime, and he was replying to a want-of-confidence motion of the House.

MR. DESJARDINS: It was in Committee, Mr. Speaker. It was in Committee and it was 5:30.

MR. SPEAKER: Oh, well let's

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, I didn't mention the Speaker. I said that's exactly it, that I said that in the way that the members of the government have tried to use the rules to suit themselves. Those are my words.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, if it's not a reflection on you, it certainly reflects on us on this side of the House.

MR. DESJARDINS: That's right.

MR. ROBLIN: And we will object to it on a point of privilege and say that the honourable member really ought not to make such statements.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, Mr. Speaker, it's getting close to 11:00 o'clock. I won't make any other statements, but it's still a free country and I can think what I want --

(Mr. Desjardins, cont'd.) (Interjection) -- Yes, that's right, and if you feel guilty -- well, maybe next year we'll try to follow the rules a little better.

Now I do feel, Sir, it wasn't challenged, but I do feel that this motion -- this is what I started to say -- that this amendment is out of order. It's out of order because it has nothing to do with the main motion and

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I must object to that, because when an honourable gentleman says it's out of order, he is reflecting on the Speaker, because if the Speaker notices a motion being put that is out of order he rules it out of order, and as a point of order has not been raised before, the Speaker has not ruled it out of order, and my honourable friend is not entitled to say that it is out of order.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, I stand corrected, Sir. I thought that I said that in my opinion -- which I did say -- in my opinion it was out of order. And I remember two years ago where the Honourable Minister of Education stood up after one of my speeches on this Committee of Youth and said that he was not going to vote. It was a very good speech I made; it was a good idea but he wasn't going to vote for it because in his opinion I was out of order.

A MEMBER: 'at a way to go, Larry.

MR. DESJARDINS: Now, Mr. Speaker, this -- well they're laughing; they're laughing for me; they might laugh from the other side of their face a little later on -- but this is an example again -- I'm talking to them, Mr. Speaker. I hope I didn't

MR. SPEAKER: I might as well remind the member that Members of the Legislature are honourable people. You may not attribute wrong to a member of the Legislature.

MR. DESJARDINS: I don't follow your point. I just explained that the Honourable the Minister of Education himself had felt that I was out of order, and therefore that the government would not support one of my resolutions, although he thought it had some merit. Well, Mr. Speaker, this is an example. This thing was changed around -- my speech on this was changed around by the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell and I know why now that maybe the Minister of Health doesn't like lawyers after this, as was stated previously by the Honourable Member from Selkirk.

Now before, when I first started to speak, I did say that I realize that this was not a popular motion. Certainly nobody can accuse me of playing politics on such a motion. I knew what I was doing. I knew that I would be criticized, but I felt that it was for the good of Manitoba and that this motion certainly had some valid points. Now the Honourable Member from Birtle-Russell tried to change my speech. I did make it very plain that I recognize first of all the value and the use of these people. I made that plain. I started the speech by saying that I would like to make a few points plain. Now I realize that those people have value and I certainly wasn't trying -- and I explained that very clearly -- I wasn't trying to bring any changes or to restrict them from practicing. That wasn't my idea, and that was plain. Certainly I said that there shouldn't be any restriction at all and in my motion there's no restrictions at all. Then thirdly, I did say that I felt that it would be unfair, unwise, uncharitable to try to take the title of "doctor" away from the people that had them now, and that should be something that would improve -- things that should be looked into in the future. So all these points, I made them clear, and I'm not going to belabour that. I'm not going to start praising all those people above what I should. I said that they're doing their job and they're trying to do their best. I give them credit for that, but I'm not going to try to bring something which I think is needed and then, in other words, pat them on the back when I'm trying to bring this thing. I just feel that they're doing a good job. I recognize that. I have confidence in them, myself. I've used their services. I intend to do it again. But this has nothing to do with my resolution at all -- with my motion.

Now this amendment was supposed to clarify everything. Well first of all, the mover of this amendment agreed with me a hundred percent. You can see I am very disappointed in -- especially a man like -- I figure that he's certainly one of the better men on that side of the House, and you could see that he was just flying a kite for the government; that this was embarrassing for them and he wasn't very convinced, because he gave proof that he agreed with me. Now he said this -- my main point as you know, Mr. Speaker, is not to restrict them but to have these people use the title of doctor when they were qualified, when they be qualified for it. Now this is what he said -- and this is on page 1345 of Hansard of April 3rd. And he said:

(Mr. Desjardins, cont'd.) "I asked Dr. Saunderson, the President of the University, what he felt were the prerequisites for a degree of doctor, and he said, in practical terms he believed that to qualify for a degree of doctor a man should have at least six or seven years of university training after matriculation. And from the University standpoint, Sir," these were his words -- "I think this is an acceptable yardstick for measuring how we should determine who should have the degree of doctor. At this time, Sir, there are few practitioners of the healing arts other than medical doctors who could qualify under this sort of definition." Now he's saying here that he believes that Dr. Saunderson gave him the right answer. He believes that. These are his words quoted from this, so therefore he agrees with me that very few of those people would qualify for the title of doctor. Then he says this -- my other idea was that I felt that this would give protection to the people by letting them know exactly who the doctors were -- now this is what he says: "I think, Sir, that we must recognize that to the general public the word "doctor" has really only one connotation and when they refer to a doctor they refer to a medical doctor. And I think it's obvious to all of us that those practitioners of the other healing arts who wish to call themselves doctor, wish to do so because of the prestige which the public feels goes with the title "doctor". And some of the practitioners of other healing arts have the legal right to call themselves doctor in the Province of Manitoba." So therefore, he's saying that he believes that they do not qualify as doctors, and he says that he believes that many of them are using this because of the prestige which they don't rightly deserve. And this is my point. I'm not accusing all those people of doing that. I think that some are and I think that the others -- it wouldn't affect the others at all and they certainly wouldn't lose any business at all. Now he states that the more he studied this question he realized there is no simple and easy solution to this problem that faces us, and he states that we are faced with a problem. Now that's all right, as I say. He was covering up for a government that probably hasn't enough courage to face these things, but I think he's going a little far when he's going out and accusing his own Minister of Health. This is what he said about the Minister of Health. He said, "He has really taken great pains to try and look at this matter sincerely and objectively and without prejudice." And then he adds -- "as much as is possible for someone who is vitally interested." In other words it's not really possible. He tried -- he tried his best to look at this, but he's so interested that he must be prejudiced. This is the only way -- (Interjection) -- All right, we'll read it again. We'll read it again. "He has really taken great pains to try and look at this matter sincerely and objectively and without prejudice, as much" -- (Interjection) -- Well, I'm just reading. Will you give me the chance to read or do you want to make a speech? -- "as much as is possible for someone who is vitally interested." Now does it mean anything else? Oh, there's the chipmunk up a tree again. But as much as possible for someone who is vitally interested.

All right; well, now as if that wasn't enough this is what he says about the doctor here. "Mr. Speaker, I like the attitude that has been taken by the Minister of Health in this submission. I like what he had to say in this submission to the Royal Commission." That's fine. "The members of this Royal Commission are persons well respected and eminent in many fields in our community. It is true that there are medical doctors on this commission," -- That's bad. You see it's true that we have medical doctors on -- "but they do not form the majority of the commission" -- and we might get a fair deal. You see again this is what he feels of the doctors. Now he's saying well why should we ask the university to rectify a wrong. This is another thing he says: we're wrong, we're asking the university. Well, we're going to rectify -- this is exactly what I'm suggesting -- that we study this and we elect the people that are qualified to give degrees; let them give the degrees -- the university, where it should have been in the first place. -- (Interjection) -- Well, what's the Committee of this House. I know you want a Royal Commission like your Metro Bill. I know that. You're afraid to have a committee of this House, but I said a committee of this House. You're absolutely right -- absolutely right. And in fact, just to make sure, maybe I'll read my motion to show you how right you are: "Whereas at the present the members of many different branches of the healing arts have been extended the privilege of using the title "Doctor", and whereas the degrees, if any, possessed by these people are not conferred or recognized by any Canadian University, and whereas the state of affairs might very well tend to misrepresent these people to the public, and whereas most of these individuals are rendering a service to the public and the practise of their profession

(Mr. Desjardins, cont'd.) is not in any way conditional to them holding such title; therefore be it resolved that a committee of this House be set up to consider the advisability of recognizing only doctor degrees properly conferred by universities." That would be an awful thing. Having faith in our university -- that would be an awful thing. The Minister of Education hasn't said anything on this at all. He spends millions of dollars through the university in education but now I'm doing an awful thing because I'm suggesting that the University of Manitoba should confer the degrees of doctor. This is awful. "Be it further resolved that the same committee study the advisability of having the University of Manitoba (1) register all members of all the different healing arts; (2) supervise examination of all members of the said healing arts before registering them." This is my motion. The Honourable Leader of this House was absolutely right. I was forward enough to suggest that maybe a committee of this House should study this.

Now this is another part that's very interesting that the Honourable Minister had to say. Now at first glance this seems like the simple and easy solution to the problem, but I'm informed by those who know more about it than I do that in practice it simply didn't work out. "Those people who presented themselves to the university for examination and failed, are convinced in their own minds that they failed through some intervention of medical doctors in the examination." These are his words. Then he keeps on. "The university will tell you that it was not only medical doctors who set and marked the examinations, but these were set by other scientists at the University in many cases, and that many of the examiners could still not pass them. Those who set and marked the examinations will tell you that there was not the standard of excellence the university could accept. Now, Sir, I don't think that either side may be totally wrong." Well, if that's not sitting on the fence I don't know what it is. That's plain. "I don't know which side is right." See, he doesn't know which side is right -- "and I would suggest to you, Sir, that there are few, if any, members of this House who have any qualifications to decide as to which side in this matter is right." But that's why the members of this House confer degrees on these people. Because they don't know anything about it. You see -- now later on he complains about the Act where it would restrict those people to practicing only in certain fields -- he thinks that's wrong, and he thinks that's not fair, but this is a legal way he was talking about -- well it's right because it's legal. And he was saying that it's the legal way -- that those people legally were restricted in their practice because these doctors, according to these acts, could in a way police, if they could see anybody practicing medicine other than was specified in their own act, well then they could bring the case up.

Now, Sir, I suggest again that for this great government that we have in front of us, that has no much courage, that has so much policies; those people are afraid of nothing; they just criticize the others; oh, for their lack of sincerity, their lack of faith -- well to do a thing like this. Now I'm disappointed that the Honourable Minister of Health didn't speak on this. I'm disappointed because I respect him and I know he's respected by all in the House. Now it's very embarrassing for him when he has a government that doesn't want to act. What can he do? He'd better keep quiet because he'll let his heart talk and -- yes, George you'd better not talk; you'd better not talk. You might say -- the Honourable Minister might say something the way -- "Oh, give him a chance; you're the one that's calling the shot. If you're not in too much of a rush to get out of here -- we've got another week or so -- you'll have all the chance in the world." And I hope that he makes a better amendment than this -- something that makes sense; something that we can support; something that's progressive, because this is what we're asked to give -- constructive criticism. Constructive criticism. And if this is not what I tried to do with my resolution, well I'm awfully disappointed because I wasn't accusing anybody at all. I wasn't trying to play politics with this at all, because it's something that certainly isn't popular and you all know it -- in fact not a few people across there thought I was pretty silly in bringing in a resolution like this but -- oh yes, and you're wise, you're smart -- oh this is -- I think we should read that again, this amendment; this amendment is really good. We've got to read this from the bright boy across there. "That the motion be amended by striking out the words after the word "degrees" -- this is constructive, this thing there -- "in the fourth line and substituting the following: "possessed by the non-medical professional groups are not conferred or recognized by any Canadian University and their "Doctor" title must be qualified by designation indicating the type of practice, and whereas at present

(Mr. Desjardins, cont'd.) these non-medical professional groups have legislative recognition and sanction to practice directly with the public within the scope of their profession, and whereas schools exist in the Dominion of Canada which confer a doctor's degree upon these non-medical professional groups, and whereas Manitobans have the right to seek the care and treatment they desire from any professional group, and whereas this becomes of importance to this Legislature and Government in the future extension of comprehensive health care services to the people of Manitoba." Is there anything other than I said myself in this? Well this is the clincher -- this is the important thing. "Therefore" -- where the policy is indicated; where the government comes out with this great big policy of the good of Manitoba -- this is their policy -- "Therefore be it resolved that this House endorse the recommendation of the Government of Manitoba to the Royal Commission on Health Services, that the future role of the non-medical groups in the health care spectrum be defined insofar as Government services are concerned." In other words, please Mr. Diefenbaker, what's this all about? Tell us what this is about. And I think, Sir, that this again shows that this government is not sincere at least in things like that. I think that they've got an excellent Minister of Health and I think that he has done an awful lot in this field, but when we're confronted with amendments like this then I still feel my own, unimportant, humble, my own personal opinion, that I still feel it's out of order and to bring in something like this that means nothing, they'll just ask Ottawa to define what their job is or something of this -- This is not the motion at all.

I'm trying to clarify this. I'm trying to defend the public, protect the public, exactly like the Honourable Member from Birtle-Russell said. That's exactly what I'd like to do, and to see that the people are qualified to be called doctors, and, believe it or not, I'm trying to help those same people because the sooner they quit this business of "all the doctors are against us", -- the sooner they try to better themselves by -- yes, it's true, maybe the university would say maybe we need -- take three years pre-med and then go into this course and you'll be qualified, and I'd never suggest every one of them had to do it. I never tried to restrict them. Let them be chiropractors. There's nothing wrong with that. They will not lose any of their touch. They will not lose any of that. They can practice just as well and they're telling us that people have faith in them. I agree with them; but at least let's put it in a way where they consider themselves. The medical profession, they were abused when they started. All those doctors were abused when they started. All right, they stood on their own two feet. That is all I am asking from those people, and it wouldn't be such a bad idea to see the university call a few of them doctors, to give them a chance to go to the university and maybe study three or four years of pre-med and then qualify for the degree of doctor. Some can be called doctor and the others who are not interested in that could keep on with the same restrictive practice as they have in this field, can go on and practice without being called doctor. Why borrow something that is not theirs, not rightly theirs, just to say, well we want the prestige? I'm not for that at all -- I make no apology for saying this. I believe that they are doing a good work and I think that their good work will not be stopped if they do not have the word "doctor" in front of their names.

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Health) (Gimli): Mr. Speaker, I just think -- I am thoroughly confused as to what this is all about now and I'll have to go back to school. I must ask the member where I should go to regain my prestige and orientate myself here; but I would, with all due respect, point out to the Honourable Member from St. Boniface, that before bringing in a resolution of this type he should have given a little more consideration as to just what he is saying in his resolution. I know what he's aiming at, but the way he presented this resolution -- he said in his resolution: "Whereas at the present the members of many different branches of the healing arts have been extended the privilege of using the title "doctor". Inferred, of course, that this title "doctor" has been extended -- this privilege has been extended by the Legislature. This incorporates in his resolution all of the members of the medical profession, and I would further advise him that this means that there's no hint, of course, that the medical profession in other words is excluded from the provisions of his resolution, and this is quite clear in his wording and I would just point that out to him. I would also point out that this of course is the licensing body. This Legislature in the field of medical practice has given the College of Physicians and Surgeons of Manitoba the right to license medical practitioners in the province and they only -- of course this body who are charged by the Legislature

(Mr. Johnson, (Gimli), cont'd.) under the Act the medical and surgical care of the people of Manitoba is vested in this College, and this College requirement is the presentation of a basic signed certificate before one can get a licence, plus the satisfactory completion of a course at a university recognized by this College. Technically his resolution places further doubt, as the Member from Birtle-Russell said, as to the validity of the degree which our university recognizes through reciprocal agreements with universities in other lands. And it just isn't as simple as he would have us believe. I resent very much his including me, and members of this side, in the term "wishy-washy", "no courage". He has prestige for medical men but they have no courage and so on. These are just words, and there is a --

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, I've never said that medical men have no --

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): You used those words --

MR. PAULLEY: Those medical men your business.

MR. DESJARDINS: Yes, they give me an awful lot of business, that's true. I never said anything about medical men. I talked about the government, and the last speaker is absolutely right; I've buried a lot of their mistakes.

MR. JOHNSON (Gimli): Well, Mr. Speaker, I think at this time of the night -- there's a medical term for what happens when we get to this stage in the day and early in the morning, and I'm sure in practice I would have had a very good treatment for the sort of thing that is tending to develop here tonight. I do think very strongly that in placing this resolution before the House, I wish to support it because you will note in the first sentence here we say: "The motion be amended by striking out after the word "degrees" in the fourth line and substituting "possessed by the non-medical professional groups" who at the present time do not have the university recognition. And as this is a universal problem and becomes of significance across Canada with the Royal Commission studying the whole health care field and being prepared to make recommendations, we in our Royal Commission brief set forth our frank opinion at this time, and the fact that it becomes of significance at this time with respect to the onset of comprehensive care plans across the country. And I just don't want to speak any longer; I'd be glad to continue this debate at some length had it been earlier in the day, but I just wanted to point out to the Honourable Member from St. Boniface that it isn't a wish to be wishy-washy or anything else, but that resolution of his simply had to be amended, Mr. Speaker, and I endorse the resolution moved by the Honourable Member from Birtle-Russell.

MR. ORLIKOW: Mr. Speaker, speaking for myself personally, I want to agree with the Honourable Minister of Health that the resolution as originally drafted by the Member for St. Boniface would not come up with an answer to what is, in fact, a very sticky problem. I'm not sure that it's an important problem but it certainly is a difficult problem. The fact is that no university in this country -- not the University of Manitoba or any other university -- is likely in the foreseeable future to be willing to set up courses or to set examinations or to give the degree of Doctor to anyone of the fields of -- what's the resolution on -- the healing arts but not the medical profession. This is a fact. It is also true that a large number of the public, rightly or wrongly, feels that some of these fields at least have a function to play. I must say for myself that I am not impressed at all with the value of most of these so-called professions. Not that I think that the medical profession have all the answers by any means but, as far as I personally am concerned, they have any of the answers which are worth having. But the fact is -- and I agree with the Minister -- that this resolution would not answer the problems which have arisen. Well then I ask, why shouldn't the members of this House simply vote against the resolution? That's precisely what I intend to do. But what we have, and I express only a personal opinion, what we have is to a resolution which was not well thought out, a weakly amendment. Because just as this government isn't prepared to adjudicate, and that's in the final analysis what's involved -- the government is not prepared to say to the public, we are going to say that this profession or that profession doesn't rate the title of doctor. I don't think that this problem is of the kind of importance that the Royal Commission, even if we passed this resolution, is going to pass an opinion on. I think the Royal Commission has its work cut out on some very important problems without having to deal with a problem which in my opinion is certainly not of major importance. And I think, Mr. Speaker, that what the members of this House should have done and what I intend to do is to vote against that resolution

(Mr. Orlikow, cont'd.) as proposed by the Honourable Member for St. Boniface. And that being the case, Mr. Speaker, I can see no reason to vote for the amendment which, in my opinion, really doesn't mean anything. It sets out to amend something which wasn't worth moving in the first place. And so it's my intention, Mr. Speaker, to vote first against the amendment, and then to vote against the resolution as established.

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

MR. ROBLIN: the adjournment of the House. Better put the main motion as amended, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, Yeas and Nays on that last motion.

MR. ROBLIN: No objections. I'm all in favour of it.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members. The question before the House is the amendment to the motion of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, moved by the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

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

YEAS: Messrs. Baizley, Bjornson, Carroll, Christianson, Cowan, Evans, Groves, Hamilton, Hutton, Ingebritson, Jeannotte, Johnson (Assiniboia), Johnson (Gimli), Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Roblin, Scarth, Seaborn, Shewman, Smellie, Stanes, Strickland, Watt, Weir, Witney and Mrs. Morrison.

NAYS: Messrs. Campbell, Corbett, Desjardins, Dow, Gray, Guttormson, Harris, Hillhouse, Molgat, Orlikow, Paulley, Peters, Reid, Roberts, Tanchak, Wagner.

MR. CLERK: Yeas 30; Nays 16.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion carried. The question before the House is the motion of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface as amended. Are you ready for the question?

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from La Verendrye that the debate be adjourned.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: I might say that the honourable member will be closing the debate.

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

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

Mr. Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House adjourned until 9:30 Tuesday morning.