

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Wednesday, March 3rd, 1965.

Opening Prayer by Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions

Reading and Receiving Petitions

MR. CLERK: The Petition of the Jewish Foundation of Manitoba praying for the passing of an Act to amend an Act to incorporate The Jewish Foundation of Manitoba.

MADAM SPEAKER: Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees

Notices of Motion

Introduction of Bills

HON. GEORGE HUTTON (Minister of Agriculture) (Rockwood-Iberville) introduced Bill No. 35, an Act to amend The Natural Products Marketing Act.

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN, Q. C. (Attorney-General) (Dauphin) introduced Bill No. 37, an Act respecting the Liability of Guarantors of Debts.

MR. McLEAN introduced Bill No. 26, an Act to amend The Jury Act.

HON. MAITLAND B. STEINKOPF, Q. C. (Provincial Secretary) (River Heights) introduced Bill No. 18, an Act to amend The Coat of Arms, Floral Emblem and Tartan Act.

MR. WILLIAM H. HAMILTON (Dufferin) introduced Bill No. 19, an Act to authorize The Town of Winkler to enter into an Agreement for the Establishment of a Regional Library under the provisions of The Public Libraries Act.

MR. HUTTON: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs, that Madam Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the following proposed resolution standing in my name and in the name of the Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole with the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

MR. HUTTON: Mr. Chairman, His Honour the Administrator of the Government of the Province of Manitoba having been informed of the subject matter of the proposed resolutions recommends them to the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The resolution for consideration by the Committee is: Resolved that it is expedient to bring in a measure to amend The Agricultural Societies Act, by providing, among other matters, for the payment from and out of the Consolidated Fund of grants to agricultural societies in respect of costs incurred by the societies in appointing judges for competitions held by the societies.

MR. HUTTON: Mr. Chairman, we amended or modified the financial assistance and other arrangements that existed between the department and the agricultural societies with respect to the provision of judges for fairs. In the past, the department had provided the judges at a hundred per cent cost to the department. As a result of the revision in the policy we made arrangements for the agricultural societies to choose their judges and the department refunded 50 per cent of the costs to the agricultural societies that they incurred in providing judges for their annual fairs.

The Comptroller-General brought to the attention of the department that although we did have the authority to provide judges at direct cost to the department, we did not have what he considered to be the authority to make refunds to the agricultural societies in respect to the costs incurred by them. So this legislation or amendment will provide that authority.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): Mr. Chairman, I presume that the Minister intends that this will apply to all fairs that are approved regardless of what class that they are, that the same rules will be applied to all of them, and I would appreciate his confirmation of that fact. There appears to be a serious problem developing for many of the small fairs in the Province of Manitoba and I'm afraid that a number of them will likely close down unless they are able to get more government assistance. It seems that the Class "C" Fairs in particular in a number of the smaller centres are having some very serious difficulties and I would appreciate hearing from the Minister as to what the intentions of the department are in that regard. The Minister mentioned that the change had been made from previous payment directly by the department for the judges to a basis where the department refunded 50

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd) percent. Could he tell the Committee when that change was made?

MR. E. R. SCHREYER (Brokenhead): Mr. Chairman, I don't wish to oppose this proposed legislation, in fact I think it is good legislation, but the only thing that I'm curious about is the fact that it seems to me the government must have had -- obviously had the authority in the past to make general grants to agricultural societies and I can't see why the grants could not have been increased just a little bit in order to enable the societies to pay for the costs of obtaining judges for events and so on. I don't think it's particularly a major point, but I'm wondering why we couldn't have resorted to just a slight increase in general grants to the societies.

MR. J. M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Chairman, just one further question to what has already been asked. Is there going to be a ceiling on the amounts that any particular society will be able to get? Also, will the rate of pay vary from the, let's say the "C" Fair to the "A" Fair, to any particular judge?

MR. HUTTON: Mr. Chairman, the changes in the policy of grants to fairs which were effective in 1964 applied to only "C" Class Fairs. The changes, as I say, were effective in the 1964 fair season. There are no ceilings. There was, we thought, some very good merit in having the local shows choose their judges, and I think that we may have learned the fallacy of the senior government undertaking to pay a hundred percent of the costs in respect to programs which are under the -- which give rise to some dissatisfaction if the department tries to, because it is paying the costs, dictate who shall be the judge, etc. We felt, and I think that on the whole the agricultural societies agree, that it should be their responsibility to choose the judges and that the department should assist financially in the cost of these people who are very necessary in carrying out an agricultural fair.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Mr. Chairman, as my Leader suggested a few moments ago, there are a number of "C" Class Fairs and "C" Class Societies that are really in dire straits. I note by "The Gladstone Age Press", and no doubt my friend did too, that at a recent meeting held there they have more or less decided, I think, to not hold a fair this year. If my memory serves me correctly, I don't think they held one there last year. It used to be a good fair. I note by the press that the federal Agricultural Minister is being criticized over certain policies in regard to fairs -- grants and so on. I wonder if my honourable friend has made representation to the federal minister in this regard or does the legislation that is proposed, does it deal in any way or any respect to give any additional assistance to Class "C" Fairs? In the Annual Report that we have before us, on Page 10 it is reported that the department provided 524 judges for agricultural fairs -- in 1963 I suppose it would be. Now I hope that this new legislation will do something to further encourage these Class "C" Fairs. I hope that something will be done in this regard because it would be absolutely too bad to see them go by the board, and the indications are that this is what they are destined to do.

MR. M. N. HRYHORCZUK, Q. C. (Ethelbert Plains): Mr. Chairman, I would like to join with the others in bringing the Minister's attention to the fact that our Class "C" Fairs are going to be extinct unless the government changes its policy. As far as I can gather, most of the Class "C" Fairs will not be holding any fair this year up in the northern half of the Province of Manitoba, and some of these societies have put out considerable capital in putting up buildings and other facilities for the holding of fairs. I think that they serve a very good purpose and I think that the Minister would be well advised to reconsider the modifications he made approximately a year ago and probably do something to encourage the holding of these fairs. The amount of money that is required by the societies to hold their fairs is a very small amount. It's a small amount insofar as the expenditures of this department is concerned but it is a big amount insofar as the small societies are concerned.

I would suggest that the Minister look into the matter and see if he couldn't come up with some suggestions as to a change, say in the type of exhibits that the small fair could look after. There are other ways in which we could change the old program of small "C" Fairs and still keep them alive, because as we know, Mr. Chairman, that once any organization of this kind becomes extinct or doesn't do anything for a year or two, then they just die completely and it's pretty hard to renovate them or bring them back into life later on. I would very seriously and sincerely urge the Minister to reconsider his stand insofar as the Class "C" Fair is concerned and see if he couldn't do something to bring them back to life.

MR. SCHREYER: Judging from the remarks of the honourable members who have just spoken, it would seem that the small agricultural fairs are becoming a thing of the past. I think this is sad and unfortunate and I don't think that it's necessarily something that can be laid at the doorstep of the government. It may or may not be a result of the times, as a result of

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) . . . changing rural conditions, rural depopulation and so on. I think it is sad to see a fair that was a big event in a rural countryside simply fold up and disappear, as in the case of Gladstone as the member mentions, also in the case of the Brokenhead Agricultural Society which used to hold the annual fair on July 1st for, to my guess, 50-55 years, and it always was well attended, drawing in all of the rural folk for thirty miles around and a good many visitors from the city. I don't know what can be done. If it is a result of changing rural conditions, perhaps it is a losing battle in any case, but I do add my remarks to those of the previous speakers to ask the Minister to really take a close look at this and to give it his sincere attention.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution pass?

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, we are in committee so there is no rule that says I can't speak twice, isn't that right? It has been suggested that it doesn't necessarily mean that I have to, but in this particular instance I have come across some new material and I would like to. I know that I am not obligated.

On Page 10 of the Annual Report of the Department of Agriculture and Conservation for the year ending March 31, 1964, there is an admission there, if not by the Minister, certainly by the Extension Services Branch, and I would like to read it -- Page 11 rather. "Agricultural societies in the past have been constructive and stimulating in their approach and impact on the community, but new ideas and methods are needed now for further vigorous development if aggressive community and agricultural societies are to be maintained."

Now I don't know, Mr. Chairman, whether my honourable friend has read that, but certainly there is an admission by the department. Prior to making that summary -- because it really is a summary -- prior to making that summary, on Page 10 it reports that they had a seminar in Brandon, a three day seminar. "The second annual Agricultural Society's seminar was held in December at the Agricultural Extension Centre" in Brandon. There were 45 officers and directors enrolled at the three day course. Following that there were two meetings of the advisory board held, and the November meeting considered the department's proposal to review the program of Agricultural societies so that greater emphasis will be placed at fairs on the commercial farm enterprises, breeding and marketing of dressed classes of cattle, sheep and swine. The department proposed," -- and then it sets out all of the various proposals that were made -- six of them. And it says and I quote, "The primary function of a "C" Class society is to encourage and promote efficient farm practices; introduction of recommended varieties of grains and grasses, vegetables and fruits to support the development of outstanding herds of livestock and poultry flocks; the conservation of land and water; rural development and beautification; fairs and other competitions; forage programs; and various educational projects."

Now I had hoped, Mr. Chairman, that my honourable friend would get up and say something about this three day seminar and the subsequent meetings and that it was the intention to carry out the recommendations made so that we could be assured that our Class "C" Fairs were going to receive, to use his own words, a shot in the arm.

MR. HUTTON: I will be most pleased to carry on this discussion or examination of the policy in regard to Class "C" Fairs when we are considering the estimates of the Department of Agriculture and Conservation. I will be very happy to make a full report.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, while we are on the subject I think I should mention too that while this will alleviate the situation somewhat as far as the operational costs of conducting a fair, I think the major cost that the people who are conducting these fairs would like to see is the capital cost. Class "C" Fairs are definitely at a disadvantage when it comes to the outlay of capital cost. The other groups of fairs are able to get assistance under our legislation whereas the Class "C" Fairs are unable to get the same assistance.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution pass?

MR. MOLGAT: Is the Minister not prepared to make any further statements at this time regarding his policy on Class "C" Fairs? This is an important one for many parts of the province and here he is bringing in a resolution respecting agricultural societies, and we can assume therefore that the government does not intend to have any further assistance provided to them. It seems surprising to me that they would bring in this resolution if they had the intention of later bringing in anything further for the Class "C" Fairs, so we can only assume in that case that the government has decided that there will be no further assistance for Class "C" Fairs.

MR. HUTTON: The Honourable the Leader of the Opposition is absolutely right. This is

(MR. HUTTON cont'd) . . . the only provision we mean to deal with.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The next resolution for consideration by the Committee is: Resolved that it is expedient to bring in a measure to amend The Planning Act by providing, among other matters, for the making of grants to organizations carrying out programs designed to foster and promote public understanding of and participation in planning.

HON. ROBERT G. SMELLIE, Q. C. (Minister of Municipal Affairs) (Birtle-Russell): Mr. Chairman, the Provincial Planning Service are finding increasingly that much of their time is spent in selling the ideas of the need for planning and also the need for particular planning schemes to the public, and we are having professional people having to spend a great deal of time both in public meetings and at municipal meetings trying to explain the work that they are trying to do in the community.

The Community Planning Association of Canada, which is a voluntary association of architects, engineers, other professional people and people just generally interested in planning in the community, have for some years been carrying out a program, in the metropolitan area particularly, where they have done a valuable work in assisting the planners of Metro now, formerly the old Metropolitan Planning Commission, with the explanation of the work that they are trying to do.

They have indicated their willingness to assist the province in other areas of the province but they have requested that these people, who are putting in their own time freely and voluntarily, that they should be assisted at least in covering their out-of-pocket expenses to attend meetings in other parts of the province and this is a measure which would allow the making of grants based on a working program which would be negotiated between the province and the association for assistance if it's felt that they can be of benefit to the planning branch in the work that they're trying to do in the community.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister if he could be more specific when he names organizations. I had the pleasure about a month and a half ago of representing the City of Portage la Prairie at the town planning conference here in Winnipeg. There was a seminar held on ways and means for the town planning people to put their ideas across to the public and it was felt there that wider use should be made of the press and of the local organizations such as Lions Clubs, Elks Clubs, consumer organizations, and more involvement with the people right in the town or village, so I would like to know if the Minister could tell us what organizations he has in mind. Are they the ones that I am mentioning or are they elected representatives or where will the authority stop or where will it begin as far as the organizations that he mentions here?

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, I don't know just what the legislation that they are going to bring forward will entail, but certainly I do not go along with extending our legislation that we have presently on the books already in connection with planners. I think we have too many dreamers already who are dreaming up schemes how to spend the taxpayer's money. I think that the powers that we have in our legislation in connection with planners is excessive today. I found this out personally while other people have been coming to me and explaining their conditions in connection with town planning. Individuals are being robbed of their rights as far as personal property is concerned and their development of the same. I know of several cases where subdivisions were made. In one case the farmer had half a section of land. The outskirts were subdivided and the following year, with no improvements made, his tax bill went up to \$4500 on that half section. This becomes expropriation through taxation, and I for one will not support any legislation in connection with planning whatever. I personally have no use for them. I think we could leave the planning to the individual concerned, to the individual who wants to develop whatever properties he has and so on. I don't think we need these planners and certainly not above all to go ahead and pay for them.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, I think that the planning function will necessarily have to increase in the next few years and in the next few decades, and judging by the remarks of the Honourable Member for Rhineland it becomes easy to see why it is that many people have come to resent the planning function. I think we have come to resent it because it does in some ways impinge on individual rights and so on. I think they also resent it because they do not properly understand it. I want to say to the Minister of Municipal Affairs that I think he is starting to cook with gas when he brings us a resolution like this, because I think it's very important that people in the local areas are brought to understand or shown why it is that certain planning devices and mechanisms must be used.

I think that perhaps this resolution of the Minister should be prepared to go one step

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd)... further, and that is to provide, wherever possible, for as much democratic control of the planning process as is possible, for as much democratic control and for as much local democratic participation. Therefore, I want to ask him at this time when is he going to bring before this House legislation which will enable the municipalities on the fringe of Winnipeg to have control of the planning of their own municipalities? I think it is desirable and necessary. I don't make apologies for repeating once again that it is a fact that in the periphery around Metropolitan Winnipeg there is Metro planning of areas and of people who have no vote on Metro Council and no representation on Metro Council. It seems to me it would be a logical extension for the Minister to provide legislation in this session which would enable these municipalities to re-acquire control of the planning process in municipalities like St. Clements, Springfield, East St. Paul, and others.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, I understand that the whole program of town planning is now nearly self-supporting inasmuch as the province is concerned. Now, Mr. Chairman, my honourable friend is nodding his head in the negative which suggests that the province is making a contribution, but I am half right I guess, and my honourable friend would say as usual, in that the municipalities are all assessed. The assessment is made on a per capita basis for the town planning service, is it not? That was my understanding. Any municipality or town wishing to enter into an agreement with the province for this service is assessed on the per capita basis. I understand that that is correct.

Now another question, Mr. Chairman, is because the resolution says that "in addition to other matters," I am wondering if one of the other matters is referred to in a bulletin of February 26 last -- Information Services Bulletin, Mr. Chairman, under that date -- headed "Twelve Manitoba Towns under 'Microscope'." My honourable friend looks surprised as if he hasn't read his last publication, but I would like to read the first paragraph. "The business makeup of twelve Manitoba communities will be subjected to a searching analysis during the next year to determine if they have achieved their full potential in respect to drawing people within their orbit and if they are providing adequate services."

Now I know that my honourable friends opposite quite frequently get into orbit, but now they are going to make a searching analysis to see if at least twelve Manitoba communities are in orbit. Now this may all be very well, but if the cost of the entire service is going to go up as the result of a lot of additional legislation, and I think this is what my honourable friend is concerned about, if the over-all cost of the program is going to go up and if the municipalities are going to be assessed accordingly then it will mean an increase in their contribution, and I would like to be assured that there is not going to be a healthy increase in the contribution that is presently paid.

MR. SMELLIE: Mr. Chairman, as I indicated in the opening remarks, there is only one organization that is being contemplated at the present time as the recipient of a grant under this legislation and that is the Manitoba Division of the Community Planning Association of Canada.

My honourable friend from Rhineland has indicated that in a case where farm lands were subdivided there was an increase in taxes, and surely this is an increase -- or surely this is an indication rather that there was no need for the subdivision in the first place. This is one of the things that is contemplated in the planning process, that if there is no need for a subdivision the subdivision should not be made, and that if lands are required for agricultural purposes then there is really no point in subdividing them. If they are required for development for other purposes and subdivided, then it usually contemplates a changing use of that particular land and is almost always followed by a change in the assessment pattern.

The Honourable Member for Brokenhead has indicated that he believes in local control and participation in planning, and certainly so far as the Provincial Planning Service is concerned this is the situation. All that the Provincial Planning Service does is to provide to a local planning commission the technical service of the architects and draftsmen and so on that they need to do a job. They offer advice; they do not do the planning for the community, it's the local planning committee, and I must confess that in most cases the advice of the planning service is accepted by these local planning committees, but certainly it need not be. The local planning committees are autonomous. They offer advice then to the local municipality and the municipality has the authority for planning in their own community.

Insofar as the additional zone surrounding Metro is concerned, we of course have a very different problem. The establishment of Metro was in order to control the uninhibited development of the area surrounding the urban centre, and at that time this House determined that it

(MR. SMELLIE cont'd) . . . was desirable that Metro should have some control over the use of land in that additional zone. I believe that such control is still desirable and we are not contemplating at the present time any change in that policy.

The Honourable Member for Gladstone obviously does not understand what this is all about, and I would like to take just a moment to explain to him how the planning service operates. At the present time in the Metropolitan area I am told that the cost of planning is somewhere in excess of \$1.50 per capita. In those municipalities where the Provincial Planning Service is used, the present cost is somewhere in excess of \$1.00 per capita. The charge to the municipalities is 30 cents per capita so that the program is at the present time rather heavily subsidized by the province.

The information release to which my honourable friend referred has nothing to do with planning for land use or land use control. This is a release referring to a business survey being operated by another department and really had very little, if anything, to do with the planning branch. So I would assure my honourable friend that this will not increase the cost of planning service to municipalities and that at the present time there is no contemplation of any change in the planning service arrangement with municipalities.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Minister's answer is half satisfactory. It is satisfactory in the sense that he points out that the government's policy is to continue and to even encourage local and public understanding and participation in the planning process, and this resolution indeed provides for this. But he says this on the one hand, then on the other hand he makes the point that the public that happen to live in the secondary zone of Metro, if they are unfortunate enough to live in that particular sector, they do not apparently have any right to participate in the planning process. They apparently do not have any right to have a voice and a vote on the planning authority board.

I don't want to pursue it at this particular stage, but it seems to me that the Minister must come up with a principle here on what basis does he make this distinction. In the town of Beausejour, for example, the provincial planning service provides the technical information and data, provides it to the local planning board on which the local people are represented. The principle is honoured there, but it's not being honoured in the case of these people who happen to live in the secondary or outer zone. It's just not good enough to say that there's a special problem there and because the special problem exists in the outer zone, because it exists we cannot honour the principle of public representation on the planning authority. There may be two or three different alternatives which could deal with this problem, but so far I haven't heard any.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise and report. Call in the Speaker. Madam Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has adopted certain resolutions and asked me to report the same.

IN SESSION

MR. JAMES COWAN, Q.C. (Winnipeg Centre): Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Pembina, that the report of the committee be received.

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

MR. HUTTON introduced Bill No. 32, an Act to amend The Agricultural Societies Act.

MR. SMELLIE introduced Bill No. 7, an Act to amend The Planning Act.

MADAM SPEAKER: Before the Orders of the Day, I would like to attract your attention to the gallery where there are some 75 Grade 7 students from General Byng School under the direction of their teachers, Mrs. Leggitt, Mrs. Froese and Mrs. Houston. This school is situated in the constituency of the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. On behalf of all the members of this House, I welcome you.

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Industry & Commerce) (Fort Rouge): Madam Speaker, before you proceed with the Orders of the Day, I would ask your leave to lay on the table of the House the Annual Report of the Department of Industry and Commerce, the Annual Report of the Manitoba Design Institute, the Annual Report of the Manitoba Export Corporation, the Annual Report of the Manitoba Research Council, the Annual Report of the Manitoba Transportation Commission, and the Annual Report of the Manitoba Development Authority, for the period ending March 31st, 1964; and also, if I may, the report of the Board of Internal Economy Commissioners for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1964.

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q.C. (Minister of Mines & Natural Resources)(Fort Garry): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I should like to advise the

(MR. LYON cont'd) House of a communication which I have received just today and which I think will be of interest not only to the House but to all people in Manitoba, and this is the letter that is addressed to me: "Dear Mr. Minister" -- and it's from the International Nickel Company of Canada Limited, Mr. J. C. Parlee, Executive Vice-President. "Dear Mr. Minister, I am now pleased to advise you that Canadian Nickel Company Limited, the exploration subsidiary of the International Nickel Company of Canada Limited, has entered into an agreement under which it will carry out an exploration program on the potash properties at Lazare" -- meaning St. Lazare -- "Manitoba, held by Prairie Potash Mines Limited. The Canadian Nickel Company's contribution will comprise up to \$500,000 expenditure for drilling and related geological exploration activities. The first stage of the drilling program calls for the sinking of five strategically located holes which will be sunk to a depth of approximately 3,300 feet. Beyond this first stage, should results so indicate, Canadian Nickel Company is prepared to proceed with further exploration by way of drilling to delineate and attempt to prove up the deposit, having in mind the economic feasibility of producing potash on a commercial basis from these beds in Manitoba. The exploration program as now envisioned will require approximately eight months to complete!" -- and is signed "J. C. Parlee, Executive Vice President.

I take pleasure in making this communication known to the House and add only that this is very good news for Manitoba and we hope this exploration program will augur well for the future and potential development of a potash mine in Manitoba.

MR. MARK SMERCHANSKI (Burrows): Madam Speaker, I would like to add my few remarks on it. I am delighted, pleased and very happy that the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources made this announcement and I am quite sure that this arrangement for further development of the potash beds should have a high percentage of success. I think that because this company has seen fit to have itself associated with the potash deposits in Manitoba, I am quite sure that a large percentage of the pitfalls or hazards of necessary financing has been more or less arranged for. I think that both the Department of Industry and Commerce as well as the Department of Mines and Natural Resources deserve a great deal of credit because they have been continuously working on this project for the last six or seven months, and I think that their efforts are going to be exemplified in the results of this additional development which I think, and I think that this is the expression of the members of the various departments, that the chances of bringing a full scale potash development into Manitoba are excellent. Thank you.

MR. SMELLIE: Madam Speaker, I would just like to say a word to the House on this occasion, because of course this proposed development is in the part of Manitoba that I like to refer to as God's Country. I realize that I may get 56 arguments around this Chamber as to the description of the area, but it is very gratifying to us to know that a company like International Nickel is interested in this project at this time, and I understand that this is the first time that they have ventured away from what is ordinarily known as the hard rock mining field. Well we wish them all success in their ventures in Manitoba.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I too would like to join in what I'm sure is in the general interests of the people of Manitoba, in the rejoicing of the people of Manitoba that this development will now proceed, at least to further exploration. Manitobans have been looking I think to Saskatchewan with some envy at their repeated announcements of developments there and hoping that the same thing would happen in the Province of Manitoba. While this isn't a guarantee at this stage, it is certainly notable that a majore company like International Nickel would be proceeding with this. I'm sure that all Manitobans will rejoice. It will mean I'm sure a great deal if this goes through to our industrial development. I think we can take some pleasure too, Madam Speaker, in the fact that over the years the Province of Manitoba has contributed a great deal to feeding the people of the world from our surface, that is from the production of our soil, and now we will contribute even more possibly by the sub-surface and the development of this very important fertilizer which is so badly needed in many other regions of this world which is facing ever-growing demands for food.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party)(Radisson): Madam Speaker, I too would like to say a word in connection with this potential development in the Province of Manitoba. I think that I can join quite heartily with others who have expressed the opinion that they hope that this is just a forerunner to more development in the Province of Manitoba. It is in a relatively new area for mineral development in Manitoba and who knows what the potential may hold. Reference has been made to the possible effects so far as provincial revenues in the field of mineral development of potash. I think all of us in this House are well aware of the fact that through the development of the potash developments at Esterhazy the

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) . . . former provincial government in the Province of Saskatchewan were able to lay a firm foundation for the government that is there at the present time.

Now the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, Madam Speaker, mentioned something about an agreement. I would like to ask him if this is an agreement between the Province of Manitoba and the developing company, and whether or not he would be kind enough to table copies of the agreement in order that the members of this House may be able to study the same. I would make this request, Madam Speaker, that if it is an agreement between International Nickel or its subsidiary company and the Province of Manitoba. I well recall another agreement that was entered into by the Province of Manitoba and International Nickel back in '55 or '56 that I think is well worth looking at once again today, and if it is a similar type of agreement, I think that we here in this Legislative Assembly would be well paid to look at it.

MR. LYON: Madam Speaker, if I may respond to my honourable friend's question, the agreement referred to in the letter from International Nickel was an agreement between the International Nickel Company of Canada Limited and Prairie Potash Mines Limited.

MR. PAULLEY: May I ask, Madam Speaker, on this question of the development irrespective of what company it is, who the company may be, is there an agreement in connection with the exploration of this area between the Government of Manitoba and any developer, and if so, is it possible to receive copies of any agreement or any undertaking or understanding from the provincial government to the developer in the area?

MR. LYON: . . . agreement as such, Madam Speaker, there are leasing rights that have been given to the first company, Prairie Potash, under the regulations of the -- pursuant to The Mines Act.

MR. FROESE: Madam Speaker, may I also join in in congratulating the firm in coming in and developing our natural resources. I think the sooner and the faster we can develop them the better for all, especially if the people of Manitoba will have a benefit through the development of them. Recently I was in Saskatchewan and I had occasion to speak to some friends and these people mentioned that the processing, or the developing of potash requires large amounts of starch, and that the firm that is developing the big mine near Saskatoon had ordered some 750,000 tons of starch and they were unable to get it on the North American continent. They had to go Europe to get this starch. I would like the Minister of Industry and Commerce to investigate this and if that is so to get a starch factory in the Red River Valley, especially in my part of the constituency, to set up a starch factory. We have a good area there where we can grow lots of potatoes and I think potatoes are a very good crop from which we can derive starch. So I think here is another area that should be looked into and if there is such a large requirement that we should find out whether a plant of this type is feasible. We have one in North Dakota. I think that we should be able to have one in Manitoba and provide them with the necessary materials that they need in this respect.

HON. CHARLES H. WITNEY (Minister of Health) (Flin Flon): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to lay on the table of the House the Annual Report for the Department of Health for the calendar year 1964. I'd like to draw the members' attention too to the green book which was distributed to them which is a summary of the activities of the calendar year for the same taken from the last report.

MR. LYON: Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, the Member for St. George asked yesterday if I had received any communication with respect to a person in the Attorney-General's Department about a private complaint. I spoke with him privately outside of the House to get more details, checked my files and find that I did receive a letter from a person relative to a private matter between that person and a member of the Attorney-General's Department.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I wonder if I may direct a question to the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer. The question, Madam Speaker, is, has representations been made to himself or to his department or any department of government respecting possible tax evasion of our cigarette and related tobacco products? If so, what action is being taken by the Government of Manitoba?

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier and Provincial Treasurer) (Wolseley): I want to thank my honourable friend for having given me notice. I have not had time to check it. I know of no such complaint myself, though it's entirely possible that they may have been received by the department. If they have been received then they are being investigated in the normal way.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Honourable the

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) Attorney-General and I must apologize for not giving him notice of this question, but I'm sure that he should be conversant with the subject matter. We previously had, Madam Speaker, an Act on the Statutes of Manitoba which made provision for orderly payments of debts and an arrangement whereby those with relatively small means could pay off their debts on a gradual basis. I'm not quite sure at the present time of the proper name of this Act, Madam Speaker, but it was ruled ultra vires insofar as the Province of Manitoba was concerned some time ago, and I understood that the federal authority assured the Province of Manitoba that they would be enacting legislation to replace the Act that was ruled beyond our jurisdiction. I ask the Honourable the Attorney-General, how does this matter stand at the present time? Is he aware of whether or not legislation is in process at the present time at Ottawa in order that these people who may be affected in Manitoba have at least a half decent break in the orderly payment of their debts.

MR. McLEAN: Madam Speaker, there was a bill introduced into the Parliament of Canada quite some time ago, that is more than a year ago, because we were discussing this at the last session. So far as I am aware, that bill has not as yet become law.

MR. PAULLEY: A supplementary question. I wonder if the Honourable Attorney-General would undertake to ascertain from his compatriots at Ottawa whether or not they intend to process this bill at this particular session of the House of Commons at Ottawa.

MR. McLEAN: Madam Speaker, I'm not aware that I have any compatriots at Ottawa, but I'll be glad to make inquiries. I rather suspect they're busy with other matters.

MR. OSCAR F. BJORNSON (Lac du Bonnet): Before the Orders of the Day, Madam Speaker, I would like to comment on an item that the Honourable Member from Carillon made in his very worthwhile speech yesterday, and I quote from what he says -- it appears on Page 178 of Hansard, "With all due respect to the Member of Lac du Bonnet when he says that there are quite a few municipalities in his constituency that will save up to 95 percent on their school taxes . . ." I just don't understand what he meant with that statement. In my books, or in my constituency it just doesn't come out that way. Madam Speaker, this is not what I said in my humble address the other day. What I did say was that the rebate of 50 percent of the school cost portion of the individual's tax bill up to the ceiling of \$100.00 of the school tax will benefit many of our municipal taxpayers. I would illustrate how this affects my area. In Lac du Bonnet 95 percent of the taxpayers will benefit. This has reference to the number of taxpayers and not the amount of the rebate. I hope this clears up the misunderstanding that was given to us by the Honourable Member from Carillon.

MR. LEONARD A. BARKMAN (Carillon) . . . my humble apologies to the Member of Lac du Bonnet.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MADAM SPEAKER: Order for Return standing in the name of the Honourable the Member

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, may I suggest that we proceed at once with the Throne Speech debate as there may be a number of persons who still wish to speak.

. . . . continued on next page

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the Member for Lac du Bonnet. The Honourable the Member for Inkster.

MR. MORRIS A. GRAY (Inkster): Madam Speaker, at the outset I wish to announce that my speech will be very brief and I'm not going to deal with the land deals. I wish to sign my name to all the compliments and good wishes to Your Honour. Many of the world's figures of the male sex occupied and are now occupying very high positions. One to exemplify your own is a lady which I've known for many years. She was a teacher in Chicago, like yourself, and now she's occupying a world's important position, namely, the Foreign Minister of the State of Israel, which indicates that teaching is not the only place for the able women to occupy, and I wish you many success.

I also wish to congratulate the mover and seconder. I think that they have given the people of this province a very fine lecture on farming, a lecture how to grow grain and not manufacture it the same as those who have large acreage who come in on the farm for a month in the spring and for a month during the harvest and then disappear. Manitoba has been known by the entire world as a part of the bread basket of the world, which is extremely important. At the same time they have admired the fact of the life of the family, of the life of raising a family on an individual farm, and I think are better off, and the more we get similar family farms, in my humble opinion, the better it is.

As the Opposition in the last few days have demanded the resignation of some Ministers and the government, realizing that I have no intention of being a candidate in the coming elections, I take the liberty, and in fear that the government may yield to the Opposition, I thought I'll perhaps put myself on record and deliver a speech in reply to the Speech from the Throne, and if the government does not yield I'll probably prepare a different speech in the coming session.

It has been my extreme good fortune to live a long and full life, trying to repay the debt to Canada for the privilege of living under a democracy. We cannot live in this province alone. Years ago I remember when I mentioned something about outside of Manitoba I was criticized to inject something which has nothing to do with the Manitoba Legislature, but I am very happy to remind the Honourable Member from Lakeside as the Provincial Treasurer finally admitted that we cannot build a fence around Manitoba because we live at a time where we could have our breakfast in Winnipeg, our scotch and soda in London, and our caviar in Moscow in one day.

We in Manitoba are ultimately affected by every event of the world, no matter how minor. Who would have thought for example that the birth of a son to a minor Austrian civil servant could have resulted in the deaths of many brave Manitobans between 1939 and 1945, and particularly the destruction of a third of the population of my people. I was born in Tzarist Russia in a Jewish Ghetto. I and others like me were, because of our race, denied any education. It was there that I became a socialist and my socialism has been always based on the teaching of my Prophets, because I believed that only the socialist philosophy gave promise of assuring a good life for all.

I also became a revolutionary because no institution such as our parliament existed through which peaceful change could be accomplished. As a result of my revolutionary activities I was forced to flee from Russia and I came as a penniless immigrant to Canada, the country I am proud to call my own, the country which has given me and my family a life of dignity and security. The improvements I have seen in Canadian society since that time are really beyond my powers of description. Perhaps I can best express them by telling you a bit about my own life, which is typical of hundreds of thousands of immigrants from eastern Europe who arrived in this country in the early years of the Twentieth Century.

After three months of waiting for a freight or cattle boat my ship docked in Halifax. I was placed in a train coach that was little better than a cattle car, hard wooden benches, no place to sleep, nothing to drink except at stations, little to eat because we had almost no money, even if there had been a dining car, but there was none. When I got to Winnipeg it was cold -- 40 degrees below zero -- in the middle of winter. Friends took me into their home, a small apartment which people lived in rooms. They shared their good food with me even though they had barely enough for themselves.

It was during my first night in their home that I began my political career. The same evening a meeting was held by the immigrants who had already been in Winnipeg for a short time, to discuss matters of importance as to how they could improve their conditions and help others during their early life under economic hardship, unemployment, low wages and unorganized help. As a result of this conversation I was drawn into politics and devoted more and more

MR. GRAY (cont'd) of my time to the attempt to achieve a political solution to the problem facing my new countrymen.

I joined the Independent Labour Party at that time and I was elected to the School Board representing that party. When the CCF was born I joined and became a Winnipeg alderman representing the movement, and eventually a member of this House, where I have sat ever since and now representing the Inkster constituency for the New Democratic Party.

While I was living more and more comfortably in Canada, my children were receiving the benefits of public education in a free democratic society, Jewish people of the world began to struggle to found a national homeland. I began to work with the Jewish labour organizations in Canada to contribute what small amount I could to assist them. Now after great struggle and hardships Israel exists. It is a progressive country, respected for its achievements by almost the entire community of nations. It is a matter of considerable gratification to me that in the case of both the countries which I hold dear to my heart, Canada and Israel, that I have been fortunate enough to play a small role in the movements which have contributed immensely to the present success and prosperity and to the present well-being of their citizens.

In Canada it has been the farm labour parties, the ILP and the CCF and the New Democrats who have done much to give a true meaning to political freedom by pressing for their rights of the under-privileged and the small man -- pensions, proper medical care, unemployment insurance, better educational facilities, special schools for mentally disturbed children, the blind and the deaf, have been or soon will be achieved largely as a result of our efforts to educate the public and the government of the day to want them. In the words of Bruce Hutchinson, the undoubtedly liberal journalist, the CCF was the most successful party in Canada's history judged on the basis of the number of its policies which have been enshrined in the statute books of this country.

The New Democratic Party is young, but I predict that it will be even more successful, for not only will it educate the people, it will form a government and implement its policies itself. When this happy day arrives, and it shall not be long coming, I see a Canada which is truly free, a Canada whose wonderful British parliamentary system will be reinforced by a society in which people have true economic and social freedom, freedom which will make political freedom truly meaningful.

In every country of the world except in those unfortunate enough to be enslaved by dictatorship or the right and the left, the cause of democratic socialism is advancing. As it does, so does the opportunity for all the people of the earth, black, brown, red, yellow, and white, to live in peace and dignity and freedom. A society based on co-operation as opposed to cut-throat competition will be founded in which men will live together like brothers, sharing the benefits of their achievements and the heartbreak of the failures.

Madam Speaker, I may not live to see it but my younger colleagues I hope will participate in a world built on the principles of democracy and socialism. I say again my life is rich, I consider myself the richest man in the world today. I have a good family, I have an opportunity to assist those unfortunates, and the opportunity of paying my debt to the country which I love and worship, the country which has given me a new and free life.

MR. DONALD M. MCGREGOR (Virden): Madam Speaker, I rise to take part in the Speech from the Throne. Firstly, I sincerely congratulate you, Madam Speaker, on your elevation to that high Chair. I have no doubt you will carry your duties properly and firmly. I think of your position possibly as somewhat of a helmsman on a ship, this ship being our political ship of state. While the opposition will rise from time to time and try to raise quite a storm, I have no doubt that the First Minister being on the bridge of this ship, and this effective and slightly salty crew, that we will weather any storm without any trouble and carry our path straight and on a positive course.

I would like to congratulate the honourable members from Lac du Bonnet and Fisher on the effective way that they described their constituencies and I also would like to congratulate the Honourable Member from River Heights on his re-election. I will try not to be repetitious because I don't like repetition any more than anyone else here I don't think but I will just give you a brief outline on the Virden constituency. Our basic revenue there firstly was agriculture and in recent years there has been a big revenue from the oil. And I'll speak firstly on oil. Last year we passed the 50th million barrel mark. While the oil isn't all within the Virden constituency, basically Virden is known and recognized as the oil capital of Manitoba. Some of it did come outside the boundaries of the constituency of Virden.

MR. MCGREGOR Cont'd

Another civil servant I would like to pay tribute to now is the reeve of the municipality in which I live and was born, Mr. F. J. Gould, who had a record of some 52 years in the council and he retired as reeve not too long ago. On that occasion the First Minister and the Honourable Member from Lakeside were there. I was not able to be at Kenton on that night, I had a fraternal obligation in Russell and I phoned Kenton only an hour or so ago and this honourable gentleman who you all who have been in the public field know, while he had a shaky voice, when he got that finger up I know those who were combatting with him had to be really on their toes to stay up with him. Well he is still as mentally alert today as he was in those days. I would next, this seems to be curling week, and I am very happy that we are watching the Manitoba rink do so well, but I would like to pay tribute to a rink from the little town of Lenore, the Horn rink who made the headlines in here a little while ago. They came in unrated, and they took out Mr. Picken from Valour Road and later took out Barry Pry who is the aggregate winner from the Winnipeg bonspiel. They later were in turn taken out. But it wasn't the games they won or lost, it is how they won them and I pay the highest tribute to Lloyd Horn, Donnie McClellan, Allan Hill and Ian Hodgson who were on that rink. -- (Interjection) --

The next area -- oh and the oil industry has tried a new program, that is feeding back of salt water into certain wells, flushing out basins. This has brought the oil production up in that field in excess of a half a million barrels per year, and they have only been using this on a very small portion of the field. The oil industry looks very encouraging there for a good many years. There's not too many rigs drilling but this other program will make up for that.

I was encouraged to hear from the Throne Speech that some action will be taken by this government regarding the lowering of the wheat price. I think that this is a very good sign and I think it is a step that we must all support because the margin of profit in the wheat and the grain industry is very narrow and I am sure that this drop will create a real hardship on many and put some out of business I have no doubt. While we see in today's press that there is some \$270 million in the '63 - '64 crop been distributed and to many people as I travel in Manitoba and Canada seem to think that this is a treasury shot but most of us I think are aware that this is strictly a wheat board, nothing is coming out of the treasury. I don't like subsidy and probably I hate the word subsidy more than any member in here but I think as we look across Canada and take say an imaginary circle around Toronto and Hamilton and realize in looking into the facts the automobile industry in that area gets more government subsidy than all the agricultural fields from Halifax to the tip of Vancouver Island, and I say when you see these facts then we may and maybe should look to subsidy to right the price of wheat today.

The next point I would like to mention again is the reference to this Racing Commission. I think this is a step in the right direction. I think the racing industry certainly can afford it. But there is just one thing I would like to mention here, while this may have been brought into being in thinking on Assiniboine Downs, I would just like to suggest in rural Manitoba the Trotting Horse Association put on many days of entertainment in the summer and I would like to see one member from the Harness Horse people or the Trotting Association to be on that Commission. Thank you Madam Speaker.

. Continued on next page

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable the First Minister.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I am pleased to have an opportunity to take part in this Grand Assize, as it were, of the record and the program of the Government of Manitoba. I wish to start in the conventional way but nonetheless sincere way of offering good wishes to you, Madam, as you discharge your onerous functions, and I can tell from the temper of the House so far this year that you may have more to do than usual to keep us unruly members in order. I feel that you will be able to handle that responsibility, however, particularly if you receive the co-operation which I think you are entitled to from those of us who sit here under your rule. I should also like to express my appreciation to the mover and seconder of the Reply to the Speech for the able and intelligent way in which they dealt with their assignments, and to say to my colleague, the Member for River Heights, that I am very pleased to be associated with him again in this Legislature.

The debate so far -- and we are close to the end of it -- has been in my view rather an unusual one, because we have seen the whole emphasis, or almost the whole emphasis, of the approach taken by the Official Opposition concentrated on one particular point, namely, a land transaction in connection with the Bain Estate, and I am not one of those people who feel that a \$100,000 transaction is a matter of no importance. I think it is a matter of some considerable importance and I am certainly willing to see discussed any comment or criticism there might be of the government's activities in that or in any other field. But surely it must strike you as odd that on this occasion when the whole aspect of the government's policy, when its agenda for the coming session is laid before us, that the Opposition should find themselves able only to interest themselves on that particular point of criticism.

I'm not adverse to criticism. I believe that it is the function of the Opposition to criticize and I have no fault to find with them because they do criticize, but I say to them that they have another function, an alternative function, which the Official Opposition at any rate has signally failed to discharge, either in this particular debate or in the last few years in my memory, and that is, they come before the people of this province as a group of men who are bankrupt and barren of the slightest idea of how the policy of government should be organized and carried on in this province. They are so eager, Madam Speaker, to get the government; they are so eager to vent their indecent spleen, if I may use that expression, on the activities of members of this side of the House that they blind themselves, they blind themselves and they blind those who follow them to one of their most real and important functions, namely, to justify the claim not to be merely a critic -- because any one can do that; it's a simple task -- but to justify the claim that they are in truth and in fact a real alternative to those who are in possession of the treasury benches at the present time. While they blind themselves to that responsibility I doubt very much that they blind the general public to the fact that they have exhibited this complete lack of alternative policy and program and the complete failure to discover any responsibility in themselves to criticize the great number of important policies and programs which the government is placing before the Legislature at this time. They are dedicated to sensation mongering. That's their line. They are dedicated to sensation mongering, and as long as they've got a good sensation going they seem to feel that they have satisfied their responsibilities and discharged their duties to the House and to the public.

Allow me to dissent from that point of view. Allow me to register a most emphatic dissent from that point of view. Allow me to dissent from it, from the aspect, from the experience of having sat in their places. I remember being a critic myself and I understand the duty of criticism, but I also recall that alternative proposals and policies were advanced at the same time. To any major extent that has been completely lacking in the performance of the honourable gentlemen opposite, and I shouldn't wonder if some of the more thoughtful members of the Liberal Party are asking themselves about the leadership that they are getting in this respect. I shouldn't be a bit surprised if some members of the Liberal Party are wondering about the leadership provided by those who sit in their front benches with respect to policy and program for the province. Aren't they getting a little bit sick of this sensation mongering which is the stock in trade of gentlemen opposite? It's all right to have the sensations. They are all very well in their way. It makes interesting reading in the newspapers. But I say to them that until they can find these alternative policies that can commend themselves to the public that sensation mongering won't get them very far.

I see they've got some young assistants to help them this year. I think that's a very good move. Obviously there isn't sufficient ability there at the present time to devise the policy. Probably with a little assistance of that kind they might come up with an idea or two

(MR. ROBLIN cont'd.) with respect to what the future should hold in the great portfolios of government which need to be discharged.

I am not going to spend too much of my time today, Madam Speaker, discussing the particular land issue that's before us because I think most aspects of that have been pretty thoroughly ventilated in the last little while and people can make up their own minds as to the rights and wrongs of the situation. I myself am satisfied after listening to the case from all sides, I am satisfied that the public acquired property that should have been required for the public use, that it was procured at a reasonable price, and that if we wish to sell that property tomorrow, if for any reason it was not required and we wished to place it on the market tomorrow, that we could not only recapture the monies that are outlaid for it but we could also recapture a very substantial profit as well, and I wouldn't be the least bit surprised to see that the advantages of this purchase become more and more recognized as time goes by, rather than the contrary. And I find myself in the position where I think it would be wrong indeed to deprive the public service of the talents of the three Ministers whose conduct has been called into question, and in case there has been any suspense on that point I want to assure the House that I hope they will continue in their responsibilities for some time to come.

But I say to the members opposite that there's an easy way to avoid criticism. There's an awfully easy way to avoid sticking your neck out in many public issues. One easy way, of course, is to proceed with the expropriation procedures suggested. You could go ahead with those all right, and if it cost the public treasury more than a negotiated price would realize, then you should care. Your conscience is clear; you'd say you protected yourself. You've protected yourself by proceeding beyond what a negotiated price would bring one and go to expropriation and if it costs more and the public treasury suffers and pays on that account, well then you can shrug your shoulders, saying, "Oh well, I was safe. I didn't take any chances. I didn't expose myself to the hurricane of public criticism and observation." Well we didn't do that. We did what we did in the belief, in the honest, in the sincere believe that all things considered it was in the best public interest to do it. Now people can disagree with that point of view. I never for a minute maintain that any administration can be completely right on all occasions. People may disagree with that point of view, but I want to say to the House and place it before the record and place it before the public, that we did what we did because under all the circumstances we thought it was good and in the best interests of the public and of the treasury.

You know there's another way in which you can avoid getting into trouble and avoiding criticism such as that that's been hurled at the administration in the last little while. You can do nothing. Did you ever think of that? How nice it is to sit in the seats of office and do nothing, or so close to next to nothing this makes no difference. Didn't we see an administration who controlled the affairs of this province for lo these many years, and their main stock in trade was the ability to sit still and do very little indeed? I venture to say that if they were over here we wouldn't be in any problem with respect to these game preserves because they never would have acted. They wouldn't have touched them at all. They didn't touch them when they were in office although they were advised to do so. But they didn't touch them, and I dare say we wouldn't be any trouble with respect to Bird's Hill or the property expropriation for the going on up there, because they wouldn't have had the imagination or the initiative to undertake to develop Bird's Hill as a park for the future of this province. We could have sat still in our seats and refrained from taking these measures and many other measures which we have taken in the past and which we will continue to take in the future, Madam Speaker, because we are going to.

MR. DOUGLAS L. CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Is the honourable gentleman saying that we did not acquire swampland, shooting land, public shooting grounds in the time that we headed the administration?

MR. ROBLIN: Well I'm certainly saying that they didn't acquire the Bain property because it was recommended to them and they never did it. I'll just continue making my speech and my honourable friend can make his.

MR. CAMPBELL: I'm asking my honourable friend if he is aware.

MR. ROBLIN: If you'll take your seat I'll continue with my speech. What I am saying is that we have taken the decision to secure these resources for the public and for the future, and although we're certainly going to make mistakes in carrying out these policies, because we'd be less than human if we didn't, we are going to carry them out because on the whole they're in the public interest that we should do so, and I once venture to say that if I happen to

(MR. ROBLIN cont'd.) stay in this Legislature as long as my honourable friend opposite, which of course is always a pretty good guess because he's been here a long time, that people will then recognize the virtue of the measures that were taken in Birds Hill and other places like that to secure these facilities for the public.

So I'm going to endorse what my honourable friend the Leader of the NDP said last night. We're going to continue to do what we think is right. We don't always guarantee to be right; in fact we can guarantee you sometimes to be wrong. But we're going to do what we think is right to the best of our ability, and we're going to do it regardless of where we think the political chips will fall and we're not going to be intimidated or put off our stride by the sensation mongering of the folk on the other side, because we're simply not going to operate the government of Manitoba because we are apprehensive of what their views might be. Because it's awful easy to pick holes in another man's job. It's awful easy to pick holes in a good job being done by other people for the public interests when you have no responsibility, and I don't object to that because that's what they're there for. If only they would add to it some little idea of real alternative policy and alternative government. I think the people of Manitoba are going to keep them in the Opposition a long time because they're good critics, but they'll never make them the government because they're not good devisers of policies and programs -- they haven't got any worth talking about it.

I really don't think that the new young men but of course I don't want to be quite so critical. I don't want to imply that in the speech that I'm replying to today, namely the speech of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition, that he had nothing to say except about his wild goose chase. He had other things that he wanted to talk about as well. He made a passing glance; he made a courtesy bow, if you like to put it that way, a tip of the hat, a nod of the head, to some of the other policies which the government are setting forth in this Throne Speech, and he had for example a few harsh words to say about priority, and if I remember correctly -- I haven't got his exact words but I think the impression he left with me was that while we're willing to rush out and buy a game preserve, all right, certainly we're giving that the high priority and we were not giving the priority to the old age pensioners, I think he said, and also to the students at the University of Manitoba. In other words, he was trying to relate what went on in connection with the acquisition of wild life areas with our priorities.

Well, you know, as I listened to those words the thought struck me very forcibly, Madam Speaker, that it was certainly strange to hear my honourable friend talk that way. The strangest argument that I'd heard for a long, long time. Because I don't think the people of the Province of Manitoba have forgotten the priority, the emphasis, the dedication of public funds, the policy, the program, the implementation of my honourable friend in the field of education which he brought into his speech the other day. I wonder how many thousands, and I say this advisedly, how many thousands of young Manitobans had their educational lives stunted because of the lack of policy and program of my honourable friends opposite. How many had their lives stunted because there was no high school in their area to which they could attend? How about that when you come to the field of priorities in dealing with the human resources of this province? We brought in a high school program which made that good. My honourable friends never talk about that. In the Speech from the Throne right now you see an expansion of that educational policy for the far north; the establishment of a new high school system and a new divisional system to take in all the northern settled areas of the province at Cranberry Portage, to bring educational facilities particularly for our Indian and Metis friends up there. Why does that receive no attention? Is that of no interest, no concern, no regard from the party on the other side. They don't even think it worth talking about. We bring in -- in our short term of office we brought in technical education. There wasn't a technical institute above the high school level when we came into office. There's one now with some 2,000 students, some of which are above the high school level. There will be more being built. Why don't they talk about technical education when they talk about priorities and the stunted record they have left for us to make good on when we come into office.

What about the University itself? We are criticized for not doing enough for the University and the university students. I say to you, Madam Speaker, and I say it advisedly, that the University of Manitoba was starved for funds in 1958 when we came into office. They were starved for funds. Two million and a quarter is the total of the operating grants for higher education in that time. It's now six and three-quarter millions and I predict that in the estimates, which I hope to table in a very few minutes today, that one will see that that sum is

(MR. ROBLIN cont'd.) up by another million dollars more. We came to the rescue of the University of Manitoba. Go out and look at it. Just look at it. See the buildings that are out there. See the new facilities that are out there. See the salary scales that have been provided and the quality of our professorial staff. See the expansion of that institution and talk to me about no priorities for education at the university.

And let's take the university students. The fees -- "the fees," my honourable friend says, "you're not fair about the fees." Well I'd like to say that the fees now pay for 19 per cent of the cost of running that University which is much less a percentage than they paid in 1958 and in years gone by. Much less a percentage. Nineteen percent is paid by student fees. We have a student fee system that is on very favourable comparative terms with student fees for other institutions in the Dominion of Canada, and furthermore, let me tell you about student aid, because it's not only necessary to have a university, it's necessary to try and get able students in there if they have financial problems. What about that? When we came into office what was the aid for students at the university? \$69,000 was the sum in the estimates for student aid. What is it now? Five times that. Five times -- \$350,000 -- and in the estimates that will be tabled soon we will show the highest figure on record for student aid. And last year, this year, almost 30 percent either through student aid or the Canada Loan Plan, almost 30 percent of the students who go to the University of Manitoba received some government assistance. And he tells this House, and he tells the public of this province, that we are not doing our part and we're not recognizing priorities when it comes to education in the Province of Manitoba.

What about the School for the Deaf? What about what we've done for retarded children? Why don't they talk about that one of these days. That surely is just as important as his goose preserve. Why doesn't he talk about the retarded children. What did the retarded children get when we came in? Well, the handsome sum of \$25,000 was what was dedicated to retarded children when we came into office -- \$25,000 -- and what is it now? Nine times that; ninefold increase -- \$225,000; and if he'd read the Speech from the Throne, and I hope he did, he'd know that in the coming estimates that will be before the House very soon, there will be another large increase in that sum because we are going to bring down some new policies and new programs for the education of the retarded. You talk to me about priorities in education. My honourable friends opposite have the effrontery to complain about priorities in education and compare it to this wild life preserve, when there isn't a fact, not a fact, on which they can base their stand. Nothing but idle talk, and that is one of the other main stock in trade of the honourable gentlemen opposite -- idle talk. They don't have to perform; they don't have to deliver; all they need to do is to talk about something and they don't even talk about it very well, because if they did, they'd have policies and they'd have programs. They'd be telling us what should be done in these fields and giving ideas for improvement and advance in progress, but what do we get from them? We get six days of talk about a land transaction, important in itself, perhaps, I don't deny it; but in proportion and in comparison to the wide front of government policies which they're supposed to be dedicating their attention to, it is only a small aspect of policy indeed. But not a word have we heard, not a constructive syllable. Not a constructive syllable have we heard from the honourable gentlemen opposite on the problems of government in the Province of Manitoba.

Oh, then he says, "What about your old age pensioners? You're not doing the right thing by them." I'm surprised that the Honourable Member for Inkster, who made a touching speech today of his history in this country -- and I wanted to say how remarkable it was to be able to listen to him deliver that story of a man who came to this country with nothing but his two hands and became a public servant of such regard and renown as my honourable friend -- I wondered how he could sit in his seat and listen to the Honourable Leader of the Opposition talk about lack of priorities on the part of his government in dealing with old age pensioners. Because we know, the Honourable Member for Inkster and I, and I dare say a good many others, we know that over there on the front bench sits the man who represented the meanest, stingiest government when it came to dealing with old age pensioners, that this province has ever seen and I think probably that the nation has ever seen. How often did we plead?

A MEMBER: And they haven't changed.

MR. ROBLIN: And they haven't changed. Oh, they haven't learned. They know they haven't changed; they haven't learned. They're still in the same old track. How often did we plead with them, the Honourable Member for Inkster and some of the rest of us, to do something about old age pensioners, but not them. They were happy with things the way they were.

(MR. ROBLIN cont'd.) And yet we're challenged because our priorities are not right on old age pensions. Well let me tell you something. We brought in probably the biggest single boon to the needy old aged and indeed to needy people of other ages when we brought in Medicare. That's what they need -- Medicare. We gave them glasses; we gave them false teeth; we gave them appliances; we gave them the right to get drugs, to go to their own doctor, to go to their own dentist. My honourable friends were urged and beseeched to do this. When they had the chance they didn't do it and now they're complaining about priorities in the field of old age pensions. And what about cash allowances that go under the title of "Social Assistance" to those who can't manage on their means and whose needs are greater than their means? We urged the honourable gentlemen opposite -- oh, how we urged them, but they sat on the treasury. They sat on the treasury bench all right; they sat on the treasury box. They never let anyone get their hand inside the treasury, particularly if it was the hand of an old age pensioner. They made sure that they didn't get in to get any of the goodies that were in there. And these folks went in need.

Now I'm not too proud of the standards that we've been able to meet in this province. They're not certainly luxurious, as I think members may agree, but at least they do meet the essential needs of our people in supplying cash or Medicare services to those who need it. We have looked after our old age pensioners in this regard. And look at the figures. There was some two million -- let me see if I can find the figure here -- some 2,415,000 when we came in. It's now 10,368,000 and I'll be betraying no secret if I say it's going to be higher in this coming year when the estimates are before us. We have done something indeed for the old age pensioners of this province, and we're proud of it, and we've given them a priority, a priority of need, and we've taken care of that and we've recognized our responsibility. And to hear men on the bench opposite who sat over here for 10 these years, to hear the member for St. George talking about that cruel tax, that cruel heat tax -- and I'll come to him if I have time before I get through today -- to hear him talk about it, with probably more needy people per square mile in his constituency than anyone else. He sat over here and so did the Member for Selkirk and so did the Member for Ste. Rose. They sat over here on their hands with their mouths tightly closed when anyone talked about help for the old aged. And now they're starting to remember their responsibilities and talk a little about it, but it's only talk. That's all it is so far -- it's only talk; and I predict that they're going to be in a position to make it only talk for quite some time to come.

Well, what about homes for the elderly? The crying need of the Province of Manitoba was homes for the elderly. What did my honourable friends do? As little as they possibly could. Their appropriation when we came in was \$190,000.00. Last year, the year that's just closing, it was \$1,103,000, about a five-fold increase in homes for the aged. You can go all over this province today and see in our towns not only the beautiful new schools, not only the new hospitals that have been built, but you can see homes for the old folks, not all in Metropolitan Winnipeg either, but scattered throughout the whole of Manitoba, because you can see there the policy that we have initiated with co-operation from local people in providing homes for our elderly citizens in the localities where they've lived their lives, where they've made their friends, where their families live, where they know and where they are known. And that policy was brought in over the dead bodies of the honourable gentlemen opposite. And yet they talk to us about priorities for the aged and they talk to us about the fact that this government should be dismissed from office because of an affair about the goose preserve.

I think the people of this province have got a little wider sense of perspective than some of the gentlemen opposite. They remind me like the horses we used to see in the old days. Remember the horse that went down the street with the blinkers on the side of his head so he wouldn't see anything, and learn anything, and know anything? They're the folks with the blinkers on the side of their heads just like the old horses were, and not only that, they've got a club tied around their leg to prevent it from going too fast. And I don't think there's anyone will object to that description as being an accurate reflection of the impression of the image of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition and those who sit beside him in his Party over there.

And then we go -- (interjection) -- well, my honourable friend is ambidextrous. He can sit on his hands and keep his mouth closed all at the same time. He did it over here very successfully for some time, as I seem to recall, and he's a little more loquacious in his present location.

But going on to deal with other matters of interest in this field, Madam Speaker, I want

(MR. ROBLIN cont'd.)to just refer to a few other points that are of interest because they've been brought up here. What about the field of culture? Oh, I know that culture isn't a very popular subject, politically. There aren't many votes in culture. I acknowledge that. And I know that when you give money to the ballet and the theatre and the symphony and the other cultural institutions on behalf of the public of this province, that sometimes you meet criticism because of that. But I am proud to say, despite that criticism, I am proud to say that we have many times exceeded the support for cultural activities that our predecessor did when they were in office -- many times. I'm not proud of the total in the sense that I think it's extremely generous, because I don't, I don't think it's generous. I think it's only the decent minimum that can be provided. But we have done it and they didn't; and also, Madam Speaker, we are going to have here in 1967 the finest cultural centre certainly in the west, probably in the dominion, where we can continue to promote those arts of the mind and the soul and the spirit which are part of our heritage and part of our life, and I want to say here that although I expect to get many words of criticism for spending money on cultural centres or proposing it or asking the Legislature to authorize it or for cultural grants, I don't think it's a waste of money because I think to refresh and restore and to enliven the spirit in the mind of man is one of the things that we can do with good heart in this country because we have a citizenship that is well able to sustain that kind of cultural endeavour and that kind of cultural advance.

Why do we never hear about things like that? The Opposition never opened their mouths about culture except the cultural centre, and I know that we're going to build that over their dead bodies, no other way. They're opposed to it, root and branch. They wouldn't spend a five cent piece on it if they could help it. There's nothing about it that appeals to them. They don't like it. They don't understand. That's the understatement of the day. However, we intend to proceed with these activities because we believe that men one day will rise up and call us blessed because we did, even though it was politically unpopular and politically unpleasant to have to stand up and support, but that we intend to do.

And what about the other important matters that are in the Throne Speech? Why don't we hear anything about roads these days? Oh, they don't talk to us any more about roads. Maybe they'll get a chance later on, and if so I'd be delighted to hear them talk about roads, because they don't talk to us about roads. When we came into office they said we couldn't build the roads we were going to build. Oh yes, the Leader the Member for Lakeside -- he was then the Leader of the Opposition -- and I dare say the Member for Ste. Rose, though I can't recall what he was doing at that time, but I wouldn't be a bit surprised if all those gentlemen over there will recall that they said we couldn't build these roads, we'd never be able to finance them, we'd never be able to put them in place; and now he says we haven't. Well, we certainly have. We've built those roads and we've built a great many more roads than those that were talked of in that time, and we are getting a road system in this province which is suitable for the traffic and the times and the economy of this particular part of Manitoba. We're doing a very good job, and if it had been left to my honourable friends I hesitate to think of what horse and buggy situation we'd still be stuck with. But they don't talk about roads. They don't talk about these things any more. They don't even talk this time about help to municipalities. What became of that? What became of that great war cry of the Leader of the Opposition, "Let's help our municipalities." Oh, there's been one or two little mentions of it over there this time. There's been some remarkably foolish statements about it, I think the prize one being made by the Honourable Member for Emerson, and if I can find the reference when I get to it I'll refresh his memory about it. But what became of the war cry, "Let's help the municipalities?" Where is it now? We haven't heard anything about it for a while. Oh, they'll recover. They'll find their tongues. They'll talk about it again. But what happened to it in the Throne Speech? After all, the biggest single item in this Throne Speech calling for the expenditure of so many millions of dollars that it will make the hair of the Honourable Member for Lakeside stand straight up -- straight up, no doubt -- what became of the cry for municipal aid? Because we see in this particular -- we see (interjection) you just make your speech when you get your chance. I'm going to carry on.

MR. CAMPBELL: dollars you were going to cut off of the road program?

MR. ROBLIN: Well, you know, I was foolish then and I was on the Opposition. Now I'm wise and I'm in the government.

MR. CAMPBELL: You're just the same.

MR. ROBLIN: Just the same. What became of the cry for municipal aid, because in

(MR. ROBLIN cont'd.)this Throne Speech which has been dismissed with such a cavalier fashion by my honourable friends, which they simply omitted to pay any attention to, one would think they hadn't read it. If I didn't know that the Lieutenant-Governor had read it to them audibly -- and he can read audibly -- I would have suspected that they had never laid their eyes on it. What have they got to say about aid to municipal governments? Not a sausage, not a syllable is forthcoming from the Honourable Leader of the Opposition in this respect. And yet I say to him that there are some of the most revolutionary plans for municipal aid in this budget -- in this Throne Speech, that have ever been laid before this Legislature. There is going to be such an increase in the aid for education as it will astonish those who see it when the estimates are tabled in a few minutes. There is going to be such an increase which is devised in a way that will guarantee relief to the local taxpayer. We tried to relieve education before, I grant you that. We tried to do it through the normal system of increasing the grants. And we learned from bitter experience that that was no guarantee by any means that the local taxpayer would see the benefit of those changes.

A MEMBER: the government gets the credit.

MR. ROBLIN: Well, the government got the credit all right, depending on which way you look at it. But whatever that might be, the taxpayer did not see the advantage. There will be a transfer of burden -- a real, tangible, visible transfer of burden from the local taxpayer to the province, such as the educational department of this government has never before seen. And there will be such a dedication of public funds in the whole field of education as will, I am sure, be a matter of great satisfaction for those who want to see the educational system of this province get ahead; and we're going to see municipal aid, and we have taken the Michener Report recommendations to divide responsibilities for roads and to divide responsibilities for major drains clearly and distinctly between the provinces on the one hand and the local governments on the other, and we have taken over from the local governments, with respect to roads, thousands of miles, thousands of miles of new provincial roads which we will now pay for entirely, and you will see in the Estimates which are shortly to be laid before us a multi-million dollar appropriation that will be designed to give effect to the particular change. And the same thing holds true with drains and you will see us recommending a payment in lieu of taxes to the municipalities amounting to hundreds of thousands of dollars. The City of Winnipeg alone will get \$650-odd thousand dollars in grants in lieu of taxes in the coming year, and the Metropolitan government alone will get a million dollars extra grants from this province for its road system and other streets and roads throughout the province will receive the benefits of the same kind. But we're told, we're told that this is a wasteful extravagant administration. I just can't remember the descriptive adjectives all in the superlative case, if that's the way to describe it, certainly all in the superlative sense, in which our shortcomings as financial administrators was described.

Well I must confess that when you have an operation that is spending about \$200 million on current capital, which is the size of the Government of Manitoba, and when you have some five, six thousand employees serving that government and serving the people, I maintain that it isn't going to be the work of genius to find something wrong with that administration. It's not going to be the work of genius or of any great depth of mind or of forceful investigation to find errors in an organization of that size -- of course you are, because we are human and our civil servants are human and it's simply a matter of fact that these defects and shortcomings can be found. So if you are to really compare what a government is doing the best thing to do is to compare it with other governments. How is it getting along compared to other governments? Because it's the grand picture that one must take into account when weighing up the grand assize which this debate is, and I can tell you that if you take the current and capital costs and put them together the net general expenses of provincial governments in Canada shows that Manitoba is the eighth lowest, only New Brunswick and Nova Scotia spend less per person on a current and capital basis for net general expenditure than we do here in the Province of Manitoba, only two less -- New Brunswick and Nova Scotia. And I maintain that our service and our facilities are on a par if not superior to provinces whose costs of administration are more than ours. And only two provinces in this nation employ fewer civil servants per thousand population than we do in this province of ours. Another indication of reasonable management.

And you will see in this -- the Throne speech says that as you will see in the estimates that will be down here before long there will be this transfer of tax burden from municipal government from local government to the province which will result in extra cost to the

(MR. ROBLIN cont'd.) province of well over \$20 million. And that dramatic and enormous shift of taxation will I think in the course of time work itself out in the public finances of this province, and that people will conclude when the operation is completed that the arrangement on the whole was in the public interest and to the advantage of all. We were urged by the Michener Commission to effect this transfer of burden from local taxation to the provincial treasury and we have been able to effect that transfer in about the same measure of aptitude as they suggest. But, oh, says the Member for St. George, and where is he? He says, oh these awful people -- and I think this was echoed by the Leader of the Opposition -- that cruel tax on heat. And I think that Bartlett's quotations must now be threadbare at least in the political section when one considers the speech of the Honourable Member for St. George. That cruel tax of which he speaks. What does it cost? Well about 60 cents a month. If you spend \$140.00 for fuel, 60 cents a month is the weight of this cruel, heartless tax imposition. And if you live in a house like mine where it costs a little more to heat and you pay \$200.00 a year, it's going to be 90 cents a month. But the average man is going to be paying something like 60 cents a month for this cruel heartless abominable unconscionable heat tax. Well I want to say, oh, my foes and oh my friends, if you're disturbed about this, wait till the Canada Pension Plan hits the tax paying public. Wait on this.

A MEMBER: Are you for it or against it?

MR. ROBLIN: I'm going to talk about the Canada Pension Plan and you'll know where I stand before I get through. I'm going to come clean on this particular subject. And I'm going to tell you this that under the Canada Pension Plan everybody earning over \$600.00 a year will pay. If you are a man earning 3,600 a year and you are self-employed, you will be paying \$108.00. You will be paying more in one month to the Canada Pension Plan than you pay for the whole year in this offensive and abominable tax on heat. That's the relationship between those two taxes. If you've got \$3,600 income coming in you're going to pay \$108.00 per year to the Canada Pension Plan, more in one month than you'd pay for the heat tax in a whole year. And everybody earning over \$600.00 is going to pay it, the ones under \$600.00 they are left out in the cold they don't get any extra pension, they are just going to have to make out as best they can. And it is going to take about \$36 million, \$36 million of the public funds in this province in a scheme of forced saving. The needy old age pensioners are left out in the cold and I've said and I say again, they should come in first. The needy old age pensioners, those who are on old age pension now are out in the cold, they don't come in.

Medical health insurance, that's left out in the cold because this is going to come in first -- where the money is coming from for the health insurance heaven only knows. The needs of education are going to be left out in the cold. A system of forced saving is being brought in, and let me say the system of forced saving is quite unnecessary for the purposes of the Canada Pension Plan. It's only there because it's necessary to please the Province of Quebec who insisted on this system of forced saving. Every Grit in this Legislature supports the Canada Pension Plan as far as I know without any reservations whatsoever. I haven't heard one of them utter a single reservation with respect to it. And yet it's going to take \$36 million of our money, it's going to cost a man earning \$3600, \$108.00 a year to pay for all his life until he gets to that stage, and it's going to produce results which are not quite as straight-forward and as clear cut as some members might think when they consider this matter.

Now let me give you some information about what the Province of Manitoba thinks about the Canada Pension Plan. First of all I've got to say this to you frankly. Our options are limited. I am not going to make any bones about it. We've got two choices. If the plan passes we may accept it as it passes from the Federal Government or we may contract out. But, and here's the kicker, if we contract out we must bring in a plan of our own with substantially the same benefits. Clearly that's Hobson's choice. It's no choice at all. Clearly we have no choice at all. If the Canada Pension Plan is brought in regardless of what kind of a plan it is, we have no choice. Under the circumstances Manitoba is bound to accept Option A, to let Canada run the plan rather than let the province run it itself. But we feel that what Canada needs and what Canada is going to get are two entirely different things. Surely there has been no piece of major legislation that has been so subject to chopping and changing as the Canada Pension Plan. One of the members opposite is criticizing us in some of our tax arrangements. Well my golly if our tax arrangements were flipped around up and down sidewise and over your shoulder the way the Canada Pension Plan was, running around to every province to see what they thought, well not every province, running around to one province to see what they thought, you would have some real cause for complaint. Because the original plan ran up against the

(MR. ROBLIN cont'd) Province of Quebec and as a result we have a bi-laterally negotiated treaty between Ottawa and Quebec in which we are certainly not consulted and we have this plan that is presented to us in its present form.

I want to read to you what I said to the Government of Canada on the subject of pension plan so that my honourable friends opposite will know what our views are. This was taken from a statement made last December 7th to Ottawa, and I read it in part. "The Canada Pension Plan. Most Canadians, and certainly the Government of Manitoba" mark this, "want better pensions for our people, and it may be that of its kind the Canada Pension Plan is a good one -- of its kind. It is true that in its original form this plan started as a pay as you go system with lower rates of contribution and this was strongly defended by federal ministers on grounds of economic policy. This aspect of the plan has been changed to more clearly approximate a funded plan and this has now been equally strongly defended on economic terms by the federal administration." They are handy with arguments on both sides -- it doesn't seem to matter. There seem to be some unresolved questions to be ventilated in this connection. Manitoba however has expressed from the beginning its deep concern about the effects of the Canada Pension Plan levy on our ability to raise funds for other public purposes. Its effect on cost of production in relation both to our domestic market and perhaps what may be of even greater importance to our international trading position need full consideration. Speaking recently in Vancouver, Mr. Louis Rasminsky, Governor of the Bank of Canada, is reported to have specifically warned us to be wary of anything which might add to Canadian costs with particular reference to our international trade. The Government of Canada in their white paper however have assured us that we have nothing to fear from the Canada Pension Plan with respect to our competitive position abroad. One wonders what the National Economic Council might say in this connection. In our mind the question is not fully resolved.

Effect of the Canada Pension Plan on taxing capabilities. Manitoba's main concern at this time however is domestic to our own province. We have reservations about the effects of the Canada Pension Plan on our provincial tax roles and consequently on our ability to finance other needs of an equal or higher priority than that plan in view of its impact in the direct tax field. After all, at a 3, 6 levy on payrolls this plan will extract as much as \$36 million a year from our citizens. This is equivalent to a yield of a four or five percent general retail sales tax in Manitoba. Manitoba has successfully avoided a three percent general sales tax for the very reason that we are now suggesting must be considered, namely its relative effect on our provincial economy. We are faced with an even greater charge for a purpose which we regard as less urgent and advantageous in terms of public priorities and public good. There is a limit to the burden that we can ask our taxpayers to bear and there are many who think that the overall tax levy in Canada may already be high enough. "If the honourable gentlemen don't care to listen to this I don't object but I'd like to be able to hear myself speak.

"Alternative needs, education and health. The new investments that are needed in education are staggering and must perhaps be given the highest priority. If this view seems to you natural coming from a province I ask you also to consider the views of John Deutsch and Kenneth Taylor who have stated the need for investment in education as a paramount national interest in terms just as strong as any I have employed." And I interject here perhaps the comment that the report of the Economic Council of Canada which has not been issued at this time emphasized these thoughts even more dramatically and positively than I have done. Going on, "Manitoba, like the Federal government and other provinces faces the problem of medical insurance. A universal plan that provides at least for the medical indigent is obviously a matter of very high economic as well as social priority. Reasonable men cannot fail to ask how education and health and pension are to be financed in terms of our taxable capacity, let alone their effect on our economic and competitive position. The real question then, and one which affects every province, as well as the Federal government and affects them now, is not whether we can afford the Canada Pension Plan in isolation but whether we can afford it as it stands in the context of our other needs. Manitoba wants better pensions. We believe that better pensions can be obtained and obtained now for those who need them to raise the present system of old age security and assistance to a threshold of \$100 or \$125 or perhaps even \$150 for those who are in need of those increases can very well be financed by a public charge far less than the product of the Canada Pension Plan levy. And get that, far less. This would involve a conscious decision to raise our concept of need from its present level to one that includes some reasonable amenities. And oh how I wish we could do that. The disabled, the widows and the orphans would automatically be included. Not only can we do this, but we can

(MR. ROBLIN cont'd) give our people a medical insurance plan for the medically indigent, interpreting that expression in a very generous way, and still not exceed the yield of the Canada Pension Plan levy. These are matters of immediate benefit, for in our opinion, you may not only have an immediate increase in old age allowance for those who need them but also the early introduction of a medical insurance plan for the medically indigent and still have considerable resources to devote to the essential improvement of education, all within the yield proposed for the Canada Pension Plan. If we assume that we can afford the cost this allocation of our tax resources seems to us to be far more nearly related to the true needs of the nation. The co-ordination of these three priorities in this way would save us from confrontation with an indigestible mass of impractical tax and cost structures that may well result if we deal with the three problems of education, health and pensions in isolation, one from another. Manitoba recognizes that we would have to forego the management and benefits of the Canada Pension Plan Fund. This we would do regretfully but willingly as we would be prepared to take our chances now as we have in the past in the public market. The more realistic consideration of relative priorities more than offsets in our mind the advantages of a fund for provincial investment." And there, Madam Speaker, you have the statement that the government made with respect to the matter of the Canada Pension Plans and if anyone is interested in reading it, I'll be glad to see that copies are provided for the consultation of members.

..... Continued on next page

MR. CAMPBELL: May I ask the Honourable the First Minister, where was this statement made?

MR. ROBLIN: This statement was made at the meeting of the Provincial Treasurers and Ministers of Finance in Ottawa on December 7th, 1964. I have made other statements on the same subject as well.

MR. CAMPBELL: Did that include the Minister of Finance as well?

MR. ROBLIN: Yes it did. Now, even if our plea goes unanswered, and I fear it will, because at the time I made this statement I got no indication that anyone was going to pay the slightest attention to this appeal for commonsense in dealing with priorities. For this plea to put first things first. Take care of our needy old aged, give us that medical plan, that health plan for those who need it and give us the money for education, that's what we ought to do with \$36 million dollars. But if that plan falls on deaf ears, and I'm afraid it does, then we must reconcile ourselves to the plan that we've got. And what kind of a plan have we got? Well in the first place the needs of the older pensioners now on pension are not going to be met by this plan at all. They don't come into it and I'm very sure of this, and this is very unsatisfactory. The Age and Opportunity Bureau estimated there are one million, four hundred and eighty-four thousand people over 65 and only nine percent of them get any benefit under this plan at all. That's the people who are not on pension yet, to say nothing of those who are 70 years and over. The pension excludes the small man that gets \$600, he's still going to be relying entirely on the old age pension system that we have now.

Just let me read you the kind of thing that happens with the Canada Pension Plan as it's developed at the present time. A wealthy man and a farm labourer are killed in a car accident. The rich man's widow can get \$168.00 a month, the labourer's widow gets nothing. What's the sense of that? A young woman goes to work at 20 and works 'til 30 earning an average of \$3,000 a year. Her Canada Pension contribution will bring her \$15.43 a month when she's 65; if she put the same amount into government annuities, her pension at 65 would not be \$15.43 but \$40.05. -- (Interjection) -- I'll table it. What's the sense of that? Mr. Smith and Mr. Brown live next door, earn the same amount and die at the same age, 66. Mrs. Smith spends her life bringing up a family and gets a pension of \$113.50 a month. Mrs. Brown went out to work; she gets a pension of \$194.23 with no children to help. Now what's the sense of that? I maintain that the welfare aspect has been completely downgraded and lost sight of in this Canada Pension Plan and if you do that you're bound to run into these extraordinary situations which I mention here where the plan is not going to do substantial social justice to the people that it should help. Now a plan that won't do that kind of thing isn't the right plan for us no matter how many people say it is. If we get it we're going to have to take it but let's be very clear that these welfare problems are going to have to be met anyway, you can't get around it. If you're going to give these kind of pensions you can't leave the welfare people out and it's just idle wishful thinking to believe that you can, and that seems to be the present tenor at Ottawa. So the bill is not only going to be the bill for the Canada Pension Plan, it's going to be a bill for many million dollars more to take care of the people that are left out.

And here is the kind of thing that happens under this plan. The richer you are, the less it costs you. If you have \$5,000 a year and a wife and two children, the cost of the plan is \$79.00, that's the gross cost, but you get an income tax credit and when you take that into account the gross cost isn't \$79.00, you get a net cost of \$62.41. Well if you earn \$20,000 a year, your gross cost is still the same, it's \$79.00, but your tax rebate is much greater. So instead of you paying \$62.00 as the man that gets \$5,000 a year does, you only pay \$43.00, although your income is \$20,000.00. So the fellow at \$5,000 pays fifty percent more than the fellow at \$20,000.00. Now what's good about that? This is the kind of inequity, of ridiculous situation that's built into the Canada Pension Plan.

MR. PAULLEY: What is the source of

MR. ROBLIN: My sources? I'll be glad to show you all these documents after, because-- I must confess, I confess that I'm no pension expert and I'm not going to say that I am. I get my information from various sources, but that is the situation.

MR. PAULLEY: Dave Kilgour?

MR. ROBLIN: Well some of it came from Mr. Kilgour's speech, I'll admit. But I want to make it perfectly clear that I'm not arguing Mr. Kilgour's case. The case that needs to be argued is the case of the needy. The case of the welfare cases. If you've got to take the Canada Pension Plan, well you have to take it, but let's not overlook the welfare case that's involved in it at the same time.

(MR. ROBLIN cont'd).....

Now Madam Speaker, I'm coming to the end of what I have to say because the clock is catching up with me and I just want to recap some of the points that I've been trying to make. I think that over on the other side, among other things, we see a classical case of political schizophrenia, we see a classical case of the politically schizophrenic, because members on the other side are against taxes, but they're in favour of expenditures, particularly in they're in their constituency. We have had a number of good examples of that. The Member for Carillon, the other day, made a plea for lower taxation and wound up by saying, but don't forget to give me my hospital in Steinbach. Well that's a kind of ridiculous approach to public affairs that certainly should receive some publicity, because members in the same speech should try and be a little more consistent. I'll admit we all fall from the path of virtue in political speeches in terms of consistency, but to put it in the same speech really is hard to take.

The Honourable Member for Gladstone wants to see lab and x-ray services extended all over Manitoba but he's not willing to put up the taxes to pay for it. That's the situation that he finds himself in. The Honourable Member for Emerson, I thought I'd come to him sooner or later, he's a great believer in government doing things. He made a statement saying to the people down in Emerson in the Carillon News that he would like to see farmers allowed an exemption on gasoline used in farm trucks, more provincial grants for education, abolition of the tax on heating fuel and a little more economic handling of provincial funds. But he's against any tax measure that is necessary to bring all these things into effect. So we get this charming situation of honourable gentlemen opposite berating the government for spending too much money on one hand, prolific with suggestions, particularly with their own constituency, as to where money should be spent on the other hand, and shying away altogether from their grave and important responsibilities of presenting themselves, at least in theory, as an acceptable alternative to the present administration. In my judgment they are failures in this complete task, and I want to tell them that always, always something beats nothing. We may not be perfect but by golly we're something. over there is just nothing but a great big zero and a great big goose egg.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The question before the House, that an Humble Address be presented to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor as follows: We, Her Majesty's dutiful and loyal subjects, the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba in Session assembled, humbly thank Your Honour for the gracious speech which Your Honour has been pleased to address us at the opening of the present session.

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

MR. ROBLIN: Yeas and Nays please, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the Members. The question before the House is that an Humble Address be presented to his Honour the Lieutenant-Governor as follows: We, Her Majesty's dutiful and loyal subjects, the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba in Session assembled humbly thank Your Honour for the gracious speech which Your Honour has been pleased to address us at the opening of the present session.

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

YEAS: Messrs. Alexander, Baizley, Beard, Bilton, Bjornson, Carroll, Cowan, Evans, Groves, Hamilton, Harrison, Hutton, Jeannotte, Johnson, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McDonald, McGregor, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Mills, Moeller, Roblin, Seaborn, Shewman, Smellie, Stanes, Steinkopf, Strickland, Watt, Weir, Witney and Mrs. Morrison.

NAYS: Messrs. Barkman, Campbell, Cherniack, Desjardins, Froese, Gray, Guttormson, Harris, Hillhouse, Hryhorczuk, Johnston, Molgat, Patrick, Paulley, Peters, Schreyer, Shoemaker, Smerchanski, Vielfaure and Wright.

Resolution: Yeas, 35; Nays, 20.

MADAM SPEAKER: I declare the motion carried.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce that the address to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor be engrossed and presented to His Honour by such members of this House as are of the Executive Council and the mover and seconder of the address.

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

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Attorney-General that this House will at its next sitting resolve itself into a Committee to consider of

(MR. ROBLIN cont'd) the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

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

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources that this House will at its next sitting resolve itself into a Committee to consider of ways and means for raising of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

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

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I have a message from His Honour the Administrator of the Government of the Province of Manitoba.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Administrator of the Province of Manitoba transmits to the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba estimates of sums required for the services of the province for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1966, and recommends these estimates to the Legislative Assembly.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Education that the message of His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor and the estimates accompanying the same be referred to the Committee of Supply.

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

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

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House adjourned until 2:30 Thursday afternoon.