

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
2:30 o'clock, Tuesday, March 2nd, 1965.

Opening Prayer by Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions.

MR. JAMES COWAN, Q. C. (Winnipeg Centre): Madam Speaker, I beg to present 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: Reading and Receiving Petitions.

MR. CLERK: The petition of Raymond Lloyd Orris and others praying for the passing of an Act to incorporate the Strathcona Curling Club. The petition of Mr. Justice Samuel Freedman and others praying for the passing of an Act to incorporate the Manitoba Law School Foundation.

MADAM SPEAKER: Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees

Notices of Motion

Introduction of Bills

Before the Orders of the Day, I would like to attract your attention to the gallery where there are some 19 Grade 10, 11 and 12 students from Beausejour School under the direction of their teacher, Mr. Robertson. This school is in the constituency of the Honourable the Member for Springfield. There are also some 29 Grade 9 students from Assiniboine Indian School under the direction of their teacher, Mr. Joubert. This school I believe we should say is in the constituency of the Honourable the Minister of Education. On behalf of all members of this Legislative Assembly, I welcome you.

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce) (Fort Rouge): Madam Speaker, before you proceed with the Orders of the Day, may I lay on the table of the House the 6th Annual Report, 1963-64, of the Manitoba Development Fund.

HON. CHARLES H. WITNEY (Minister of Health) (Flin Flon): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to reply to a question that was given to me by the Honourable Member for Elmwood who asked for a statement of any meetings that I had had with the small meat processors and the small meat slaughterhouses in the province, or any meetings that I had had with the Federal Department of Agriculture in regards to Canada Approved meat inspection.

The remarks that I make right now refer to the major meat processors who wholesale meat products and who have not to date achieved full Canada Approved status. Meat processed in these establishments is obtained from Canada Approved slaughter plants and is processed further under the City of Winnipeg Health Department inspection. Eight such plants are operating currently.

During 1964 a proposal to establish a "Manitoba Certified" stamp was studied in detail co-operatively with the processors and chain store managements. The result of this study was that meat process representatives agreed Manitoba Certified would not solve the problem and the proposal was rejected.

Subsequently, technical assistance has been provided that meat processors can meet federal requirements. It can be reported that two plants have completed plans for full Canada Approved, two plants are drafting plans, two plants are planning necessary changes, and all renovations or new construction are being completed in line with Canada Approved standards. The meat program directed both toward slaughter houses and meat processors has been continued by the Department of Health with the co-operation of the inter-departmental committee on meat which includes representatives of the Departments of Health, Agriculture and Conservation.

The meetings that were held over the past year: a meeting was held by the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce with the chain store officials on April 29, 1964. I, as the Minister of Health, held a meeting with small meat processors on May 19, 1964. A meeting was arranged by me to discuss with the meat processors Manitoba Certified stamp in detail. I held a meeting with Dr. S. C. Barry, Deputy Minister of the Canadian Department of Agriculture and Dr. K. F. Wells, the Veterinary Director General of the Canadian Department of Agriculture on June 19, 1964. I held individual meetings with chain store officials June 26, 1964, and again on July 9 and 10, 1964. I held a meeting with the meat processors on July 10, 1964.

A statement was released by me to the newspapers on September 10, 1964 re Manitoba

(MR. WITNEY cont'd) Certified, and during that statement with respect to slaughterhouses it was reported that "as regards slaughterhouses, efforts have been directed toward extending federal inspection to the smaller slaughterhouses on a basis which is practical and reasonable for these small operators. This has been done by both correspondence and meetings with the federal authorities. The federal government has expressed an agreement in principle and is now processing the necessary legislation for an agreement with Manitoba. As soon as this is completed we will negotiate for an agreement in respect of financial arrangements, the volumes of slaughter and standards required. It is our sincere hope that we will be able to offer slaughterhouse operators a practical prominent solution to their problems in the near future."

During October the federal government advised they had processed the necessary legislation to enter into an agreement with the Province of Manitoba to extend Canada Approved federal meat inspection to small domestic slaughterhouses. Since that time, further negotiations in respect to the agreement have been undertaken with Ottawa and Manitoba is currently finalizing this agreement.

HON. OBIE BAIZLEY (Minister of Labour) (Osborne): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I wish to lay on the table of the House an interim report of the Labour-Management Committee reviewing labour legislation and functioning under the direction of Dean Woods of McGill University. Madam Speaker, there will be copies made available for the honourable members of the House.

MR. DOUGLAS L. CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I would like to lay on the table of the House certain documents. These are the documents that were laid on the table of the House at the August session in response to a request of mine for an Order of the House concerning them. They are the official report of the last committee to deal with the rules of this House, the Rules, Orders and Forms of Proceedings of this House as they existed at the time that that committee began its sittings, and the Rules, Orders and Forms of Proceedings in force before that time. I call the particular attention of the Honourable the First Minister and the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party to the latter document which the First Minister referred to as the "orange book" and asked me to take especially good care of because he said it was the only copy that the government has available to it. The Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party said that he wished to avail himself of the opportunity to study this orange book as well. So these are the three documents that I requested at that time. I again express my appreciation to the government for making them available and I return them herewith.

MR. BAIZLEY: Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day and before tabling the Annual Report of the Workmen's Compensation Board, I would like to direct the attention of the honourable members to Page 1 of the Annual Report of the Workmen's Compensation Board where the number of accidents reported are stated as 31,818. Now the Annual Report, Madam Speaker, of the Department of Labour, Page 33, on Table 2, you will note records only 29,141 accidents. This figure is a reasonably accurate projection from the total to December 15, 1964 and is given in Table 3, Page 34. The reason for the difference between the figures of the board and the department is a simple straightforward one. The Board receives reports on a variety of incidents which are not accidents within the meaning of the Act and the Board then reports to the department only those incidents which are accidents under the Act. Madam Speaker, I would like to table the report of the Workmen's Compensation Board.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party) (Radisson): May I ask the Honourable Minister in connection with the report just tabled if copies -- are they available to all members or at least to the various caucuses?

MR. BAIZLEY: I am sure they are. If they are not I'll see that they are available to all caucuses.

MR. PAULLEY: Actually presented to the caucuses. Fine. Thank you, Mr. Minister.

HON. GEORGE HUTTON (Minister of Agriculture) (Rockwood-Iberville): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to direct a question to the Leader of the Opposition. Would you answer a question?

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker, on a point of order, has the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition accepted office in the Government of Manitoba?

MR. HUTTON: It's on a point of privilege.

MR. CAMPBELL: I would suggest to my honourable friend then that he take up his point of privilege.

MR. PAULLEY: May I suggest, Madam Speaker, that points of privilege can only be

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) . . . taken after an event which has taken place and not the next day.

MR. HUTTON: Madam Speaker, I'd like to point out that this is the first opportunity that I have had to raise it since this took place. Madam Speaker, I would like to ask if the Leader of the Opposition would care to identify the two Ministers that he stated in a television broadcast last night that had visited the late D. H. Bain? Would he care to identify them?

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): No problem at all, Madam Speaker. My information is that the Minister who has just spoken and the present Minister of Health were the Ministers who called on Mr. D. H. Bain at his home on Eastgate Street.

MR. HUTTON: Madam Speaker, on a point of privilege, I would like the Leader of the Opposition to withdraw that statement which he has made on the basis of no evidence whatsoever and he has deliberately deceived the people of Manitoba over a public medium.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I deny that altogether and I will not withdraw the statement. I asked the Minister last week whether he had been there. He refused to answer my question and my information is that he was there.

MR. HUTTON: Madam Speaker, I am still asking the Leader of the Opposition to withdraw his statement. It is completely false.

MR. MOLGAT: I have no intention whatever of withdrawing my statement, Madam Speaker. If the Minister says he wasn't there let him say so. Let him make a statement that he wasn't there, and if he wasn't let him tell us who was.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, on a point of privilege dealing with all members of this Assembly, and I think that I have a very valid point of privilege, are we gathered in this Legislative Assembly to iron out what any individual member said or did not say over the media of TV or press unless it directly refers to happenings within this particular House. May I respectfully suggest to you, Madam Speaker, and also to all of the members of the House, that we are here to do a job for the people of Manitoba. Let us, if we have differences of opinion as to what happens on TV and radio and other media, deal with them in like media and not take up the time of the members of this House. I think that I am one of them who are here to deal with the problems confronting Manitoba that happen in this Legislative Assembly. I respectfully suggest, Madam Speaker, that you might take this point under consideration, and if like circumstances arise in the future that you may, after contemplation and consideration, rule out of order any reference to like statements.

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q.C. (Minister of Mines & Natural Resources) (Fort Garry): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, if I may get away from points of privilege and points of order and things of that nature, and draw the attention of the House to a fact which occurred last week and about which I have not yet had an opportunity to speak on the Orders of the Day. I rise as the member for the constituency of Fort Garry to call the attention of the House to the fact that a ladies' curling team from the Wildwood Club in Fort Garry has won the Canadian Ladies' Curling Championship, the first time in the history of our country that that championship has come to Manitoba, and I am very proud -- I'm very proud of Mrs. Peggy Casselman, Mrs. Val Taylor, Mrs. Pat McDonald and Mrs. Pat Scott for the excellent job that they did on behalf of the Wildwood Club, on behalf of the Municipality of Fort Garry, on behalf of Metropolitan Winnipeg, and on behalf of all Manitoba. I thought that all members of the House would like to join me in this commendation of these lovely girls.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I am very pleased at the opportunity that the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources and the member for Fort Garry has given me to speak on this matter. I just might say that it's unfortunate that the member for Fort Garry is as derelict in the duties of his constituency in that he is about four days late in making the statement to the House, which was made the other day by the member for St. George. So it's obvious that the member operates the same way as a member as he does in the operation of his department -- consistently late.

MR. LYON: Madam Speaker, I can only add that I was so enthused by the reception that I attended the other night for them that I merely had to convey that enthusiasm myself to the House.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Madam Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. I'd like to make a short statement. First of all, I would like to refer to Page 125 of Hansard of yesterday afternoon, and I quote from the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources statement, third paragraph, "One group that was apparently interested in the Delta property, excluding the 800 acres of the Inkster Farm -- that's excluding -- was a

(MR. JOHNSTON cont'd) . . . group of businessmen from Portage la Prairie. Discussions took place between this group and Aronovitch and Leipsic in late July around the group's offer of \$125,000 for 2,100 acres of marsh land and shore property, including the Bain Lodge but exclusive of the valuable Inkster Farm on the south end of the property. They were negotiating just for the marsh property, the shoreline, the lodge, not the farm on the south end."

Then in the next paragraph, and I'll skip a few words, it says again, "This offer is even more interesting, Madam Speaker, because we are told one of the members of this Portage syndicate was the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie." Madam Speaker, I would like to say in my statement at this time that I categorically deny this allegation in this statement, and I call on the Mines Minister for a retraction of this statement. Thank you.

MR. HUTTON: Before the Orders of the Day, there were two . . .

MR. JOHNSTON: Madam Speaker, on the question of privilege again, may I have the retraction?

MR. LYON: I said yesterday afternoon I would accept the member's statement about his relationship and I do accept his statement. I do point out, however, Madam Speaker, that this is not a point of privilege because my honourable friend spoke not only yesterday afternoon during the debate, he spoke again last evening, and has had full and ample opportunity to explain his position. In any case, I accept his statement about his relationship. I have, under the rules, to accept his statement, and I do.

MR. JOHNSTON: Madam Speaker, the reason I did not make the statement yesterday was the Minister made a 52-page statement and in his usual way he talked around many points and I had to be careful and read it in Hansard to find exactly what he meant. I would also ask him to retract the inference that he made on television last night about the same statement.

MADAM SPEAKER: I would like to draw the attention of the House to Beauchesne's Fourth Edition, 1958, Citation 105 (3) where it says, "A dispute arising between two honourable members as to the allegations of facts hardly fulfills the conditions of a privileged question"

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker, may I on that point of order ask you to consider the fact that there is quite a bit of difference in what Beauchesne uses as the question of facts and the question of an imputation of wrongdoing to a member of the House. Questions of facts are one thing; imputations on honourable members are another thing.

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Madam Speaker, on a point of privilege and also of courtesy to the Leader of this House, I wonder if the Premier would take this occasion also to withdraw this erroneous statement that he's made on television and repeated on radio a few days ago.

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier and Provincial Treasurer) (Wolseley): Madam Speaker, the statement that I made was factually and literally correct.

MR. DESJARDINS: I think you should read Hansard and the points that I brought in yesterday because it was completely erroneous and false and misleading.

MR. ROBLIN: My honourable friend as usual is incorrect and using grossly exaggerated language.

MR. DESJARDINS: . . . if he wants to prove that, Madam Speaker. I think that he knows that this was a tax for the hospital purposes and he pretended that this was a donation from the government. This is exactly what he did and we had a Special Session -- if he reads Hansard of the Special Session he'll find out that it was erroneous and misleading.

MADAM SPEAKER: I think I must ask the members of the House to again consider the ruling I just gave.

MR. HUTTON: Madam Speaker, I had two questions directed to me, one by the member for Carillon in respect to the use being made by the farmers of the soil testing service provided by the department. To date 8,000 soil samples have been received, and although we don't know the actual number of farms, we estimate it to be about 1,000.

I had a question directed to me the other day by the member for Portage in respect to the intentions of the engineers with respect to controlling the level of Lake Manitoba during the period of construction of the dykes in the marsh area. The question was, was there any intention of lowering Lake Manitoba while the dykes were being constructed in the marsh area? The answer from the engineers is "no".

MR. J. M. FROESE (Rhineland): Madam Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the First Minister. Is the government appealing the decision made by the court in connection with the Duthoit case? I notice that several members have referred to this case in their

(MR. FROESE cont'd) . . . speeches. And a second question, are we as members barred on speaking on this case, because this is already a matter of public information because of the court case.

MR. LYON: The case is under appeal and the sub judice rule applies insofar as discussing the merits of the case. I think reference can be made to straight factual matters from the judgement that is under appeal, but it is under appeal at the present time.

MR. JOHNSTON: Madam Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Agriculture. I have here the latest news release of "Farm and Home News" put out by his department. At the end of the first paragraph, the last sentence says, "Prices may soon be stabilized since potato stocks and storage appear to be sufficient to supply local needs until spring." My question is, is the government considering price controls on the price of potatoes?

MR. HUTTON: The government isn't controlling the price of potatoes. The price of potatoes is set by the Potato Marketing Commission and they are related to the price of potatoes that are available from sources outside of Manitoba.

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): Madam Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Attorney-General. Has he had any representations made to him either in person or by telephone or in writing from a person who is complaining that a member of his department has failed to comply with a court order?

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN, Q. C. (Attorney-General) (Dauphin): No, Madam Speaker.

MR. GUTTORMSON: The answer is "no"?

MR. McLEAN: No.

MR. GUTTORMSON: I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. Has he had any representation either in writing or by telephone or in person complaining that a member of the Attorney-General's Department has failed to comply with a court order?

MR. LYON: Not that I'm aware of, Madam Speaker, no.

MR. McLEAN: Madam Speaker, I would imagine -- not imagine, I think the answer to the member's question is "yes". Some time ago I had a telephone call from a lady who had some comments to make.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Did the Minister say "yes"? -- (Interjection) -- Did the Attorney-General take action in this case?

MR. McLEAN: Madam Speaker, I informed the person who telephoned me that it was a civil matter to be arranged in the regular way, the procedure of which is well-known to all of the parties concerned.

MR. E. R. SCHREYER (Brokenhead): Before the Orders of the Day, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Mines. He intimated to the House yesterday that he was given legal opinion that the government did not have adequate powers of expropriation relative to the goose sanctuary. I would ask him is he in a position to tell us what the source or sources of that legal opinion were?

MR. LYON: That was at the time. The opinion was not of course given to me, but it's from the law officers of the Crown. There is an opinion now being prepared or should be ready very shortly from the Legislative Counsel to this effect, as I advised my friend the Leader of the Opposition last night.

MR. MOLGAT: On that subject, Madam Speaker, if I may ask a question of the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, did he not state last night that the quotation that he read was actually from the legislative Counsel?

MR. LYON: I have it in the same pocket as a matter of fact. This is a penned piece of paper from the Legislative Counsel which I would have no hesitation of putting on. I will confirm this memo tomorrow. I have no objection to laying it on the table of the House, but it's coming in printed form.

MR. MOLGAT: I wonder if the Minister would table that.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I wonder if I may direct a question to whoever is responsible for, or in charge of TV programs, whether they would kindly table the contents of the TV show which have been referred to on numerous occasions today in order that those of us who couldn't spend the time to listen to the show may be acquainted as to what transpired on that occasion.

MR. SCHREYER: Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, a supplementary question to the Minister of Mines. I would ask him if he is personally aware of any appropriate or pertinent case law relative to the power of expropriation for a game preserve situation, and

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) . . . if he is aware, could he cite the case law that he is aware of.

MR. LYON: Madam Speaker, that's a question calling for a legal opinion and I'm afraid I couldn't answer it.

MR. MOLGAT: Before the Orders of the Day, I would like to address a further question to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. Could he inform the House what date the Pitblado Hoskins firm was retained by the government to act for them on the purchase of the Bain Estate, and in particular Mr. Hunter.

MR. LYON: I'll take that question as notice, Madam Speaker.

MR. MOLGAT: The Minister does not have that information now? I would assume that with the amount of research he did, the date should be reasonably fresh in his mind.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MADAM SPEAKER: The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Brokenhead

MR. SCHREYER: Madam Speaker, I would like to ask for permission to have the matter stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Inkster.

MR. MORRIS A. GRAY (Inkster): With the kind permission of the House, Madam Speaker, I would like to have the matter stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Inkster. The Honourable the Member for St. Matthews.

MR. W. G. MARTIN (St. Matthews): Madam Speaker, I beg the indulgence of the House to let this matter stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I do not propose to proceed at this time.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for St. George. The Honourable the Member for Dufferin.

MR. WILLIAM H. HAMILTON (Dufferin): Madam Speaker, I beg the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Ethelbert Plains.

MR. M. N. HRYHORCZUK, Q. C. (Ethelbert Plains): Madam Speaker, I wish to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lakeside, whereas the appointment of an Auditor-General in other jurisdictions has proved of great benefit in controlling waste in government and has provided savings to the taxpayer, therefore be it resolved that there be appointed an officer known as the Auditor-General and that he be empowered to make independent spot inspections and running audits of all government departments, boards, commissions, and utilities, and to report to the Legislature, and be it further resolved that the Auditor-General should be appointed by the Legislature, be responsible only to the Legislature, and be removed from office only by a two-thirds majority vote of the Legislature.

MADAM SPEAKER: I have had this proposed resolution under consideration and I will advise the House as to its admissibility at a later date.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Would I be remiss in asking, Madam Speaker, the reason for taking the resolution under consideration? I feel, Madam Speaker, that having moved the resolution, that I am at least entitled to know why it is being taken under consideration.

MADAM SPEAKER: I haven't had sufficient time to peruse this as I have all of them, and I would ask you to abide with me until I have given it sufficient

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Seeing Madam Speaker, that you've struck upon a very kind soul, I'll take that.

MADAM SPEAKER: The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Emerson.

MR. JOHN P. TANCHAK (Emerson): Madam Speaker, I think if I proceeded with this it will be ruled out of order, so I would prefer to let it stand until I see what legislation the government brings in. So therefore I would like the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Selkirk.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Madam Speaker, may we have this matter stand please.

MADAM SPEAKER: The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, whereas in the area of consumer purchasing, there are numerous complexities and continually altering conditions and devices which have the effect of nullifying or blunting legislation designed to protect the consumer; and whereas long-range improvements in this area are contingent on a continuing program of research, education, supervision and legislative review; and whereas it is necessary to maintain a favourable climate for consumer purchasing, just as we now concern ourselves with providing a favourable climate for industry and commerce; therefore be it resolved that the government do forthwith give consideration to the advisability of establishing a Department of Consumer Affairs. My seconder is the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MADAM SPEAKER: In giving consideration to this proposed resolution, the government has announced in the Throne Speech, and I quote: "Since we last met my Ministers inform me that much study and consultation have taken place on the subject of consumer credit. You will be asked to consider legislation and future policy on this subject." In the light of this announcement, I consider the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party, that he anticipates legislation which is to be submitted for consideration -- our Rule No. 31 of Rules, Orders and Forms of Proceedings of the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba, and accordingly I must rule the proposed resolution out of order.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I know that your ruling is not debatable, but I simply ask you if you would mind taking a look at the resolution once again because the words "consumer credit" is not contained within the resolution and this is deliberately.

MR. ROBLIN: If I could perhaps just make a comment on this, I think that my honourable friend may have a point that should be reviewed here because his resolution, while it talks of consumer credit in the preamble, in the body of the motion he refers to consumer affairs, which conceivably could take into account a wider scope than consumer credit. So if you do decide to take this under consideration I would point out that difference between the two ideas.

MADAM SPEAKER: I will hold this one to consider the terms "consumer credit" and "consumer affairs". The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. PAULLEY: I ask the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand because I'm afraid that this one might transgress the rules of the House.

MADAM SPEAKER: The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Lakeside.

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Member for Ethelbert Plains, whereas a Special Select Committee of the House was appointed on the 21st day of January, 1960, to give consideration to the Rules, Orders and Forms of Proceedings of the Legislative Assembly in Manitoba with a view to recommending such amendments as might be deemed to be in the interests of a more orderly and more effective conduct of the business of the House, and whereas this Committee reported to the House on March 1st, 1960, which report recommended among other things, "that for the improvement of the procedure of the House and the attainment of a higher degree of efficiency, Rule 33 of our present Rules be repealed, and replaced by speeches limited to 40 minutes. No member, excepting the Premier or the Leader of the Opposition Party, or a Minister moving a Government order, or a Member making a Motion of No Confidence in the Government or the Minister replying thereto, shall speak for more than forty minutes in any debate, provided, however, that the Leader of the Government and the Leader of the Opposition shall have the right to designate some Member of his party to speak in any such debate for such time as he shall desire, but in such case, the Leader, if he speak in such debate shall be allowed to speak for 40 minutes only." And whereas the report of the committee was concurred in by the House on March 26th, 1960, and whereas Rule 33 as it appears in our printed copy of the Rules, Orders and Forms of Proceedings varies both in language and principle from Rule 33 as recommended by the Committee and adopted by the House, therefore be it resolved that Rule 33 of the Rules, Orders and Forms of Proceedings of the Legislative Assembly be repealed and replaced by the rule recommended by the committee and adopted by the House.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker, all honourable members who are interested at all

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd) in this matter will likely recall that I spoke on it on at least two other occasions, the first occasion being when my honourable friend the member for Brokenhead brought before the Legislative Assembly a suggestion re some extra remuneration for the leaders of all parties in the House -- all parties in the opposition. I mentioned at that time that the Honourable Member for Brokenhead quoting the rule as it now appears, Rule 33 in our Rule Book, brought me up with something of a start because I said to myself, "Surely that's not what our rule says." I didn't have the copy of my rule book with me at the moment but I looked a bit later and found that as is more customarily the case with my honourable friend from Brokenhead, and some others I could mention, that he was right, and that the rule was as he had read it.

Then being a rather stubborn individual I had to find some way of appearing to justify my doubt on the subject and I said to myself, "I am sure that is not the way the committee recommended that this rule should read," and I possessed myself of the copies of the minutes that I had kept as a member of that committee and discovered that the rule as recommended by the committee was not the same as it appears in the rule book at the present time.

So having noticed that, I brought that matter before the House and asked the Honourable the First Minister if he would have it checked. The Honourable the First Minister reported that he had it checked by the Clerk of the House and the Clerk of the House saw little or nothing in the suggestion that I had made. This of course increased my ardor for some further researches, but in the meantime my copy of the minutes of the committee that had sat on this matter had escaped me. We've been dispossessed persons in our group, not only as a government but from territorial domain on two or three different occasions around the building, and in the process some place I had lost my file on this matter. So I had to ask last year to have the actual copy of the report laid upon the table of the House so that I could peruse it and be sure that it was correct.

Now, Madam Speaker, I make the statement as contained in this resolution that the Rule 33 as recommended by the committee and adopted by the House is not the rule that we have in our Rule Book, and this is an interesting speculation as to how the change has been made. I certainly am not accusing anybody. There's been so much talk recently about accusations against this government but I am not accusing the government of changing this deliberately. Certainly I am not accusing the Clerk of the Committee and I am not accusing anybody. This is undoubtedly a slip somewhere, but the fact is there is a slip, and consequently I think it should be changed. It should be corrected. We should have the rule as the committee recommended it.

Now this is not at all inspired by any wish to cut down the time that's allotted to my honourable friend the Leader of the NDP party nor my honourable friend the Leader of the Social Credit party. As far as I am concerned I would be quite willing to listen to either one or both of them as long as they care to go on in the House, and this is the way that the rule read at one time. But this was discussed in the committee and it was decided not to extend that privilege to them on this latter occasion. It wasn't only this latter occasion, Madam Speaker, the rules that we were working on when this committee sat did not have that provision. If they had then I would have guessed that perhaps just a mistake had been made and we copied in the rule from 1951 rather than what the committee had recommended, but even in 1951 we didn't have this provision. That is why I had asked for the famous Orange Book so that I could check back to the rules revision before that time, in 1940, and of course at that time we had this provision in the rules whereby the leader of a recognized opposition in the party was placed in the same position as the leader of the government and as the official opposition. But that change was made away back in 1951, and though I recall that my honourable friend the present leader of the New Democratic Party at this latest rules committee argued that there was merit in this suggestion, his argument did not prevail and the recommendation of the committee adopted by the House was as stated in this resolution.

Now let me once again say in all sincerity that I am not a believer in us being slaves to the rules. I believe in the rules being made to fit the business of the House, but I think that these committees that sit, more or less frequently, are a very good idea and we should have discussion among the members of all the parties of the rules to make them accommodate themselves to the two main objects of the rules. Having been a long time on the government side of the House I am one who is prepared to maintain that the job of getting the government business done, because after all that's the business of the province -- now whether we agree with the way it's being done or not is another question -- but the job of getting the business of the government forward is one of the important reasons for having the rules the way we have.

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd) . . .

But the other job is important too, Madam Speaker, and you as the custodian of the rules and the rights and the privileges of this House are the one who I am sure is most cognizant of this fact. The other job is important too, to see that the rights of the minority, not only the minority but every individual single member of this House are protected too, and that is why that when the rules are agreed upon and incorporated in our rule book they should be observed by the members of this House in their individual and collective capacity and enforced by the Chairman of the House who is Madam Speaker.

Certainly I think it follows from that that when the committee has deliberated on this question and has made a decision on it, and it did not escape discussion in the committee, that the rule should appear in our rule book in the way that the committee proposed it. I have no interest whatever in assessing the blame for what happened. I am quite prepared to admit that it's just been a slip along the line, most probably of the printer. I repeat that I am not in any way inspired in making the suggestion of the change toward any malice toward the two gentlemen who happen to be concerned in this matter as being deprived of what the present rule appears to give them, of the right of speaking more than 40 minutes. All I am interested in is that the regular orderly conduct of business should be continued in this House, and when the committee reports that the rule should be so and so and the House adopts it, then that rule should be the one that appears in the rule book, and that is not the case here.

Madam Speaker, I hope I have made myself clear on this matter. If the House agrees with me that this is what the committee recommended, then I assume that the House will agree also that arrangements should be made for the proper rule to be put into our rule book. This is the reason -- because I saw this resolution was coming up on the Order Paper -- the reason that I laid the official documents back on the table today so that any one who wants to check them carefully can do so before they have any further consideration of this resolution.

MR. SCHREYER: Madam Speaker, may I ask one question of the member for Lakeside. I would like to ask him where the inadvertent error came in. Did it come in in the actual report tabled before the House? The question is, did this House, in the member's opinion, adopt a report that was fallaciously worded or erroneously worded?

MR. CAMPBELL: No, Madam Speaker, as the resolution itself points out -- if I could have it back -- the resolution -- well it's here on the Orders, I have it -- as the resolution itself points out, this paragraph is what the committee recommended, and I take it because this is what the official minutes say, that this was recommended, and this seems to me to correspond with my recollection of what happened in the committee, but after all my recollection of what happened in the committee is not the thing that I expect the House to go by. It's the official report of the committee and this is the paragraph that appears in the official report. But some place between the official report being adopted by this House and the printing of our rule book a change got in there.

Now I certainly am making no accusation toward any member of this House or any official as to this having been done deliberately. I simply state the fact that it is different from the way the Committee recommended it, and it's interesting to speculate on how it could have occurred but there's the difficulty. It does not appear in our rule book as the committee recommended it. I say it should.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Inkster, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. JOHNSTON: Madam Speaker, in view of the statement made by the Minister of Health, I would like to have my resolution stand so that I could examine his remarks more closely as to whether or not I should proceed or not.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the Member for Lac du Bonnet and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition, and the proposed further amendment by the Honourable the Member for Portage la Prairie. The Honourable the Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Madam Speaker, in taking part in this debate, first I would like to extend to you my sincere wishes for the position that you hold in this office. I

(MR. PATRICK cont'd) would also like to compliment the mover and the seconder of the Speech in Reply from the Throne. As a matter of fact I enjoyed the speech of the mover very much because he gave us a real good explanation of his constituency in the way of minerals, lakes and fish, but like all good sportsmen he never told us the particular area or pool where the fish concentrate. I also enjoyed the seconder's remarks as he outlined his constituency and the farm land and the area that he lives in.

Madam Speaker, the other day I listened to the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce and the remarks he made in connection with the COMEF Report and the progress that they have made. Some of his statistics nevertheless were very encouraging but it was also indicated in the Speech from the Throne that in 1965 emphasis will be placed on research and development for small business. This is indeed a most needed possibility, but I'm quite concerned how does the government, or the present government plan to do this.

I'm aware that we now have in our province the Manitoba Research Council, but I'm sorry to say that our research council is not much more than just a name. I understand all it is is a director and a secretary. These people no doubt are most capable, but I understand there is no laboratory facilities where research and development would take fruition. Our natural resources and agricultural industries are crying out to be developed and improved through research. The potential is there, but are we taking full advantage of the potential given us by the kind Providence.

Madam Speaker, the present government is much too slow in implementing recommendations of the COMEF Report in this particular regard. In British Columbia, Saskatchewan and Alberta, research councils were established many years ago and now are making a definite and a worthwhile contribution while we are dragging our feet. I want the Honourable Minister to tell us, or will he supply the members of this Chamber with the Research Council's report and their progress. I'm quite aware that a research council to be useful will require additional staff and facilities. I realize it takes time to get a staff, but every year that a government procrastinates and delays puts us further and further behind our neighbour provinces.

The Research Council of Saskatchewan did a tremendous amount of research on potash and cement which helped establish these industries, and a more recent announcement of a heavy water plant in Weyburn to a great extent, I understand, was assisted by the research council in that province. I feel this government should immediately undertake to sponsor research projects in proper departments at the University of Manitoba. They have a very highly qualified staff and facilities, but often there is a lack of proper co-ordination. If it is not possible to fully sponsor research projects, it may be possible to support certain areas of research. I would like to see support directed to areas of research of specific interest to our province. For example, in such areas as minerals, or agriculture, this would be an easy matter to implement it through our research council.

I wonder what has been done to the Kaolin development which was announced by the government last year, because we haven't heard much more about it since that time. I understand there are commercial research establishments such as the Ontario Research Foundation which can be engaged to undertake more urgent projects. Perhaps our research council is already making use of this now. I'm not a technical person in this field but it is only common sense that scientific research is a modern miracle. I say let us not sit back and watch the other provinces take advantage of this miracle.

Madam Speaker, it is most heartening to know, according to the Speech from the Throne that the government plans to establish an agricultural research station for the University of Manitoba at Glenlea. I think agriculture is one of our most important sources of income and this kind of research I feel can guarantee this income for many and future generations.

Madam Speaker, I would like to make some reference to our Summer Session and the taxation that were imposed. I believe that taxation of heating fuels, telephone and hydro services is a most unfortunate decision. These services under no circumstances can be classed as non-essential, and this levy is penalizing many people in our province who can least afford such taxation. I ask this government to rescind this most unjust legislation. I believe it would be safe to say that this government has made a serious mistake in this tax package plan imposed during the Special Session. This has been quite adequately covered by my colleague in his resolution on heating and fuel tax, so I probably would be repeating many of the things that he has mentioned and said already, so I would like to confine my remarks to some other items, and one of these is the land transfer tax.

I would like to say that in the interest of the people of the province this government should

(MR. PATRICK cont'd) not delay its withdrawal of the land transfer tax. There has been no statement from this government if they plan to proceed with the legislation passed last August. Are they going to withdraw it or are they going to modify it? There's been no statement with exception that there were press releases that the government plans to modify the legislation in some way.

Now, Madam Speaker, I was opposed to the land transfer tax at the Special Session and I did concern myself with that item at the Special Session and was opposed to it, and I say now I'm also opposed to this land transfer tax in any modified form. I can't see why the government is delaying in making their announcements what their plans are because it certainly concerns many people in industry, in construction, in development, and I think that they should have an answer.

It seems all levels of government for many years encouraged home ownership as a basis of a direct boost to employment and the general economy of the country so that its citizen may enjoy one of the highest standards of living in the world, which to a great extent is due to the high percentage of home ownership. The object of the federal government's winter works program, the \$500.00 bonus, was to create winter employment. From evidence available so far it appears the scheme worked, in fact it has worked much better than even the most optimistic officials have foreseen.

The proposed land transfer tax will affect farm transactions as well. I think it will be quite substantial. The estimated average selling price for a quarter section of land is somewhere between \$10,000 and \$12,000.00. On this basis alone the one percent land transfer tax would amount to somewhere between \$400 and \$480.00. To develop land involves the installation of services, roadways and other requirements for a subdivision. Many times suitable land for development is frequently on the outskirts of an urban area which sometimes within a few years is used for road purposes, and the normal course of developing this land is very prone to multiple taxation by the present land transfer tax if it is imposed in the present form. But as I said before, I'm against this land transfer tax in any form.

Let's for instance, for an example use in the first place land sold from a farmer to an investor. We can call it the first land transfer tax. Land sold by an investor to a developer. This is the second land transfer tax. Land improved by installation of services and sold to the builder. There's a third land transfer tax. Fourth, sold by a builder to a homeowner after construction of a house. We have a fourth land transfer tax. In a normal course of business this added cost will be passed on to the ultimate property owner. I stress to this government not to impose this tax in any modified form.

I have covered a few of the items that I wanted to be concerned with at this time. Madam Speaker, I'll have an opportunity to talk on this again so I will take advantage of it and do this at a later date. Thank you.

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

MR. FRED GROVES (St. Vital) I would like at the outset of this debate, Madam Speaker, first of all to bring congratulations to you and to the office in which you are raised by the Members of this House, and I want to assure you, Madam Speaker, that these are not meaningless words. These are words that I say, firstly, because I think highly of you as a person; secondly, because I think that you are doing a good job as Speaker; and thirdly, even if I did not believe in the first two reasons for saying them I believe in the high honour that your office should hold for the members of this House and for the tradition of the office of Speaker which goes back so many years in our British parliamentary system. So I bring to you, Madam Speaker, and to the office which you hold, my sincere congratulations and wishes for a long tenure.

I would like also to congratulate my fellow members in the backbenches of this side of the House on the speeches which they made in moving and seconding the debate on the Speech from the Throne. And again, Madam Speaker, I use not meaningless words. I think that both of these gentlemen had excellently prepared speeches; they delivered them in a very excellent manner in my opinion; and they too in the job that they performed in this debate were taking part in a tradition that is almost as old as the British democratic system itself, one that is important and one that I think warrants a few words of respect from those members who take place in this debate.

I would also like to welcome back to the House the Honourable Minister the Provincial Secretary and the member for River Heights. Since the summer session the Minister has gone through a lot and I am pleased to welcome him back as a member on this side of the House.

(MR. GROVES cont'd)

I would also, Madam Speaker, like to -- I have noticed from recent newspaper reports that our Lieutenant-Governor may be retiring at the end of June. I would like at this time on behalf of myself, and I am sure other members who sit in this Chamber and who know him and of the work that he has done, to congratulate him on the high standard which he has brought to this high office and for the excellent job that he has done in this office for the people of this province.

It's been interesting to note, Madam Speaker, over the years that the opposition have constantly been complaining, particularly at times when they're considering the estimates of the Department of Municipal Affairs, about the unfair burden of taxes on the homeowners. All along throughout these debates they have urged the government to do something about this high rate of taxation on property. It has been a recurring theme with them that taxes on property have been too high.

Well at the special session that was held last summer, Madam Speaker, something was done about the high taxes on property. This was to be accomplished in three ways. Firstly, by the provincial authorities taking over major responsibilities that were formerly responsibilities of the municipalities, namely roads and main drains, and depending on the actions of the municipal councils in respect of these matters, these particular measures can result this year and in succeeding years in major reductions in municipal budgets throughout this province. Secondly, the province proposed to pay full municipal taxes on provincial government property in the municipality by way of equivalent grant; and thirdly, they proposed to make direct payments to the school taxpayers of this province. With respect to the latter, the small school taxpayer was to get fifty percent of his school taxes rebated; the large school taxpayer on the other hand runs into the ceiling of \$50.00 and ends up paying substantially more of his school tax bill than his less fortunate counterpart.

I agree, Madam Speaker, that some consideration should be given to the problem that was raised in the House the other day by the Honourable Member from Gladstone with respect to those persons who have more than one tax bill. In defence of this -- I think that this is something that should be looked into further, but in defence of it I can only say at this time that these measures were after all introduced as measures to reduce the onus of property taxation and that these particular persons are actually large payers of school taxes. By and large though, Madam Speaker, on balance, surely this legislation cannot be called negotiating or catering to the rich or expropriating or ignoring the interests of the poor, or as the member of the Leader of the NDP said, catering to our -- I just can't find it here for a moment -- "We wish to avoid alienating our friends in the business world."

It's easy, Madam Speaker, to urge that something should be done and it's easy to say that when it is done that it should be done differently, but surely it is the responsibility of the opposition if this is the way they feel, to say how differently they would do this, and I challenge them in the course of the debates that are to follow in this House to say how they would bring about this reduction in the onus on, particularly school taxes, which they feel that the taxpayers of this province are entitled to. So far, to the best of my knowledge, they have not proposed in any of their speeches a measure that would indicate any policy on their part as to how this job might be done.

I'd like to spend a few minutes on this matter of catering to the rich and ignoring the poor. It's well and good, Madam Speaker, that we criticize, and I agree that it's part of the opposition's job in this House to criticize, but surely in the process of our criticism we shouldn't lose sight of the many good things that have been done and credit should be given I think where credit is due.

Millions of dollars have been invested by this government in new hospitals during the past few years. Thousands of people, sick people, who a few years ago couldn't afford to get sick, and if they did couldn't afford to get into a hospital, now have these benefits available to them. Surely, Madam Speaker, this type of policy can't be considered as catering to the rich and ignoring the poor. Under the Medicare Agreement thousands of people that are on social welfare in this province now have the opportunity and can afford dentures, eye glasses, medical and dental care, that prior to the coming into force of these particular regulations under The Social Allowances Act they were unable to have. Surely again, Madam Speaker, the provision of these services and needed appliances to the less fortunate people in our society cannot be called catering to the rich and ignoring the poor.

In the field of old age pensions and old age assistance this government has met its

(MR. GROVES cont'd) responsibilities to the older and the poorer people of this province, as did the government prior to the present one in Ottawa. In the program of supplementary old age pensions and assistance, this government has done its part and has met its responsibilities to these people. Hardly, Madam Speaker, a policy of catering to the rich and ignoring the poor.

What about, Madam Speaker, the policies with respect to higher education. Bursaries, scholarships and student loans are available to the low and medium income families of this province who prior to the coming into force of these policies could not afford to give their children a higher education.

We had complaints the other day from the student body of the university about the rise in fees. I wonder, Madam Speaker, if these students realize, I wonder if the members of the opposition in this House realize, that nineteen percent of the cost of the education for these people is paid for -- nineteen percent of the cost of their education is paid for by fees and the balance of 81 percent is paid for by the taxpayers of Manitoba and Canada, largely on an ability-to-pay basis, and paid in many cases by persons whose incomes are far less, far far less than the incomes of these students will be when they graduate from university. And in many cases even the students that are in our university now and are paying nineteen percent of the cost of their education, they are further helped by bursaries and loans, and I am advised that students' fees at the University of Manitoba are presently the lowest in Western Canada. Surely, Madam Speaker, these particular policies as it applies to our university cannot in all conscience be called a catering to the rich and ignoring the poor.

What about the establishment of the School for the Deaf, Madam Speaker, making this facility available in the province to the people that have been unfortunate enough to have children with this handicap? What about the senior citizens homes that we see now that we didn't see a few years ago in practically all of the larger centres of this province? What about the millions of dollars that have been pumped into the education scheme at the high school level that has made possible in these past few years a standard of education in rural Manitoba more closely approaching the standard of education that our children have been getting in Greater Winnipeg for a good many years? Surely, Madam Speaker, these policies can't in all conscience be called policies of catering to the rich and ignoring the poor. Great strides have also been made in this province in the past few years in the field of mental health.

We now have a major network of paved roads that connect the larger centres of this province, roads that I think we as Manitobans can be very proud of. These things, Madam Speaker, the speakers on the opposition side of this Chamber conveniently forget when they devote 75% or more of their time in this Throne Speech debate to what they refer to as a goose preserve. So, Madam Speaker, I think that surely these policies that I have outlined are worthy of more mention than they have had to date in this debate.

The members of the opposition in my opinion, the official opposition, are taking advantage of the national mood for scandal, a pace which has been set by their colleagues in Ottawa, and they are trying by insinuation to infer that this sort of thing is going on in the Province of Manitoba. Madam Speaker, I am convinced, and I think a large body of the public in this province are convinced that this sort of thing is not going on in the Province of Manitoba. They are trying by innuendo to say that it does. They are latching on to sensational tidbits to cover up for a lack of policy on their own and to cover up for weaknesses in their own backyard. Sure they're getting the headlines, Madam Speaker, but this is no indication of the general support which they feel they have for their position. The Leader of the New Democratic Party is absolutely right when he said the other evening that the Liberal Party in Manitoba is completely barren of policies of their own.

During the by-election in River Heights that was held last summer they had a golden opportunity, a perfect forum to place their policies before not only the voters in River Heights but before Manitoba as a whole. They had a chance to let the people of this province compare their policies with the program that has been proposed and has been enacted over the years by the government.

Well let's see, Madam Speaker, how they took advantage of this opportunity to display their wares to the public of Manitoba. The government candidate in that by-election issued one main piece of campaign literature which I have with me. In this newspaper practically the whole field of government endeavour and accomplishment over the past few years is covered; daylight saving time, income tax, the Arts Centre, power, insurance, things of beauty in the Natural Resources Department, transportation, recreation, training, education, welfare, all these things were covered. I think the government through its candidate in this by-election presented

(MR. GROVES cont'd) . . . to the people of that constituency and through the news media of this province their program . . .

MR. DESJARDINS: I wonder if the honourable member would permit a question. He stated at the by-election that there was a chance to do something. I wonder will he explain that the government or any member of the government refused to debate the Roblin administration but tried to get a sympathy vote instead of a . . . I wonder how he can explain that.

MR. GROVES: I think -- I'll answer any questions when I am through my speech, Madam Speaker, but I will have a few words to say about sympathy votes.

So, Madam Speaker, I think the government and its candidate in this by-election presented a fair and a factual account of its stewardship from the time that it took office.

Now what was the contribution of the Liberal party in the way of campaign literature in this by-election? Well I don't know of any other, but it seems to me, Madam Speaker, that their main contribution was this sheet of some -- I forget the number now -- of 13 questions, all dealing with the matter of the Arts Centre and the conduct of the Provincial Secretary, and in this great piece of campaign literature, the main piece of campaign literature of the Liberal party in that by-election, there's only one mention of what you might even remotely think to be a policy that was presented by the Liberal party, and that is the last question. Why does Mr. Roblin refuse to have an Auditor-General of Manitoba? In a great big sheet of paper like this with all these questions on one particular subject, only one mention of policy of the Liberal Party, and this was repeated, Madam Speaker, in ads in both of the daily papers, the same questions and again the same mention of only one policy of the Liberal Party of Manitoba.

Now with respect to this particular pamphlet I have my own words to describe it but I am afraid, Madam Speaker, that it would be unparliamentary if I were to use them here. But I will read, and I think it is worthy of reading, an editorial that appeared -- or part of an editorial that appeared in the Winnipeg Free Press after the issuing of this particular pamphlet. Pardon me, it's the Winnipeg Tribune. "The Liberal candidate has not offered a shred of evidence to support a case either against Mr. Steinkopf or the government. In fact he has gone to considerable pains to assert that he was not attacking the integrity of anyone, but at the same time in public statements and in campaign literature he has by innuendo called into question the honesty and probity of both the government and Mr. Steinkopf. He has repeatedly referred to a \$137,500 profit on the Arts Centre and a conflict of interest in the purchase of the property. The Liberal candidate was not prepared to make direct charges or to support them with evidence. He chose rather to pose questions in a way that implied impropriety and wrongdoing. These forked questions were repeated in large type in a handbill widely distributed in the neighbourhood on Tuesday, again without a shred of evidence.

"The Liberals must underestimate the sense of fair play among the voters of River Heights. Mr. Wright attempted to make the government's record a major issue in the campaign. He must think that the people of River Heights have short memories. Voters in this riding, as in other parts of Manitoba, are well aware of how much Duff Roblin had to do to make up for the years of neglect by the previous Liberal administration in education, highway construction, flood control, social service and farm policies. On the basis of the present government's record, Mr. Steinkopf should also meet with solid support at the polls." Which he did, Madam Speaker, and the net effect of that by-election on Mr. Steinkopf's vote that he received in the election in December of 1962 was a reduction in 88 votes. So, Madam Speaker, I hope that we'll have in this session of the Legislature . . .

MR. SCHREYER: Would the honourable member table all these documents he is reading?

MR. GROVES: Sure, I'll be glad to table copies of them, Madam Speaker, but not today. I'll assure the member that I'll give him . . .

MR. SCHREYER: Madam Speaker, if he's going to quote, let him table them.

MR. GROVES: I'll abide by your decision, Madam Speaker. I have offered the honourable member to make available copies of whatever I have been quoting from.

MADAM SPEAKER: I believe the honourable member will have to table them unless the honourable member from Brokenhead agrees to copies.

MR. SCHREYER: I don't want to be unco-operative, nor do I want to be a party to breaking the rules. The honourable member is quoting from documents there which aren't properly mounted and so on, and I think he should have to table them today.

MADAM SPEAKER: The honourable member will table his copies.

MR. GROVES: Madam Speaker, during this session of the Legislature that we'll have a more constructive approach to the problems that face people in Manitoba from the Liberal

(MR. GROVES cont'd) Party in particular than we saw during the by-election in River Heights.

There will be other opportunities I am sure in this debate to discuss other matters, but prior to sitting down I want to say a few words that are of some interest to the people in my constituency, namely the Pan American games. The Mayor of Winnipeg spearheaded the move to have the Pan American games come to Manitoba in 1967 and he committed, as was I guess his responsibility, the City of Winnipeg to this responsibility. The province and the federal government were approached, and as was proper again, they agreed to share in the cost of having the Pan American games here in 1967 on the grounds that the province and the country would benefit and that it was more than strictly a local matter.

When the final Pan American budget was prepared the mayor figured out I guess the maximum amount which he thought the city could contribute towards this project, got the federal and the provincial government to up their antes, and still found that he was far short of the amount of money that was going to be required to finance these games. Mayor Juba found out at this time that he had bitten off more than he could chew. The area municipalities earlier in the game had led him to believe, and had made it quite clear that they were not prepared to use their taxpayers' money to finance the Pan American games. In my opinion, the area municipalities have made it quite clear that they couldn't care less whether the Pan American games are held here or not, and also in my opinion there does not seem to be any general interest in these games amongst the general public of this area.

Despite this, however, the Mayor of Winnipeg determined that he was going to push on and in desperation he turned to his arch enemy Metro to bail him out of this situation. He appealed for this help from Metro despite the fact that the suburban cities and municipal councils had rejected this sort of financial aid for his project. And what is even more amazing, Metro, knowing what the feeling was amongst the area municipalities, agreed to give this financial support.

The federal government may have a stake in this and I would like to read from an article that appeared recently in the Winnipeg Tribune entitled "Judy Didn't Want The Games Here". Now I realize that in last night's paper there was a partial denial of this article, but two paragraphs are I think of interest. "Consultation between Winnipeg and this government has been very remote and vague from the start, said Miss LaMarsh. All along, however, there has been" -- and then I am skipping a paragraph and this is a new paragraph -- "All along, however, there has been a great lack of information and contact. For example, the plans envisioned the athletes being accommodated at various military establishments in the Winnipeg area. The only trouble was that nobody had mentioned this to the military."

The mayor, all along, from the time that he first got this idea of bringing the Pan American games to this area in 1967, has played his cards too close to his chest. He tried to take the credit for this for himself, has not consulted as he should, obviously with the federal government, nor has he consulted as he should with the area municipalities and cities whom he is now calling upon to bail him out of the financial trouble that he is in over these games. Ottawa should in my opinion have been kept closely in touch with this situation from the beginning because it is more of a national thing than it is a local. If we are to have the games here, Madam Speaker, Ottawa should be paying a much larger share of the cost. They should be contributing to these games in much the same manner and on the same proportion or formula that they are contributing to Expo '67 in Montreal and not leave the burden, both financial and otherwise, for a national event in our Centennial year with the strictly local people, and if Ottawa won't pay a fair share of the costs of this international event to be held in our Centennial year then I think that they should be abandoned.

Metro should not be used at the request of the Mayor of Winnipeg to burden these costs onto the suburbs of Winnipeg against the wishes of the elected representatives of these people. If Ottawa isn't willing to contribute, Madam Speaker, and local money is available in the amounts that have been mentioned recently with respect to subsidizing the Pan American games, then I think it should be used not to sponsor for the Mayor of Winnipeg an international contest in which there appears to be no local interest, but for the building of sports facilities that can be used to develop and encourage our local young people, and for the providing of facilities to organizations like the YMCA, the YWCA and the community clubs, not only in the Greater Winnipeg area but in the other parts of the province, and other organizations with like aims and objects who are begging for money and have been for years to expand their facilities.

Things are getting to the stage, Madam Speaker, where we can't field a hockey team in

(MR. GROVES cont'd) Canada, our national game, to beat the Russians and other teams from Europe where the game is fairly new. Surely then, Madam Speaker, this is an argument for this local monies which the Mayor expects to be forthcoming to be used to develop our sporting facilities and our athletic programs amongst the young people in our own province. It's better to provide, in my opinion, Madam Speaker, these sports facilities for our boys and girls rather than to spend this money on, local money that is, on huge facilities that may never be used -- or I should say that may never be used to capacity after the Games are over.

So it's hoped, Madam Speaker, that on this topic that the federal will see its way clear to paying its just share of these Games and that the suburban communities of this area will not be called upon to impose upon their ratepayers costs which are in effect national costs for a national purpose and for which they will in reality receive very little benefit.

. . . continued on next page

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. ALBERT VIELFAURE (La Verendrye): Madam Speaker, first I would like to again offer you my congratulations and wish you well in your high office. I hope that I have learned a few things in the last three years and that I will not necessitate your ruling on my part. I would also like to congratulate the mover and the seconder on the Speech from the Throne for a job well-done. As my Leader said, I think they had a hard subject to talk about but they did very well. Also, I would like to congratulate the Honourable Member from River Heights who was re-elected and is back a Minister.

Madam Speaker, I wish I could go on congratulating and offering wishes. However, I have now run out of material. I would like to say at this time, however, that while criticising the government I do so as people who are performing a duty and in the last few days we have heard a lot in here about innuendos and so on, personal charges. I have absolutely no personal charges against any Minister and in criticising their action I do so as them having to exercise powers to govern this province. I think it is our duty as members of the Opposition to do so, and as far as I am concerned all members of this House are honest members and until I'm proven different I have no quarrel with their personal honesty.

Madam Speaker, as I listened to the Speech from the Throne I did not think there was too much in it. I was very surprised to see that the use of purple gasoline for farmers was not part of it, and I was surprised to see that the tax on fuel oil was not removed. Madam Speaker, I think we have had a very poor administration in this province last year. I think it is the poorest since this government has been in office. Last session we were told here that our province was in very good shape, our taxes were low, we had a very good credit rating, and we even had a surplus. However, Madam Speaker, in August we were asked to come here and approve \$22 million of new taxes. This was practically seven percent of the budget, and this, Madam Speaker, was in order to relieve the real property tax owner, we were told. I said it then and I'll repeat it now, Madam Speaker, that I don't get along with the philosophy of taxing more to relieve from taxes. If we were to pay \$22 million more in taxes in order to get back eight million I don't think we are doing too much relieving. I think we had very poor legislation at the Summer Session and I will only mention one of them, that is, the land transaction tax. I remember very well my honourable friend, the Member from Selkirk, and I think the Honourable Member from St. John's, making a point here that this legislation was not ready, could not be applied in its present form, and I do think they made their point because we haven't seen this tax implemented since then, and certainly this has brought no money to the treasury but a lot of inconvenience to a lot of people who were planning land transactions.

Now, Madam Speaker, another point that I'd like to make to show the poor administration of this government last year was the one cent tax on diesel fuel for farmers. Madam Speaker, I just cannot understand this one. As you know, before up to last year farmers used to buy gasoline and paid a tax on it, then apply for a refund, and they were remitted the tax for that gasoline that was burned on their farm. Now when we introduced last year purple gasoline we were to do away with this refund system. We were to eliminate this costly procedure and gas would be sold to farmers in a purple colour, tax free. This was last spring, Madam Speaker. So at that time -- I have here a form -- the farmer, after he has burned the gas, would apply to the department under The Gasoline Tax Act, fill this form and ask for a refund of his gasoline tax used on the farm. Now we were to disband or eliminate this costly department and from now on there would be no more refunds. Purple gasolines or diesel fuels would be tax free and clear, or colours other than purple were to be taxed.

Now, what do my honourable friends do after the Summer Session? They impose a one cent tax on purple diesel fuel. But, like other taxes, Madam Speaker, it wasn't a heavy one; it could be refunded -- it would be refunded. Well, I say again, Madam Speaker, why impose it if we are to refund it? We have to go through all the same procedures as we did in the previous refunding system that we just eliminated in spring, and here is the form the farmer has to apply for another permit because I am told that we have 45,000 gas permits -- permit holders, I should say -- farmers, that were all scrapped or destroyed last spring. Now these have to have a new permit in order to have their refund of one cent on the purple diesel, and again the farmer has to apply for a permit first and then pay the one cent tax. At that time the dealer has to send a copy of that invoice into the department, it has to be filed, and after the fuel has been burned he again makes an application on practically the same form we had before for one cent, Madam Speaker. I cannot understand why. If somebody can explain it to me I'll gladly listen, but I cannot see what reason for putting this one cent tax if it is to be refunded, unless,

(MR. VIELFAURE cont'd.) Madam Speaker, my friends figured that farmers, who are practical people who hate bookkeeping and reclaiming in refunds, might not bother with this, because in many cases where it's a small farm and a small tractor there is only maybe 500 to 1,000 gallons involved, so the trouble of applying for a permit and then making this claim is hardly worth the effort. So this would be good free tax money for the department.

Another form of tax, which I am very much against and which I can't see, was introduced, the famous one cent tax on heating fuel. Madam Speaker, I said it last year and I repeat it again, I cannot see why some other forms or other products or other fields could have been chosen for this tax. Certainly if this is intended to relieve the real property tax owner this is not the one, because, Madam Speaker, as one who delivers fuel oil and who has to charge \$1.50 or \$1.60 or \$2.00 every fifteen days whenever you deliver fuel oil to a home in order to relieve him of his real property tax, well, Madam Speaker, who is the real property owner who doesn't buy fuel, electricity and telephone? We are charging him today in order to get it back a little later, and besides in a confused form, because as you all know, whoever has to pay this tax will have to go and pay to the municipality and then apply directly. Madam Speaker, I cannot agree with this tax and I think this is poor administration.

Another field of poor administration, I feel, is under the Minister of Agriculture. The Minister has told us for many years that Manitoba had room for more cattle, should produce more cattle, and I think this is a good policy, forward-looking, and we certainly should try and have more cattle in the province. However, I feel that the Minister last year should have given the farmers of Manitoba more notice that there was a poor crop coming out of our fields during the last summer. I have here a bulletin in October which says the supply of feed throughout much of the province is good, so there must be some merit in over-wintering the animals. Now, Madam Speaker, a little late in November hay is in short supply throughout Manitoba, although the situation generally is not as serious as in Saskatchewan and Alberta. The shortage arose following a summer drought situation. Well, Madam Speaker, definitely the drought situation was in when the bulletin saying that the feed supply was good in November, the same drought situation was on.

Then my honourable friend goes on to say oats and wheat straw can be used as substitute for hay to provide the roughage requirements. Well, I agree, I agree with this point, but I say that if the honourable minister had given more warning to the farmers last summer that more straw would have been baled, we would not have the situation that we have now, because right now in my end of the country you cannot even buy straw—you can't find it. Now, the Minister tells me yesterday that there is feed movement assistance in certain parts of the province because of the crop shortage, while in my end of the constituency, Madam Speaker, right now hay is being sold for 95 cents a bale, and if this doesn't show that there is a shortage of feed down there I don't know where the shortage is. And again I just repeat that my complaint here is that the farmers should not have been given the idea that we had a good crop last year. That was one of the big faults of our feed shortage now. There was a lot of straw that should have been baled and was not baled because many farmers were under the impression that they would not even be able to sell the straw.

Well Madam Speaker, there are many other points which I could develop but many other speakers will be on here, and these are a few of the points that will lead me to support the amendment that is before us at this time.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. S. PETERS (Elmwood): Madam Speaker, may I, as those have spoken before me, add my good wishes to you and to the office that you hold in this Assembly. May I also congratulate the mover and seconder. I was especially taken by the mover's speech. He took me through a tour of his constituency and I have been travelling through his constituency since about 1930 and he just brought me up-to-date. He almost made me feel like going out on a tour again.

May I also extend my congratulations to the Provincial Secretary on his re-election and re-appointment to the Cabinet.

Madam Speaker, there has been much said in this House of this vicious and cruel tax, heating tax, and that it should be rescinded. Madam Speaker, I agree that it should be rescinded, but of all the speakers that have spoken, I have not heard one yet give an alternative to what they would do if they were to rescind this tax. We have always said in this party, Madam Speaker, that the only fair way to tax people is on the income tax basis ability to pay. Here the government members are making so much that they've put on this tax what they were

(MR. PETERS cont'd.) leaving people by reducing the provincial income tax by one percent. Who is gaining by that? The Old Age Pensioners, Madam Speaker, that get \$75.00 a month, and the two of them who make \$150.00 a month? They pay no income tax, but they have to heat their homes and they don't control the weather, Madam Speaker. They're the ones that are suffering, and this is one of the worst taxes that this government has put on. And they were asking for advice -- what would you do instead? Well I'm telling them what to do. Increase the income tax, on the ability to pay. That's the only fair way to do it, Madam Speaker.

I have heard members opposite speak of all the wonderful things that have happened in their constituencies and all the good things that are happening there about the hospitals that are being built and everything else. Well, Madam Speaker, I happen to represent the constituency of Elmwood, and we were promised and the Willard Report stated that it should be done, that in 1964 a start should be made on Concordia Hospital. Sixty-four has come and gone. They've taken the sign down because there's no start on that hospital. It's now been postponed until 1970. I understand that the government says that they have to find a different location, they're going to find a different location for them, and by 1970. I suppose they feel that by 1970 they might have a Conservative member sitting in Elmwood, then they might be able to say that "this is what we're doing." Well let us not dream too much, because I remember, Madam Speaker, in 1962 when the then Minister of Health was speaking at the nominating convention in Elmwood, he said, "Look at the wonderful hospitalization plan and health plans that this government is proposing. Give us more Conservative members and we'll do more for you." Well, Madam Speaker, if I thought that they would have done these things I would gladly see a Conservative member there, if the people in the north end of the city would have got a hospital which is desperately needed. But, Madam Speaker, I mentioned this hospital and the need of it in the maiden speech I made in this House. And everybody said yes, it's needed there and we're going to look into it. There was all kinds of land available at that time, and if the government doesn't snap to it and get the property that is still available, the first thing we know there'll be no property available to build a hospital.

While we're talking about the hospital program that this government has started, I mentioned also in my maiden speech, Madam Speaker, that we needed more girls to come into the nursing profession, and that we had to pay them more, and when they graduated and became registered nurses that they should be paid a decent salary so that we could hold them in this province. What is happening here now, Madam Speaker? We are losing nurses; they are going to other provinces. And why are they going? Because they're getting more money there. Madam Speaker, we talk about building more hospital beds. I am told on pretty good authority this addition that they're putting on to the Winnipeg General Hospital, that when they do complete it they'll have to shut down some of the older wards because they won't have the nursing staff to cope with the situation of more hospital beds. Now, Madam Speaker, this is not right. The government knows about this. They should be planning to do something about this. It takes three years to train a nurse. I understand that the first speech that I ever made in this House that at that time they were getting no remuneration at all. Then they were given some remuneration; now I understand they get no remuneration again. To me, Madam Speaker, there is something wrong with the whole system when a girl labouring or doing work as a waitress can get as much money as a nurse that takes three years to be trained. There is something wrong, Madam Speaker, and this should be taken into consideration and a very serious look taken at it.

Now, Madam Speaker, there has been some talk here about the Pan American Games, and I don't care who's going to gain by it or not gain by it. I think personally, Madam Speaker, that we should have the Pan American Games. I don't think that the public at large are too concerned about the Pan American Games, but we hear statements made that the Federal Government is not paying enough, that this government is not paying enough. I don't care who pays it, the Federal Government or the Provincial Government or the Municipal Government or the Metro Government. It's the taxpayer that pays it in the end. And, Madam Speaker, they're not tapping the right people, the people that will be making money when we have these games here. There are all kinds of business institutions along Portage Avenue. You take the meat packing plants. They're going to make lots of money because there are going to be lots of people coming here and they're going to have to eat. Has anybody asked them for donations? They're always going at the taxpayer, and this is the wrong place to go, Madam Speaker.

(MR. PETERS cont'd).....

Madam Speaker, I did want to touch on the doctors and their medical plans. For the time being I would suggest to the Minister of Health, very strongly suggest to him, the Hall Commission has made two reports now and they strongly urge that there be set up a comprehensive health plan. I urge the Minister to get together with the doctors. Let's not run into trouble—it's coming. You know it and I know it and everybody else knows it. We're going to have a comprehensive health scheme. Let's not leave it to the last minute and then just rush something through like the government said that the hospitalization plan was pushed down their throats, that they took over and that the Liberals did it as one of their last desperate acts and then they had to take it over and it was no good because they had problems with it, and all the rest of it. I'm asking the Minister of Health now, to meet with the doctors, find out what their problems are, why they object to these things; and let's get these things straightened out. Let's not wait until the last minute and then just say, well here the Federal Government has finally said that we're going to have a health scheme and the Provincial Government is to participate, and then all of a sudden have the doctors mad at the patients and the patients mad at the doctors and all the rest of it.

Now Madam Speaker, there is one thing that I would like to point out to the Minister of Health, and that is that I think the hospitals themselves --and I wish that through the Hospital Commission that he could get the message to them-- they're doing a very poor public relations job. People don't realize what hospital costs are until they themselves are involved, and when they find out they start screeching and screaming. "Why," they say, "for \$30.00 I could have gone and rented a suite in the Fort Garry or the Royal Alex or any big hotel and had private maids and all the rest of it," What they are not told, Madam Speaker, is all that goes with it; the equipment that is used; what it costs for this equipment. They're not told. I know of a case where a fellow went down to Minneapolis for a long weekend and his wife got sick when he was there. He had to rush her into the hospital and their hospital costs were \$25.00 a day, but it didn't include all the facilities that we get, Madam Speaker. And for all the tests that were taken in that one day it cost this man \$125.00. Fortunately in this province --certainly we're paying more for hospital costs, and if the government takes my suggestion and advice and pays the nurses more-- and they deserve more-- it's going to cost more, but you have to explain to the people what they're getting. Let's not just -- the people that are going to hospitals now, they're just enraged when they find out what the costs are, and there's been nothing done to set up a harmonious relationship between the public and the hospitals and the doctors.

Madam Speaker, I have a few more items that I intend to deal with but I'll leave them until we get to the estimates.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable the Member for Carillon,

MR. LEONARD A. BARKMAN, (Carillon): Madam Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity and join the preceding speakers in congratulating you and the mover and the seconder to the Speech from the Throne. It was very interesting to listen to the Member of Lac du Bonnet and the Member of Fisher who both so capably described their own constituencies. They deserve much credit for the interest and time they put into this effort. I am sure their own constituencies will be very proud of both of them.

Madam Speaker, it behooves me to make certain remarks concerning the Speech from the Throne and if this House is kind enough to listen to me for awhile I would like to stress certain grievances of my constituency and some of the problems that exist in our Manitoba. I am not going to try and crack any jokes today because they tell me the trouble with political jokes is that occasionally one of them gets elected.

Madam Speaker, I rise today with rather mixed feelings as did my honourable colleague from La Verendrye. I am quite disturbed about a lot of matters. If I dilly dally a bit from one subject to another I hope you will bear with me. I guess it is a well known fact by now after listening to the various different speakers that there is a feeling and nearly everyone in Manitoba now feels that they are paying an unjust amount of taxes for quite a few things. That, general speaking, also that the people of Manitoba have not even asked for or in fact have not even had a say about the matters that created some of these huge expenditures. Now I ask this government, and surely if they are honest they must be asking themselves by now where is this all going to stop, leave alone slow down.

Madam Speaker, it is hard for me to understand the First Minister using or mentioning the Federal government as a decoy or scapegoat so often when problems seem to mount in our own government or for that matter in the Province of Manitoba. I am not here to try and protect the Federal Government or for that matter throw bouquets of flowers their way. I do

(MR. BARKMAN, cont'd).....not see any justification in some of the First Minister's statements concerning policies of the Federal government any more than I myself as the Mayor of the Town of Steinbach would be justified in throwing some of our problems to the Province of Manitoba that strictly belong to the Town of Steinbach and not to the province. I know we are all human and we may all be inclined to do so but let us make sure we do not necessarily do so to avoid the responsibilities of our very own province.

Madam Speaker, I would like to reiterate with my colleague the Member of Gladstone that I am also one that feels the summer session should either have been covered or have covered the present session or the present session could, I believe, or it seems to me help cover the summer session as it is supposed because the government in their own words say this session is supposed to stress a re-allocation of costs and responsibilities of the various departments. While I believe they should be discussed, and thoroughly discussed, I feel we might have done so during the summer session. Not only does this signify a waste but also so much of the Michener report is lagging behind and waiting for approval and, of course, we all know the longer we will wait to fully accept this report, which is a good report, the longer we will find ourselves and all of Manitoba in agony and frustration for want of a solid plan and policy. This piecemeal attitude is not enough to procure the progress and attention needed for the paramount growth of our rich and wonderful Manitoba.

So much could be said about all of Manitoba, leave alone one of the finest constituencies in the province and I hardly need mention the name because naturally it is Carillon. The constituency with the wooded trees and rich pulp paper and other industries and industrial resources in the far eastern part of the province but where people are finding it hard to make an honest dollar.

Then to the industrial and prosperous town of Steinbach on which I shall not dwell too long because 40 minutes would be a very short time to talk of some of the problems and achievements of this up and coming community. Going westward from there we reach our old and traditional French settlement. Some of the finest French people live right in the St. Pierre, St. Malo, Otterburne and Ste. Elizabeth area. I am happy to say that these original pioneering French families are still able to worship and express their own sincere Catholic faith in their schools and churches as they have believed for so many years because their school districts constitute mainly of people of their own belief and therefore do not feel the financial pinch or strain that seem to hit some of the Catholic schools of greater Winnipeg so severely. I have often thought when I think of a similar but reverse situation in Quebec, and I am sure the First Minister has also, why the French people give the Anglo-Saxon people in Quebec the privileges that the French Catholics in Manitoba seem to have so hard a time to attain. I hope a solution will be found soon. I do not need to go into detail concerning this matter I think we are all very well informed.

I will at this time not mention the other thriving Ukrainian and Mennonite communities in Carillon but go on to mention some of the grievances this constituency and all of Manitoba are feeling. Madam Speaker, it may have been said many times before but apparently it must be said again and again listening to the speeches that we have heard the last few days or the several days in debate to the Speech from the Throne. When, how and who is going to pay all our past, present and future taxes imposed on us by this present government. It seems there are no answers from this government to some of these so vital questions on taxation and policy. Whilst it is true that many of the members of this Legislature have been greatly disturbed, I wonder how much more our constituents or our taxpayers who we heard the other day from my honourable leader that the average citizen still earns less than \$3,000 a year with the cost of living still mounting as it has the last number of years. Here we find added burdens for the people who can least afford it.

I was astounded the other night to hear my honourable friend the Member of Roblin choose a subject called debt. I thought it was quite becoming that somebody from that side should start discussing this vital problem of debt. I thought when the honourable member mentioned the many grievances and hardships that he had experienced in his early days --and I can feel with him in this respect because I also had to go through that-- I thought at least he would give us the right description of debt but unfortunately I gather that he still did not believe that this province was in debt enough to take note. I do agree with him however --he chose the Carillon News to find out some of the facts of life that bring him up to date. I would like to quote some of the articles that were mentioned in this wonderful paper, the Carillon News. The paper goes on to quote me. It says, "The new taxes imposed during the summer session of 1964 will cost the average Manitoba family an extra \$105.00 per year. In 1958 the cost of

(MR. BARKMAN, cont'd). . . . Provincial Government in Manitoba was \$380.00 per family, of five. In 1964, it was well over \$700.00 per family of five. During the same period, the provincial debt has risen from \$264.00 per person to \$561.00 per person, or as my leader said, the highest in Canada per person. The interest charges alone on the provincial debt are now costing the average Manitoba family well over \$100.00 per year." I could go on and on but this paper is still honest enough to state the facts as they are and I for one think they have a right to do so.

Madam Speaker, at this time I'd like to turn over to some of our farm problems. The problems confronting the farmer seem to be growing more complex indirectly or in direct proportion to the scientific and technical advances that have been made to date. Only ten years ago a dairy farmer with a 10,000 pound milk contract was considered a respectable financial risk, even by the banker. Today, unless he has a 20,000 pound contract he can't make a living, or take the case of a poultry farmer. Years ago his hens started laying in spring when the sun came out, quit laying again before Christmas. Their feed was simple, a bit of wheat, a bit of oyster shells, a bit of green feed if it was available. Then of course came the great revolution. Hens were awakened with lights that went on automatically early in the morning; feeds were scientifically balanced and a hen was expected to lay at least 200 eggs a year. Poultry farming became something of a science and a man who kept them expected something in return for his work but it was only the beginning of this scientific advancement for the poor hen and the men who raised her. The economic returns grew lower instead of higher. Agriculture specialists then decided that the hen was taking up too much room so they experimented with keeping her in a little cage, one on top of the other; instead of using up four square feet of room she only used up two square feet, and all the time the egg prices kept going down while the overhead continued to go up. So our scientist added more concentrate to her feed and put more birds into the same cage. Where has all this scientific advancement left our poultry farmer? The only answer we seem to get is very much in the red financially. Today the bulk of the now scientifically trained poultry man seems to be financially indebted to feed companies, hatcheries, equipment, manufacturers. A local prominent poultry man in the Carillon district says that the present egg price slump is unexplainable. Manitoba has no surplus of eggs. Fresh eggs are being consumed as rapidly as they are brought in, yet egg prices remain at an abnormally low level. For years, he says, I fought against an egg marketing board but I must now concede that this is perhaps our only hope. I bring this story out because I believe the government and all of us could be more helpful when the farmer thinks of such things as efficiency, technology, credit, fertilizers, farm accounting, feed conversion. We can go on and on --special crops, automation, whatever you wish to add. I'm sure that we are all aware when a farmer plants a bushel of wheat and gets back thirty or forty bushels per acre that is new wealth for the economy of Canada. I'll go on to say, when a cow drops a calf that is new wealth; when a sow farrows a good litter, or hens lay eggs, this is all new wealth for the community and the country as a whole. Farmers deserve more than pittance they get today. I wonder if we are ready to do our share.

Madam Speaker, I must say this. I felt sincerely sorry when the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce got more than he bargained for at the Manitoba Farmers' Union meeting, when he stated that he believed that the prices are controlled by the law of supply and demand, and stated that cattle were brought into Manitoba from the United States because there was a shortage of animals in Manitoba. I understood that a lady had replied to the honourable minister: "There is no shortage of animals in Manitoba. The farmers will not sell their beef for 21 cents a pound and have it retailed at \$1.25 a pound." When I read this article I was just wondering where was our Minister of Agriculture and Conservation at such an important meeting, rather than putting the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce in a position that possibly he was just not quite familiar with. In fact, sometimes I'm not quite sure if our Minister of Agriculture and Conservation is as familiar with the subject as he ought to be.

The Winnipeg Free Press on December 4th, 1963 --there was a big headline about the Honourable Mr. Hutton and the headline was this: "Back to the farm is Hutton's call". It goes on to say to this group, "Since the end of the war the farm labour force has dropped by 30 percent because we have been utilizing extensive farming instead of intensive farming." He goes on to say, "Agriculture is more efficient than any other industry in Canada." He may be right, because we all know that one farmer can grow a lot more today than he could 15 or 20 years ago, but it bothers me a lot when I see today that our livestock prices are lower but our costs are higher. The future in the cattle industry for some time to come I don't think is good

(MR. BARKMAN, cont'd). regardless of how rosy it was painted by some people only a few years ago. In fact, the cattle problem in Canada today points up the need for more research and careful study by farm experts, and I include all the farm organizations, the associated industries and this government before irresponsible statements of guaranteed markets and all out production are widely advocated. --(Interjection)-- The farmer is the one who is hurt hardest when a 5 percent surplus on the market depresses the price from 10 to 50 percent.

Madam Speaker, while we are on the topic of agriculture, it has often struck me quite emphatically why this Department of Agriculture or some other department could not help our farmers even more in so many different ways such as farm credit --I should say more farm credit, and others. Oh, I admit -- I will admit that too much farm credit is a curse. It may be a necessary curse. But smaller things such as helping them with better seed and possibly extend the use and need to make or take more soil tests, to know just exactly what type of fertilizers they must use. I'm sure the Honourable Minister would, as he said this afternoon when he told us that there were approximately 8,000 people or tests taken by the University, I think this is good, and I understand from what I have talked to the University officials that their department is short of funds, even at the cost of \$9.00 per farmer, or possibly per test --although I think there is a little variation there -- which I think should be dropped. The cost should be dropped completely.

And another thing, possibly not coming under your department, but it has interested me greatly last summer. The number of farmers I visited, so often the complaint was this: "Why do our television stations not give us a decent weather forecast analysis? I said I did not know but I can certainly see how important this is to the farmers and especially during harvest. One just has to go across the line to find out how elaborate their weather forecasts are. Now I say I do not know if this is your department, but whoever's department it is, whoever is going to do something about it is going to be a very important person with the farmer. It is practically lamentable --it may not seem important to us, to some of you people here, but this is a very important thing, as I said before, especially during the harvest time.

The only other thing that bothered me in the Speech from the Throne in regards to agriculture, that there was practically nothing mentioned at all in the line of agriculture. While this department has fallen, I am sure it hasn't fallen down to that degree.

Madam Speaker, I ask this government, are they meeting the conditions that they have promised the people of Manitoba faithfully when they asked them to vote for them? In fact, I would like to ask myself and everyone else in this Legislature, and especially we on the Opposition side, are we doing our duty in our capacity to keep this government awake, alive and honest? When we hear of so many things that have taken place in the last two or three years I wonder if we on the Opposition side have done our duty.

The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce mentioned the other night Economist Dr. Deutsch, leading Canada's Economic Council, has outlined what Canada can be and in some cases what Canada must be within the next five years. Dr. Deutsch goes on to say the potential is nothing but staggering, and the Council's reports, based largely on Canada's past performance, shows to be very little short of disgraceful. Therefore, it is of paramount importance that we do everything in our power-- and here I also particularly point out, you the government, you are the ones that must show more leadership and guidance regardless how hard you claim you already have. It is not enough; more is expected of us. The Independent Businessman have this as their headline in the February issue, and it read thus: "In a nice way Economic Council tells Canada now is the time to take the lead out." And I agree with them. This government has talked of promoting industry, of decentralizing industry, of rural areas getting more industries, and we must do more about it. How are these increased costs due to the new taxes going to affect our transportation rates, our fuel and licenses gone up? Or for that matter we could go on to our long distance calls, our hydro bills or fuel oil or natural gas, on and on. Madam Speaker, I say to you, prospective industry will take a second look at Manitoba's economic future and go elsewhere if we are not careful.

The present system of school tax --I will just touch it briefly because the Honourable Member from La Verendrye has covered it well-- but I could also say the present system of school tax rebates will not benefit industry. For example, a \$50.00 rebate on a \$10,000 or a \$20,000 school tax bill I think is an insult. Average increase of school taxes in Steinbach in 1963 was \$30.00 per owner. Add this new sales tax as imposed by the government and the \$50.00 rebate it is a joke, leave alone the increases for 1964 which might add up to another \$25.00

(MR. BARKMAN, cont'd). . . . It is an insult to the citizens of Manitoba that the First Minister has so grossly underestimated the intelligence of Manitobans. Surely any person, as the member said before, with a Grade III education can add up, or can add an 11 million dollar surplus to an increased tax of \$22 million and have \$25 million left over after deducting \$8 million rebate. With all due respect for 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, turning to a different subject now, on February 14th, 1957, a prominent Conservative member of this House at that time made a statement that municipalities of Manitoba were loaded with debt. If that statement were true at that time how much more true is it today? I was glad to see that same gentleman who made that statement later acted as chairman of the Michener Report. I believe he knew what he was talking about. Madam Speaker, talking about the Michener Report, municipal conventions have been shelving important municipal problems in anticipation of the Michener Report. Although the recommendations have been well received by municipal men the government has, with a few exceptions, ignored this fine report and the pleas of the municipal associations. In fact, the few recommendations that have been implemented will boost provincial revenues by adding further burdens to the local governments. I refer particularly to the entire cost of municipal assessments to be borne by local governments, also the policy changes for assistance to municipalities for public works projects; also provincial taxes on services provided by public utilities such as hydro and telephone. We could go on and on with a long list of taxes, not forgetting the heating tax, a tax imposed on a country that should have been encouraged by this government, possibly even to be subsidized. No, instead we go and increase the price of heating.

I must say this. Some statements made some time ago, and I must refer to it, that this Roblin government was elected on the promise that it could do a much better job than the previous government, elected on the promise that it could fulfill all its promises without increasing taxes, has from its first year in office, steadily taken more out of the pockets of Manitobans each year. Madam Speaker, this Roblin government, so highly advertised as progressive and efficient, has been revealed to the people of Manitoba as the very reverse, and Madam Speaker, this is serious. In Mr. Dawson's book on democratic government in Canada, he goes on to discuss some of the provincial-municipal relations. Current problems of provincial-municipal relations spring primarily, he says, from extending municipal functions and insufficiency of municipal funds to meet the increased strain which has been placed on them. And he goes on to say that the natural result is that municipal bodies have been extremely reluctant to take on new functions and some have been too slow in discharging many of their existing responsibilities. Granted this is true, what choice have the municipalities? It just seems to be a matter of getting along from day to day, leave alone from year to year. So I say to you Madam Speaker, let us get on with the Michener Report and see if some things can be changed.

Madam Speaker, before I step down I want to take this opportunity to thank the Minister of Health for coming out to our opening ceremonies of the Steinbach Hospital District last summer. It was much needed, but I can assure the Minister that it is already filled and we will be at his doorstep asking for another one soon. So we vividly see we have problems on every side, but it is up to this government and to all of us to try and solve some of these problems efficiently but soon.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kildonan.

MR. JAMES T. MILLS, (Kildonan); Madam Speaker, at the outset I would like to convey to you my best wishes and salutations and to hope you will continue for many many more years in your exalted office and be given the power to continue to make wise and constructive decisions. I would also like to congratulate the mover and the seconder of the Reply to the Throne Speech for the capable manner in which they carried out their revered duties. Madam Speaker, I would be also remiss if I failed at this time to congratulate the Leader of the Opposition on an excellent talk. As a matter of fact it was in my opinion one of the finest he has given in this Legislature. Yes, this speech was a ball of fire and brimstone and it exuded a lot of steam, but it's turned out to be just another form of a smoke screen and I'm sure will fade away.

According to a local newspaper, Madam Speaker, the Opposition has proposed in the Throne Speech, or rather the Throne Speech was proposed by them formerly. Or, in their

(MR. MILLS, cont'd) terms, it was an Opposition speech. Being a fairly new member I feel, and I suspect the public at large feels, that if it is good legislation it should really not make any difference who thought of it first. But the credit must still go to the government who implements it and who in the final analysis must accept the responsibility for its success or failure. Madam Speaker, we -- and this includes the general public-- should shower nothing but praise upon this government for the plans it has in store to create in Manitoba a dynamic province, and in doing so provide for our people a better way of life. But to build a dynamic province we must spend money, and to date we have followed judiciously the conventional method of raising revenue. There was, . . . however, a general sales tax be levied but, Madam Speaker, speaking as a retailer in the City of Winnipeg and on behalf of the retailers of the Province of Manitoba, we say thank you Mr. Premier for not bringing in a sales tax. The reasons are listed in a publication just recently brought out by the Retail Merchants Association.

Incidentally, the Mayor of Winnipeg, Steve Juba, praised the province and is calling our province the shoppers' paradise. But as I previously mentioned, to carry out plans for this dynamic province, money must be raised somehow and taxes were levied this year. True, there has been criticism, but I feel there will be quite a change of heart when the next tax notices are mailed out and the rebates that will follow. Yes, Madam Speaker, these new taxes will raise approximately \$20 million, but \$10 million of this will be returned to the taxpayer through a school tax rebate amounting to cuts up to \$50.00 per parcel of land. Indeed every school tax in Manitoba will be reduced. Of these 64 percent will be cut in half and the remainder substantially reduced.

Madam Speaker, it has been said the Throne Speech has spelled out something for everyone. This is certainly the case. I would like to point out a few of these somethings. In the field of education we must admit that since 1958 there has been a revolutionary change in this field of endeavour. We are therefore allotting approximately one-third of our budget to this department, to bring something to everyone. And that substantial advances have been made cannot be denied by anyone, for instance, as we now have a universal high school system; a new technical institute and two more planned, a junior vocational school planned for Metro Winnipeg; a new Manitoba Teachers College to appear shortly on the University campus; a school for the deaf; winter upgrading schools for adults lacking basic educational skills. Yes, Madam Speaker, this department is definitely on the move.

And on the move is also another department, the Department of Highways. 1965 will be one of the largest expansive periods in the history of Manitoba. The rural municipalities will transfer approximately 4,000 miles to the province who in turn will pay 100 percent construction, maintenance and snow clearing costs. Metropolitan Winnipeg will also gain. For example, the province will accept a 50-50 ratio cost on Metro streets and bridges, and are planning many other changes towards a metro street system. Yes, Madam Speaker, the plans for 1965 to be inaugurated by the Highways Department will be very extensive and will be very noticeable and enjoyed by all Manitobans this time next year.

As stated before, and rather than explain the something for everyone for each department, I would like to dwell on something the Leader of the Opposition mentioned in an interview last Sunday. He was asked whether he favoured a sales tax, and he replied, Madam Speaker, to my interpretation, that he was in favour of one. Does he realize the impact that this tax would have on the tax-paying public or consumer? He thinks the tax on heat, gas and telephone aren't fair, but under a sales tax plan these utilities would carry the same tax as all other services and commodities would carry. His complaint about the effects on tax on heating costs for the north is ridiculous when compared to a sales tax on heavy underwear up there, mitts, gloves, shoes --yes, transportation, I understand, is also very vital to the importers to the north. And imagine the tax on cars, snow tires, repairs, snowmobiles, hunting and fishing equipment. Yes, Madam Speaker, when I say impact, I mean impact. And again I reiterate that the people in Manitoba, particularly the northern area, should shower praise on this government for not implementing a sales tax and to accept the recent taxes as just and fair.

Yes, Madam Speaker, no one, including myself, likes taxes to be imposed, and particularly to see an ever-increasing spiral of tax increases, but whether we like it or not they will continue to rise as long as we want and demand governments to give us a better way of life. The Opposition will attack and hit at our tax plans, but I often wonder what their alternative would be, and I would personally like to state, Madam Speaker, that first we must have faith in

(MR. MILLS, cont'd)our future, and I am sure, Madam Speaker, 1965 will prove another banner year for all Manitobans.

In conclusion, Madam Speaker, I hesitated to bring forth a Cook's tour of the municipality or rather the City of East Kildonan this year --I have done so the last two years-- but I think I would be remiss if at this time I would not congratulate the International Organization of Kiwanis on their fiftieth anniversary and particularly for all the good work the Kiwanians of East Kildonan are doing, particularly in the building and looking after the old folks in Kildonan.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. LEMUEL HARRIS, (Logan): Madam Speaker, I wish to give you my congratulations on your re-appointment to your high office of Speaker. You have been most fair so far, and I know you will continue that way. Congratulations I give to both the mover and seconder to the Speech from the Throne. They both did a very worthy job. Also, I would like to give my congratulations to the Honourable Member from River Heights. He reminds me of a gladiator that was in the Roman arena in the old days, and came out very gory but with a thumbs up victory, sign of victory, from his constituents. So they have shown to him that they believe in what he represents. Now I don't agree with him always but I say we each have different ways of thinking and sometimes I often wonder whether the other guy is thinking straight, but that's his opinion and I have my own opinion.

Madam Speaker, during the recess several articles dealing with the problems of poverty in Canada came to my attention. In essence they all argue that our present system of welfare payments, our system of taxation, and our educational situations do little else than undermine the prosperity of our already prosperous middle class. The article claims, and their claims seem to be well founded in fact, that while the average annual income of Canadians has been increased there has been created a large group of people who have not been able to participate in general prosperity of the country. These are the unemployed, the under-employed and the unemployable. These groups are poor. They have been forgotten --the invisible poor. It is generally accepted that a family wholly dependent upon wages for its support is living at a poverty level if its income is below \$3000 a year. Well, a farm family that can supplement its food by home grown produce is living in poverty if its total income is less than \$2500 per year. ARDA claims that 25 percent of the rural families of Manitoba are living at a poverty level and 48 percent of the rural non-farm families are in a similar plight. Similar figures are not available for urban dwellers but if the cost of welfare payments is any indication the proportion must be considerable.

The government of this province, to give it its due, has made small beginnings in tackling this problem through utilization of ARDA funds, and through the beginning of an adult education program. However, they have not taken the one obvious step open to them to have an immediate effect on relieving the burden of poverty from the shoulders of many of the citizens of this province. They have not raised the minimum wage law --and this is doubly true of the rural areas-- to a level where a decent standard of living is ensued for those fortunate to find a job. In rural Manitoba the minimum wage, I believe now, is 70 cents an hour, based on a 40 hour week and 52 weeks pay periods. This means an annual income of \$2,800.00. Thus a man in Manitoba can be gainfully employed, can work the normal number of hours and though being so employed disqualify himself from much welfare assistance and still be unable to supply his family with a minimum of goods and services considered to be essential in this country. We all owe a debt of gratitude to the people whose pride will not allow them to discard these jobs at a minimum wage level in favour of unemployment insurance and other relief measures which would pay them more, better feed and clothe their families than does the product of their honest toil. To the extent that the government has allowed this situation to develop it is deserving of severe criticism, but the government's guilt does not end with its intention to the Minimum Wage Law. Its labour legislation, especially those portions dealing with certification of unions, have done much to hamper the activities of unions in rural areas, thus effectively denying the people forced to attempt to live with the minimum wage now ensured by legislation. The right to collective bargaining, through collective bargaining the people can ensure themselves to a decent standard of living, but the government's seemingly unwillingness or inability to see the problems of the rural working man persists.

The government has improved the physical facilities for education in this province. It is increasing the age level of which school attendance is compulsory. Commendable. However, how many children living on an improper or insufficient diet will be able to fully benefit from these programs? How many children who are improperly clothed or whose clothing is of

(MR. HARRIS, cont'd). obviously inferior quality to that of other children in their class will be able to benefit from improved facilities? I am not being frivolous in mentioning clothes as an issue. To children especially, adolescents, it is a matter of great importance to be truly attractive. It is a shame and a disgrace that in a nation such as Canada, a province such as Manitoba, people should still be subject to grinding poverty, that children should be unable to sleep because of the aching of their bones brought on by malnutrition. I want to read into the record a paragraph from a recent MacLeans Magazine article entitled Our Invisible Poor: "Some poor are separatists in a deeper sense than the racists of Quebec. After 20, 30, 40 years of frustration they no longer care. They escape apathy, anger, alcoholism, or crime. Forty-two percent of all admissions to Manitoba Provincial Jail at Portage la Prairie last year were Indians or Metis, a group whose crime rate is almost nil. When they have something to live on, about 40 percent of these women are imprisoned for prostitution, and most men have an alcoholic problem. The poor, according to one survey, are three times as prone to emotional depression and 40 percent more liable to mental illness than the more prosperous. Poverty creates a health problem, an alcohol problem, an Indian problem, and the list goes on and on."

I ask you, Madam Speaker, what are we doing about this problem, the federal and provincial governments? Vocational training program is an admirable scheme for the children of the reasonably prosperous middle class but it does little for the unemployed and the unemployable. Eight of the 10 training programs set forth under the 1964 federal training Act assume that the student had high school training. Students with less than Grade 9 can only take a few courses such as hairdressing, carpentry, welding, mechanics, heavy machinery, and each of these trades is already overcrowded. The bulk of the courses are not designed for the people who must need training. Nearly 70 percent of the rural people have never been to high school. There have been some small beginning at upgrading the education of unemployed in Manitoba through adult education courses, but these courses are too few and far between. The government has not turned its mind to tapping the industry, ability and idealism of our young people. Canadian Universities Service Overseas, the American Peace Corps, Civil Rights workers in the United States, the young people working for political parties, charitable organizations and other community service groups, show that there exists a large pool of talent capable of playing a role in educating our poor to a standard which would equip them for learning useful trades. These young people, I am sure, work in the evenings for nothing or next to nothing in this worthy cause. If the government would set up a recruiting program and establish machinery necessary to make use of the young people's ability and energy, cost need not stand in our way. There are still selfless dedicated people who will labour in a worthwhile cause for nothing.

Look at our proposed Canada Pension Plan and see what it is doing for our rural poor-- nothing. They have neither pensions nor savings and are not covered. Again, middle class prosperity is being underwritten while the poor are ignored. I think it is about time we began a rapid and all-embracing study of the problems of the poor and the effect of our social welfare measures upon them. I have nothing against ensuring the continued prosperity of the middle class. This must be done, but at the same time the poor must not be ignored. For too long Conservative and Liberal administrations have taken the view that welfare is designed to plug holes in our economic system. This is costly and an irresponsible attitude whose effects are now becoming obvious. Welfare to be effective must be related to and made part of all our total economic system if it is to be truly effective.

I urge the government to begin immediately to study the problems of the poor with a view to producing some long term solutions. I urge them to raise the Minimum Wage Act to a respectable level. I urge them to create a climate favourable to the growth of trade unions. I urge them to give our young people the opportunity to assist in educating our unemployed. A thousand years ago Pope Gregory said, "We must make men clearly understand that the land that yields men's income is the common property of all man and its fruits for the common welfare. It is therefore absurd for people to think that they are not robbers when they do not pass on what they have received to their neighbors. Absurd, because almost as many people die daily as there are rations. . . . up for use at home. Really, when we administer any necessities to the poor we give them their own. We do not bestow our goods upon them. To not fulfil the works of mercy we discharge a debt of justice. What was given by a common God is only justly used when those who have received it use it in a common cause. Hundreds of generations of men have lived and died without acting on the words of the great Christian

(MR. HARRIS, cont'd).....leader. Let us make a beginning here today in Manitoba.
Thank you very much.

MR. ROBLIN: May I suggest you call it 5:30 Madam?

MADAM SPEAKER: I call it 5:30 and leave the Chair until 8:00 o'clock tonight.