

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA  
8:00 o'clock, Thursday, March 14, 1968

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. At the adjournment I had just finished indicating to the House that I have a publication here which apparently is published by the continuing Committee on Social Issues and Concerns, Lutheran Church in America, Canada Section; and I also indicated that various arguments have from time to time been raised concerning a comprehensive medical care program ever since the program was launched by the Province of Saskatchewan. I don't intend to deal with each of those arguments because I don't have the time, but I would indicate to members of the House - and I believe that each of them has received this publication - that every single argument that has been raised against the plan is, in my submission, very adequately dealt with by the publication. The publication deals with the myths, and lists these as the myths of higher administrative costs: the myth of over-utilization of health services; the myth of freedom of choice; the myth of government intervention, interfering with the doctor-patient relationship; the myth about state medicine involving some sort of departure from our democratic system of government; the myth that a deterrent fee will effectively prevent over-utilization of services; and the myth that the quality of services will decline. It deals with each of these problems in a manner which I believe should commend itself to the members of the House.

It does something else, Mr. Speaker - and I know that here I'm on shaky grounds and I don't wish to become too involved in this aspect of the discussion because it would certainly become an emotional one - it identifies the type of health care which this party proposes; it identifies it with Christianity, and I as an individual, Mr. Speaker, feel that I can just as easily identify it with Judaism and neither of these identifications would be contrary to one another, that really it deals with this position on a fundamentally moral and ethical basis. And it's this aspect of the matter which I choose to deal with in the last remarks that I'm making to the House.

I'd like to remind the House that the first thing that happened after the legislation was enacted in Manitoba, and it was part of a continuing assault on the medical care program, is you had the doctors suddenly putting themselves in an enormously powerful bargaining position, immediately increasing their fees, Mr. Chairman, and I suggest to you that if one examines the situation, the change in fees for the same services between 1962 and 1967 is very close to a 100 percent increase which is something which would be intolerable by the public if it was done for instance by trade unions. But the doctors did this and I'm really not blaming the doctors for doing this; I blame the government for not doing anything about this situation. I blame the government for saying that we are going to let these people put themselves in an incredibly powerful bargaining position without any effective means being taken by the government to see to it that medical services would be supplied on a reasonable basis.

I'm sure that there were many avenues available to this government and they certainly are aware of them. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that the government could just as easily have entered into a program saying that they would pay, not charge, but that they would pay every person who wanted to go to medical school the sum of one thousand dollars a year, that they would be willing to pay this so as to possibly triple or quadruple in a short period of time, or over a period of years, the number of doctors who are available to practise in the Province of Manitoba, that this would be an effective means of balancing to some extent the bargaining position of the medical profession. Or I would be willing to give my honourable friend the Minister of Industry and Commerce an easier task than he entered into. He went across the ocean to try to get people to work here for \$1.00 an hour to keep wages down. I suggest to you that I'll give him the same proposition, go over the whole world and offer people the opportunity - doctors - the opportunity of working for roughly \$20,000 to \$25,000 a year. It appears to me just as good an incentive and I'm sure that he would have just as good success if he tried to do that. But this government has really done nothing and has put us in a position where we will have an increase in medical costs, not because of a medicare program, because we've had that over the last six years without a medical care program, and I suggest to you that the bringing in of a comprehensive medical care program has done nothing to make those costs increase.

But in any event, this is what started happening, and eventually, Mr. Speaker, two

(MR. GREEN cont'd)... themes emerged predominant: one was the theme of inflation and the second was the theme of compulsion. But those two were the last arguments, and by the way I think it's the latter argument that this government appears to have adopted, to suggest that it can't go along with this plan on principle.

But dealing first with the theme of inflation, Mr. Speaker, it appears to be the Federal Minister of Finance who is trying to use this as a bogey man to prevent the implementation of this program, and we had an argument between the Federal Ministers. The Minister of Finance said it would cost a billion dollars to the people of Canada to institute this program; the Minister of Health said it would cost \$680 million. I don't wish to try to resolve the dispute as between the two Ministers, what I wish to say is that if we accept what either of them said it is not an inflationary program, because, Mr. Speaker, inflation means that the price of goods has increased and the amount of productivity has stayed the same. If today 100 units of a commodity costs \$100 and a year from now that same 100 units costs \$150, then we would have an inflationary situation; but if you had 150 units at \$150 there would be no inflation because the amount of the commodity has kept pace with the amount that people were paying; and what is suggested in medicare is exactly that. What is suggested is that for the same amount of services as the community is now paying - \$600 million - they would continue to pay \$600 million and the extra \$80 million would be for an extra \$80 million worth of services, or if you want to call it a billion - which is Mr. Sharp's figures - use Mr. Sharp's figure. They kept saying this was an inflationary program because it would mean a billion dollars of public spending, but, Mr. Speaker, again this is economic nonsense and any economist will say so.

When one looks at the spending program of the nation one must take the entire spending program, and if the spending program on health spent by the people of Canada was \$700 million last year, and this was transferred from private expenditures to public expenditures - assuming that it did not go up for the moment - this wouldn't be inflation because it was public spending as against private spending. Exactly the same amount of money would be spent on health, and insofar as this province was concerned, I repeat not one cent was to be spent by the public for the implementation of this health program but nevertheless inflation - the scare of inflation and we see inflation - and it would be indeed a surprise if there were no inflation.

We have never had a war and I'm sorry that no responsible person identifies the cause of American inflation - of North American inflation. We know that \$30 billion worth of productive power every year is not available to our market, is removed and is completely obliterated - nothing comes in exchange for it - and if one could expect prices not to rise in terms of that type of situation, then one just does not understand economics. We can't produce \$30 million a year and take it out of the market and not get anything in exchange for it and not expect the price of everything else to rise. It's happened in every war up to now and it'll happen in this war, and that's the cause of the inflation, and that's the major cause of the North American inflation. But they said that inflation was the cause and gradually it appeared to be that there was a - I don't want to use the word conspiracy because it's a bad word - but there appeared to be an arrangement whereby certain provinces started to pressure the Federal Government into getting out of the plan, and one by one there were dropouts. I don't remember the order but Nova Scotia dropped out, Quebec dropped out, the Province of Manitoba dropped out, and that's when the Free Press wrote that the last nail has been driven into the coffin of medicare.

But, Mr. Speaker, the effect of what was done by these provinces was exactly opposite to what was intended because it pulled the rug from under the seats of those Cabinet Ministers who said that the program was inflationary, because by the time the program is ready to proceed on July 1st, 1968, we have only two provinces going into it and the Federal Government and those ministers who are pushing for medicare quite properly said, "Well, it can't be inflationary because there are only two provinces going in and eventually the other ones will". . .

MR. SPEAKER: I hesitate to interrupt the honourable gentleman's trend of thought but I should remind him he has four minutes.

MR. GREEN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I'll certainly try and conclude.

But nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, exactly the opposite happened. By pulling out of the plan it made it almost inevitable that the forces in the Federal Parliament who said that it wasn't an inflationary program, that it would not involve a lot of spending, were able to hold

(MR. GREEN cont'd)...sway with the Federal Cabinet and have this program go into effect on July 1st, 1968.

My honourable friend the member for Souris-Lansdowne said he still has hopes for this convention that they're holding in April, and he bases his hopes no doubt on what he chooses to refer to as the compulsory aspect of the program. And this is where we become involved in the argument on principle, Mr. Speaker, and I say that this is where our party differs from the position taken by the other parties in the House. We say that the question of compulsion doesn't arise at all. It doesn't arise in what we suggest and it doesn't arise in what the government suggests. There's only one problem that has to be resolved in the minds of every member in this House. Does he regard the provision and cost of health services to be one for which we are all socially responsible to each other, or does he say that the provision of these services is the responsibility of the individual, because if he decides -- and as a resolution which was passed in 1931 by this House - and I note that it doesn't use exactly the words I'm referring to, it indicates that both are responsible - but this is a resolution that was moved by a Mr. Pratt, who is still a lawyer I understand practising in Birtle-Russell, which was passed, and I read from the Journals of 1931 in which amongst other things says, "Whereas the Public health is a matter of paramount importance not only to the individual but also to the state, therefore be it resolved" - and a committee was appointed and I note that the Honourable the Member for Lakeside, Mr. Campbell, was a member of the committee back in 1931 considering this question. But once that issue is decided, I say that the question of compulsion doesn't come into it at all, because once we decide that this is a social responsibility, one to be paid for a social expense rather than an individual expense, we put it into the category of every other service that is provided in that way.

Now the honourable the First Minister seems to suggest that those who can pay for it should and those who can't pay for it will have the state pay for it, or the government pay for it. Now, Mr. Speaker, I seriously challenge the First Minister that if he believes in that proposition as a principle and not just as a way of getting out of instituting this program, if he believes in that as a principle, then, Mr. Speaker, I challenge him to do the same thing for public school education; say that those who can pay for it should pay for it by themselves and the rest the state will look after. Say the same thing, Mr. Speaker, if you don't want to do it for public school education, say the same thing for higher education; say that those who can pay for it will pay for it by themselves, because you know that you are now subsidizing the rich - in fact 80 percent of the cost of their higher education and they're essentially the ones who are getting it - say that they should pay for it by themselves and those who can be supported will be supported by the state. You know what will happen - you know what will happen - you will have the children of the wealthy not going to school because the wealthy won't want to put it up for themselves and you'll have the state supporting the children of the poor.

If you think that that's too radical, then I challenge you to do it with regard to fire protection. I challenge you to tell the municipalities that those people who don't want fire protection can opt out, they can do it on a voluntary basis; and those people who have nothing to protect - relatively nothing - they won't have to pay for it and the rich will pay for it by themselves. Or if you think that's too radical, do it with police protection; let people opt out of paying for the protection of private property...

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, I..

MR. GREEN: I'll wind up in just a few minutes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: One more minute.

MR. GREEN: All right. If you think that that's too radical, then I say do it for the people of Manitoba in connection with this compulsory intelligence service, let people opt out; let them say they don't want any of their taxes to go to it; let me say so in particular. Mr. Speaker, the principle is bankrupt and I suggest that even Gerald Hart would say that with regards to protecting the Rhodesians from the blacks it's a matter of social concern and everybody in the state has to pay for it; nobody can opt out. And I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that if the principle which my honourable friend says requires him to remove Manitoba from this plan is unsustainable, it's a principle which is adopted for the purpose of satisfying particular groups in our society. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable...

MR. MOLGAT: Did the First Minister want to speak at this time?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MOLGAT: It's not my custom normally to engage twice in the Throne Speech debate, but I had made a point the other day in my own comments that I wish to come back to one particular item and that's the matter of the Electoral Divisions Act and the changes in that Act, and I served notice at that time that I would be speaking again. My only opportunity is on the sub-amendment because I cannot speak again on the amendment obviously or the main motion, so I would like to take a little time now on that very important subject for Manitoba.

Before doing so I just want to say a few words about the sub-amendment that is directly before us. The Honourable Member for Inkster accustomed to court room procedures makes an excellent case. He can put his side of the story in very eloquent terms and very convincing terms at times. He hasn't really convinced me, Mr. Speaker, on all the points of his presentation, although I might say that I intend to support the sub-amendment. It is a want-of-confidence motion in the government and I do not have confidence in the government. I don't think the people of Manitoba have either, and on that basis I'm going to -- well my honourable friend the First Minister is the one who put the matter of confidence to the test recently - I didn't - he did and got his answer, but on the basis of being a test of the confidence in the government, I intend to support the resolution.

I might say that that doesn't mean I support all the items in the resolution and my honourable friends knew that full well when they drafted it, and drafted it with that in mind. -- (Interjection)--No, no, not at all. That's their game; I don't object to that. I accept that it's a want-of-confidence and on that basis I will support it.

To go as far as my honourable friends to the left of me want to go I think is completely out of the question at this stage in Manitoba. There are many things I want to see done in Manitoba. There are many improvements I want to see. I want no child prevented, no young man, no young woman, prevented from going on to university through lack of finances. I don't want to see anyone lacking proper medical care, many things like that, but there are questions of priority. We have to operate in this province on the basis of what we can afford to pay and I think that many of the things that my friends to the left are asking for simply are not possible at this stage, and on that basis I don't think deserve support, as such, as resolutions that are feasible for Manitoba right now. So with that proviso, Mr. Speaker - and I make that very clear - I am supporting the want-of-confidence motion; I am not, by any means, supporting all the items that are in it.

I want to turn now to the main question that I had in mind and that's the changes in the electoral reforms, or Electoral Elections Act. Now in the Throne Speech we had a warning from the government that something was going to be done in the following terms: "My government will seek approval for certain amendments to The Electoral Divisions Act so that the decennial redistribution of constituencies may be proceeded with." Prior to this there had been a few kites flown over the period of December-January to test the public opinion on the subject and some of them were rather alarming kites. --(Interjection)-- No, I hadn't been the one proposing it at that time. I must admit that my party some 18 months ago spoke out on the subject and I'll refer to that in a few minutes. But some statements were made then that there was going to be a change in the ratios and a change in the make-up of the commission and so on.

Then last Friday we had the Honourable the Member for Virden speaking and he brought the matter up and he said that this was a problem that was very close to him, discussed it, but didn't come out with any suggestions as to really what he thought ought to be done or any indication of what the government was going to do. Basically, and he closed off by saying, "So I say that whatever our format or formula, let's be very careful that we do not hurt or destroy rural, because if rural becomes dormant the Greater Winnipeg will certainly follow that very fastly. So I hope the city members will realize just that, and speaking of redistribution along this line, I think if you give the rural member the same footing, the same toehold, he'll compare very favourably." Having read that two or three times, Mr. Speaker, I still don't know what it is that the government is going to do.

But I think it's extremely important that we're careful as to what we do in the whole change because the procedure that we have followed in Manitoba is one that really we had gone into in considerable detail. It started back in 1955. At that stage, two bills were introduced. They were companion bills. One was an amendment to the Election Act and the

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd)... other one was an amendment to the Electoral Divisions Act. They were brought in in the 1955 Session, and I might say, Mr. Speaker, that they not only received the general support of the House, but in fact at that point had so much support that there was really very little debate. In the case of the Election Act, which was the minor of the two acts at that time, it was introduced by the then Attorney-General, Mr. Hryhorczuk, and the speakers were the Leader of the Opposition, at that time Mr. Roblin; the Leader of the CCF, at that time Mr. Stinson; and the one Communist in the House, Mr. Kardash. Those were the only three speeches on the Election Act at that stage and it went through completely agreed to on second reading, on first introduction, went to Law Amendments Committee - there was some amendment there - back to the Committee of the Whole and reported without amendments.

The Electoral Divisions Act had even less debate. The Leader of the Opposition of the day, Mr. Roblin, did not enter the debate at all. Mr. Hryhorczuk spoke in introduction, and Messrs. Kardash and Stinson. It went to Law Amendments, was reported without amendments from Law Amendments, reported back to the Committee of the Whole without amendments again, and passed through completely as in its original form.

Now those two bills then in 1955 formed the whole basis of the redistribution in Manitoba. It is very important, Mr. Speaker, to go through this historically because the basis of it really was consensus in the House. It was not a Party matter as such. It received the approval of every Party in the Manitoba Legislature and received the approval of every individual in the Legislature when it came up for final vote, and as you can see, in fact very little debate in opposition to it even at that stage. The story from the newspapers at the time are headlined, "Electoral Seats Bill Passed House. Final reading was given to a bill Tuesday that will allow establishment of Canada's first independent commission to carry out a redistribution of provincial electoral seats."

So here we were, Mr. Speaker, in Manitoba, marking a first in Canada in this very important area. We took the whole question of redistribution out of political hands and we put it in the hands of an impartial commission. The bills then that were passed in 1955 formed the basis of the commission which was set up then, and based on the census figures of 1956 came back to the House on 1957 in the form of a final report. I won't go through the 1955 bills, though I have them here before me, but in almost every instance they're identical to those of 1957. The changes are only slight changes of wording or of dates where they apply, but the intent of the bills is clearly the very same. When we reach the 1957, by that time the independent commission had been set up, had done their work, came back with their report. At that stage the bills received a little more discussion but no major changes were made or proposed at that time. There was a second bill suggested by the Leader of the CCF, Mr. Stinson, which did not pass, but the basic bills, the Election Act passed with only Mr. Hryhorczuk, Messrs. Gray, Roblin and Paulley speaking on it. It was agreed to and reported without amendments from the Law Amendments Committee.

The big act, the Electoral Divisions one, received more discussion. Mr. Hryhorczuk, Stinson, McDowell, Draper, Kardash, Gray, Roblin, Kopp, Prefontaine, Campbell, Birch, Paulley, Mitchell, Harrison, Willis, Molgat, Teillet and Clarke. But all in the stage of one debate, Mr. Speaker. They were not adjourned or sent back for further study or anything of the sort, but in the course of one debate they were passed through this House, agreed to at second reading, went to Law Amendments - there were some amendments there - came back and went through the House without any further debate. Once again I emphasize that to point out very clearly, Mr. Speaker, that these received the general support of this House. There were no disagreements as to the basis. They were unanimous on their final passage.

Now the key bill in this is the one termed in short, The Electoral Divisions Act. Now this Act set up the basis of this independent commission. It stated that the commission shall consist (a) of the person who from time to time is Chief Justice of Manitoba; (b) the person who from time to time is President of the University of Manitoba; and (c) the person who from time to time is Chief Electoral Officer.

Now I want to point out, Mr. Speaker, that those persons are persons independent of the political structure in the Province of Manitoba. The Chief Justice is appointed by the Federal Government; the President of the University is appointed, as I know, by the Board of Governors of the university, not by the government in power or by the House; and the Chief Electoral Officer is an appointee of this House. But specifically, Mr. Speaker, at

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd)... that time a change was made in the position of the Chief Electoral Officer to guarantee that he was independent of the Party in power. Prior to that the Comptroller-General of the province and the Civil Service Commission were independent individuals in that whilst they were appointed by the House they could only be removed by a two-thirds majority in the House. That had not been the case until then for the Chief Electoral Officer. But an amendment was made in The Elections Act of that year to guarantee that independence for the Chief Electoral Officer and he became the third officer in the province to have that position. So he exists, admittedly by virtue of this House, but not by virtue of any Party in this House. He is an independent individual. He can only be removed not at the whim of any one government but only by actions of this House itself. So the independence of the three individuals is clearly established; their relationship to this House is clearly established in that they are not appointees of either the government or of any political party.

The duties of the commission were clearly laid out. Every ten years they were to bring in a new report. "The commission shall in the year 1967, and in each tenth year thereafter, prepare a report to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor which shall contain the recommendations of the commission. In the year 1967, and in each tenth year thereafter, the commission shall submit its report to the President of the Council who shall lay a copy thereof before the Legislative Assembly forthwith if it is then in Session, and if not, then within seven days of the opening of the next Session." In other words, the report of this commission, Mr. Speaker, it doesn't go to the government as such, it's a report that goes to this House, and the time limits are clearly laid out in that in the 3rd section, "Their report shall in each case be submitted within the six months following the date on which the Dominion Bureau of Statistics issues its final report in respect of the then latest census of population and agriculture."

So even the method of action of the commission, Mr. Speaker, is taken out of the hands of this House and it is laid by statute on fixed timings, based on an action by another government. Now all of this, Mr. Speaker, with one purpose in mind, to make sure that it was in fact a totally independent report. I think that this is the fundamental question that we must keep in mind in any decisions or any discussions of this Act, because this was the first time it was done in Canada and it was a major forward step - a major forward step, Mr. Speaker, in the protection of the rights of our people, and any change in that at this stage, in my opinion, would be a fundamental error.

Now it may be that the government has no such intention. I would certainly hope that they haven't, but in view of the stories that were floating about, I believe it's important to the House to re-emphasize, Mr. Speaker, its belief that this is the proper way to proceed, and I want to make it very clear that, in my opinion, there is no need to make any changes in that aspect of the Electoral Divisions Act. I think that the commission is a sound one, as established, and the fact that there are now two other universities I don't think changes this picture at all. The Act is clear. We are referring to the President of the University of Manitoba. The balance of the appointments are equally clear and I see no reason for changes in this.

Going on then to the other aspect of redistribution, Mr. Speaker, I want to make my position and that of my Party very clear. When this original Act was brought forward the seven to four ratio which is established as well was eminently a forward step. Until then we had not only a wide disparity between urban and rural seats but we even had a very wide disparity between rural seats themselves and urban seats themselves. We had, in fact, a greater disparity than that which exists now. We have at the moment, because of shifts of population, the Leader of the NDP and my colleague the Member for Assiniboia who represent far more people than they should by comparison to the others of us in this House. --(Interjection)-- Kildonan possibly now too because of new areas being built up. But seven to four ratio was a forward step. It established a clear-cut base; it did increase the urban representation.

But, Mr. Speaker, I think that we have to proceed further than that now, and my Party has been studying this question. At our annual meeting some three years ago we appointed a special group to study this, and I might say that my colleague the Member for Lakeside, who was the architect of these original bills and who got this very major piece of legislation brought into our law here in Manitoba, was the one who was asked by our Party to study this question. A report was made, and some eighteen months ago at our annual meeting the

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd)... Liberal Party of Manitoba passed the following resolution, and I would like to read this into the record, Mr. Speaker, because I think it gives a clear principle and enunciates a clear policy that should be followed by the House. The resolution is as follows: Whereas the Campbell Government at its 1955 and 1957 Sessions implemented substantial improvements in Manitoba's Electoral Divisions Act; and whereas these acts marked a notable advance in the electoral philosophy and practice of this province by (a) endorsing and moving towards the principle of representation by population and thereby removing some of the discrepancies which had existed not only between urban and rural representation but also between rural constituencies themselves, (b) establishing an independent, non-partisan commission to determine the areas, boundaries and names of the constituencies of the province, (c) creating single member constituencies throughout the province; and whereas four general provincial elections held since passage of these Acts have demonstrated their value but have at the same time emphasized the fact that disparity still exists between the representation of urban and rural seats; and whereas continuing improvements in transportation and communication progressively minimize the justification of such disparity; and whereas the population of the urban areas has increased at a greater rate than that of the rural areas; therefore be it resolved that the Liberal Party of Manitoba, while recognizing that area must always be taken into consideration in establishing constituencies, again endorses the principle of representation by population and states that further progress toward this end is long overdue and further action should be taken at once.

That, Mr. Speaker, is the policy of the Liberal Party of Manitoba as established some eighteen months ago in our annual meeting, and it is the policy that I believe should be followed at this time. I think we must do away with the seven to four ratio. I think that we cannot defend a ratio of this sort. I recognize that there are problems of area, and certainly for the far northern constituencies of Rupertsland and Churchill special consideration must be given. For other areas in the province where there is sparse population, other considerations should be in as well. In fact, the original Act passed in 1957 did establish that these should be factors in the consideration of the commission. The commission of course was still bound by the seven to four ratio which was part of the Act, but they were told that in fixing the boundaries of any electoral division they shall take into consideration (a) the community or diversity of interest of the populations thereof; (b) the means of communication between the various parts thereof; (c) the physical features thereof; and (d) all other similar and relevant factors. So I think that the basis is there, but obviously because of the seven to four ratio they were limited. So, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the time has come to move towards the general principle of representation by population, recognizing that there have to be some leeways due to these other factors. And that, Mr. Speaker, is and has been the position of my Party for now well past some eighteen months, and in fact was started by the Liberal Party of Manitoba under my previous leader, the then Premier of the Province.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to wait now to see exactly what the government has to recommend in this regard, but I am going to close, repeating again that I am not prepared to consider any changes in the impartial nature of the commission, and I serve notice on this government that should they attempt to do so they will, in my opinion, be going at the roots of an Act that was passed by this House in 1955 and subsequently 1957, which was the first time in Canada that this was done. It has stood the test of time and any changes in it would be a step in reverse.

..... continued on next page

MR. WALLY MCKENZIE (Roblin): Mr. Speaker, in support of the mover and the seconder of the Speech from the Throne, I rise at this time to offer you the congratulations of my constituents in that you are in the office of the Speaker for another year. My constituents also bring their congratulations to the new Leader of my Party.

This government has done wonderful things for the Roblin constituency which I represent in this Legislature, and while it would take me some great length tonight to orate all the various things that are of this particular nature, I think at this particular time there is one mention in the Speech from the Throne that I must draw to the attention of the House, and that is the one of the Asessippi Provincial Park.

I might also, Mr. Speaker, bring to the attention of the Assembly that the Shellmouth Dam will be a reality in 1968. According to PFRA officials the initial filling of the reservoir is planned to start in August, 1968, and it is estimated that that reservoir capacity will be reached by November, 1968. The maximum operating capacity of the reservoir will be reached in approximately five years and this reservoir, when filled, will create a lake some 45 miles in length and back the waters of the Assiniboine River into the Province of Saskatchewan for a distance of some 20 miles.

Now the Asessippi Provincial Park represents one segment of the reservoir near the retaining or the control structure at the southernmost end of the reservoir. However, Mr. Speaker, lands acquired by Water Control and Conservation, and the other Crown lands, composed the major public land areas of the remainder of the reservoir. In order to assure the proper development of the reservoir lands, the Canada Land Inventories section of the Department of Mines and Natural Resources is now in the process of completing a detailed land-use plan of the reservoir, and this land-use plan will provide guidelines for the disposition of the excess lands beyond the designated reservoir boundary and for the use of lands within that boundary. It includes an opportunity for grazing, for wildlife, for fishing, for private and public recreation, and agriculture, Mr. Speaker.

Now the Asessippi Provincial Park, the development will consist of some 5500 acres and it will be closely tied to the water facilities that will be provided by the reservoir and will offer, I dare say, exceptional scenic, boating and fishing opportunities that are non-existent in the area at this time. The park includes both escarpments of the Assiniboine on the forebay and all the lands in the escarpments of the Shell River Valley easterly to Provincial Highway No. 83. This park will include a camping area, a beach and marine services, picnic areas and hiking trails, and I am told, Mr. Speaker, if local demand develops, there will also be ample opportunities for winter sports development in the area. But I am impressed with the total development of this park, and in conjunction with the land-use for the total reservoir area, it's going to guarantee long-time success of this reservoir in providing for us of that particular part of the province - and I am sure there are many others that will benefit - a wide range of recreational needs for the region and for the province in general, and will undoubtedly become one of the real assets of this province and I give great praise to this government.

Mr. Speaker, my constituents feel very sorry for the Leader of the Opposition and his Party over there and the difficult task that faces them today as they go about selecting a new leader for the national group. There is a lot of rumblings in my constituency, Mr. Speaker, that leads me to believe they have a very difficult job. In fact many say today they don't know who in that gang will be able to pick up the reins and bring the country back to the usual government that it has had in the past.

MR. MOLGAT: You're speaking from experience are you Wally?

MR. MCKENZIE: Right. My constituents are also concerned about the Leader of the New Democratic Party, who at one time they figured was a right wing socialist, should I say, and they were comfortable with him, but after his remarks in the debate on the speech the other day they've moved him so far to the left now they don't recognize him and are wondering the reason of his great shift to the left.

MR. DOERN: Explain.

MR. MCKENZIE: Explain? These are some of the concerns of my constituents, Mr. Speaker, that have been drawn to my attention in the last few days and I thought it should be brought to the attention of the House. But there is one -- I have spent considerable time during the course of the past year with the Indian problem, and it was rather unique in my debate on the Speech from the Throne that I was going to speak on this particular subject, and the

(M R. McKENZIE cont'd.) . . . matter was brought up in the House today of another bungle made in Ottawa with our Indians. My constituents are most concerned with the Indian education and the Indian cultural relations as it exists today with the Government of Canada rather than any one particular area, and my comments therefore, Mr. Speaker, will apply to Canada as a whole and not to any particular area of this province. If some of my remarks might seem unwise or unfair, please remember what I have just said.

When I refer to Indians tonight I will be generalizing to the extent that the word will encompass all people who have Indian ancestry; it will then include the Treaty Indian and the Non-Treaty Indian. It will also be applicable to those white people who for reasons of isolation, desire, or necessity, now live what is generally known as an Indian way of life. In a sense then I think I shall be speaking of all those people whose cultural habits make it difficult for them to fit into our modern 1968 society, and because of the diverse groups of people across Canada and in our province, I think I would like to deal with this subject in five general aspects: the inter-cultural problem, the economic problem, the biological problem, the motivational problem and the educational problem. I will deal then with action by organized groups who I feel might alleviate the problem.

Now it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the basic problem which faces our Indian today is whether he should retain his own culture and let it revolve around traditional lines or whether he should cast it aside and strive to be an ordinary citizen who merges either with the English or with the French or with the Ukrainian or the German or the other ethnic groups whose culture is in the community in which he lives, and at the present time there is considerable controversy among the Indians regarding that particular question. Some want to become white Indians, while others want to become Indians in a white society, and it's this classic problem I say which confronts the two cultural groups in exactly the same area; do they integrate or do they assimilate? Now as I used the term integrate, to me that means two cultural groups living and understanding, free from prejudice toward one another, working at the same jobs, being equal in status, and with the children of each group having similar opportunities, and it supposes that the two groups, as such, each retain certain essential elements of their cultures.

Now a good example of this type of integration in my mind, Mr. Speaker, is that integration which exists between the Welsh and the English in Great Britain. If a society wishes to assimilate its minority groups another approach must be taken, and by assimilation I mean that the minority group must accept the language and the culture of the majority. Now many of our ethnic groups in Canada today such as the Ukrainians, the Icelanders, Polish people, the German people, are slowly but surely being assimilated by the English majority. Certain South African countries have successfully adopted the policy of racial assimilation and one common language and one common culture predominates, with inter-marriage taking place between the Indians, the Negroes and the whites.

There is of course a third approach to the problem, the apartheid approach which is used in South Africa, and until recently in some areas of our neighbours to the south. But the argument with apartheid seems to me is the separate but equal facility. It's never worked to my knowledge because proponents of the system, I understand, believe in the basic inequality of men and which has been proven scientifically, culturally or ethnically to be dribble. But I say that we must, however, take a look at the Reserve system as it exists in Canada today because the Reserve system to me has elements of the apartheid and could, I say, in the wrong hands be developed into a system of degrading and unjust as any system in the world. I think this is what's wrong with our Reserve system, Mr. Speaker, and I suggest that there are three approaches to solve it: Integration, assimilation and apartheid, and all three to me pose a very serious ethical problem to our white society. I accept complete integration, I think, as the only solution. Apartheid I reject for reasons that I mentioned in my earlier remark there, and I think I feel just as strongly about forced assimilation. As an individual, as an MLA, I just cannot condone myself - or others - saying to a group of people: you will be as I am whether you like it or not.

Now what will develop I hope, Mr. Speaker, is an integration of the Indian minority groups with our society, and slowly but surely they will accept those parts of our white society which they desire or of necessity must accept. In the meantime, they must retain those elements of their Indian culture which give them their sense of identity, or those which are found to be superior to the values of the whites. And I'll say a little more of this later on,

March 14, 1968

(MR. McKENZIE cont'd.) . . . . Mr. Speaker, but at this time I must point out to the Assembly that we have many Manitobans today living in the same community with Indians and they don't even know them or appreciate them, or appreciate the many outstanding things that the Indian has been to our society or his culture. Is it just human nature to tend to see that which we dislike, or do we just want to not get friendly with our neighbour, or is this the tradition of a Canadian?

The economic aspect. In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, the economic aspect of the Indian problem is one which affects every person in our society and is of particular interest to the group most closely involved; in my constituency, the taxpayer. The economic cost to the taxpayer in my constituency - he is concerned with the health of the Indian; he is concerned with the housing of the Indian; he is concerned with the welfare and the education, believe it or not relatively small. But in regards to the treaty Indian the Minister of Indian Affairs, the Honourable Arthur Laing, has stated in this year's budget, if you've had a chance to take a look at the figures, that it will be about \$140 million. Now that's a very small budget when one considers that many many billions of dollars will be spent on defence or for war purchases.

It is my opinion, Mr. Speaker, that our employers and our employees today in our society, when they're asked about an Indian, they have some kind of a stereotyped image of the Indian. Everybody says he's lazy, he's stupid, he's good for nothing. He isn't even considered as being equal on any field, and I cannot accept that, Mr. Speaker. I say the Indian is one of the unfortunate groups in our society, both white and brown, who's caught in a sort of a transitional period between a rural-oriented change, and this change is evident in our agrarian group, in our fishing group, in our trappers, in the lumbering industry, and various other fields of our society due to one thing, a technological change. And it's happening to many of the white people in our rural towns in Manitoba today, and I dare say in the cities as well as to the Indian People. The only solution to the problem for all this particular group, I think, is to accept them as best we can and let's put our major stress on more adequately taking care of the youth, to try and see if we cannot fit the youth into this technological world in which we are living today. And that situation, that situation for the Indian, I think, is more desperate than it is for the white man due to the fact of his biological set-up on his Reserve or in his Indian community, and that's the third point that I would like to consider.

The biological facet of the Indian problem involves the rapid growth of our Indian population. Now this increase first became noticeable to me in figures that I have analyzed during the period of the First World War, but I don't think the average citizen in our country realized it because it was a rather slow and a gradual increase. But since 1950 the Indian population has increased some 35 percent and shows signs of even making greater increases in the next generation. Now the point of difficulty is that while Canada as a whole is a spacious under-populated sort of a country, the Reserves are not. Although actual living space is not at a premium on the reservations, I dare say that the economic base under which it is set up today cannot support such large numbers of people as we have on the Reserves today, and so consequently there has been an economic pressure on the Indian to move off that traditional area and move to the towns or move to the cities where there's a chance of gaining some employment, even if it's part-time employment.

Now does that strike you as being the pattern of a lazy people? I think the Indian is just as eager as you or I to benefit from the material wealth of the nation, and please remember that when the Indian leaves the Reserve he is cutting himself off to a large extent from the welfare system of the Federal Government. And of course once he moves into the white man's society he don't fit in at all. I dare say that the problem there is lack of education, his lack of any skill in the technical field and his different social attitudes. They don't permit the Indian to fit into our industrial society at all which is regulated by the plot or the five day a week system. So what happens? The employer rather takes a dim view of him immediately because he can't fit into that established pattern. Now not all have failed; many have become fine members of our society and our communities and we are often very unaware of their ancestry.

I had occasion the other night to listen in Minnedosa to a young Saskatchewan Indian - and I think Blackbird was his name - one of the real brilliant men of the west that we must follow and watch in the next decade. Some like him have distinguished themselves in other

(MR. McKENZIE cont'd.) . . . phases of our society or even in government, but for the most part there has been all too many who have been able to secure only the labour of the most menial type, sort of an ill-paid sort of a job, and their prospects for advancement in our society is very meagre. I reviewed some figures the other day of the City of Winnipeg, and the figures that I checked tell me that there are some 8,000 Indians in the Greater Winnipeg area, many of them living in abject or slum conditions.

Now as a result of these unsuccessful attempts to integrate or to fit into the white man's society, many of our Indian people have become filled with despair and frustration. And let us be clear on this matter. Even though the Indian in most cases doesn't understand our ways, he doesn't understand our point of view, I dare say that he has attempted to a far greater degree than we'll give him credit for, or than we realize, to adjust, and I give him credit for it. His changing to our ways, to the way we expect of him, is his difficult period. Our classrooms and in our industrial positions I think everybody expects the level of achievement of the Indian the same as he does from his own citizens. So when we look at the Indian and we find that he doesn't fit into that environment, we look at him as a failure; we look at him as a drunk. And what does this do? This sort of, in my mind, strengthens the stereotype of this Indian that's with us in our society today.

And this leads me to the fourth point that I think that we should analyze and that is motivation. If you have tried, Mr. Speaker, I say for a better life and failed, what does that do to yourself concept? If you're living in a miserable shack or in a sort of a decrepit slum, how does that affect the lives of your children? If your children are ill-fed, if your children are ill-housed, if your children are ill-clothed, how much will those children be behind the children in a school, or of the other society? If your father or your mother are unable to provide suitably for you, what happens? You're classed as a failure in a white man's world. And what model do you have to follow? What model is there or pattern for the Indian to follow? If you aren't dressed as well as the other children in the school or you can't seem to learn as quickly as the other child in the classroom or if you don't have the books in your home, you have trouble expressing yourself in school or to the white man in his society, you live in possibly a two-room house with eight others in those two rooms, you can't keep clean, you can't keep tidy. What would happen? You'd feel out of place. And what happens when you feel out of place? You stay away from that environment. I see in the area that I represent, Mr. Speaker, as children are trying to be phased into our educational system the administrators of the area, in order to determine how best they can serve these Indian children, give them a sort of period of tests - I.Q. tests. And how do you give an Indian an I.Q. test, the same I.Q. test as you give the white man. I suggest that in this environment or where the Indian is fitting into the white man's society we should have a separate I.Q. test for the Indian child or the Metis child, but at the present time I don't think that the teachers are given or have any information in this particular field at all.

So let's look at this I.Q. test. The I.Q. test then assumes that there are standard tasks that all individuals learn at about the same speed or at the same time through their development, and that an individual's intelligence can be judged by comparing his performance on an average performance with other individuals of his own age or his society, where does this put the Indian child? I have no serious disagreement with the concept inasmuch as it applies to our middle class society, but when the middle class society, when that test is used as the criteria for the Indian child, then I object. I reject the results completely. The Indian child to me is from a distinct linguistic group. He's got an entirely different set of experiences. In a large Manitoba town I am told the results of an intelligence test indicated that 24 percent of the Indian children attending the public school in that town fell into the range commonly known as the mentally retarded. Now that extreme case points out to me the pitfalls into which that school administrator and that teacher may fall if they continue to use the standard I.Q. test that they are using today.

A second problem that I find is the one with the teacher and the pupil, the language struggle that goes on between the Indian student and his teacher. I think we will all agree that a child knowing only the Cree or the Sioux language is at a great disadvantage in a Grade 1 classroom in our province today. It is though - or is it - is it however as great a disadvantage as we sometimes think? In Canada today we're striving to find a means or a way for our bilingual people, and in our province last year we brought a bill in hoping to meld the French student with the English-speaking children in our public school system. I

(MR. MCKENZIE cont'd.).... think that we feel, through a knowledge of another language, that the lives of our children are going to be enriched. I think this is a general and accepted statement. If a knowledge of French enriches, then I think we should consider that the knowledge of the Cree enriches, or is it detrimental? Perhaps this Indian child is at a disadvantage only because we - you and I - are the ones that see him in that disadvantage that he shows to us in position. I think that if our teachers possibly would change their attitudes a little bit and modify their teaching methods and their curricula approach to this particular point that I raised here, Mr. Speaker, then a great advantage will be gained by our Indians.

Now let me stress a little farther. I do think that the major problem of our Indian today is his attitude towards himself. I think this is his major problem. But at the same time I can't help but believe that this Indian's attitude towards himself is generated by the white society in which he's got to live, and that any major change that we bring about, or that government brings about, has got to be through our school system. And the teachers in our province today, the ones that I have had a chance to talk to, I think they agree, they agree that with the Indian and Metis that it could be handled quite nicely if they were in a little group by themselves until they phased into our society.

I read a little pamphlet here a while ago, "The Cycle of Poverty", and in this little booklet they mention one of the cycles, and the cycle of moral and spiritual poverty was one of the cycles that I took particular attention to. Now Indians and Metis learn the morals and the values of their families, and one of these moral standards and values of their families is the conflict with the moral standards of the white society. The child, it seems to me, tends to reject the value of his parents, and yet because he is the product of his parents' environment he can't accept the white man's values, and in many many cases - I think too many cases - he ends up morally poverty stricken. In short, he's got no standard of values or he's got no standards for him to guide his life by. He's also imprisoned in the society or the cycle of aspirational poverty. His parents moved to the city. Why? They moved because of their aspirations, and unfortunately these aspirations are rarely successful, so the Indian and the Metis child sees his parents as failures. He hears them talking about unemployment; he hears them talking about hardship; he hears them talking about sickness, prejudice, possibly imprisonment. Inescapably, most children, I think, inherit the heritage of hopelessness, and in that environment, pretty soon they feel that all society is against them.

There's also the other cycle of educational poverty. In most cases the parents of the Indian children today are illiterate. Now the parents have a value for education in general, but I think often it's a lack of understanding of the specifics of the educational system that's offered. And because of this lack of parental education coupled with the economic strain of the environment, no books, as I said earlier in my remarks, on the shelf, no magazines in the home, they immediately feel that they're out of place and so the parents seldom become involved in school matters because they have no way of fitting into our society. In addition, I think the particular concepts concerning the raising of children which operated successfully on the Reserves are not satisfactory in our urban environment, and of course this immediately makes the parents loth to get themselves involved because they realize immediately that they haven't been successful parents. To many Indian adults and children I think the entire situation appears hopeless, and I...

MR. SPEAKER: I must interrupt the honourable gentleman for a moment and tell him that he has five minutes.

MR. MCKENZIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well I'll move on in the summary of my remarks, Mr. Speaker, but I will say I think that it is the duty of us as legislators to become dedicated and involved in trying to solve the problem of our Indian. The Indian in the area in which I live is in an environment which is about the lowest of the low, and I suggest that we look at some of the real factors as it affects me as a man representing the area. I have nothing in common, it seems, with the Federal Department of Indian Affairs. We can't seem to work together on the problem, and I think that if we can get together in organized groups and as individuals, progress will be made, and I think it's got to be made with individuals such as you and I. We can't avoid the issue any longer. In fact, this chap Blackbird in his speech in Minnedosa the other night, he closed his remarks off by saying that "we the Indians are worried about the white man and his society and all the technological things that he has with him, and if he's not careful he's going to blow himself off the face of the earth." And where

(MR. McKENZIE cont'd.).... are those few that might be left going to go? He says, "They're going to come back on the Reserve with us."

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Carillon.

MR. LEONARD A. BARKMAN (Carillon): Mr. Speaker, in reply to the Speech from the Throne, I will try to be brief and make a few remarks.

First, of course - later maybe, - I would like to join the others in complimenting you, Mr. Speaker, in doing a hard job very efficiently. Also, I wish to congratulate the mover and the seconder who probably by now are tired to receive all these congratulations but they must be sincere or they wouldn't be forthcoming. I would certainly like to join with the others in extending congratulations to the new Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, and certainly join my colleagues and others in welcoming back my colleague from Turtle Mountain; and last but not least, to congratulate the new Premier, now our captain of the ship, I guess Congratulations.

Mr. Speaker, the other day I was imagining what a Throne Speech might sound like if, for example, a municipality might wish to make a similar type of speech, not exactly a Throne Speech but one similar to this, and after all, I think it might even be a good idea to inform the public, the municipal taxpayers, of any municipality's intentions or the conditions or possibly the ambitions of the forthcoming year. I pursued this idea for a little while and I tried to imagine what a so-called Throne Speech from many a municipality might be. Possibly these are some of the items that we might see. I've mentioned a few here and I wish to read them:

- 1) Our over-all economic advances have not reached the peak they should have, but if the Manitoba Government had done its part, then things might have been different.
- 2) Job training and employment opportunities have improved since 1930 but mainly because of the municipalities own sweat and efforts, and also because we were ashamed to admit that the Manitoba Government did not have the time and ambition to help the rural areas enough so these areas could have expanded farther. Therefore, we tried hard to create our own jobs and successful enterprises.
- 3) Education is still the municipality's largest single uncontrollable item, but our municipality has continually begged the Province of Manitoba to help find more financial help and, since the last two elections, are finally getting a little more; however, it is hoped that agreement by the Province of Manitoba to help us more will not and cannot be much longer delayed.

I have a few more that I thought might be in order:

- 4) That all municipalities would like to receive in the very near future an answer to where these 10 or 12 vocational schools will be placed in Manitoba. All municipalities are aware that a school of this type is very important to all parts of Manitoba if we're hopeful of keeping our present standards of living at par. Therefore, we urge the present provincial and federal governments to act quickly.
- 5) This municipality is also very conscious of the rising hospital costs due to the improved services and capital expenditures that we were forced to make during the past years.
- 6) That this municipality is also very much aware that the costs of living due to provincial and federal and municipal spending has gone up by leaps and bounds, and the taxpayer has reached the stage where he will have to have higher wages, shorter working hours and more welfare aid or we will have to face a serious challenge of either increasing our rate of productivity or we need to get more provincial and federal financial aid. We hope municipalities will not be forced to encourage bingo, horse racing, legalized gambling and other means of controlling our uncontrollable budgets.

Mr. Speaker, you could go on and on but I doubt if our municipalities in Manitoba today would be as successful as they are if they would not continually - they cannot continually keep on blaming the provincial government or blaming the federal government; there comes a time where you wish to and have to stand on your own feet. And I think it's come to the time that I wish to urge this government, under the new Premier especially now, to get all the help available from Ottawa, certainly, but let us make sure we expect to build our municipalities or for that matter our province, on that basis alone and not blame it on other governments as has been done so often. I enjoyed listening to the Member for Roblin when he mentioned that some of his constituents' main complaints were possibly the solution of the leadership race in Ottawa, and possibly it is a big problem - I do not know. I think the New Democratic Party can speak for themselves as far as their leader is concerned, and I

(MR. BARKMAN cont'd.).... don't have very much to say about our leader, but I think you are very fortunate if these are some of the main concerns of your constituency, and I hope that they will find relief for you in Ottawa if not in Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to be short but I do want to say a few things, and I think maybe while I'm hardly in a position as a backbencher from this end, I think I'd like to make a few remarks, especially to encourage our new Premier. After all, he is a new broom now and they tell me that a new broom sweeps cleaner than any other broom, and I hope that if he's had any original ideas - and I sincerely believe that he has - I hope that they will stay with him and they will not be wiped away by, let's say possibly politics, or by massive persuasion by other influential people. I wish you would give your own ideas a try and face the challenge that lies ahead for all of us, certainly in this Assembly and for the people of Manitoba. I know this comes from a backbencher only, but I am very sincere in presenting this suggestion.

Mr. Speaker, the other day I read where the Minister of Industry and Commerce was having difficulties in persuading people to come to Manitoba or come to Canada - in this case Manitoba - and that he was complaining that some of the rules to help immigrants into Canada were possibly, too strict, and I'm very glad that some of these rules have been changed by now but I wish to encourage the Minister not to be discouraged by this. I think he was along the right track in this endeavour. I was happy to see that this government did not try to make political hay. Some time ago, about two years ago, when some of the federal Conservatives made so much political hay concerning the entry of some of the Mennonites from Mexico - this happened about a year or two ago. We may all agree that the conditions they came in were not exactly what anybody wished them to be, but I think we would have to possibly agree that not too many in this Assembly for that matter, or at least not your parents or great parents, not too many of them had a chance to come into this country in a new Cadillac or similar conditions. I think we should not be too critical of people who have not the same advantages as we have today, and I think we should be very happy that we still have some people who still have the initiative and the ambition left to go to a different country and try it on their own. I for one was not ashamed of their intentions and, as I said, I'm not grumbling about anything this government, provincial government, did at that time, but I for one am not ashamed of the spirit that existed, and I think in this fact-changing world today this kind of spirit, if there's still some left, doesn't hurt at all.

So particularly at this time, as far as the Minister of Industry and Commerce is concerned, he knows and we all know there's a lot left to do, and I have a feeling that as the session progresses there will be a number of members reminding him that there will be a lot of work left to do for him, but I thought at least along these lines I must certainly agree with him. Also, the other day I received a caption in the mail that I thought was of real interest in proving that we don't always succeed at the start but that eventually if we keep on going at a thing it will pay off, and this one is - I wish to read it for the record because I thought it was very interesting and I hope it can encourage not just the Minister but all of us to stress the importance of our industry and commerce section.

It's headed "Powerful Babies". "Babies grow up to be people..." and not like fish... the Leader of the NDP - "and people are what makes the economy go round. Here's what Dupont...", and I'm using the company because they put this out, - "economists figure the four million babies that were born in 1960 will use up in their life time ..." and I thought it was really interesting and I hope you will think so too. "They will use up a billion pair of shoes, 25 million pounds of beef, 63 million suits and dresses, 11 million new cars, 91 billion gallons of gas, ..." at 17 cents a gallon of tax this is a lot of money; "6 1/2 million refrigerators, one million new houses at the present interest rate, 200 million tons of steel, 65 million tons of paper, and 50 billion quarts of milk." By 1975 the birth rate will be around 6 million a year, according to this caption.

MR. SPEAKER: I must interrupt the honourable gentleman. I have a very important duty to perform at this particular time and that is to call the question on the amendment to the amendment. Are you ready for the question?

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if you might state the question before the House so that there's no mistaking the question that is being posed by the amendment moved by myself.

MR. SPEAKER: I had an idea that the honourable members would be quite familiar

(MR. SPEAKER cont'd.).... with it.

MR. PAULLEY: Pardon?

MR. SPEAKER: I had an idea the honourable members would be quite familiar with it. However, I will put the question. The proposed motion of the Leader of the New Democratic Party in further amendment thereto (and we're speaking, of course, to the motion of the Honourable Member for Virden), that the amendment be amended

1. By adding the following sub-sections after sub-section "B" of the first section.
  - c. Urban transportation
  - d. Urban renewal
2. By placing a comma after the word "failed" in the first line of section two and inserting the capital letter "A" and a comma before the word "to" in that line, and by adding the following as sub-section "B" of section two
 

"to accept its responsibility as a government to ensure producer controlled, orderly marketing of farm products within its jurisdiction.
3. By adding the following sentence to section three.
 

"has failed to relieve the high cost of municipal taxation which places an undue burden on local taxpayers, particularly those on fixed and low incomes."
4. By deleting all the words in section four and substituting the following:
 

"has failed to accept the principle of the Hall Commission recommendations namely, that the responsibility for the provision of health care to all Manitobans should be borne by society generally through a comprehensive and universal health plan, rather than by individual.
5. By adding the following sections after section five of the amendment.
  6. has failed to provide for higher education at social rather than individual cost.
  7. has failed to introduce adequate legislation for the protection of consumers in particular and citizens in general.
  8. has failed to adopt and to recommend to the federal government that it adopt the principle of equity in taxation as suggested in the recommendations of the Carter Royal Commission on Taxation.
  9. has abandoned the principles of responsible government by insisting that allocation of public monies by the Manitoba Development Fund are beyond the purview of the legislature.

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

MR. PAULLEY: Yeas and Nays please, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

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

YEAS: Messrs. Barkman, Campbell, Cherniack, Clement, Dawson, Doern, Fox, Green, Hanuschak, Harris, Hillhouse, Johnston, Kawchuk, Miller, Molgat, Patrick, Paulley, Petursson, Shoemaker, Tanchak, Uskiw and Vielfaure.

NAYS: Messrs. Baizley, Bjornson, Carroll, Cowan, Craik, Einarson, Enns, Evans, Hamilton, Jeannotte, Johnson, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McGregor, McKellar, McKenzie, McLean, Masniuk, Roblin, Shewman, Spivak, Stanes, Steen, Watt, Weir, Witney, and Mesdames Forbes and Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 22; Nays, 29.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the amendment lost. The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Member for Virden and the proposed motion of the Leader of the Opposition in amendment thereto. The Honourable the Minister of Agriculture.

..... continued on next page

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I choose to rise on this occasion to bring some order of perspective to the debate that we've been having to date on the Throne Speech, particularly in that realm as it pertains to agriculture.

We've had a lot of verbiage coming from across the way about our failure to respond to the real needs of agriculture on this side, and anything that I have to say I want to preface by saying that certainly we're aware that a problem exists and we're prepared to do all that we're empowered to do to solve that problem. I think it's fair to say that this year, particularly underlying the basic issue that we face in agriculture - and I refer to the problems of rising costs of productions and that of selling our produce, more commonly referred to as the cost-price squeeze - a year where we in Manitoba, our farmers in Manitoba, have produced a record volume of wheat, some 90 million bushels never yet produced in this province; a year where our hog production is rivalling that of the wartime production record level years; and yet at the same time have in fact suffered some very noticeable decreases in the price of the goods, price of our produce that we have to sell. So I'm just mentioning that at the outset, Mr. Speaker, and I want to make it very clear that any suggestions that members opposite have been making during the course of this debate that we're not aware of some of the frustrations of our farm communities and that we're not prepared to respond to them to the fullest of our ability and our extent, just doesn't hold water.

But a great deal of the debate and the talk that we've heard to date as it refers to agriculture has been rather far off the mark, and I might add that this general missing of the target is not confined to the debates and the talks of agriculture here within the Chamber; it's also very much the case outside the Chamber within our general farm community. And certainly I suppose I should acknowledge and expect that to the farmers of Manitoba Ottawa is a long way off, and if they are looking in some instances to vent their frustrations at the present situation, well I can expect that some of it would be directed at myself or indeed at this government.

But I want to bring into a framework of just where we are empowered to act and where we are empowered to respond within this whole agricultural industry of ours. What I have to say is nothing particularly new or dramatic and I don't intend to get involved in a full resume of the departmental's activities, and I do so only for the purpose of bringing back into focus the debate that we undoubtedly will continue to have throughout this Session, bringing it into focus into those areas where this province and this government has jurisdiction and have some ability to respond to and ability to react to.

I suppose we could start right off the top, our basic agricultural extension service and our ag reps that are situated throughout the province. You know I don't want to bore the members with a long list of their duties and services and their contributions to this whole area of program, but undoubtedly I and many of you other members have, particularly in these last number of years, had the pleasure of being at some banquet or some dinner where the dinner speaker very often chose as his subject the concern and the problems of trying to sort out some of the very serious difficulties in providing an agricultural base in the under-developed countries in this world, a base from which they hopefully at some time would begin to produce at least some of the goods necessary for their sustenance. Indeed, from time to time members of our department have taken a year's leave of absence and have worked in this field, and if I were to point out to you the one principal theme of these after-dinner speakers, as you want to call them is the problems that they have in these countries to bring modern technology, to bring the knowledge that we have into the hinterlands and the outbacks where it can be used by the farmers or would-be prospective farmers of these countries.

Now while I well appreciate that the position of our ag reps here in the Province of Manitoba or anywhere else in this North American continent isn't quite that dramatic, but by the same basis it forms a very solid and sound backbone to the whole package of agricultural programs that this government and any government can offer to the healthy agricultural industry that we're trying to maintain and continually improve. And while I can accept criticism and suggestions and indeed invite suggestions in what manner of ways their service may be improved or in what manner and ways their services perhaps should be deployed, specific areas, I can't accept any suggestion that the service, as a whole, isn't sound and isn't contributing a great deal to the problems and to the building of our agricultural industry.

(MR. ENNS cont'd) . . .

It is of course through these that we -- if we move one step backwards and we refer to the research arm of our department, and it may be a surprise to some that we have a research arm -- and I refer directly to the Faculty of Agriculture at the University of Manitoba -- because it is since this administration took office that real input began. In the last ten years some \$11 million of direct money from this province has gone into the building and improving the Faculty of Agriculture at the University of Manitoba. Very often our university is sometimes under some criticism, and justly so, for not relating its services and its functions directly to its environment or to the province and to the particular developmental programs that we are attempting to achieve here. I'd like to say that in the Department of Agriculture, through the services and through the cooperation at the Faculty of Agriculture, this is not the case, or at least it has gone a long way in doing the academic and the research work at the university that has a distinct and profitable bearing on the community that it's meant to serve.

I don't have to list these in any great detail; these programs are well known to us. Our soil testing program -- upwards of 30,000 samples are now being processed in our soil laboratory. Directly tied to this is our crop insurance program, and this is big business gentlemen -- 14,000 farmers -- a little better than 14,000 farmers, half of the eligible farmers in Manitoba have written up some \$30 million or \$32 million worth of insurance in this year, certainly proving beyond doubt the success of the program, the acceptability of it to the farmers in Manitoba, and it's a wonderful way of course for them to hedge some of their rising production costs. And of course I suppose no greater compliment can be paid to us in this respect than by the universal acclaim that this program has achieved here in Canada and its adoption, in many instances, adoption of the whole program in other parts of this country.

Still referring to the programs that we have put forward, coming through the research that's being carried on in the Faculty of Agriculture, are such allied programs as the feed analysis services that we provide where the livestock producer, the poultry man, can get his custom feed analyzed or indeed his commercial feed analyzed. There is no difficulty here with commercial companies. The commercial sector is well aware and appreciates the services that this program has to offer. Our veterinarian diagnostic services enable our stockmen to get prompt diagnoses of the problems and ails that beset their particular industry.

In the area of farm management -- and I'd like to take a minute or two on that because this is an unheralded and perhaps one of the most under-rated programs that the Department of Agriculture has to offer -- and yet I place extremely high priority in this particular area. We have at the moment some 800 farmers enrolled in this course and this is not an easy course. This is a vigorous course -- four year course. Some 500 farmers successfully graduated out of this course, and just about in each instance these farmers will bear testimony to the success of these courses, and very often the input of management skills, barring all else, has done more to increase the income position of these particular farmers than anything else we could do or could offer in the Department of Agriculture. I'm well aware, Mr. Speaker, that 1,000 or 1,200 farmers is just a small dent in the 25 to 35 thousand farmers if you want to take that wide range of farmers that we have in this province, but nevertheless, it's in this area where the program that my department has to offer the farmers of Manitoba can perhaps make its most significant contribution in aiding the farmer to meet the many complex problems that he is expected to meet day in and day out on our farms.

As I said, Mr. Speaker, at the outset, it's not my intention to list or go through the wide range and gambit of programs that we have to offer. What I am attempting to do, Mr. Speaker, is simply to invite the members opposite to bring their discussions and their debates on agriculture into perspective, into that area where we are empowered to act, in that area where we can effectively, to the best of our ability, help in this very serious price-cost squeeze that the farmer is facing. Certainly, of course, you'd have to add to that program, or part of the program that I've just mentioned, the many functions of other departments that have a direct bearing on agriculture.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, every improvement to our provincial road systems and provincial trunk highways bears directly on the vital interest of agriculture. Surely, Mr. Speaker, every improvement made to the ever-growing network of provincial drains bears

(MR. ENNS cont'd) . . . directly on the vital interest of agriculture. So I suggest to the members opposite that when measuring the commitment that this government has and will continue to make in the interest of this most important industry in our province, one surely has to be prepared to allocate major portions of the funds in these other government activities to that of the interests of agriculture.

In the field of education - the paramount field of education - it can't hardly be argued that if our future generations of farmers are going to cope with some of the very technical and complex problems that they face, that in the very real sense the efforts to equalize the education opportunities throughout this province have a very distinct and beneficial bearing on the interest of agriculture. And in like way, every effort that the Department of Industry and Commerce brings to bear in bringing new industries, particularly those industries related to the agricultural industry, have to be welcomed as providing perhaps the greatest opportunity that the farmers in this province have in the immediate years that lie ahead, and any suggestion, Mr. Speaker, that there is any basic conflict in these two particular areas, these vital areas in the development of our province, just can't be borne out.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I'm well aware that what I have said today, or to date, or to this time, is nothing that hasn't been said by many other speakers on this side of the House and on the other side of the House in the general description of agriculture's problems and what our programs are in facing some of these problems. I'm also well aware that speakers before me - my immediate predecessor, Mr. Hutton, or indeed my former First Minister, when they acknowledged and talked about the cost-price squeeze and what they were going to do about it, these are some of the things that we have been and will continue to do about it. There was never any suggestion, however, never any suggestion that the major and the root cause and the first real steps to the solutions of this problem lie in Ottawa. I can just about anticipate the cries of "buck passing" coming from the other side of the House, but it's a simple fact that can't escape anybody that's involved in the agricultural industry.

I also recognize that this whole talk about cost-price squeeze, or price-cost squeeze or name it what you want, is nothing that particularly new. It's been hanging around the neck of agriculture for a long time. But you know, if you had to look for a particular place, a particular point and time to hang your hat on a peg so to say, I can think of one - I can think of a pretty good one with respect to the current inflationary spiral that has caught agriculture in such a squeeze - and I refer back some two summers ago at the time the seamen's strike and the time the Federal Government agreed to a 30 percent wage rise settlement, and I would think that in our current problems of inflation that's about as good a time you want to choose to pick on in terms of the problems that we face, the problems that bear so directly on our industry here. Mr. Speaker, . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I'm sorry to interrupt the honourable gentleman but it is now 10 o'clock.

MR. ENNS: Fine, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: May the honourable gentleman have leave to continue? --(Interjection)-- Yes, I know.

MR. ENNS: I have about five more minutes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. PAULLEY: . . . . . tomorrow, he has the right to complete his time, so I suggest we abide by the rules for the first evening sitting.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer, that the House do now adjourn.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House adjourned until 10 o'clock Friday morning.