

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Friday, March 19th, 1965.

Opening Prayer by Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions
Reading and Receiving Petitions

MR. CLERK: The petition of the Fidelity Trust Company Praying for the passing of an Act to amend an Act to incorporate the Fidelity Trust.

MADAM SPEAKER: Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees.

HONOURABLE STEWART E. McLEAN, Q. C. (Attorney-General) (Dauphin): Madam Speaker, I wish to present the first report of the Standing Committee on Public Accounts.

MR. CLERK: Your Standing Committee on Public Accounts beg leave to present the following as their first report. Your Committee met for organization and appointed Honourable Mr. McLean as Chairman. Your Committee recommends that for the remainder of the Session, the Quorum of this Committee shall consist of ten members. Your Committee has examined the Public Accounts of the Province of Manitoba for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1964, as published, and find that the receipts and expenditures of the monies have been carefully set forth and all monies properly accounted for. Your Committee received all information desired by any member from the Ministers, heads of Departments and members of the Comptroller-General's office with respect to receipts, expenditures and other matters pertaining to the business of the province; and all necessary papers were produced for examination. The fullest opportunity was accorded to all members of the Committee to examine vouchers or any documents called for, and no restriction was placed upon the line of examination. Your Committee agreed to meet again as and when required. All of which is respectfully submitted.

MR. McLEAN: Madam Speaker, I move seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Education that the Report of the Committee be received.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Notices of Motions
Introduction of Bills.

The Honourable the Provincial Secretary.

HONOURABLE MAITLAND B. STEINKOPF, Q. C. (Provincial Secretary) (River Heights) Introduced Bill No. 84, An Act to amend the Unconscionable Transactions Act.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable the Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia) Introduced Bill No. 87, An Act to incorporate the United Fund of Greater Winnipeg.

HONOURABLE GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Education) (Gimli): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Attorney-General that Madam Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a committee to consider the following proposed resolution standing in my name.

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

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

MR. CHAIRMAN: The resolution for consideration by the Committee is: RESOLVED THAT it is expedient to bring in a measure to amend The Public Schools Act by providing, among other matters, that a school division may be established in the northern part of the province to which grants payable to school divisions under Part XIX of The Public Schools Act, and such other additional grants as the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council may deem advisable, may be made, from and out of the Consolidated Fund.

MR. JOHNSON: His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor having been informed of the subject matter of the proposed resolution recommends it to the House. Mr. Chairman, this resolution refers to the, is a money resolution and must come in by resolution and is referred to the Committee. The Bill will be referred to the Committee forthwith. This legislation is in connection with the radar base at Cranberry Portage which has been acquired and at the last summer session honourable members will remember that we passed certain capital monies which made it possible to purchase this site. We've already initiated the changes or development that will be required to convert this to a secondary school centre to serve the several settlements throughout the north.

(MR. JOHNSON, cont'd).....

As we go through the estimates and look at the Bill, you will realize that it's intended initially to service all the townships north of Township 22. Children from these remote one-room highs or where there is no high school in remote settlements, special school districts and so on, the secondary level, 9 to 12 will be offered an education at this centre. This resolution provides the necessary monies to operate this school. Some of the money will come out of operation of schools and underdeveloped settlements which appears in the estimates. Other monies will come out of general grants. It is proposed as we look at the Bill later on on second reading, you will see that it calls for the appointment of an official trustee, and that the whole area would be run as a division with this school itself being mainly devoted to the secondary school level.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution adopted. Passed. Committee rise and report. Call in the Speaker. Madam Speaker, the Committee of the Whole House has adopted a certain resolution and ask leave to report the same.

IN SESSION

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

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

MR. JOHNSON Introduced Bill No. 47, An Act to amend The Public Schools Act (2).

MADAM SPEAKER: Before the Orders of the Day, I would like to attract your attention to the gallery where there are some 180 students from Selkirk Collegiate, Grade XI students under the direction of their teacher, Mr. Purvis. This school is in the constituency of the Honourable the Member for Selkirk. Also in the gallery there are some 40 Grade XI students from Crystal City High School. This group is under the direction of their teacher, Mr. McGinn and this school is in the constituency of the Honourable the Minister Without Portfolio. On behalf of all members of this Legislative Assembly, I welcome you. Orders of the Day.

HONOURABLE DUFF ROBLIN (Premier and Provincial Treasurer) (Wolseley): Madam Speaker, before you call the Orders of the Day, I would like to draw the attention of members of the House to the news that appeared in the press this morning of the death of Mr. Justice Ralph Maybank, and I would like to take this opportunity of moving a resolution of condolence on this occasion. I think that Ralph Maybank may be thought of as a typically colourful and Canadian political personality. He was a man who had to make his own way in life; he worked his way through the educational process as an employee of the railways of this country and throughout his long and distinguished career always retained a very warm and affectionate interest in what might be called labour problems and the labour movement in the nation.

Mr. Maybank served in this House quite some time ago, from the 16th of June 1932 until October 1935; and he also had a distinguished career in the federal legislature where if my memory serves me correctly, he was appointed on at least two occasions to the office of Parliamentary Assistant in the time that he served in that House. He subsequently was appointed a judge in the Court of Queen's Bench where he rendered distinguished service in these last few years. I think though that we will think of him most as a fascinating personality, a man who brought great warmth of human feeling to his responsibilities as an elected representative and who has earned the thanks of the community for the many years of devoted service that he has given to public affairs.

I would like to associate in the moving of this resolution the name of the Honourable Member for Lakeside whom I believe is the only man who served in this House with Mr. Maybank, and I would therefore move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lakeside that this House convey to the family of the late Honourable Mr. Justice Ralph Maybank, who served as a member of the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba, its sincere sympathy in their bereavement and its appreciation of his devotion to duty in a useful life of active community and public service, and that Madam Speaker be requested to forward a copy of this resolution to the family.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. DOUGLAS L. CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Madam Speaker, though I believe that the Honourable the First Minister is correct in saying that I am the only member of the House who sat with Ralph Maybank in this chamber, certainly I am by no means the only one who was a close friend of the distinguished statesman and jurist whose passing we mourn today. I had known Ralph for many years before he entered this chamber. I am not certain whether he began

(MR. CAMPBELL, cont'd).....his public career as a School Board member or whether he went directly to the City Council, but certainly he was an alderman for some time, then came to the Legislative Assembly, after a fairly brief stay here went on to the Federal Parliament where he stayed for some time and as the First Minister mentioned, had a very distinguished career.

I think if I were to mention a particular characteristic of Ralph Maybank that should appeal to the most of us was that he had a great capacity for winning elections. I think he was one who retired without ever having known the taste of defeat and in the prosecution of his chosen work whether it was as a labouring man in the early days to put himself through the university or whether it was as a lawyer in which field he also attained great eminence later on or whether as a public figure which perhaps was his favourite vocation of all, he gave every bit of service that there was within him and he deserved the distinguished career that was his. I'm sure that he will be mourned by a great number of friends and I would like to express along with the rest of the members of the House, our sincere appreciation of the good community and provincial and national service that he gave and express our sympathy to his wife and son.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party) (Radisson): Madam Speaker, I desire to associate the members of the New Democratic Party in this Assembly and in Manitoba with this tribute of condolence to the folk who Ralph Maybank has left behind. I didn't have an opportunity of sitting with him in this House, he was a little ahead of my time. But I did have the opportunity, Madam Speaker, of knowing Ralph Maybank quite personally, particularly after I became a member of this House on many occasions. The honourable gentleman attempted to console me and to guide me in my ways. Of course in that there may have been slight differences Madam Speaker, but we honoured and respected each other.

As the Honourable the First Minister has indicated Ralph Maybank is one of those individuals who came up through the school of hard knocks, as a trainman I believe he was with the Canadian Pacific Railway. He at all times, after he became interested in political life and when he went into the federal arena, at all times he was ready and willing to serve his fellow workers of former days. In addition to this he took part in community affairs and was a member of the Order of Eagles and on many an occasion a very pleasant evening was spent by the membership of this particular organization. We recall that not so many years ago a great tragedy befell our friend in the loss of one of his dear ones in an unfortunate circumstance. It hit and hurt Mr. Justice Ralph Maybank for awhile but he did bounce back like the man he was Madam Speaker, and on this occasion I too make note with regret of the passing of this outstanding Canadian, this outstanding Manitoban, and associate myself with the remarks that have been made here this afternoon.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q. C. (Selkirk): Madam Speaker, I would like to join with the others, not as one who sat in this House with Ralph Maybank, but as a friend and an old classmate. Ralph and I started in university together. He was the only man whom I ever knew who was called judge before he received an appointment. That term I think was given to him while he was working his way through university by the men in the CPR freight yards in Winnipeg, where I believe he was a switchman. Ralph was loved by everyone with whom he came in contact. He was a man of the people; he was a man who had a very independent mind and he's a man who could not stand anything that was phoney. He was highly respected by the members of the legal profession; he was dearly loved by all of his friends and his passing has left a void in the legal and community circles of this province which is going to be hard to fill.

To his wife and his son I would like to join Madam in expressing my deepest and most sincere sympathies in his passing. I had the greatest personal respect for Ralph and so did everyone who ever came in contact with him.

MR. MORRIS A. GRAY (Inkster): Madam Speaker, may I add a word to the beautiful words that have been spoken by the other members. I entered the City Council in the same year as the late Mr. Justice Maybank, right at the beginning of the depression years. Almost immediately we were sworn in. They decided to organize a special committee which was called the Unemployment Relief Committee and naturally at that time there were so many applications for relief by people that have had beautiful homes, they have carpets, they have televisions, but did not have a loaf of bread in the house and they were forced to apply for relief. Some of the older men at that time looked, at some of them do now, more at the expense of the City Council than on the help to give those unfortunates who had not had any help and did not have sufficient funds to maintain themselves. At that time there were 8,000 files for applications,

(MR. GRAY, cont'd). and he was the one, he was appointed chairman of the Unemployment Relief Committee and I was a member there, and a vice-chairman, and he was fighting every minute of his day and he was fighting all the time in council for treating those unemployed as human beings who unfortunately were unable to maintain themselves. I remember him then. He left council the first term, came into this House and then you know his future career politically and after he was appointed as a Judge of King's Bench. I will never forget him. I have seen him many times since and I told him personally, I told everyone, of the wonderful work of the wonderful struggle he has made on behalf of those unfortunates who were unemployed. So I feel like saying a word to his credit and remembrance.

HONOURABLE CHARLES H. WITNEY (Minister of Health) (Flin Flon): Madam Speaker before the Orders of the Day, I would like to lay on the table of the House, an answer to a question asked by the Honourable Member for Inkster and a return to an Order of the House dated March 15th, on motion of the Honourable Member for Inkster.

MADAM SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

HONOURABLE GEORGE HUTTON (Minister of Agriculture) (Rockwood-Iberville): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I'd like to lay on the table of the House a return to an Order of the House No. 13, on a motion by the Honourable Member for La Verendrye, March 15th, 1965.

MR. E. R. SCHREYER (Brokenhead): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to direct a question to the First Minister. It is of the nature that he probably couldn't answer today but I would like him to take it as notice and for possible future action. That question has to do with the recent action taken by the Department of Immigration to refuse entry to a professor of political science in the University of Minnesota, Professor Mulford Q. Sibley, refusing him entry to Canada, specifically to this province and to this city, on the grounds that as I have it from a reliable source, on the grounds that his entry would be a violation of Section 5 (1) of The Immigration Act, namely that his character is such as to constitute a possibility of sowing attitudes of subversion by force against constituted authority. I want to tell the First Minister that I know the professor, I know of the professor very well.

MR. ROBLIN: I ask my honourable friend to excuse me from interrupting him but is he not making a speech, not asking a question?

MR. SCHREYER: All right Madam Speaker, I will frame it in the interrogative. In view of the fact that this action has been taken by the Department of Immigration and in view of the fact that many citizens of Winnipeg, particularly those who invited the speaker to come to Winnipeg regard this action as an infringement on their civil rights, on their right of free speech, to hear free speech, would the First Minister consider this action as perhaps impinging on provincial civil rights; and if so does he intend to investigate this further along this line and possibly issue a communication to the federal authority?

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I am not familiar with the case my honourable friend speaks of but judging from what he has told us about it, I would think that this is a matter outside the jurisdiction of the Provincial Legislature and therefore not one which would be admissible as a matter for question here.

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): Madam Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Education. Is he aware of any of the students at the University of Manitoba using marihuana; and if so, has any investigation been launched in this respect?

MR. JOHNSON: Madam Speaker, I know nothing more than what I have read in the newspapers and also I understand that the president of the University has asked the RCMP to investigate this matter.

Before the Orders of the Day I thought I should draw to the attention of the Committee some remarks made by Professor Thiele of New York. If you recall the other day, I notified the House that eleven directors from the State of New York, directors of vocational training, paid a visit to our institution last Thursday and these people visited our Manitoba Institute of Technology. This is the sixth week of their tour and in response to the questioning as to what they thought of our Institute out here, I thought the Committee should know that Professor Thiele said that he came here because for a number of years certain New York educators have been asked to come to Winnipeg Institute and teach, and since many of these were friends of his word got back to him that this would be a fine place to visit with these eleven directors, all of whom will be going back to New York State to initiate comprehensive vocational programs within 35 mile radii of each other throughout the state. When he was interviewed as to the impression of the facilities he said "I would say they are superb. I would say they are about the

(MR. JOHNSON, cont'd).....finest I have seen any place on tour. The buildings are modern, the equipment is very, very adequate and the type of equipment is good for the training as given. It is very practical. The courses are effective. The instruction looks as though it is about the best you can get." When he was asked by the interviewer if there was any basic difference in the approach to education in Winnipeg than in the States he said, "No, I don't think the approach is different. It is just that it is so complete and so inclusive in the type of education that is needed. I would say they are doing a fine job here." I just think the members of the House and of course all Manitobans should be very proud this independent opinion has been expressed as to Manitoba's supposed secondary facility.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): Madam Speaker, I am very happy the Minister brought the matter up. I wonder if I might ask him a question? Did he indicate to the House the other day that the decision of this group to come to Manitoba had been because it had been recommended to them as the best place to come?

MR. JOHNSON:..... This is one matter I checked Madam Speaker because I think both the New York vocational educators and our own people have interchanged a great deal, have had a lot to do with one another, and also the Federal Director, Dr. Ford concurred that this would be an excellent place for them to look at and I just think that the fact is that here's an independent outside appraisal of your facilities in Manitoba.

MR. SCHREYER: Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to direct a question to the Attorney-General. In view of the fact that civil rights is a matter of provincial jurisdiction; and in view of the fact that there is some controversy in the past 24 hours as to the conflicting jurisdictions of the Federal Government in immigration and the Provincial Government in the field of civil rights, will the Attorney-General undertake to investigate this controversy regarding Professor Sibley to at least satisfy himself that civil rights have been not violated.

MR. McLEAN: The matter, Madam Speaker, is one for federal action and not one for provincial action here.

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to ask a question of the Honourable the First Minister. Is there a tax on marihuana?

MADAM SPEAKER:..... Address for..

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to ask a supplementary question to the Minister of Education. These reports about the smoking of marihuana at university would certainly be most disturbing. Is there any indication at all or has there been any investigation made as to its use in high schools.

MR. JOHNSON: No, nothing has been to our attention, Madam Speaker, that we know of.

MADAM SPEAKER: Address for Papers.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I would like to ask a question of the First Minister. Has the First Minister any indication at all as to the proceedings with the new offer made to Ottawa subsequent to his offer insofar as the Pan-Am games?

MR. ROBLIN: I have had no official communication from the Federal Government. I understand that the city, who are the active negotiants in this matter are negotiating now with the Federal Government. I have had no word of the results.

MR. SCHREYER: Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Education. In view of the headline in the newspapers yesterday that some students, some few students at the university were in fact using marihuana; and in view of the fact that although this matter might be small in terms of numbers but large in terms of public concern, has the Minister taken any sort of steps to investigate the situation, with a view to disclosing whether or not this matter indeed exists or whether it is in fact a hoax and a lark, which it may very well be.

MR. JOHNSON: Madam Speaker, this is a matter for the Board of Governors of the University and President. I can inform the House I was not able, just for my own information in case this came up I tried to contact the President this morning and I was not able to do so.

MADAM SPEAKER: Address for Papers.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I wonder if my honourable friend would consider allowing this address to stand. There is an interesting point in connection with the first question here which we are having some trouble in resolving from the point of view of procedure. I would appreciate his allowing that item to stand and we might deal with it perhaps on Monday.

MR. MOLGAT: That is with regard to the correspondence between the government, Bell Telephone System and Ottawa? Fine, I have no objection to letting it stand Madam Speaker. And while I am on my feet if I may, I am obviously having troubles with my Order for Returns because I think the next four are also to stand until next Monday at the request of the Minister.

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

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Boniface that an Order of the House do issue for a return showing

1. The name and address of all senior citizens homes and/or alternate care institutions in Manitoba.
2. The type of care provided in each.
3. The per diem rate paid to each by the Manitoba Government for the various types of care provided.
4. what needs test, if any is applied for admittance to any of these institutions.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

HONOURABLE J. B. CARROLL (Minister of Welfare) (The Pas): Madam Speaker, before you put the question I would like some clarification if I could. In the first, under number one, you say all senior citizens' homes. I presume you mean Elderly Persons Housing rather than...

MR. SHOEMAKER: Well, Madam Speaker, I would think all senior citizens homes and/or alternate care homes where there are in fact inmates whose care are being paid for by the province. That's really what I meant.

MR. CARROLL: So that I understand it clearly, you mean then elderly persons housing and personal care or nursing homes which may be licensed either by the province or the municipality. Then the next thing is as of what date. Did you have any particular date in mind, or shall we just select a date.

MR. SHOEMAKER: As of the 31st. of December, '64 I think would be fine.

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

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker..... Minister I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce that Madam Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider Bill No. 16, an Act to amend the Mineral Taxation Act.

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

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

Bill No. 16 was read section by section and passed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise. Call in the Speaker.

Madam Speaker the Committee of the Whole has considered Bill No. 16 and has directed me to report same as passed.

IN SESSION

MR. COWAN: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Member for St. Vital that the report of the Committee be received.

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

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce that Bill No. 16, an Act to amend The Mineral Taxation Act be now read a third time and passed.

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 Brokenhead.

MR. SCHREYER: Madam Speaker, I would ask for the consent of the House to have the matter stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed. The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Inkster and the proposed amendment as amended by the Honourable Member for Selkirk. The Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, this has been a very interesting debate on the question of divorce and it seems to me that there is considerable opinion that the laws of Canada should be changed respecting the grounds for divorce. I may say Madam Speaker that while I may not agree with all of the grounds that are contained in the amendment to the resolution or indeed so far as the resolution itself is concerned, I am convinced however that the time has come for the Dominion authority who basically controls divorce, to take another look at the situation.

I do however, Madam Speaker, wish to make a comment or two on some of the matters that have been discussed during this debate. I am particularly concerned and intrigued with some of the comments made by some of the members in this debate when they refer to the younger people of today. Some of them have suggested Madam Speaker, that our youth of today are more irresponsible than they were in our time or in our mother's time or in our grandfather's time. Madam Speaker, I want to reject this entirely. I think that the youth of today are if anything far more responsible, notwithstanding police spokesmen's orations, notwithstanding some criticisms of social workers and the likes regarding the youth of today, I think by and large we should be proud of our young men and our young women today.

We discussed here a few moments ago questions dealing with the possible use of marijuana in the university receiving great and vast headlines and comments in our daily paper, and it is suggested that there was about six or seven of a student population of approaching 2,000 or in excess of it --6,000-- 6,000, that may be partakers in this. And what is the net result Madam Speaker? Another blot, another blot on the youth of today. And I can't reject this more vigorously Madam Speaker. I think I know what the trouble is with the youth of today. I think they're too open. I think they realize facts and face up to facts and the facts of life as well, far more than we did. I think they are subjected to more close scrutiny than was the case when we were younger. They can't lead the secluded lives that many of us and our ancestors were privileged to lead. So I say I think our youth of today are far more honest than we were; far more open and far more forthright. They'll call a spade a spade. They will have their associations and their groups to consider such things as sex and related subjects. But they'll do it Madam Speaker in the open today, whereas we went behind a high board fence and in a smutty atmosphere to consider the same thing because of the fears that we had. They'll smoke their cigarettes and their pipes and their cigars in the open today, whereas in our day we'd go and peel some bark off the cedar posts that were along the railroad track. This is what we did, and I frankly confess it. But what are we today doing, or many of us, and all too many of us? We're saying that because of the honesty of our young people they're immoral, they're immature. And I say Madam Speaker, that this is not so. We have more young people today going to our universities and our higher schools of learning; we have more young people taking an active part in affairs of state and politics today than we had. And I don't think Madam Speaker that I could use a better example than my colleague for Brokenhead who came into this Assembly at the age of 22.

So I say Madam Speaker, that when we're dealing with the question of divorce let's divorce any consideration or suggestion of immaturity or immorality in regard to this question of the youth of today. I'm satisfied Madam Speaker, that in a considerable number of instances in the field of divorce it's not those who have been married two or three years who are applying for divorce and obtaining the same, but in many cases it is people who have been married for fifteen or twenty years. And I say, let us not stand up in this House and say to those who are following us today, you're immoral, you're immature, you don't know where you're going. Let us reject this and give the youth of today credit for the job that they are doing. And when I say this I realize, I realize as every member of this Assembly will, that there are youngsters who will make mistakes and go down the wrong path. But Madam Speaker, I suggest that their likelihood of being caught is far greater today because we're living in a system of society where we're all exposed at all times in our most innermost lives and our social associations. So I say Madam when we're dealing with this question let's not, let's not deride the youth of today, for if need be these youths that some of us criticize today were called on to protect us in another great conflict they would bear the brunt in order if necessary to preserve the democracy as we know it today. So let's give them credit for what they are and the good job that they are doing and not use this Assembly or any other to deride them and speak ill of them. So I say.

MR. FRED GROVES (St. Vital): I'm sorry to interrupt the honourable member but I was wondering if he would tell us who which member castigated the youth of today the way he describes it.

MR. PAULLEY: I am saying to my honourable friend if he would take the trouble as I did to read some of the comments that have gone on in this House during this debate he would find the source, the same source as I; and if he's not keeping up to his homework then let him get cracking and do a little reading or a little listening while the debates are taking place. If my honourable friend had been in the Assembly at the same time and all of the time like I have in this debate, he would know. I'm not naming any member but I'm saying that this has been said in this debate.

Now Madam Speaker, others have said and touched on the necessity for premarital education. I heartily endorse this. This is something that should be done, something that is necessary. Many of us have attempted this in our own homes with our offspring and I'm sure the majority may have done this. Many of us before we were married attended seminars within our respective churches or with our ministers on the problems of marriage. But I say Madam Speaker, that more emphasis is necessary in this field. Others during this debate Madam Speaker, have taken a stand because of the fact of their particular religious affiliation and I respect them for it. I want to say Madam Speaker, I too am a Catholic; although not a member of the Roman Catholic fraternity I am a Catholic, I am an Anglican and I am proud of it.

But I want to place on the record Madam Speaker the position of my church, which church I have the honour of being a warden for my rector in Transcona for fifteen years. I want to place on record the official position of our synod here in the Diocese of Rupertsland on this question, and state what the Archbishop of Rupertsland, who incidentally is the Primate of all Canada, had to say to the recent synod meeting held in Winnipeg in June of last year. And I think Madam Speaker, that if members listen to me they will gather from my remarks of a changing attitude within the church itself, because it wasn't too long ago that the Anglican church had the same approach and the same outlook as the other churches who call themselves Catholic had. But there is a change within the Anglican fraternity of the approach --not insofar as the adherents themselves are concerned but the approach and the recognition of the situation as it affects all of us in this province in this Dominion.

I quote now Madam Speaker from page 11 of the Archbishop of Rupertsland's charge to the diocesan synod in June of 1964 here in the City of Winnipeg. And I quote from His Grace's text: "Now we turn to another question, marriage and divorce. In a secular society we have no hope of imposing christian teaching about divorce on the whole Canadian community, and indeed it is doubtful if we should ever try to impose it. To convince the Canadian people that our Lord's teaching is the only right teaching is one thing; to impose it is another. I believe that the divorce laws of Canada will have to be changed because they no longer reflect the Canadian conscience. But I also believe that as Christians we should do all in our power to protect the family stability and to protect the children who are the chief victims in a divorce. Divorce should never be easy. In the Christian community we shall order our practice so that those who believe in Jesus Christ may really follow Him. For one thing we must surely ask that those who are married in church should mean the solemn promises that they make. They should really intend a lifelong union. I do not believe," His Grace continues to say, "that people should get married in church only because it is a more attractive social event than a civil marriage. There is good hope that at our next general synod our Canon Law will be amended, so that we can support more surely those who seek Christian marriage and also deal in pastoral concern and consistent principles with those who, despite their Christian hopes, come to a time when divorce and remarriage seems to them the only solution. A truly Christian rule about divorce will always be stern. What Christian morality is not. But a truly Christian discipline for church members will be one in which mercy and truth are met together."

I think Madam Speaker that this is the approach in this very important matter that we in this Assembly should take. We may not agree entirely with the grounds that are suggested for the changing of the basis under which divorce may be made possible in Canada, but let us realize that notwithstanding what we may think of the other, whether we as individuals attempt to live a true Christian life or not, there are those who may need the changes that are suggested in this in order that they may unshackle themselves from situations which are at the present time preventing them from leading a full life which might as His Grace suggests lead to a full Christian life.

MR. R. O. LISSAMAN (Brandon): Madam Speaker the Honourable the Leader of the NDP has made rather a blanket allegation that speakers in this debate downgraded the youth of this country. I fail to catch any of this reflection in any of the debate so far, and I would ask him to identify who he thinks has downgraded the youth.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I refuse to do that. I'm not privileged to do it, but I will point out to my honourable friend if he would meet me, the passage that I was referring to. And I did not state that all members of this House took that attitude. I said "some".

MR. HILLHOUSE: That is the point, Madam Speaker. He has said "some". Now, I spoke on this debate. I would like to know from the honourable member whether I'm classified among those "some".

MR. PAULLEY: I assure my honourable friend for Selkirk he was not.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Okay that's all I wanted. . . .

MR. PAULLEY: And the Member for Brandon was not.

MR. VIELFAURE: Madam Speaker, I'd like to ask the same question.

MR. PAULLEY: It was --if the member asked it, I ask him, the member who has just asked the question, to read his speech when he speaks of the lack of morality among our young people today. And if I have taken him out of concept then I apologize to him, but my impression was it was the Honourable Member from La Verendrye who spoke of a lack of morality among some of our youth today.

MR. ALBERT VIELFAURE (La Verendrye): I must confess that I don't speak as often as my honourable friend and I haven't read my speech that much, but I certainly had no allegations of that kind. I spoke of the immorality of the advertising, the billboards that we saw around, but certainly not the youth.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker then in order to clear the record, I accept the contention and the position taken by my honourable friend. I apologize that if I misunderstood his remarks, I mean him no ill will, and if unfortunately I've attributed this to any member of the House I sincerely apologize and I hope my apologies will be accepted. But I think that I can say in saying this, that this has been said on numerous occasions, so may I change my text. That many people have this approach and if I've offended anybody in this House, Madam Speaker, I ask your apology and the apologies of the member. I mean no ill will when I say what I said here this afternoon.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. RICHARD SEABORN (Wellington): Madam Speaker, I'll be very brief, for the other day I supported the sub-amendment submitted by the Honourable Member for St. James, and in doing so I think that I voted rather unwisely. I must confess that this is one subject that places me on the horns of a dilemma for I have seen the consequences of marriage failures manifested in many many ways, and if I think of this matter from a purely human standpoint, then I am inclined to agree that some leniency or relaxation of our divorce law should be considered. However, I do feel that these tragic failures are not a cause in themselves but are the result in part of a general moral and spiritual decline in our national life. And reference to the one book that reveals the Christian precepts that we should follow has persuaded me that marriage is indeed a very solemn thing and should not be dismissed lightly. I do feel therefore that a relaxation as considered in this resolution and in the main amendment would be wrong and consequently I'll be voting against them.

MADAM SPEAKER put the question.

MR. GRAY: Madam Speaker, I'm sorry, I waited for somebody else that wishes to speak.

MR. JOHN P. TANCHAK (Emerson): Are you --is the honourable gentleman. . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GRAY: I'm not closing the debate.

MR. TANCHAK: Oh, I'm sorry. I thought the honourable member was closing the debate.

MR. GRAY: No, I'm not. Do you want to go ahead?

MR. TANCHAK: No, I'll wait. I'll wait. I was going to adjourn it.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. TANCHAK: Madam Speaker, I thought that the honourable member was closing the debate. I was going to adjourn it.

MADAM SPEAKER put the question.

MR. TANCHAK: Madam Speaker, I move seconded by the Honourable Member from Carillon that the debate be adjourned.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Inkster and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable the Member for

(MADAM SPEAKER, cont'd). St. Matthews. The Honourable the Minister of Welfare.

MR. CARROLL: Madam Speaker, I suppose there have been very few subjects that have received the interest and attention that pensions have received during the last twelve months. I suppose one of the reasons for this is that we're very conscious that a great many people have reached the retirement age inadequately prepared for retirement. We recognize that there have been a great many changes in cost of living since many made preparations for retirement. We also recognize that we're living in a much different society today than we did a few short years ago. We recognize that there is a very distinct lack of employment opportunities for people who have reached advanced years; and we recognize too that no longer do families encompass the elderly the way they did at one time, where grandparents and aged aunts and uncles were a part of the family unit and today that is no more. So I suppose it's natural that we should be concerned about pensions and about providing adequately for those who have made life much easier for the generations growing up today. We in this House have a very great interest in pensions for the elderly because we are pledged to support and to meet the needs of the elderly to the extent that there is need beyond the amount available to them through pensions or other resources available to them.

I would like to say that the Member for Inkster has been very persistent over the years in his fight to increase pensions for the elderly. He's been a very staunch and sincere advocate in his work for the pensioners. And I'd like to say that he's had a great deal of company in recent years. As the Leader of the New Democratic Party would say, there are a lot of "Johnny-come-latelys". I don't know what position he has on this bandwagon, because he has certainly climbed on it with some vigour, as one reads his contribution in this particular debate. I think we all recognize that there is great competition, a bidding up of pensions for the elderly; and I think that all members of this House would agree that the elderly deserve important consideration in government spending programs. But I believe that we must also consider the elderly and our expenditures for their support in terms of total government programs and expenditures.

I recently received the Brief of the Age and Opportunity Bureau which was addressed to the National Minister of Health and Welfare, in which they outline the views of their association with respect to the Canada Pension Plan. I'd like to comment very briefly on the recommendations and some of the preamble which is contained in this brief dated February 1st, 1965. The recommendations are as follows, and I'm not going to read them in full. "The needs of older people should be met immediately by an extension of old age security pension using the existing machinery. 2. The Government of Canada should determine the amount of the minimum pension required. 3. Appropriate reduction should be made in the case of married couples where their need is not so great" . . . and I haven't read that in its full text. " 4. Provision should be made for adjustments in the benefits in line with any changes in consumer price index" --apparently they're not very happy with the way in which adjustments have been made in recent years. "5. Every person who is financially able should contribute through income tax payments," etcetra. And No. 6. --and this is the one I would particularly like to draw to the attention of the House. "The Government of Canada should determine the national needs in the areas of health, housing, education and income maintenance and establish their priorities." And No. 7 (c) 136. The Canada Pension Plan should not be adopted in its present form."

I'd like to go back now to the preamble where they elaborate a bit and which I think is particularly of interest in this debate. "The responsibility of the community to the older person is fully recognized by the Bureau, as is the need for public assistance within the ability of society to provide it. In the final analysis the productive ability of the people will determine the amount which can be used for welfare purposes.

Canada has the productive capacity to meet all its welfare needs. There are needs for health services, for good housing and for education, just as pressing as the need for a comprehensive pension plan. It is important that the priority of each of these needs should be considered as well as the extent to which the provision of one will tend to alleviate the need of another. It is also important that this sense of independence, the dignity and the initiative of our people be maintained." I think this is a very responsible statement on behalf of an organization dedicated to working in the best interests of the elderly and in helping to provide for their needs.

Now I would like to turn very briefly to the proposal which was put forward by the Member for Inkster. This proposal was analyzed by the Member for St. Matthews and he reported to the House that on the basis of his calculations the proposals would cost in addition to what we are presently paying on behalf of the elderly \$46,950,000 for the elderly in Manitoba. And

(MR. CARROLL, cont'd). this is an annual payment. I regret that the Member for Rhineland is not here because I think he would find this figure quite different from the one he was using in his speech the other day. I would like to say that this is a small "c" conservative estimate because I think the Member for St. Matthews was using figures which probably originated in the 1961 census and which are outdated today, because our calculations indicate that the cost of implementing this resolution in Manitoba alone would cost in excess of 50 millions of dollars per year, and we'll all recognize that this is more than the costs for the total provincial welfare program and the total health program together. It costs more than is required to meet the needs of the elderly today on the basis that we are providing it here in Manitoba. Including the needs of the families who have been deprived of their breadwinner, including the neglected, the abandoned and orphan children including assistance to the unemployable, the blind and disabled, including the total relief costs for the unemployed in unorganized territories and local government districts, including our provincial share of unemployment relief in municipalities and their other welfare costs, including the costs of our community development program, fitness and amateur sport, our contribution toward improving conditions in the Salter-Jarvis area, including our total contribution on an annual basis towards the capital costs of elderly persons housing, and our care services organization, this all added with the total cost included in the health estimates is less than what is being asked for in the resolution that is presently before the House.

And many in other debates in this House have been expressing very great concern about the cost of provincial taxes on the poor of the Province of Manitoba. We know some of the problems in implementing the tax measures which were proposed last summer in raising some \$20 million in taxes, and we look at this in terms of the \$50 million which is being requested in the resolution that is under consideration. I would like to point out merely that if this total amount had to be raised in the Province of Manitoba by provincial tax sources it would require a provincial sales tax of some 10 percent. And if we think that there has been an impact on the poor in the tax measures which are now in effect in the Province of Manitoba, we would certainly have seen nothing compared to the impact of a 10 percent sales tax to cover these additional costs. But I think what's more important Madam Chairman, is the fact that this additional \$50 million in new revenue would not meet the needs of the elderly citizens of the Province of Manitoba. There would still be many in need who would have to be supported by the Province of Manitoba.

And then of course I was particularly interested in the "pie in the sky" speech of the Leader of the New Democratic Party the other day because he wasn't satisfied with the resolution proposed by the Member for Inkster. This is what you call "one-upmanship". He wasn't satisfied, he wants to bid the pension even higher. And so what does he say? He says that pensions should be geared so that those who are in greatest need should not have to apply for supplementary assistance. And I would just like to refer -- he was so proud of that particular statement that he insisted on reading it twice. He said it in a speech earlier and repeated it again the last time that he spoke on this resolution. He says "I am not satisfied that we should have an old age security pension of an amount which makes it necessary to apply to the provincial authorities through social allowances or any other method to increase what we deem to be a pension that should be adequate at least for the basic necessities of our senior citizens." Well now what costs are we talking about here? I have taken the average cost for the frail elderly requiring care in the Province of Manitoba and that's included in our annual report which was tabled here just a short while ago. And if one wants to refer to it on page 10, the third paragraph from the bottom -- and I am talking about the 1917 persons requiring care whose average supplementary assistance is \$95 per month-- and if we want to take that figure and project it and create a pension which would cover all of these people and lower it to age 65 we would see a proposal that is requesting an additional payment on behalf of the elderly in the Province of Manitoba of \$118,546,000.00. And this is the kind of proposal that we have now made by the Leader of the New Democratic Party and presumably represents the thinking of his particular party. One need only look at the provincial estimates to see how ridiculous a proposal of this kind is in terms of provincial government spending, because it's an amount which is greater than the total estimated requirements for the Department of Welfare, Health, throwing in Education, our biggest spending department, the Provincial Secretary, Public Utilities, Municipal Affairs, Labour, Industry and Commerce and Treasury and we still have a couple of million dollars left over. And this of course doesn't take into account the fact that we did not compute medicare costs in the estimates upon which we based our calculation of

(MR. CARROLL, cont'd). 118 million dollars. And if the burden of this particular increase had to be met entirely within the Province of Manitoba we would find that we would be faced with a sales tax which would range somewhere between 20 and 25 percent, and this I suggest would be an impossible burden for provincial taxpayers and would drive people out of the province faster than we could cart them in.

So I say Madam Chairman, that we must examine priorities, both provincial priorities and national priorities as has been suggested on a number of occasions by the First Minister of this House and which is suggested by the Age and Opportunity Bureau in their latest presentation to the Federal Government.

I would like to point out Madam Chairman, that there are a great many other needs of the elderly which may be more important than increased pensions. I think it's a shame that we too often try to buy off our responsibilities towards the elderly by talking about increased cash grants or cash supplements. I think that there are a great many other responsibilities which we have to elderly people. Elderly citizens want to be useful contributing members of our society and not to be a burden. And how can we help them to maintain their independence? I'd say that one of the ways that we can do this is through elderly persons housing --and I'm not talking about the provincial government-- I'm talking about the contribution of citizens, the various non-profit organizations, municipalities and service clubs and church organizations that are helping to support our elderly in this way. Helping them to live in financial independence at rentals within the reach of most of the people who are accommodated in these institutions; adequate accommodation in which they can live out their life in dignity and respect, free from the fear of loneliness --and this is a very real need for the aged-- in accommodation that's designed to meet their particular physical limitations or handicaps which many of them have or many of them develop as time goes on. And they can do all of this in close proximity to their friends and their relatives where they have grown up and where they've made their contribution and want to continue to contribute towards the life of their community. This is all provided in an atmosphere that enables them to move freely within the institution, within the home, regardless of weather conditions outside, because most of them are designed with central corridor facilities, lounges and various recreation facilities. This is one of the ways in which we can help to contribute and which is most important to the elderly citizens of our province.

Then we have of course the various home services that can be provided and are being provided by many organizations in Manitoba today. We have the Homemaker Service, The Victorian Order of Nurses, various visiting services; meals on wheels, a new program that is receiving consideration and will likely be implemented during the present year. These of course are all designed to help frail or incapacitated elderly people to live independently in their own accommodation. Services can keep them independent and enable them to live comfortably and happily through many years of life which would otherwise not be available to them. And I think that we can make a great contribution too in terms of occupational and recreational activities, it's been said that idleness and lack of purposeful activity is one of the greatest enemies of the aged; and I believe this to be true. There are many today who are helping to provide this kind of service to the elderly in handicraft programs and recreation of various kinds, picnics and outings, the day centre activities that are being supported in the City of Winnipeg. I recall this year having heard of an experiment that was done among a group who were very heavy users of medical services in a particular country and they found that these people who had nothing to do, the aged were paying trips to their doctors at the rate of some 50 calls per year and after the implementation of an occupational therapy program these visits were cut down to five calls per year, which shows the value in terms of physical well being that programs of this kind can provide to elderly citizens. Then of course there are the programs of advice and counselling which are needed by the elderly in times of crisis and sickness where many of their relatives may have predeceased them and they feel alone in the world. Helping them to adjust also to physical and mental incapacity.

These are some of the things Madam Chairman, that I mentioned that can't be purchased through increased pensions, that can't be bought, programs that are being supported by many of the private agencies in Manitoba, the Age and Opportunity Bureau which I have already mentioned, home welfare services, the Victorian Order of Nurses, our Day Centres, our Service Clubs, the Family Bureau, various church organizations and health agencies, many of these services are being supported by government programs today.

Before I sit down I would like to mention briefly the contribution of the Member for Rhineland who referred to the excellent program they've got in the Province of British Columbia

(MR. CARROLL cont'd). and the Province of Alberta saying that they have the highest pensions in the Dominion of Canada. I would like to say that they had a flat grant system a few years ago that was the highest in Canada but apparently that system didn't work. Many of the senior citizens in those provinces did not have their needs met by that program and they scrapped it. They scrapped it to get a program that I think is among the best in Canada because they copied the program that is available and that we instituted a number of years ago in 1959 with the passing of the Social Allowances Act which was supported by every member of this House. I would also like to mention very briefly the reference to the means test which was made by the Leader of the New Democratic Party the other day, and I have much, I am not really very happy to say this, but we have so much to praise the Minister of Education for and his accomplishments as the Minister of Health and Welfare initially, as the Minister of Health later and now as the Minister of Education, and I hate to be critical of him, but I think his one outstanding failure in this House was that he was unable to convince my friend, the Leader of the New Democratic Party of the difference between the old means test and the needs test that's being applied under our Social Allowances Act. I would like to suggest to the Minister of Education that possibly he institute a correspondence course of some kind that might help to shed some light on this subject for the benefit of our friend from Transcona.

I think he tried in his remarks the other day to attribute to the Member for St. Matthews, attribute to him a suggestion that we should return to this means test system of applying pensions and I think if he would read the speech of my honourable friend more closely, as he has recommended to other members of the House in other debates, I would think that he would find that the Member for St. Matthews repeatedly stressed throughout his speech his concern for the needs of the elderly, his concern for the needs of people and that we should not have to wait to meet these needs, these needs should be met today. I think if he exemplifies anything it's a man whose life has been dedicated to meeting the needs of others, both in his profession as a spiritual leader and through his life in service to the public as a representative and as an outspoken advocate of helping those who are less fortunate than himself and particularly the aged as we learned in his speech here the other day. I would like to commend him for his outstanding example of service to members of the House and I would hope that others of us may follow his lead. We in Manitoba have pledged ourselves to meeting our responsibilities with respect to the elderly and I believe that the Government of Canada has an obligation to determine its responsibilities and to do as the First Minister has suggested and as the Age and Opportunity Bureau have suggested, in the light of national need and priority.

MR. GRAY: Madam Chairman, by speaking, I close the debate. I wonder whether anyone else wishes to speak?

MR. ROBLIN: Is my honourable friend really closing the debate. Is he not, are we not still on the amendment?

MR. GRAY: Pardon?

MADAM SPEAKER: We are on the amendment.

MR. GRAY: Yes I know. Oh I am on the amendment. Thanks very much.

MADAM SPEAKER: Before the honourable member proceeds I would like to ask the cooperation of the House and the press gallery that if you wish or find need to speak to one another, please lower your voices. It is very difficult to hear the speaker and I think we should extend this courtesy to each and every member of the House, and I ask your co-operation in this. The Honourable the Member for Inkster.

MR. GRAY: Madam Speaker, I do not need to lower my voice because I have no voice --(interjection)-- It's a voice in the wilderness. At the outset I wish to say a word about the last speaker. I am not interested in the millions of dollars. I do not understand it. They are being wasted in Canada on something which is not essential, but being a Biblical student I wish I would go to school and get grade 12 rather than a Biblical student. It says that the saving of one life is the same as saving a nation, so your entire speech, the entire speech of the Honourable Minister who has just spoken means one thing, that the government says "No" and that settles it. So I have no intention of discussing it because I don't know figures and I don't understand figures and I don't think the figures should be taken in consideration. When I came into this House the budget was about \$20 million. Now it is about \$150 million --(Interjection) -- \$185 Million. It's necessary, each year I am supporting it, I am not objecting to it, I ask for more because it is in the interest of the people. That's my reply only to the last speaker and I hope he'll understand it.

(MR. GRAY, cont'd).....

I am more interested in the speech made by the Honourable Member of St. Matthews. First of all I want to thank him for his kind words to me when he discussed the Old Age Pension resolution registered under my name. I am also very happy that a minister of the gospel has expressed and endorsed the need --now underline this please-- the need of the old age pensioners, realizing that they cannot get along with the pension in view of the very high cost of living. I appreciate his statement and I think the last speaker should take it into consideration speaking for the government. They are now giving a pension which includes rent, food and necessary essentials but they emphasize that they wish only to give to those who are in need, and principally I may agree with him. I have no quarrel with this. But with his philosophy I and my party have always opposed the idea of a means test which would be necessary if we are to follow the reverend gentleman's suggestion. Unfortunately I have had many experiences with the so-called minister during the 12 hungry years of unemployment on relief which is known to all honourable members --it would take too long to describe it which I have no intention to do it. After all, irrespective of the financial situation and hardship of the individual he is still a human being and has a pride towards his family. He is in need of help through no fault of his. Should he be degraded as a human being and lose the respect, love and affection of his wife and children. Moreover it would be impossible for the administration to ascertain the true facts of the financial situation of the recipient. And finally I do not think it is a great loss to the state if pensions are granted to those who perhaps do not need it. In the first place I am quite certain that there are a large number of the pension age who do not apply for the old age pension if they do not need it. I have no statistics on this, but with my conversation with many people daily in my political and social and business life makes me to believe there are many that have not applied for the old age pension when they were eligible. Secondly, those receiving old age pensions who do not need it, their livelihood pays back a large sum in income tax so we are getting back their money. Thirdly, many recipients are using the money for charity so I think that it is not a serious problem and at the same time we can maintain the honour and dignity of those who require this pension to keep their body and soul together and have some security.

The honourable gentleman has mentioned figures in the millions. In my opinion it is only figures. I still remember when, as I said, that our budget was \$20 million. Now whether the increase of \$25 could be given them now or during the coming three years or the year of the Centennial is immaterial to me, although I would prefer giving them now. The main point for us to recognize that the builders of Canada --and I underline this-- the builders of our institutions from the beginning of the twentieth century under hard economic stress -- I can assure you that the future generations will not complain as they are now benefiting of the many good things we have prepared for them. I say Madam Chairman that the millions of dollars of figures only scares the people and it scares those who haven't got the millions. It is maybe scaring them but it is not the solution. There's all kinds of money in this world and all kinds of money in Canada. Canada is being billed as a democratic free country for the purpose of giving each and everyone an opportunity to live as a human being. That's the point that we have to consider and not what it'll cost today or tomorrow. What are we asking in this resolution? We are asking is, we are celebrating the 1967 our centennial year. It's a very big affair. It will be bigger than a hundred years from now, which our generations may celebrate. Why not --and we are building beautiful buildings, we are building art buildings and so on, we are spending millions of dollars for this. What are those people at the beginning of the 20th century who slaved and sacrificed their lives for ten and fifteen cents an hour, what are we giving them? What are we giving them? The art galleries? That's for our future generation. We've got to give them something for them to know and their children to remember and the grandchildren to remember when they celebrate a hundred years from now, to know who is responsible for that glorious, free, democratic country like Canada. I love it. I love Canada; but at the same time when people dug sewers and built railroads and built the same building for fifteen cents an hour wages where we are sitting now, what are they getting? What monument are they building for them? The only thing I suggest is, they are building for them a monument to give them for the rest of their few years, and..... show they don't live long after they get their pension, but during that time, let them have their meals, let them have their food, let them have their room, let them have their smoke, let them have a dime to go to a show. That's what we have to establish. This is our monument for the thousands of people who are in this position, and when the Minister comes up and calculates all this thing in the hundreds of

(MR. GRAY cont'd).....millions, I don't pay any attention to it. It's only money; it's only figures ; it's only millions; but it's not helping human lives.

MADAM SPEAKER: May I also ask the co-operation of the House in another matter. I hesitated to stop the honourable gentleman when he was reading his speech. I would appeal to all members of the House on all sides that you deliver your speech without reading it. I know it's hard to say just who is reading and who is not, but I request this of all members, and I must serve notice on the honourable gentleman that in future he must not read his speech. He's quite capable of giving us a splendid address. Are you ready for the question?

MR. S. PETERS (Elmwood) Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Seven Oaks, that the debate be adjourned.

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

..... Continued on next page

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition, The Honourable the Member for Souris-Lansdowne.

MR. M. E. McKELLAR (Souris-Lansdowne): Madam Speaker, I will take your suggestion to heart and try to deliver a speech in the best way that I know how and in the shortest time that I know how too.

We have a very interesting resolution here, one dealing with something that we have no control over whatever, something that we are asking the Canadian Government to take action on, and I find it very interesting, after going through two federal elections and a promise which was made by the Liberal government asking for \$2.00 wheat. As we all know, the farmers of western Canada did not take this promise very seriously. They rejected it entirely and not one seat in western Canada went to the Federal Government in the rural areas. So this resolution in the minds of the farmers is not accepted at all.

I looked at the resolution and in reading the last paragraph -- I would like to read this to the members of the House here: "And be it further resolved in order to protect the grain producer, and thereby stabilize the Canadian economy and world food supplies, that the Government of Canada, in a manner consistent with achievement of international wheat price stability, establish a two price system for wheat and a guaranteed minimum of not less than \$2.00 per bushel for No. 1 Northern Wheat, basis Fort William."

Well that was one principle, but when you read the speech of the Leader of the Opposition you find an entirely different principle, and I'm going to read this principle to you. "We believe that there can be instituted in the system, which will not interfere with the independence of the Canadian Wheat Board, which will not lessen their desire to sell, both factors with which we agree. But we can, through a system of subsidy on a certain basic delivery which would give the small farmer an opportunity at the time when he needs it in most in the fall of a higher price and give him the stability that is required. We think this can be done without interfering with the Canadian Wheat Board." Then he went on further to say, "What we are suggesting is a basic minimum for a certain delivery, beyond that then you take your chances in the market." Well here is a different principle entirely than the one in which he is suggesting a two price system -- an entirely different principle than his resolution.

Madam Speaker, most of us know the two price system has no place in our present economy, for all it does is raise the price of bread to the people of Canada. I figured out here this afternoon, after asking some people the price of bread -- I'm one who goes to the stores and never asks the price of anything. I pay for it and go home with my supplies, but many people are conscious of the price of everything and know the price better than I do. Some people suggested the price could be around 20 cents or 23 cents, so I figured up if you're going to subsidize a hundred million bushels, which is our local consumption, to raise \$40 million which would amount to about \$200 a farmer, you would have to raise the price of bread up to 28 cents. I was asking myself then what would the poor people, as the NDP people call them, the poor people of Canada think about this. Well I can imagine what their thoughts would be. They would reject this entirely and the farmers would be caught in the same position as they are before.

So I think that we have to look at these two principles. Do we accept the principle of \$2.00 wheat or do we accept the principle of two prices, one for our export price and one for our local consumption. I reject both of those principles entirely as a farmer. I think they will do no good for the farmers of western Canada, and I think they will entirely take away the values that we have received from the Canadian Wheat Board over the years, because they have looked after our interests I think most effectively.

I think that what we need, if we're going to assist the farmers in some way, is to assist them through other programs such as the ones that our Conservative government during the years 1957 to 1962 brought in: crop insurance, better agricultural credit system, and another program I think which has not been endorsed or brought out to the people of Canada enough, the program that did more good for the farmers of western Canada than anything I think that ever was brought in, was the devaluation of the dollar. I think more pats on the back should be made to the Diefenbaker government because of this policy of devaluating the dollar because what it meant, it meant an increase of about 16 cents to every bushel of wheat that we sold, and I think it also meant the possibilities of selling our wheat in the foreign markets which we were not able to do during the years of 1953 to 1957.

I want to go back further and I think most of us -- our memories are short at times but I myself do have, well I shouldn't say I'm old, I can remember back during the thirties when we had poor crops and everything went wrong from dry weather to rust, to drought, to grasshoppers,

(MR. McKELLAR cont'd) and everything else that was possible happened in the thirties, but we survived. I should say our parents survived and we survived along with them.

And then along came the forties and the start of the war. Our prices picked up, and then from the period from 1946 to 1953 I think they were the best conditions that we farmers ever existed under. Our prices were excellent, our costs of machinery and our expenses were I think as reasonable as could be expected. We all had money in our pockets during those years.

And then along came 1952, and I think most of us can remember quite vividly the International Wheat Agreements were being debated, I think in Washington at that time, and then there seemed to be a disagreement of five cents between Great Britain and Canada at that time, and what happened was that the International Wheat Agreement was dropped for a period of years over that five cents. What happened then at that time, our wheat prices dropped by 25 cents a bushel and most of us also can remember our six bushel quotas which also hurt us immensely over those years. We started to go on the downhill period during those years because of short sales and poor wheat prices, and only after about 1958 to 1959 did our prices start to improve and our sales also.

And what happened at that time was that the export credits were brought into existence. Our export credit sales to China I think was the first start around 1960, which was criticized severely by every party I think except the NDP who are very favourable to any sales to Communist countries, and I think the breakthrough in our world market was that export sale to China which was a large sale and one which we as farmers can be very thankful of. The United States at that time disagreed most severely with the Canadian Government but they too have since changed their thoughts on this idea and they are now selling to Communist countries.

We farmers I think also from then on, 1962 on, were very pleased over the sales to Russia which were I think in 1962 or 1963. They in turn unloaded our granaries and we were very pleased about the Canadian Wheat Board and the Federal Government being able to make those sales. I'd like to mention too that we hope these sales will continue, because if we're not able to sell our wheat, no matter what the price of wheat is, whether it's \$2.00 or \$3.00, it means very little to the farmers of western Canada. We have to sell our grain in order to be able to survive under the present conditions. So I would think that selling of the wheat is just as important or more important than the actual price which we receive.

Now I'd like to quote the Searle Grain Company statement that come out here just the other day, March 10th, and I would like to state to you, as many people here in the Legislature are very uninformed as to what actually the farmer obtains and the prices over the various years, and I'll just quote a few years to illustrate what the prices were: 1945-46, the price of wheat at Fort William was \$1.83; and then you go down to 1952-53, it was \$1.81. Those were excellent years as I mentioned before. Then you drop to 1953 as I illustrated -- the break in the International Wheat Agreement which reduced our prices considerably -- 1953-54, it was \$1.56, a drop of 25 cents a bushel; and then we go back to 1957-58, \$1.62; and then on to 1959-60, \$1.59; Then 1960-61 was \$1.79; and then the year of the devaluation of the dollar, which I considered before in my statement, the wheat price went up to \$1.91 which was a 12 cent increase at that time. And then this year -- and I along with the Leader of the Opposition must say that we are very pleased with our final payments this year which I haven't received so far but I imagine it will be in the mail at home and I'm looking forward to this week -- and to receiving -- there's 1963-64, \$1.96. Well I think we can all be thankful that we're getting those prices, but also we have to consider the drop in the prices that have taken place in the last two months on the export market, and we won't be as fortunate next year in our final payment.

Now I want to bring you to the price index of commodities and services used by farmers and to also illustrate what that means to us in the price that we receive for our products. In 1946 -- comparing 1935-39 as a dollar value -- the price for 1946 for the commodities and services that we pay for, \$1.43; and then I want to mention the price in 1964, which is \$2.76. Now these figures just mean that for every dollar that we get for our grain today we are only actually -- it'll only pay for half as much as we were getting before in 1946, which is a period of nineteen years. So this is the squeeze that we are caught in in the west, and what it means is that each farmer has to buy more land; he has to expand; he has to produce his grain and his livestock cheaper; and also try to cut down on the costs in every manner that he can.

So I visualize that if we are not able to export our grain and get a fair price for our grain that we're going to have to sharpen our pencils as they say in the industry and try to accomplish something in that manner. I don't think that having \$2.00 wheat is going to do anything at all, because what it will do, it will take our Canadian Wheat Board and reduce it to a

(MR. McKELLAR cont'd) government agency from a Crown corporation which now exists, and they will I think be less effective to the farmers of western Canada than they are at the present time.

I think there's an article in the Searle Grain Company report here and I'm going to read this and put it on record, because I think it also illustrates most of the views of the farmers of western Canada very effectively. I'm surprised that the Leader of the Opposition -- I think he may be had his resolution tabled too soon, because I think that since he tabled his resolution some of the members of the Federal Government have come out against his thinking very solidly, especially the Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Hays, and Mr. Sharp, and I think he would have been wise to have had a phone call in to them previous to putting in his resolution before this Legislature.

But I'm going to read this statement. I know it's a little long and I know there's many other more important things than wheat, but as far as I am concerned it's the most important thing in my livelihood and I'm going to let you suffer with it for about five minutes longer. "While there may be general appreciation of the natural desire of wheat producers to maintain a reasonable level of income in the face of recent price declines and the continuing pressure of rising costs, in all honesty we must agree with the Minister of Trade and Commerce that the proposed pricing and subsidy measures do not provide the answers. The easiest course politically would have been for the government to bow to the widespread demands of western Canada even though it might have been against their better judgment to do so. The fact that they did not accede to the demand for a two-price system in the subsidy of wheat exports reflects a sense of responsibility that is commendable.

"It took courage for the Minister of Agriculture to admit the adoption of a two-price system into the Liberal Party platform in 1963 was a mistake, and to state that in his opinion such a policy would be economically unsound in the long run. It took courage for the Minister of Trade and Commerce, Mr. Sharp, to say, 'Let us move forward, not backward. Let us not imitate the mistake of our competitors, the USA, which they profoundly wished that they had been able to avoid. We do not intend to adopt any policies that will interfere with efficient operation of this producers' marketing agency, the Canadian Wheat Board, or that will reduce the Board's incentive to go after markets on behalf of the producers.'

"These decisions were probably not very well received in wheat farming communities across the west, but it may well be that in the future many including the wheat farmers themselves will come to the view the government's stand in the spring of 1965 as a wise one. In other words, this is not a popular decision but it could save a lot of trouble later on.

"So much is involved in the whole question that it is possible to mention only a few of the points raised by the Minister of Trade and Commerce and others. These are that a combination of a \$2.00 minimum price and the subsidization of wheat exports would seriously affect the operations of the Canadian Wheat Board which would inevitably be converted from the producers' marketing agency it now is to a straight government agency. Gone would be the incentive to sell as much wheat as possible with the best possible prices, and the efforts that are now being made to build up markets would be seriously weakened.

"In the words of Mr. Sharp, there would be a running battle between the producers and the taxpayers which the producers would not always win, that the proposed pricing and subsidy measures would be prejudicial to international trade regulations and international pricing policies. The recent extension of the International Wheat Agreement, mainly on the insistence of the USA, was for one period only." -- And I'd like to bring that to the attention of the members here that in 1966 the International Wheat Agreement ends. Our only hope is that they can extend it for a long period because it is the livelihood of the western grain farmers.

"For many years the United States along with Canada has exerted a powerful influence in stabilizing international wheat prices. Should the United States decide to go her own way at the end of the present International Wheat Agreement extension, and it might not take very much to influence her in one direction or the other, she would be free to price her wheat in any manner she saw fit. The adoption of the two price system in Canada is felt will only serve to encourage the US to operate unilaterally in the world market. That for some time Canada has complained bitterly about the effects of the US export subsidy system, the others in the same approach that is now being advocated here," -- and this is what the resolution states here -- "The payment of substantial subsidies to farmers in the US has not solved any problems there, and on the contrary it has raised many new ones.

"Moreover, the United States is now very seriously questioning the heavy cost of her

(MR. McKELLAR cont'd) . . . own price support and export subsidy program. How, it is asked, can Canada ever expect to follow suit and bring in the wide wheat acreage and production controls with all the tenant regulations and complications which they imply. This is a time when USA seems to be working in the direction of removing restrictions and controls and of freeing markets of government participation. "

I would like to say there that in the last year the votes of the farmers in the United States rejected entirely acreage and price controls, and at Minot, North Dakota, when I was down there in November, the price of their wheat was exactly \$1.45 a bushel at that time and hasn't changed since.

"There are so many aspects of the whole question perhaps enough has been said to point up some of the real dangers inherent to the two price subsidy assistance.

"So far Canada has managed to keep out of parity price controls, two price systems, subsidies and all that goes with this very doubtful package. In doing so she has maintained the freedom of her farmers to plant what they want and to market freely, at the same time with one price at the most for all to see and without all the encumbrances which accompany a system of controls. She has gained the confidence of her customers abroad, and has managed to attract considerable export business in all parts of the world. It would be a pity indeed if she were to so change her mode of operation that some of the advantages she now enjoys would be in jeopardy.

"In closing, it is pointed out that the current price of wheat following the recent drop is at or close to the level at which the large Soviet sale was made in the fall of 1963. There is evidence too that prices would stabilize near present levels. With this in mind, the effect of the recent price cuts would not be felt until the 1964-65 final payment is made in the spring of 1966. It is scarcely surprising that the government is not in a hurry at the moment to change its present marketing or pricing policies. There is no doubt however that they will be watching the situation closely. What producers want is some assurance that their returns will not be permitted to fall below reasonable levels. Whether the point is not yet reached is not within our province to judge. This is something that will have to be determined by the government of the day in consultation with the wheat producers, but whatever happens it is now clear that the \$2.00 wheat two price wheat subsidy formula will have no place in the minds of our present leaders. If therefore the income of western prairie farmers is to be safeguarded some other more constructive and effective means of dealing with the situation will have to be found. "That is the end of the editorial and I endorse this editorial entirely.

Well, Madam Speaker, I think in closing that I think we have to be more positive in our approach to this type of thing. I think before we ask Ottawa to do something we have to look over this whole situation over the years, over the last 20 years as I mentioned, and come up with something very constructive without destroying the whole operation of the Canadian Wheat Board. I think we have to look at this for a long long while. I for one would be in favour of setting up a committee, an agricultural committee to go into this whole matter entirely, and maybe we could come up with more effective policies than this one that has been endorsed in this resolution. I ask the members to reject this resolution and stand up and be counted. I know we have eleven farmers on our side here and I think that most of them that I have talked to are not in favour of this resolution, so I ask the urban members to do so too. Thank you very much, Madam Speaker.

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q. C. (St. John's): Madam Speaker, would the honourable question permit a -- would the honourable member permit a question? I might say there is some doubt as to whether I was not right the first time. The reason I expressed myself so inappropriately is that I think, I hope I misunderstood him, but I wonder if he would clarify or enlarge on a statement which I think I heard him make to the effect that the NDP party or the NDP members are always or are very grateful for the sale of wheat to Communist countries. If he said that, would he care to explain what he meant?

MR. McKELLAR: What I meant, Madam Speaker, is that the NDP party at the time that this change in the policy was at Ottawa were very favourable to this new policy. I think the records also show at that time the Liberal Party were very critical of this policy but since then they have been very favourable to this policy. Is that the answer or am I getting to the point?

MR. CHERNIACK: Well I believe you,

MR. McKELLAR: Well I was dealing in wheat only. I wasn't dealing with relations between the NDP party and the Communist countries. I was dealing with the wheat policy to Communist countries.

MR. CHERNIACK: I wondered only about the use of the word "grateful". I gather now it should have been favourable.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. ALBERT VIELFAURE (La Verendrye): I beg to move -- oh, pardon me. I wish to adjourn the debate, but if the gentleman wants to speak, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Burrows, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for St. George, and the proposed amendment of the Honourable the Member for St. Vital and the proposed amendment to the amendment by the Honourable the Member for Gladstone. I have considered this amendment of the honourable member and he may proceed.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Madam Speaker, I spoke and at the end of my speech I moved the amendment there. Now I don't think I can speak again because I moved it and I don't think the House would like me to speak again for a little while, but anyone else . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Is there anyone wishing to speak on the debate?

MR. MARK G. SMERCHANSKI (Burrows): Madam Speaker, I would like to voice my disapproval in reference to the fuel tax and I feel that I would want to say something in favour of the north. I believe that the fuel tax in the northern part of Manitoba becomes a double burden simply because it is more isolated and the cold weather lasts for two to three months longer than it does in the south. We also hear much about the undeveloped and the unlimited resources of our north country. At times this is referred to the mineral possibilities of our north.

Madam Speaker, there is only approximately 18 percent of the area of our northern part of Manitoba that can or will be developed as a possible mineral occurrence in this province. Northern development is a very easy thing to say, but when considered from the practical standpoint and when undertaken is a fantastic and a colossal undertaking.

The tax on the fuel oil may be a small amount, but when you consider a diamond drilling operation on one of our lakes in the north, when you consider that people have to live in tents -- and by the way, Madam Speaker, living in tents is a very comfortable way of living -- and when they are carrying out this exploratory work every camp is equipped with fuel oil and those fuel oil stoves operate for 24 hours every day. You also have your accommodations around the drill shack, the pumping stations, and I would venture to say that on an average small type of exploration this runs into something between four to five thousand gallons of fuel oil a month.

Now, Madam Speaker, here again if the fuel tax that has been imposed by this government is such a small insignificant paltry amount, then I say if an error has been made let's remove it. I feel that the people in northern Manitoba have got sufficient difficulties to overcome by virtue of the climate and their location, that the least we could do is make their every day existence a bit lighter in terms of financial responsibility.

To add to the difficulties of our pioneers or settlers of the north -- and, Madam Speaker, I say advisedly pioneers because it is a hard difficult but a very invigorating and healthy type of life -- all your freight, all your commodities, and I dare say 90 percent of those things that are required for the use in the every day life of a family is brought in by tractor freight in the winter time, and here again the imposed tax on the fuel that is used by these tractors has a direct repercussion and a direct bearing on the increase in the movement of this freight and thereby an indirect increase in the cost of living because of the indirect increase in the cost of supplies to the northern residents. I think that the average northern resident is less able and less prepared to pay the additional tax than possibly the poorest family living in what is known as the southern part of Manitoba.

In the north you have to use the snowmobile as a method of transportation. This has now become a must. Originally they had dogs, and when I look across the House I would only think that either the Honourable Member of Rupertsland, and I am not so sure about the Honourable Member from Churchill, whether they have ever mushed dogs or not. I, Madam Speaker, mushed dogs for quite a time and I recommend the travel of snowmobiles as being a far more pleasant method of travelling in the north.

Here again you have an additional tax to pay because being a resident of the north you have to pay it, and I feel that this is an unfair way of adding on -- it is true they might be small and insignificant in the eyes of some -- but when you add that every move that a man in the north makes today is geared with heat and transportation, and the movement of his supplies for his every day use is indirectly involved with ground transportation.

(MR. SMERCHANSKI cont'd)

It is my opinion, Madam Speaker, that this government is being unfair to the people living in the north. I would like to see this government, or any government, give serious consideration to encourage people to live in the north, because truly they are the pioneers of an area that the average citizen of Manitoba does not care to live in.

I would suggest, Madam Speaker, that this government seems to have no reservation about placing certain restrictions on the citizens of Manitoba, and I think it may be fitting to have the government examine itself and see if they should not place some restrictions on themselves once in a while. Because why should -- why should a fuel tax and a transportation tax in terms of tax on fuel be imposed on those people who are doing much for the Province of Manitoba. If you undertake a project in the north, whether it is in connection with lumbering or mining or exploration or fishing, Madam Speaker, and I speak this from experience, it takes twice to three times the effort to accomplish the same amount of work that it does in the southern part of Manitoba.

I reinstate that the fuel oil as a source of heat and transportation is an absolute necessity to the people of the north. Tractor trains, which have an indirect bearing on the additional cost of living. I know it is a small amount. If it is a small amount let us remove it. Let us make some imaginary line north of the 53rd or north of the Pre-Cambrian shield, because, Madam Speaker, these pioneers and settlers are there to further the development of our north country, and if they were to move out of that area, it would be a difficult area to try and develop, so these people are contributing something to the Province of Manitoba. Need we penalize them more with these unnecessary taxes? I think that if you add it up in terms of dollars and cents what you will get in total taxes from the residents and pioneers living in northern Manitoba, we would be all surprised of the relatively small amount compared to what we are trying to collect in the way of total taxes, and we would be well advised that if we have made an error this should be revoked.

MR. GORDON W. BEARD (Churchill): Madam Speaker, there has been several references on this resolution, particularly to the area of Churchill, and I feel at this time that I should arise to defend the position I have taken on this particular taxation field.

At this time I would like to thank the member for Burrows for his appeal. I think it was a good one, well thought out, and I believe there is merit to it, in that thought in the way that he has presented the problem as he sees it, and he is very knowledgeable about affairs in the north. But, Madam Speaker, I would ask that you consider it in another form. I do feel that there are many things that we must come to you for from time to time, recognition in different fields, and I do feel that in this particular field of taxation that we should accept -- we should accept this taxation, because how can we come to you from time to time unless we do accept and shoulder a responsibility that is the same as the rest of Manitoba percentage-wise.

I do agree that when this program was first introduced that I did have reservations as to how it could be accepted in northern Manitoba, and, Madam Speaker, on doing a little research -- and as the member of the NDP party this afternoon, the leader suggested, I did my homework -- and I did find that I could come up with support for this type of tax because it was a transfer -- it was a transfer tax that was transferring the burden in the taxation field from a few to all of us individually, and I believe this is enabling it to become a more equitable tax.

I would find that the mover of the resolution did state that nothing is sure in this province except death and taxes -- nothing is sure in this province except death and taxes. I can recall, Madam Speaker, that before my father passed away, he at many times had spoken of death and taxes -- death and taxes -- and they seem to be two pretty cruel things. None of us are immortal so we must face the fact that we will die and we'll probably die paying taxes. But Madam Speaker, when the Honourable Member for St. George links the name of the First Minister with this, then I feel that he is recognizing the fact that Duff Roblin is going to remain the First Minister of this province for many years to come, even as long as we'll have taxes, and, Madam Speaker, if this is the case, then I'll agree with him.

But, Madam Speaker, the member's speech refers to our tax as a carelessly imposed tax, as a cruel tax, as a vicious tax, as an unfair tax, as one that strikes at the little man, and a tax that hits some residents harder than others. Madam Speaker, I suppose at this time I would again refer as others have to the fact that there are many people in the north who haven't had the opportunity yet to use fuel other than wood, and as the Honourable Member for Burrows has mentioned -- indicated rather -- that this will probably be a problem we'll have to

(MR. BEARD cont'd) live with for many many years to come. The fact that many of the residents are out in hard-to-reach areas, many hundreds of miles away from the railroad centre, then it must remain that in all probability this problem will not be overcome for many years unless they seek to move into more populated areas or there are extensions of growth in railroads to these centres. So, Madam Speaker, there are thousands -- there are thousands of people in northern Manitoba who will be using taxless fuel for some time to come. This is an unfortunate matter but this is the case.

In reviewing the taxable fuel consumption with the dealers in Thompson, we did find that the consumption is somewhere in the vicinity of 1,000 to 1,200 gallons a year. This is the average consumption and, Madam Speaker, to extend it we must find that this cruel sum would come to approximately 25 cents a week or three and a half cents a day. I don't believe, Madam Speaker, that you could call this a carelessly imposed tax or a cruel tax, or a vicious tax. I do not believe it's an unfair tax, nor is it a tax that strikes at the little man, nor is it one that hits some people more than it does others.

Madam Speaker, I believe that this is a tax that allows it to be imposed on people in the amount that they use, so that the small house owner, that the possibilities of a pensioner having a small house would use less tax, less fuel than those who have larger taxes, those who are younger people and in all probability in a higher wage bracket, and of course those commercial users who usually shoulder the burden on a tax basis, so they must be taxed according to their consumption.

Madam, the tax that we're speaking of allows government to transfer a tax which has grown -- a tax that has grown to be unfair and to be cruel and to be a vicious tax, a tax that was unfair to the little man and struck some harder than others. This was the tax that we had on our property, and the property owners, the house owners were a group that had to accept the burden of education tax, and in transferring this tax we are allowing all people in Manitoba to help shoulder the burden of education which benefits all.

Now, Madam Speaker, I spoke before on the fact that I felt that we in the north were ready and willing to shoulder our fair share of the tax if we could gain recognition from government on the demands and the desires of our people, and I think in the Speech from the Throne this year that we did gain a measure of this recognition.

We had tax dollars allocated for the creating of what I feel is a new exciting school program for all of northern Manitoba that should remain a tribute to the Manitoba Government and this Assembly for many years to come. I find there are tax dollars that are allowing the introduction of electricity to many of our communities in northern Manitoba which will certainly assist in our development. I find that there are tax dollars being made available for new exploration plans to develop our natural resources. And, Madam Speaker, there are tax dollars that have been and are being allocated for the expansion of our highway programs in northern Manitoba. I think that we all recognize the fact that this year in completing the highway to Thompson ahead of time is one of the greatest recognitions in all probability that my own town of Thompson will receive for some time. These are progressive plans of government that I am sure will rest well with the people of northern Manitoba.

Madam Speaker, I would further ask that the opposition come out and show our people the full story, not just half a story. I doubt really, Madam Speaker, if this tax is costing the individual much more than what government is being forced to spend on printing what we say about it. This tax was intended to transfer the burden from the landowner as a singular group and share it with the people of Manitoba as a whole. Surely we must recognize that the amount of 25 cents per week cannot be a cruel, vicious or careless tax, or as discriminating against the little man. I don't think further, Madam Speaker, it is really the small wage earner that is protesting. I think it's the small politician and I think that there should be a tax on hay that these politicians are trying to make out of this tax.

Madam Speaker, it reminds me of the boy that cried "Wolf Wolf" once too often. Some members of the Opposition have tried to start witch hunts to cover the spending of government taxation -- or government spendings rather. They have tried to look into now the taxation field, and I am sure that if they don't move over to constructive criticism and progressive planning that many of our people are not going to rally to the call of "Wolf Wolf" when they find that there is really no reason.

So, Madam Speaker, at this time I would like to support this tax on the basis that it is allowing us to transfer the burden from a few, so that all of us can do it in a more equitable manner where none should have to suffer too much. Thank you.

MR. SMERCHANSKI: Madam Speaker, would the honourable member permit a question?

MR. BEARD: Yes.

MR. SMERCHANSKI: Did I understand him to say that there were approximately 1200 gallons of heating fuel oil going into the north? Is this the figure that the honourable member mentioned?

MR. BEARD: No, Madam Speaker, I said the consumption -- the average consumption per householder in Thompson was approximately 1000 to 1200 gallons per season.

MR. SMERCHANSKI: How does the honourable member account for three and a half cents in the increase of fuel tax? Out at Riverton, Sigurdsons Transfer moves over 600 drums of heating fuel oil into the north. It doesn't seem to -- where does my honourable friend get the three and a half cents?

MR. BEARD: This, Madam Speaker, was the amount of tax, not the cost of fuel oil, the cost of tax that the individual had to shoulder.

MR. SMERCHANSKI: Per day?

MR. BEARD: Per day.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. GUTTORMSON: Madam Speaker, I have listened with a great interest in the remarks of the member for Churchill. I am even more surprised that a man who represents that area could make the speech that he did endorsing the heat tax which is so discriminatory to the people which he represents. -- (Interjection) -- I certainly heard what he said. He said he endorsed the heat tax, and it certainly is discriminatory because the people in his riding pay considerably more on the heat tax than those do in southern Manitoba. Now how he can endorse a tax which hurts his people more than other people in the province, I'll never understand.

He said the people in his area only pay about \$12 a year on the heat tax. I'd like to remind him that some of the people up in his area have contacted me in connection with this tax and have advised me that some people pay as much as \$35 a year in taxes under this new heat tax.

He says thousands of people in his area don't burn fuel oil and are not affected by the tax. I am sure there are a great number of people in the Churchill area which aren't affected by this tax, but I would like to remind him that there are thousands that are affected. What about the people in Thompson, Churchill, and other mining centres who are affected by this tax and are paying more than they should be. The impact of this tax is greater than it is on those people in southern Manitoba because the temperature is much colder up there.

For him to suggest that this isn't an imposition on the small man is just ridiculous. Why did the Minister of Welfare change the government policy on welfare if it wasn't having an effect on the person with the small income? He brought in the change making it effective April 1st. Suggesting he didn't think it was having a detrimental effect on the person of small income, why did he make this change? I'll suggest to the member for Churchill that although the government will vote down this resolution, that before the next session comes about the heat tax will be abolished, because although they are afraid to admit it to us here in the House, I am predicting here and now that the heat tax will be abolished before the next session comes around. And for him to suggest that everybody is in favour of this is just ridiculous. -- (Interjection) -- Pardon?

HON. ROBERT G. SMELLIE, Q. C. (Minister of Municipal Affairs) (Birtle-Russell): Put your money on the table.

MR. GUTTORMSON: You bet I will. To accuse the members of the Opposition for bringing this matter up is being small, he is entitled to do that, he can do that if he wishes, but I would like to remind him that there are more people in Manitoba agree with the stand taken on this side of the House than that taken by him and his party on this issue. As I said, I would like to see the member for Churchill walk down the streets of Thompson and tell the people there that he approves of the heat tax and that it won't bother them. This heat tax, even in the greater Winnipeg area, is the equivalent of a mill rise of two mills on the home with a \$5,000 assessment, and yet he says that this hasn't any impact on the small homeowner.

He says they are trying to transfer the burden of the small property owner. The government says they are going to pay approximately \$8 million of this in rebate and yet they are going to collect approximately \$25 million through the other taxes. Where is the other money going if you are transferring the load? This is just ridiculous. The people are not getting it. You are taking one dollar out of one pocket and giving them 50 cents in the other, and if this is relieving the taxpayer I fail to believe it and so do most people in Manitoba.

MR. BEARD: Did I hear you correctly when you said that the tax would cost the people of Thompson \$35 a year?

MR. GUTTORMSON: I said, and I have correspondence from people in his constituency who advised me that some people were hit as hard as \$35 a year by the tax.

MR. BEARD: The tax didn't raise the price of fuel oil in Thompson.

MR. GUTTORMSON: I didn't hear you. Would you repeat that please?

MR. BEARD: The tax did not raise the price of fuel in Thompson.

MR. GUTTORMSON: I am not concerned about the price of fuel, I am concerned with the tax.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. VIELFAURE: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Carillon, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Ethelbert-Plains. The Honourable the Member for Souris-Lansdowne.

MR. McKELLAR: 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 Member for Emerson.

MR. TANCHAK: Madam Speaker, I would like the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Lakeside and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party. The Honourable the Attorney-General.

MR. McLEAN: Madam Speaker, with your permission and the permission of the House, I would like to have this stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Logan. The Honourable the Member for Roblin.

MR. B. P. STRICKLAND (Hamiota): Madam Speaker, could we have this matter stand?

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Churchill. The Honourable the Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Madam Speaker, I ask the indulgence of the House to have the matter stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party. The Honourable the Member for St. Vital.

MR. GROVES: Madam Speaker, I would ask the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand. I did understand though that one other member wanted to speak, Madam Speaker, and I have no objection.

MADAM SPEAKER: Anybody wishing to speak? The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the Member for Morris. The Honourable the Member for Gladstone.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Which one is this? Madam Speaker, I have got two or three adjourned here. We are now -- we are clipping along pretty fast here. I beg the indulgence of the House to have this one stand, but I would welcome the speeches from all other members of the House between now and 5:30.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Seven Oaks. The Honourable the Member for Wellington.

MR. SEABORN: Madam Speaker, I doubt very much whether I could deal with this subject in the amount of time that we have at our disposal, and in view of the fact that tonight is government business I wonder if I can allow this matter to stand till a more convenient time.

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

MR. R. O. LISSAMAN (Brandon): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Pembina, that Whereas emphasis could be placed upon the value of Canadian Citizenship by a dignified and impressive ceremony upon the granting of citizenship papers, this would impress upon new citizens and all Canadians that Canadian Citizenship is a condition of value and pride; and whereas some of the judiciary make considerable effort to establish a proper ceremony when conferring citizenship, others place varying emphasis on the occasion; and whereas some patriotic organizations have recognized the importance of

(MR. LISSAMAN cont'd) . . . the occasion and have attempted to lend dignity and importance to the granting of citizenship, with some supplementary ceremony. Therefore be it resolved that this House urge the Government of Canada that it take steps to adopt a uniform appropriate ceremony to be used at the time of granting citizenship. Failing the adoption of a uniform policy for all of Canada; that the Canadian Government permit the Provinces to establish a ceremony for this purpose within their own boundaries.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. LISSAMAN: Madam Speaker, as members will recall, this resolution was introduced last year on the Order Paper and because of the lateness of the time was withdrawn with the agreement of the House. The resolution is really being sponsored jointly by myself and the member for Pembina because we feel that a proper ceremony uniformly used across Canada would be of great value to this country.

Now, Madam Speaker, so often when one, by requesting certain things to be done, implies criticism of that which is already in existence. I would like to make it amply clear that no criticism is intended of any ceremony or any group who have any connection with the granting of citizenship papers. On the contrary, I would like to compliment those who appear with Citizenship Court and the various judges who attach importance to this across the province, and to the various patriotic organizations who do lend their service, and their imagination to attempting to make the granting of citizenship an important thing both to the new Canadians and to Canadians.

Well then, one might almost ask why such a resolution? Well, Madam Speaker, I wonder if members, particularly urban members, realize that there are only about eight Citizenship Courts across Canada: Moncton, Montreal, Toronto, Hamilton, London, Winnipeg, Edmonton and Vancouver. Now beyond these large centres, in the relatively large centres of population, because of civic pride and citizenship pride there are ceremonies attached to the granting of citizenship papers, but when you get out into the rural parts of the country, then the ceremony depends more or less upon the inclination of the judge, or whoever has the duty of handing these citizenship papers on, and so as a result there is little uniformity and in some instances, it is sad to tell, very little ceremony attached to the granting of citizenship.

Now Canada of course is a relatively new nation, and particularly at this time I think it is important to emphasize to new Canadians and to existing Canadians the meaning of nationhood and the potential greatness of this country, and I say potential because probably Canada, being a young nation with not a large population, is not the great world influence that many of us would like to see her become, but we shall become a great nation with great world influence with the growth of population and the service of the citizenry to the nation.

We have recently adopted a new flag. While that flag may not be what you or I or some other members of this Legislature or various citizens of the province would have chosen, nevertheless I think we should not blind our eyes to the fact that thirty years from now, children who are unborn and who are young now will look upon this new flag with as great a reverence and respect I would propose as we do upon the Ensign and the Union Jack; and it is unfortunate that in times such as presently exist that we have this threat to Confederation.

At times I am inclined, having gone through the process, to relate this to a parallel of a couple getting along in the early years of marriage, and little things which appear to infringe upon the other's rights assume disproportionate emphasis and quarrels and differences result, but with goodwill on both sides and the eternal trying to understand one another, then contentment and happiness can result, and I have the feeling that this will be the story of our country when those who follow us look back maybe fifty or a hundred years from now.

The one thing I am attempted to regret is the suggestion of threat from one group or the other, and I think it is unfortunate that a province which certainly with some degree of voluntariness at least chose to live in -- what would you call it -- a withdrawal, a seclusion, a sort of a parochial type of existence, now rather than placing the blame where it should lie really, maybe upon themselves, tend to blame the other segment of Canada. This I think is maybe understandable with hotheadedness and an awakening to the potentials of the country and their rightful place in it, but I would remind members that early settlers in Manitoba, the various ethnical groups didn't have a very rosy time of it.

I remember men who came as apprentices to this country when I was a boy, telling me of signs of jobs: "No Englishmen need apply". We have heard and passed here in this House how the Icelanders didn't have an easy time of it, but I suppose this could be said of all racial groups when they come to live side by side with other groups; but they won their place in the

(MR. LISSAMAN cont'd) sun and I think we would all say more power to the French element of Canada if they would just simply get on with the job of winning their place in the sun with our understanding and blessing. I think this is the way the nation will come to greatness. I know, Madam Speaker -- you must forgive me this an aside from the actual matter under discussion but I can't help but draw some reference to it, with the forecast that I think in time, because times cures all, this will become a great nation. And so with this thought, I think that we should be placing emphasis upon the value of Canadian citizenship.

Now Canadian citizenship is rather a new thing, and I hope members will forgive me to refresh their memories as mine was refreshed in reading from a pamphlet put out by the Canadian Citizenship Branch, Department of Citizenship and Immigration, entitled "What It Means To Become A Canadian Citizen", and I will break in at a point which is relevant. "In 1881 a new Naturalization Act was passed, principally for the purpose of bringing Canadian legislation into line with the Imperial Naturalization Act of 1870, but until 1914 persons naturalized in Canada could not be legally recognized as British subjects in other parts of the Empire. This situation was corrected by the Naturalization Act of 1914. There continued to be confusion relating to national status in that Canadians, so-called, had no legal right to designate themselves as such. The Canadian Nationals Act in 1921 was passed to clarify this situation. This gave Canadians, either natural born or naturalized, the right to call themselves Canadian Nationals, thus distinguishing them from British subjects.

"There were now three acts on the statute book that dealt with the status of Canadians, so that anyone who wanted to understand his rights as a Canadian had to study not one act, but three, the Immigration Act, the Naturalization Act, and the Canadian Nationals Act. These three acts regulated the status of natural born and naturalized Canadian nationals until the Canadian Citizenship Act came into force January 1, 1947." Most of these acts then, certainly the last two, have occurred within the life of members in this Legislature.

We have now Canadian citizenship, and I think it is important not only to the new Canadian to have an emphasis placed upon his acquiring citizenship, an emphasis with dignity, respect for certainly the new citizen, and respect for the country to which he has become a citizen. As a friend of mine pointed out the other day, probably this means more than we Canadians -- already Canadians -- realize to the one newly acquiring citizenship, because this is, he pointed out to me, the realization of something that he wants badly and has worked for, and it's an accomplishment.

So, Madam Speaker, I hope that all members will agree with the resolution and vote in its favour. I would like, before taking my seat, to explain the reason for the last paragraph. And if -- this paragraph was written into this resolution -- if there can be no complete unanimity between Canadian provinces yet, which I hope and pray some day there will be, and if any province could see something that they might object to in a uniform ceremony, then this would at least give the other provinces wishing a dignified and uniform ceremony for citizenship, the right to acquire it at least within their boundaries.

MRS. CAROLYNE MORRISON (Pembina): Madam Speaker, I wish to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre, that the debate be adjourned.

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

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce) (Fort Rouge): In view of the hour, I wonder if you would care to declare it 5:30.

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