

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

8:00 o'clock, Monday, December 12, 1966

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for St. Vital for an Address to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor in answer to his Speech at the Opening of the Session; and the Proposed Motion of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition in amendment thereto; and the Proposed Motion of the Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party in further amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Speaker, I would like on the outset as is customary in this House to congratulate you, Sir, upon your election to the highest office within the gift of this Assembly. I must confess that I was a little worried a week ago today when it appeared that there was going to be in fact a contest and you had come all decorated for the occasion. But having listened to the mover when he was enumerating all of your qualifications I felt then and there that there was no doubt but that your election was assured, because the qualifications that he did list were three in number as I remember them that really carried some weight with the Assembly and the one was that because of your complete understanding for the Eskimos and the Indians and the sympathy that you had for them that he felt that you were qualified to deal with the members of this House -- and I didn't know whether he was referring to this side as the Indians and that side the cowboys or vice versa. But nevertheless sincerely, Mr. Speaker, I wish you well and congratulate you Sir, upon your election to this very high office.

I would like, as well, to thank the mover and the seconder of the Speech from the Throne. I think they did a very good job. I thought the mover was a little bit optimistic when he suggested that we should consider this whole matter of hours wasted here and he said for instance that if I spoke for an hour, that in fact meant 57 hours that were wasted. He didn't mention my name in particular but suggested that.

I will never forget, I guess, as long as I live, a statement that a fellow who isn't here tonight, the former Minister of Agriculture, the Honourable George Hutton getting up one night after I had asked him what his philosophy was in regard to the Family Farms and so on and so forth and said that if he would just get up and say that he endorsed everything that Gilson and Dr. Wood and a few of these fellows had said then we would know exactly where he stood and our honourable friend got up and said - as a matter of fact I found this today in some of my clippings - and Mr. Hutton got up and said "It's all right to talk about philosophy in principles in college but in here, in this House, we've got to forget about these things, in here it's for real and gee whiz -- I hope that someone will develop on the other side that will replace Mr. Hutton because he was, to say the least, a very colourful character.

Now I would like to congratulate too, Mr. Speaker, the - I think the 17 new members that are present here - I haven't counted them but something like 17 new ones. By the same token I suppose there are 17 that are not here, but I would like to congratulate the new ones, the new members of the Cabinet as well. I hope that pretty soon, though, Mr. Speaker, we will get a new seating plan listing the posts presently held by the Cabinet because I'm confused when I address a question before the Orders of the Day - because of the recent shuffle I'm confused as to whom I should direct a question to. So I hope that shortly we will have a new plan listing the names of the various Cabinet.

Now I would like to think, Mr. Speaker, that one of the reasons that I'm back here - I would like to think that one of the reasons that I'm back here, is because of the help that I had throughout the campaign from my honourable friends opposite and I should probably, when I'm handing out bouquets, thank them for assisting me in this regard because it was most helpful the things that were said, both by word and by advertising. I said on several occasions in speeches prior to the 23rd that my greatest allies this time around was my honourable friends opposite and I would, if elected, thank them most kindly for assisting me in this regard. Most of the people, I think, that are present here tonight will remember an ad that came out fairly early in the campaign -- and I know, Mr. Speaker, it doesn't do any good to rethrash a lot of old straw, but I'm just thanking my honourable friends opposite for the help they gave me and there's nothing wrong with that. But early in the campaign there was an ad that came out that suggested that if you didn't vote for the government you wouldn't get anything. You remember that. And surely to goodness my honourable friends opposite remember that one because it did result in them losing a few seats. I think it was first started by the former Minister of this House and the chap from Portage la Prairie by the name of John Aaran Christianson. I think he was the first fellow that brought the ad out and I suppose it took quite a bit of figuring out to come up with something like this. It was the one where it said "Figure it out for yourself

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd.) - governments build roads and governments build parks and they build vocational schools and it's tough to get these projects for Portage and -- it's tough to get them if you're sitting with the Opposition." That's what he said. So "Sit with Duff Roblin and share in Manitoba's growth. Elect John Christianson on June 23." It said "Read between the lines."

Well, I'll tell you, Mr. Speaker, a lot of people did read between the lines and that was what was so helpful to me and I want to thank my honourable friends for bringing that out. There's no question about it that it received the blessing and approval no doubt, of all the members opposite. I would think it did, and probably John Aaron wasn't allowed to use it until it first met with the approval of the people opposite.

Now, I thought, Mr. Speaker, that this whole business you know of collecting taxes from everybody and paying out the benefits or the spoils from the taxes to a limited few persons kind of ceased at the time of the Magna Carta. I thought that because you will recall the people of the day forced King John down and said that this had gone on long enough. But apparently it was resurrected again prior to June 23rd and they said now if you vote for the government you'll get so and so - if you don't vote for them you'll get absolutely nothing, not a blade of grass, nothing at all. Not a half a loaf, my honourable friend says.

But there is one thing that I do want to thank them for, too, Mr. Speaker, and you'll probably be surprised about this one, but throughout the campaign it was suggested about a week before the campaign, that if the Premier was elected, that he would call a special Session about September to deal with certain things and he listed them. In fact, he made a public announcement, the Premier did, three days before the election and it said "If re-elected, Roblin plans Special Fall Session". For the express purpose of what? My honourable friends should know because they decided they were going to have it. It was to deal with purple gas. I think that was the first deal and then -- no, in this order: "The Special Session would deal with medicare, farm gasoline tax and school tax rebates." That's what the special session was going to do.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my honourable friends opposite for not calling a special session. I want to thank them for that, even though they said they were going to have one in September - that's what the article says here. You know what I have said, Mr. Speaker, on so many occasions. I think this idea of having a special session, or having two sessions in one year, without legitimate excuse, is a complete waste of the taxpayers' money -- and you will recall last time where I said that even as valuable as I was to the House I didn't think I was worth \$200 a day because at the last special session we got \$1,800 for nine days. Surely you can't forget that one. That was about two years ago and the Speaker -- one of my colleagues said "What did the Speaker then get?" Twice as much as I got. Admitted the Speaker was worth twice as much, but that was \$3,600 for nine days, and that's pretty good wages when you consider that about 44 percent of the farmers according to a book that everyone has here, earns less than \$1,200 a year. We earn that much in six days; we earn that much in six days. And so I want to congratulate my honourable friends on deciding this time, even though they promised it, deciding against it, having second thoughts and deciding to do it the way you are doing it now. That's the way to do it, if you've got to have a session and then adjourn, and only pay us once, because there's a lot of members in this House that are getting far more than they are worth now. I think so. My honourable friend is trying to put me on the spot here. Another reason I'm sure that the public thought that there would be a special session -- in fact I'm sure that the public even at this early stage in our proceedings are a little bit concerned because no announcement has been forthcoming from my honourable friends opposite in respect to the sales tax because I think the people by and large rather expected that the Throne Speech would announce a sales tax -- probably they didn't want to spoil anybody's Yuletide activities by announcing it before Christmas. I still say that the people are looking forward, not with pleasure, but looking forward to a sales tax. You know, Mr. Speaker, I don't suppose that you were in attendance at a very very important meeting that was held in Neepawa about two or three weeks ago today - I don't believe that my honourable friend the Minister of Utilities was there although he generally attends most functions of this kind - but on Monday, November 21st there was a very historic meeting held in Neepawa. It was attended by no less than three members of the House of Commons, who I understand are getting about \$18,000 a year, but they felt that this meeting was so important that three or four of them left Ottawa and went to the one at Neepawa and there were no less than three or four members of the House there. My honourable friend, the Member for Souris, I think was there and spoke at

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd.) some length so they tell me, and my honourable friend from Virden, I believe that he made a very healthy contribution to that meeting. Another fellow that was there that made an announcement -- while the other fellows made a contribution of some weight, my honourable friend who doesn't happen to be in his seat at the moment and I wish that he was, because my guess is that he would be snaking his lead in the negative if he was here -- the Minister of Highways and conservation and big ditches and stuff, he was there. This whole paper is full of it and I'm not going to -- only make the announcement in the House that I think was made there by my honourable friend. Will I read what my honourable friend Earl McKellar said too? He was very concerned over this referendum that was coming up and he had some second thoughts, but Earl I'll let you tell that when you get up to speak because there seems to be some difference of opinion among my honourable friends opposite, but better let them tell their own story. But here is an interesting observation for my honourable friends opposite, no doubt you've heard this once because no doubt the Minister of Highways would come back and certainly announce to the caucus the announcement that he made up there at Neepawa. It says the sales tax came under scrutiny at the meeting and Mr. Weir explained that tax readjustments must be made because provincial municipal services are increasing more rapidly than federal services and new tax sources must be found. He suggested that a provincial sales tax could result in decreases in municipal taxes -- see he's preparing them for it -- and questioned further - that didn't satisfy the meeting - questioned further he replied that a sales tax would be dropped as soon as the provincial debt is paid off, just the same as it had been done in every other province.

So you see, Mr. Speaker, one of the reasons that the people are eagerly waiting to hear this announcement is this, either the sales tax is going to be extra heavy, probably about 100 percent, or the debt is a lot smaller than I thought it was, because he says well what in the world are you fellows worrying about anyway, we'll just put on a sales tax for a few days and as soon as the provincial debt is paid off, we'll drop it, exactly the same as they did in all the other provinces. Well, what provinces, I don't know, Mr. Speaker, but what provinces put it on for a few days and then dropped it? I don't remember what ones did that, but if my honourable friend was here he'd probably explain this better because surely he is reported correctly, because he was the only one that had nerve enough apparently -- when the subject of sales tax come up he was the only one that would get up and had nerve enough to explain the whole thing away to this famous Tory meeting, that's what they called it. And so, Mr. Speaker, I would be very eager to find out just exactly what he meant - by this very short, small tax and very short in duration, perhaps he would explain that to us.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I see that about half of my time is gone already and I haven't got too much into the Throne Speech yet. But I'll tell you what I intend to do this time. The Throne Speech -- and it has already been suggested by some of the newcomers to this House, it does provide every member of the House with the opportunity of saying what they would like for their own constituencies. Not only do some go into some length to describe their constituency, and I'm not going to do that; but I'll tell you what I will settle for; I was toying with the idea of asking my honourable friends to fulfill or explain the 78 or 79 promises that were made by the Premier prior to the election -- was it 78 or 79? Seventy-eight, 78 trombones, I believe that's right because I remember Peter Kuch's cartoon with his 78 trombones representing the 78 promises. I'll tell you what I'll do, I'll just settle for the 9 or 10 promises that they made in Gladstone constituency, reduce it from 78 to 9 because they made nine promises for Gladstone constituency, they made nine promises. -- (Interjection) -- My honourable friend said they only made three in St. Boniface.

Now this is the time for my honourable friends opposite to say that that ad that said "Vote for us or you get nothing," there was nothing to it after all, it wasn't our idea but some other fellows. Now if you want to redeem yourself and if you want to keep some of the promises, some of them, nine out of the 78, this is the time to do it, and I'm just going to remind my honourable friends what they promised they would do for Gladstone. This is what they promised they would do and in this order, in this order, and it's listing what their candidate will do, and you will remember what the -- my honourable friend's candidate was pictured far more frequently with the Premier than any other candidate opposite - than any other candidate opposite, which certainly suggests that my honourable friend had -- (Interjection) -- well he was good looking, there's no doubt about that -- (Interjection) -- both of them.

They tramped all around Gladstone and all around Neepawa and here's what they said they would do. They will -- there's no question about here's what we'll do if so and so is elected --

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd.) we will (1) . . . Obtain adequate medical and dental facilities for the area. Now, Mr. Speaker, that kind of rings a familiar ring with me. Do you know why? You will remember that at the last session of the Legislature, we spent about two days on Bill 100 and I did my darndest to get the government opposite to allow the people of Neepawa to proceed to build a clinic which we, the Chamber of Commerce, Neepawa Area Development Corporation, the businessmen and everybody else in the constituency felt that this was one way in which we might in our area encourage medical personnel, doctors, dentists, nurses and so on to come out to our area. But what did my honourable friends do? They turned it down flat. Now I want to make one exception here because I see my honourable friend the Member for Brandon looking me square in the eye and saying well I didn't, that's true, and thank you very kindly my friend, because my honourable friend from Brandon did vote with me and spoke in favour of it and so did the former Minister of Industry and Commerce, Mr. Steinkopf, he supported it. But with those two exceptions. -- (Interjection) -- Pardon.

MR. EVANS: He wasn't the former Minister of Industry and Commerce.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Oh he wasn't? Well that's what confuses me. -- (Interjection) -- Provincial Secretary I am informed. Well anyway he voted with me and I want to thank him for that. But here on, oh a month before the election after having turned it down flat, this Bill 100, now they say come out and they say, we are going to give it to you; we are going to establish a policy they say, that will assure that you people out there will have adequate medical and dental facilities. Now how are you going to do it? Because the day that Bill 100 was defeated in Committee in there, I wrote a letter to my honourable friend the Minister of Health -- and I have it right here, and my honourable friend remembers getting it. It was about a two page letter -- and I said in effect, well you hinted and the Premier hinted that he had other alternatives. He said listen Nels don't worry too much about the defeat of Bill 100, because we have other measures that we think will provide the facilities that you are after. Well I badgered my honourable friend the Minister of Health all through the election and about August I got a reply to it, and I haven't got the reply here -- and I forgive him for not answering me during an election because I suppose that when you are in the heat of an election -- but he had from April the 22nd to June 23rd or for a while there that he could have answered my letter, but now they're going to do it and I -- they've promised it. Surely they intend to keep this promise. This was number one on the list and I hope they will develop a policy that will not only assure medical and dental facilities to Gladstone but to all of the rural areas, because you know it is a fact -- I imagine probably, Mr. Speaker, you have some difficulty up in Swan River getting all the dentists and doctors and so on that you want. If you haven't you're the exception, because I believe -- I see my honourable friend the Minister of Education says it is not true of Swan River -- of Gimli, sorry. Well I want to ask him this, isn't it a fact that there are roughly 1,200 doctors that are licensed to practice in Manitoba; and isn't it a fact too that roughly 900 are resident in the Greater Winnipeg; and isn't it a fact about 50 percent of the people in the province live in Greater Winnipeg; so this means that 300 doctors are serving the rural areas, 900 resident in the city. My honourable friend the present Provincial Secretary and the former Minister of Industry and Commerce -- I think I have it right this time. . . .

MR. McLEAN: Not quite.

MR. SHOEMAKER: I'm not right yet eh? Well anyway the former Leader of the House, who is now fourth rung down the ladder I understand and according to the Trib, he will recall making a wonderful announcement in this House one day that twelve towns were under microscope, and that eventually a survey would be forthcoming, and the whole purpose of having these twelve towns under microscope was to see what was going wrong with some of the key areas in the province. Well just about, what? -- four or five months ago they tabled the surveys that were made in ten of the areas that were under microscope -- and really when the survey was boiled down -- and I have ten of them in the desk and I have no time to read them all tonight -- but, the question was asked -- and this is the one that really meant something. These questionnaires went out to -- well in the Neepawa area I think they were mailed out to something like 1,200 people of which 300 replied. They were amazed and delighted with the percentage that replied to the questionnaires. They told us that when they presented that, they said it was an excellent result from the survey. But the question that was asked was this: If you are not presently doing 100 percent of your shopping in Neepawa, as an example, what has prompted you to go outside of Neepawa to do your shopping? Now this same question was asked in the twelve towns that were under microscope. Do you know what the people said -- do you know what they said? -- my honourable friend, I see the Minister of Education there, he doesn't like

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd.) . . . me to mention this I suppose -- but here's what they said, in Neepawa: 68 percent said they had to go outside of Neepawa to get dental services. And what's the next on the list? Fifty-eight percent said they had to go outside of Neepawa to get doctors' services. But leading the list by far, leading, 68 percent of those that replied said - well listen, if we need dental care we have got to go outside of Neepawa because we have only got one dentist there -- and incidentally just today, I was talking to a family at Neepawa and the whole family went to Brandon, and what did they say - having gone to Brandon or somewhere else to get dental services, the wife went along and did a lot of shopping. Now there's no question about it that these surveys are of some value, but here's what they are saying. Now what's my honourable friends doing about it, that's what I want to know. What are they doing to provide and see that the rural areas of the province overcome some of the problems that the government has found by tabling of the 10 or 12 reports. I recommend the contents of these to my honourable friends. I suppose they have stashed them away in some drawer. My honourable friend the Minister of Health said the other day that the report on dental services was dead. Well it's not dead and the members that served on it are not dead either, and if they are dead they can be resurrected. Let's resurrect it and let's resurrect some of these surveys that my honourable friend made and do something about the recommendations contained herein. Let's get on with these other eight promises.

Do you know what the second one was? Here's what you promised: To resolve school problems to the benefit of all children. I see my honourable friend nodding his head in the affirmative - he intends to do that - resolve school problems to the benefit of all our children - now they are going to do that. Now Number 3: Establish vocational school facilities in Gladstone constituency, so I take from that that one of the ten vocational schools, I take by that that one of the ten vocational schools that my honourable friends have promised in the rural areas will be built in Neepawa. They say they would have built it if they had elected a candidate to their side of the House. Now I say get on with the job -- he's shaking his head - whether he didn't promise it or not, how did this get down here, that's what I'm asking. And yet you know, it's a funny thing, Mr. Speaker, one of the men that is elected to this famous Boundaries Commission, and a defeated Tory candidate I might add -- (Interjection) -- I don't know whether there are others or not but this fellow here you know very well, because I believe that he lives up in your area. You know what he said to two school teachers in Neepawa? He said, you'll never get a vocational school in Gladstone constituency and he said why - because you didn't vote right. And he is on the Boundaries Commission. -- (Interjection) -- That's what they call independent. I haven't got time to go into any more detail. I see I'm running out of time here. I'll show you his picture here. This is what he said and I'm satisfied I can get a sworn statement from this guy as to the comment that he made. Now the other promise, I'm down to No. 3 only. No. 4 - what was No. 4? There'll be real action on the White Mud River Watershed. That's a good one, because we were declared an area eight years ago. It's about time I would think there'd be some action after eight years. If there's ever going to be any action at all, it's about time they got started. But I'm glad to know that they intend to get right at it, come January 1 - they are going to get right at it. I see my honourable friend who made that announcement in Neepawa is back in his seat again now and I'll have a chat with him later.

Now No. 5 is what they are going to do in Neepawa-Gladstone area, develop tourist facilities, and they cite a few - they cite a few. They are going to develop Lake Irwin and they don't elaborate at Gladstone, and Langruth, etc., but at least they are going to develop tourist facilities in nearly every little village in the constituency.

No. 6. They are going to continue the road improvements and they are going to hard surface the road from Arden to Birnie. Well I've asked for that for a long time; I'm glad to note that you are going to do that my honourable friend. It's on your program I understand, because you promised it, it was promised. And then if the Honourable Leader of the Opposition and myself have made this request once, we have made it a dozen times and I'm going on record to make it again now, for heaven's sake complete that hard surface from Plumas to Walderssee. You've done about three or four miles. In the meantime there has been no less than four people killed, no less than four people killed and a lot of property damage done because you run off the end of this blacktop into a cloud of dust and you can see nothing. So I'm glad to see that they have at last promised that they are going to hard surface it next year, they have promised that. -- (Interjection) -- Did my honourable friend want to make another statement?

MR. WEIR: No, I'm just helping you.

MR. SHOEMAKER: No. 7. Obtain tax free gas for farm trucks used as a farm implement. They were pretty cagey on that one, pretty cagey. You know how we asked for it, Mr. Speaker? We said it is not good enough unless it is on the same basis as what? - Alberta and Saskatchewan, and nothing else will be good enough. That's what we said. I know that my honourable friend the Member for Souris-Lansdowne, he's satisfied if he doesn't get any because he said it wasn't really right to let the farmers have it, they'd all take off to Florida with truckloads of gas and stuff. But I say, that if it's good enough for Saskatchewan and Alberta, what is so different about our farmers in Manitoba anyway, other than being a little harder up than they are up there, and they deserve it. I know my honourable friends said throughout the campaign, I'll tell you what we'll do, it's a special deal for an election year, we'll give you a couple of gallons of purple gas if you never leave the yard, but if you ever head out onto the highway, we'll fine you for sure.

I don't know nothing at all about fighting elections, I'll admit that, Mr. Speaker, but I'll tell you one thing I wouldn't do, there's one thing I wouldn't do, I wouldn't go out fining people during a week before the election anyway for burning purple gas. Surely to goodness . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please, may I please remind the honourable member he has four minutes.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Four minutes, thank you. And I've got about three more promises and then I'll be through because here's what my honourable friends were going to do - and the next one, government assistance for seed cleaning plant in Gladstone and Neepawa. Who produced the survey last year to point up that this was needed? - I did. And who was more surprised than anybody in the House? - my honourable friend the then Minister of Agriculture, who was sitting there at the time. This survey that the government put out pointed out beyond any question of doubt that the farmers were not sowing clean enough seed. And what were they saying? - there should be more seed cleaning plants, that it just wasn't good, right and proper to take it to the elevator where they got a lot of wheat seeds and stuff like that, so I see they are going to do that, that's another thing they are going to do.

And the last one on the list, they are going to work for the increased farm income to keep the farm in the family. Well who in the world has been asking my honourable friends what their philosophy was in this regard for eight years? I was one of them. And what makes me wonder what their philosophy is when they turn around and loan \$1 million to a big vertically integrated farm down here, that's just changed hands last week for the benefit of my honourable friend, and when I was talking earlier today, the Carillon News is all full of it, so I recommend that he pick up a Carillon News and it tells the principles in the new company and everything else. I asked him earlier today whether the government had recovered the loan in full, plus interest without any loss to the taxpayers and he said he didn't know anything about it yet, but if he gets the Carillon News it will tell the whole story. It tells who bought it and everything else but it makes me wonder whether my honourable friends opposite, really have the solution to the multitude of farm problems that we have, when they design legislation to put them out of business and that's what they are doing, when they loan \$1 million to a huge corporation like that, down there.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I just want to say once again, that I hope that my honourable friends will forget about the 78 promises if they like but at least keep the nine that they promised for Gladstone. They promised them, it was their promises, not mine theirs - they are shaking their heads in the negative, some of them - if they didn't promise them, then what they said in the first ad that came out must be right - the inference was that if you didn't vote right, you'd get nothing. Now I say that this is a dandy time for them to redeem themselves and say that we didn't mean anything by that ad - they can say that when we sit down around our big table and make decisions, we never consider the representation in the House. I hope that they can say that. That's the way it should be done, that's the way it should be done and now before I sit down I see I have a half a minute left, Mr. Speaker, and I probably won't be speaking again on the Throne Speech tonight, and I would like to wish you and all present here and those that are absent the Compliments of the Season and a Very Happy Yuletide.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. D. MORRIS MCGREGOR (Virden): Mr. Speaker, firstly I would like to congratulate you on your elevation to that stately position. I will grant you one thing that probably to my eyes you are not as much pleasure as the former speaker. This may well be my human weakness or man's weakness as we look with a little more light on the fairer sex, but I do wish you health and long tenure in your office. I know as I knew you your principle has always been the shortest distance between two points was a straight line and I'm sure you will govern and rule this political ship of state in that manner, knowing full well when any ship puts out to sea, you do meet troubled waters from time to time.

I would also like to congratulate the Honourable Member from St. Vital on the way he moved the Speech from the Throne, and also the Member from Fisher who gave us a very capable coverage of his constituency and it did make me very jealous the things that he has that I have not, and believe me, my ministers are going to hear - not here but in other areas.

But I would like to congratulate all the new members, and I'm very sorry that many of those are not with me who I got to know, and I believe and I hope to do this in the future with the new members even though they sit elsewhere. I don't believe we can be a true and a progressive legislator unless we know every area of Manitoba and talk to them on their own grounds without breaking any code or rule from their party or from mine, and I do look forward to working with them in the future.

Also, congratulations to the three new Ministers. One has been here a lot longer than I have; the other two are new in the political wars, at least of this call, and I hope that if they need any of my assistance I'll be around to assist them in whatever way I can.

As my contribution to the Thone Speech debate I would like to speak on a subject about which I have been deeply concerned for some time, a subject that in my opinion is extremely important. We have a very serious problem in Manitoba that we as legislators must in the next few years give our very careful attention. It is the simple problem that approximately one-half of Manitoba's population lives in the Metropolitan Area of Greater Winnipeg, and that the large bulk of the wealth of the province is situated in that same area. It is a problem which I think we must deal with now before it becomes more serious.

It is the problem that is unique to the Province of Manitoba, for Saskatchewan has two large centres well situated with several smaller centres, and likewise Alberta who has again two large centres, not in any one corner of the province but well situated, where we in Manitoba have one big metropolitan area in the one corner in full respect to the area south and east but the vast wealth and contributing factor is to the west and to the north of this metropolitan area.

This problem can only get worse, because population trends are to the larger urban areas, and to the suburbs, and in the rural parts of the province to larger farms with less and less populations living on these farms. And I can think back personally half a dozen years ago; there were five families making a living on what I now run and I don't pretend to be a land hog, but this is a trend we must somehow get around.

As compared with other provinces, in Manitoba the problem is doubly serious since we have actually only one large urban area into which over half the population of this province is fitted.

So, as the rest of the province shrinks and possibly dies - I'm one who doesn't believe exactly that, but the one metropolitan urban area of Winnipeg grows and the rest of the province becomes somewhat of a hinterland, an ever-decreasing and ineffective ripple when it comes to industrial growth that affects the general welfare of this province as a whole.

As time goes on, Winnipeg or Greater Winnipeg and the Province of Manitoba will become virtually synonymous. We have to face and recognize the fact that despite the progress that we have made in the field of industrialization in this province, that farming and industries associated with farming are still the economic backbone of this province, and we are going to have to recognize this as such for many years to come.

Untrained people are leaving the rural parts of the province, going into the larger urban centre of Winnipeg and accepting the insecurity of unskilled work. Many of them who have little education are ending up later on on the welfare rolls in this part of the province. We have to recognize the fact and to encourage government policies that will stem this emigration from rural Manitoba and in fact reverse it. We have to improve on the policies that we now have to build up industries in the rural part of the province and start encouraging people back into the smaller centres of the province from the large industrial complexes of Greater Winnipeg.

(MR. MCGREGOR cont'd).

This problem is further complicated by the fact that it is very difficult to get professional people to settle in rural Manitoba. We have in rural Manitoba a very serious shortage of doctors, dentists, lawyers and other professional people that are necessary if we are going to encourage people to stay in rural Manitoba and make it possible for them to enjoy in the smaller centres the amenities of life which they can obtain in the Greater Winnipeg area. All one needs do is look at the membership rosters of the many professional associations in the province and we find that a very small percentage of their members are practising their professions in rural Manitoba.

This centralization of our industrial and professional people in the large urban centres of this province is a growing threat to a strong and balanced economy in the Province of Manitoba. The government should be commended for what it has done in the field of bringing industries to all of Manitoba, but this effort must be maintained, and it must be speeded up before the problem reaches the stage where we become basically a province totally identified with Greater Winnipeg.

Not only is it necessary to bring new industry into rural Manitoba but we have to encourage policies that will encourage industries and commercial businesses that are there to remain, and in order for them to remain they have to be assured of at least a constant population. As the population of the towns in Manitoba decreases there is a tendency for the merchants to want to leave for larger centres, so we have to have policies that will encourage people who are living in rural Manitoba to remain, and secondly, to encourage people to come from the larger centres and build up the smaller centres of our province.

By overlooking this problem, by allowing the smaller centres in rural Manitoba to lose their very lifeblood, by taking away services from their areas and concentrating them in Greater Winnipeg, it is making it harder and harder for business and professional people to have faith in the future of the population centres of our province outside of Greater Winnipeg.

It just doesn't make sense to concentrate all of our industries in the larger centres of the province. There are people whose family backgrounds are in the rural parts of Manitoba and they go back many years. These people would like to stay in the rural areas where they are known and with which they are familiar, and we as legislators have to adopt policies that will make it more possible for these people to stay and to build up a good future for themselves and for their children in rural Manitoba. We must do everything that we can, not only to stop this migration of people from the rural areas to the large areas, but indeed reverse this trend.

Mr. Speaker, I am not suggesting that this is entirely a government - whether it be provincial or federal - responsibility. I have endeavoured for the last few years to make each and every individual in my constituency and outside of my constituency aware that they too must co-operate and work at encouraging business and professional people and industry to locate in rural Manitoba, and I believe that this has been accomplished, to some extent at least, inasmuch as there have been several surveys taken in Virden constituency regarding how many women would be available for work and also the strength of the available male work force, because this is the only way we can prove our case to industry. And with this approach I look forward to success in rural Manitoba and especially Virden constituency. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, Gentlemen. First of all, Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to follow the tradition of congratulating you for having attained the highest office which this Assembly has to offer. When the pageant which took place on the opening day had concluded, and after your election took place, I noticed it was with great reluctance that you were convinced to occupy the Chair. As a matter of fact, knowing the British tradition and the abhorrence which that tradition places on forced labour, I take it that that's the only instance in which people in this province will be required to forcibly take their position and to fulfil their responsibility. And I say, Mr. Speaker, that I'll have much more to say on this very subject later in the debates in this House.

Mr. Speaker; in addition to congratulating you, I think that I have some responsibility, a responsibility which by the way, I take great pleasure in saying something about the Member who last occupied the seat for Inkster constituency. And I may say that I'm sure that the absence of a member representing the Inkster constituency at the last session of the Legislature, I'm sure must have been -- that absence must have been sorely felt by all members of the Chamber, especially because of the dignity with which the former member has occupied

(MR. GREEN cont'd). . . . this chair. The member of whom I speak is, of course, the late M. A. Gray who gave his entire life to the public service - his entire life in Canada, that is, to the public service of the people in this province.

There is nothing much more that I can say about Morris Gray that the members of this House haven't already heard, but I would like to perhaps think of what Morris Gray might have said had he been sitting in this Legislative Session, and knowing Mr. Gray I feel that he might have said something, Mr. Chairman, about the government's decision to call a session of the Legislature which starts on a Monday. Those people who are well versed in, or who have had a great deal to do with recent immigrants who came to this country, will realize that they had some inarticulate aversion to starting things on a Monday. For instance, in my law practice, I notice that many immigrants would not take possession of a house on a Monday, or they would not start a business on a Monday, and I always thought that this was some peculiar superstition but as with most superstitions it does have some base and that is a base that I'm sure that the late Morris Gray could have brought to the attention of the members of this Assembly.

Now, I have with me, Mr. Speaker, the Bible, and I'm going to read a few verses from Genesis which I think will explain the reluctance of people to start doing things on a Monday. In Chapter I of Genesis it says (I'm sure you're all aware of this) "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth, and the earth was without form and void and darkness was upon the face of the deep. And the spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters and God said: Let there be light. And there was light. And God saw the light that it was good. And God divided the light from the darkness. And God called the light day and the darkness He called night, and the evening and the morning were the first day."

Now gentlemen, I would ask you to note that "God saw the light that it was good." That happened on the first day. Now I'd also like you to note that the first day, according to the Old Testament, would be what we commonly know as Sunday. So let's regard Sunday as the first day, for my purposes at this point.

Secondly, "And God said, let there be a firmament in the midst of the waters. And let it divide the waters from the waters. And God made the firmament and divided the waters which were under the firmament from the waters, which were above the firmament. And it was so. And God called the firmament Heaven, and the evening and the morning were the second day." And there's no mention of that day being good, Mr. Speaker. "And God said, let the waters under the Heaven be gathered together unto one place, and let the dry land appear, and it was so. God called the dry land Earth and the gathering together of the waters he called the Seas, and God saw that it was good." This was the third day.

Now if you continue to read Genesis you'll find that every day that God did something it was good, except on the second day. As a matter of fact, on Friday it's very good and on Tuesday there are two good's, and I think, Mr. Speaker, that it's probably a mistake and the person who originally wrote the scriptures, that one of Monday's good's happened to fall into Tuesday. But nevertheless the interesting feature is - and I think that probably the late Morris Gray was the kind of man who would bring this to your attention - is that people don't generally, people who follow or who have the inarticulate feeling concerning Mondays, don't start things on a Monday, but apparently Conservatives walk in where angels fear to tread and they've decided to call the session on a Monday. Mr. Speaker, it's also peculiar that I'm making what is called my maiden speech on a Monday. You'll note, Mr. Speaker, that I took the caution to rise on two or three other occasions before getting to the floor on this occasion, to protect me, if such protection I need.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I suppose that those people who know me would say that the last thing that Green will do when he gets into the Legislative Assembly is to read from the Bible, but apparently this Chamber has a mystical and wonderful effect, and one can never know what to expect when one reaches the Chamber. I thought that it would be better to perhaps relive a little of Morris Gray rather than just saying something about him. I hope that this exercise will bring back a little of Morris Gray to this Chamber, because Mr. Chairman, I believe in immortality to the extent that I believe Morris Gray's presence will never be entirely removed from this Chamber, nor will the relationships which he has created and the amount that has rubbed off from him to you and from you to him that these things will ever die.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is also customary - and I'm going to be very conservative in sticking to custom - to deal in some way with the nature of the constituency which a member represents. I suppose that the constituency of Inkster is as model an urban constituency as one can see in the province of Manitoba. It's become a cliché to say that my constituency has

(MR. GREEN cont'd). representatives of every ethnic group. That is so. It also becomes very commonplace to hear a member get up and say that my constituency has people in all economic groups. This is so of Inkster. I think that there's an important thing about Inkster that I would like to say in respect of these things, that there are two binding features about the people who live in Inkster constituency. One is that although we stem from different ethnic groups, we regard ourselves and we regard ourselves proudly as being united in that we are Canadians, and perhaps as important or perhaps more important, the people of Inkster constituency are all working people, and when I say working people, Mr. Chairman, I don't mean people who merely work with their hands. In that classification I include railroad workers, carpenters, plasterers, skilled tradesmen, doctors, dentists, accountants, and since I'm in a charitable mood I'll even include lawyers under the heading of working people. And I think that Abraham - I'm working now, Mr. Speaker - I think it was Abraham Lincoln who said that the greatest affinity between human beings apart from their affinity to their own family, is that bond of kinship which attaches itself to all working people in all places all over the world. And that bond does attach itself, Mr. Speaker, to the representatives, to the constituents of Inkster constituency, to the Canadian citizens who live in that constituency. They are all working people. I think that they all consciously desire to have Inkster constituency and the Province of Manitoba become a better place to live in. They are working towards that end. I believe that they are willing to accept the responsibilities incumbent upon each of them to achieve that objective, and I think, Mr. Chairman, in addition to being willing to accept the responsibilities they are hopeful that they will achieve some of the benefits of the productivity which they themselves are prepared and are working to achieve.

Now what is it about Inkster constituency and every urban constituency which is critical to the times in which we are living, and more particularly which is critical to the political situation which we find ourselves in today? Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that the dilemma which the people of the constituency of Inkster have in common with the people of every other constituency in the Province of Manitoba, is the problem which faces them every time they feel that they inarticulately are able to see a way out of some of the problems which they see facing them. They hear from every set of politicians - and in this I include the PCP over there, and the LP over there and the New Democratic Party over here - that they hear from all these groups basically the same type of aspiration. They hear these people saying that we are after increased productivity, that they want everybody to have a better life. They hear from all of these people we are after a more equitable distribution of the things that society is able to produce, and they hear from all of these groups the fact that we are interested in equality of opportunity. And yet, Mr. Speaker, whenever somebody comes up with a practical suggestion which appears to offer a way of achieving these things which everybody unanimously choruses, they find that they run into a philosophical barrier, that these proposals which appear to offer a way out run into a philosophical barrier and this philosophical barrier is inevitably a statement that what you are trying to do is against some concept which the Government party and which the Liberal party says is contrary to our way of life.

Now we've had an example of that, Mr. Speaker, just the other day in the House. The Minister of Education has come out with a plan to offer the citizens of Manitoba a better way of managing their elementary school divisions. He speaks as though - and I think he is correct in this thought - everybody in this House agrees that these school divisions should be so re-established as to give a better system of education to the people in this province. And then he has all the elected members of these people here assembled who say that this is right, but he says that we can't do this because it's not the democratic way of doing it, that we who are democratically elected cannot do these things because it's not the democratic way, and those were his words, Mr. Speaker he says that it's more democratic to have the elected representatives of the people go out and sell a political program with the hope that the people in the province would then vote for that program and then we will do it after we have, so to speak, an additional mandate from them to go ahead with this program. So that a simple reform, like larger school divisions, which everybody agrees with and everybody mouths approval for, the Minister of Education says he can't implement because it would be contrary to democracy, and of course he's trying to preserve democracy. Well I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Education isn't trying to preserve democracy at all, that what he's trying to preserve is the sensitivities of some trustees across the Province of Manitoba, who will thereby see their role in a particular phase of our activities removed from them.

(MR. GREEN cont'd).

Now I don't think that this example which I used is a unique one or an isolated one. This example of all of a sudden setting up a philosophical barrier to something which everybody says is true carries forth in every sphere of our society where basic inequities are apparent, and what are these basic inequities which the people in Inkster see just as clearly as the people in every other constituency see, and just as clearly as all of the members of this Chamber see because they all say these things, and they all repeat them, and they all refer to them as inequities. Well, one of the basic inequities, Mr. Chairman, and I'll use the system of priorities which has been chosen by the First Minister, is the basic inequity in education, and I'm not at this point, Mr. Speaker, dealing with education in terms of the elementary and secondary and high school, I'm dealing with higher education. Because, Mr. Speaker, it's in the area of higher education that a citizen is most greatly affected insofar as his future years in society are concerned. I don't think I have to argue to this House very much that those people who have a higher education are the ones who get a greater share of the economic pie; that it's those people who are able to graduate from either medical school or law school or even Teachers College - and they are not very high up but certainly they are higher than the average - but it's those people who are able to get a higher education that eventually reap the greater benefit and the greater share of the wealth that society produces. And I'm not sure, as it's often been said, that it's because these people produce more, that if we educate people that they'll produce more and therefore education is a good thing. I think it's because the people who have achieved higher education manage to align themselves with people who have greater power within the economic world, such as the Medical Association, such as the Law Society, such as the Accountant; and that it's for this reason that those people are able to get a better share of the economic pie.

Now what is the situation with regard to higher education? The situation is that this Government and most of the politicians who fall into the same trap of political philosophy which I have referred to, says that we cannot handle higher education in this province in such a way as to remove the tuition fee. Somehow we have accepted the philosophical concept that between Grades 1 and 12 everybody is entitled to equality of opportunity in education, but when we reach Grades 13, 14, 15 and 16, Mr. Speaker - that's all that it is - at that stage we cease to be responsible for their higher education. It now becomes the responsibility of either the student or, what is probably more so, his parent.

Now this type of barrier, this type of suggestion that higher education is something that we philosophically can't accept, just won't hold weight with the people living in the constituency of Inkster, nor the people who live in other urban or rural constituencies in this province. Now the reason, Mr. Speaker, that it won't hold weight is that it's not true; that first of all what we are doing in the area of higher education for the most part is that we are subsidizing the rich. The general population of the university and the colleges - and there are exceptions; I'm not going to say that this is universal - but the general population comes from the people living in the upper income brackets, and those people are then asked for a nominal, Mr. Speaker, tuition fee, nominal to them, not to people in other income groups, but nominal to them. And are then subsidized, for the most part their education is subsidized by the taxation which is levied across this province. So that we accept the principle that we are going to subsidize this higher education but we weed out the number of people who are able to obtain higher education by placing a tuition fee, which successfully, Mr. Speaker, prohibits many people from ever thinking of getting a higher education. And don't, Mr. Speaker, let it be said that, well we can't afford to eliminate the tuition fee because this will result in a much greater call on the provincial treasury. If it were the question of whether or not we could afford it or not, it wouldn't be a question of tuition fees, it would be a question of who becomes educated. If this province came to the sober conclusion that we can only educate 3,000 people this year and give those 3,000 people a higher education, if we were talking in terms of dollars, then we would say, "We will educate the top 3,000 people." Not top money holders, but top mark obtainers. So it's not a question of finances and nobody can convince me that it is. It's what I said before; it's a philosophical barrier which says to the people of Inkster and it says to the people of every other constituency - of which Inkster I suggest is analogous or a model - it says, "When elementary and secondary education is the responsibility of society, we accept that. We were reluctant in accepting it when it was first foisted on us but it's too late to go back and we accept it. But we're not going into higher education and for that reason we're not taking off this tuition fee.

(MR. GREEN cont'd).

Now what is another basic inequity that citizens in Inkster are constantly aware of and which everyone in this House says is something that has to be removed? I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that another inequity is the provision of health care. I haven't heard a single politician or a single responsible newspaper of late saying that every person in Manitoba should not have equal opportunity in terms of his health needs, in terms of seeing to it that he is protected from disease or healed from injury or disease when that misfortune occurs to him or his family. And when someone poses a very simple solution that we pool our resources and provide those health needs to the people who need them when they need them, regardless of whether they are rich or poor - and I'm quite willing to have this principle apply to everybody - then the argument of philosophy is held before them. The first argument that was held before them, or which was stacked against this type of plan, was that the provision of these needs is the responsibility of the individual, it's not the responsibility of society. That argument was broken down with the Saskatchewan fight for the medical care provision.

So they are now faced with a new argument. The new philosophical barrier towards the universal provision of health needs is that this would make citizens be forced into participating in a public health plan; that such provision of health needs would not be voluntary - it would be compulsory. Now is that really, Mr. Speaker, an adequate explanation and is it really true? We know that 70 percent of the people in Manitoba, or approximately 70 percent, are now covered by medical care plans. The balance of the 30 percent are not covered. By strange coincidence, the 70 percent represents the top 70 income earners of the province, 70 percent of the income earners, and the bottom 30, the people who are not covered, represent the bottom 30 percent of the income earners of this province. Now I presume -- that's largely so, Mr. Lyon, and you can check the figures. People in this House would suggest that this really means that the top 70 income earners voluntarily purchase health coverage and the bottom 30 voluntarily refrain from purchasing this coverage.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that that's not the same; that if this government - and I notice that the provision of medical insurance is contained in the Throne Speech - if this government really wanted to have a voluntary plan in the use of the word "voluntary" then they would have this plan paid for entirely by provincial levy, and those people who wished to take advantage of it could take advantage of it and those people who did not wish to take advantage of it would not take advantage of it; and that this would be a truly voluntary plan because the people of Inkster are not blind, Mr. Speaker, and they see that this type of protection is provided in other areas of our society when we are not talking about health fees.

First, when we talk in terms of fire protection and when it's apparent to citizens of our community that it's unbearable to expect one person, an individual, to be responsible for protecting his home against fire, then we automatically and without a great deal of argument, and especially because it affects great property owners, we automatically set up a fire department and we pay for it socially, and nobody says that we are forced to participate in a compulsory fire protection scheme. And we do the same thing when it comes to the protection of private property against loss by theft or against being wroagly dealt with by unruly elements of society. We set up a police protection division and nobody says that we have a compulsory police protection plan.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if we say that we will accept social responsibility for the protection of private property which is going to be damaged by fire; if we say that we accept social responsibility when we say that we are going to protect private property from being damaged or taken away by criminals, then surely we should accept social responsibility in the same way for protecting people whose health needs are affected, and this whether they be rich or poor, Mr. Speaker, because to the members of this party it doesn't make any difference. The family of the millionaire and the family of the people in the lowest income group should be able to walk into a doctor's office and get his medical needs attended to at the cost of all of us, not for free, because the members of this party are not advocating a free system. We know that nothing is free. We know it just as well as the members of the other parties. What we are advocating is a system that will be socially provided and socially paid for.

Mr. Speaker, we see the same inequities which exist in the running of our economy. The people of Inkster see that certain things can be done to make the economy run better but they are advised that government should not mix into the economy; that this is philosophically wrong. But they don't see this in fact. They see that when it's necessary for the government to help private enterprise, then it does so; that it provides special tax concessions to Monaco Forest

(MR. GREEN cont'd)..... Products, or whatever the name of the company is, in order for them to successfully carry on their business within this province. It sees that the great manufacturing interests of this country don't stand entirely on their own, that they do their best first of all to eliminate domestic competition and then they set up tariff barriers to eliminate foreign competition. So that there is no philosophical barrier apparently to the government intervening to assist industry, to assist manufacturing, and we suggest, Mr. Speaker, that there is no philosophical barrier to this government's investing itself in other areas of the economy when it sees that it will be of assistance to the people if it does so.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would venture to say that the members of this party have gone into politics, and most people go into politics for the very same reason, and that is that the members of this party, like the members of the other two parties, the three parties in this House, have accepted some sort of social call to try to do something towards bettering the conditions under which people live in the Province of Manitoba. We don't think that we're any different from the other parties in this respect and we accept the sincerity of the other members of this House in having just as noble and fine objectives as we do, but we suggest Mr. Speaker, that when it comes to actual legislation and action, that the other parties in this House have suggested that they are blocked from taking such action because of philosophical means. We see no such block. We in this party, I suggest, are being perfectly pragmatic and perfectly realistic. Not idealistic - realistic. We say, in the words of Dean Swift, that the person who does something for society is that person who can make two ears of corn grow where one once grew, and we feel that by accepting a greater and greater degree of social responsibility we can make those two ears grow, and we suggest that we won't be blocked and that's the difference. We won't be blocked by some fictitious, philosophical barrier which the other members of this House apparently find they cannot hurdle. We will hurdle it and we say, Mr. Speaker, that there is every justification for hurdling it. We say, Mr. Speaker, that legislators have two duties which apparently are not recognized by all political parties; we say that there's first of all the duty upon legislators to see that our economy produces at its maximum efficiency, that we are able to produce as much of the material goods of society as it is physically possible to do. So one of our responsibilities is to ensure maximum production.

But we also say, Mr. Speaker, and just as important, it is our duty to ensure equitable distribution, and that's the point at which other legislators, members of other parties, apparently feel that they have to draw the line. We don't recognize this line and we are not prepared to draw it.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, may I say that when I entered University I remember very well the words the Dean of Arts addressed to us in assembly at the old Administration Building, the Residence auditorium at Fort Garry. He used an expression which I felt has been a guide to me and which I hope will be a guide to me in this Legislature. He said, "Have the courage to be thyself." I think this is a paraphrase of what Polonius said to his son in bidding him farewell in the Shakespearean play, Hamlet: "But this above all, to thine own self be true, and it must follow as the night the day, thou canst not then be false to any man." Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Under the provision of Rule 34, sub-paragraph 2, it is my duty to interrupt the proceedings and forthwith put the question on the sub-amendment to the Throne Speech, being five day of debate.

MR. SPEAKER put the question and after a voice vote declared the sub-amendment lost.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the Members.

A standing vote was taken the results being as follows:

AYES: Messrs. Campbell, Dawson, Desjardins, Dow, Doern, Fox, Froese, Green, Guttormson, Hanuschak, Harris, Hillhouse, Kawchuk, Miller, Molgat, Patrick, Paulley, Petursson, Shoemaker, Tanchak and Uskiw.

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

MR. CLERK: Ayes, 21; Nays, 29.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the sub-amendment lost.

The adjourned debate on the Throne Speech, the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for St. Vital for an Address to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor in answer to his

(MR. SPEAKER cont'd).....Speech at the Opening of the Session and the proposed motion of the Leader of the Opposition in amendment thereto. Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for St. Matthews.

MR. ROBERT STEEN (St. Matthews): Mr. Speaker, let my first words be those of congratulations to Your Honour upon your selection to the position of Speaker of this House, presiding over the 28th Legislature. I was personally very pleased with your selection and trust that you will find your term of office both interesting and enjoyable. I hope that you will not find your duties too onerous nor the House too unruly nor the freshmen members such as myself requiring too many reprimands for the blunders in parliamentary procedures we may make because of our inexperience.

I wish at this time also to congratulate both the mover and the seconder of the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne, on the excellent and eloquent contribution that each have made to this debate. I would also like to thank all the members of the House who have extended a courteous and kind welcome to those of us, like myself, who are freshmen here for the first time, both in the speeches they have made in the House and in coming directly to us in the corridors of the Chamber.

I would also like to congratulate the three new members of the Cabinet upon their elevation to this high honour, especially the Honourable Member for Cypress who has attained many firsts in her career, being the third woman that was elected to the House; the first woman to be named Speaker of our House; and the first woman to be named to our Cabinet. And this afternoon the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party when referring to members on this side of the Chamber as the heir apparent, neglected to make reference to the Honourable Member from Cypress as a possibility in this regard of attaining a first also in Canada.

The other two members who are like myself making their first appearance in this House, have brilliant careers ahead of them; both are very young and able men and I know that each will do well in this House, especially in the added responsibilities that they come in here with, with the important departments under their wing.

The seat in the House to which I was elected was for three Legislatures in eight years represented with great dignity and distinction by my illustrious predecessor, Dr. William George Martin. He was a most able and eloquent spokesman for St. Matthews and I know that his presence and his contributions to this House will be sadly and sincerely missed by members on both sides of the aisle. In his fourscore years Dr. Martin has enjoyed and been outstanding in many careers: a clergyman with the United Church of Canada, a Chaplain with the Canadian Army during the First World War; a world traveller; an arctic explorer and historian; an orator and dramatist of renown and an excellent photographer and oil painter. Dr. Martin had the privilege accorded to few in this life of serving in the Legislature of two different provinces. He was twice elected to represent the City of Brantford in the Ontario Legislature and in 1930 became the first Minister of Public Welfare of any Provincial Government in Canada. It is quite a challenge to me to follow in the footsteps of such an outstanding Canadian and I can only promise to do my very best to live up and try and equal the high standard set by my predecessor in this House.

The Constituency of St. Matthews may not be familiar to all members of the House. It is that area of the City of Winnipeg lying between Central Park in downtown Winnipeg and the Polo Park Shopping Centre in the city's western limits. It lies north of Portage Avenue to Ellice Avenue with the exception that there is an additional triangle bounded by Central Park and Balmoral Streets. In this constituency you will find United College, the Winnipeg Enterprises Facility such as our Arena, our Stadium and the cycle course erected for the Pan American games. It is the home of four of Winnipeg's curling clubs; a number of its schools and churches and the majority of Winnipeg finest restaurants. It is the home of the Canadian National Institute for the Blind; both Winnipeg television stations, which incidentally do not show any favoritism towards the local candidate, and three large provincial government buildings. It is a large commercial and fairly large industrial district but it is mainly a residential area. In St. Matthews you will find the Central Park Lodge, the largest institution of its kind in the province - a private enterprise personal care home. Also in St. Matthews you will find the Lions' Club Manor which is home to more than 200 of our senior citizens. This institution was built by the Lions Club of Winnipeg on land acquired by them under a program instituted by this government whereby the Lions Club put up 10 percent of the cost of construction of the building and the Provincial Government gave, as a gift under The Elderly Persons' Housing Act one-third of the total cost of construction. The balance of the cost was

(MR. STEEN cont'd)..... loaned by the Federal Government through the auspices of the Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation. The success of the Lions Club Manor and its long waiting list points out the need for the construction of more institutions of this nature right in the heart of downtown Winnipeg, close to good transportation and shopping centres where people who have lived all their lives in the midst of the hustle and bustle of a busy city life can continue to live in the same environment. However, there are many people who prefer the serenity of homes erected in the quiet beauty of our suburbs. I applaud the role of the government in this field but I would draw to the attention of the House that there is an increasing demand for similar additional facilities.

Since my constituency probably has proportionately the largest percentage of old age pensioners and senior citizens than any other in Manitoba, I will be taking a special interest in the problems of these people. I consider it quite a compliment and quite a challenge that these people should have elected as their representative one who is less than half their age. I welcome the new program of the Federal Government in instituting the recommendation of the Senate Committee on Aging to provide our senior citizens with a minimum monthly income of \$105.00. Any aid whatsoever in this field is very much appreciated. However I dislike the strings that are attached because they resemble too much the re-introduction of the dreadful means test.

I would also point out that the report of the Senate Committee on Aging is nearly two years old and has not taken into account the rapidly increasing cost of living that has occurred since the report was originally tabled, all of which goes to prove that the figure of \$105.00 per month is already out of date.

I am very pleased the government has established and set in motion the Department of Recreation and Tourism. Tourism is the world's richest industry. The City of Winnipeg is becoming more and more a convention city of top standing, breaking record after record in this field and many organizations both national and international have in recent years met in our city for the first time. Through the co-operative efforts of the Department of Recreation and Tourism in the City of Winnipeg and Manitoba Travel and Convention bureau, this will be but a beginning and tourism will become one of Manitobas and Winnipegs richest industries. However, the increase in the number of conventions being held in Winnipeg highlights certain problems because Winnipeg does not have as yet a much needed convention centre and we still need more hotel accommodation.

In the field of urban renewal, housing and slum clearance, the City of Winnipeg took a long time to get off the ground. However, since 1961, they have made marvelous progress in this field and take second place to no one in Canada. The Burrows and Keewatin project has now been completed; the Lord Selkirk project as well on the way and the first two stages of the central Winnipeg project covering six hundred acres has been started.

The Winter Works Program initiated a number of years ago by the Diefenbaker Government has created a lot of employment in Winnipeg and has resulted in the City of Winnipeg having one of the lowest rates of unemployment in Canada, 2.3%, considerably lower than the 4% often quoted by economists as the maximum percentage of unemployment in a healthy economy. I am proud of the fact that our local government has taken advantage of all the incentive programs initiated by senior governments.

I noted with great interest, Mr. Speaker, the reference in the Throne Speech to the review of the minimum wage in this province being conducted by the Manitoba Minimum Wage Board. Due to our spiralling cost of living it is necessary that such matters be kept under constant review. This Government deserves full marks for the recent appointment of two women members, one from Labour and one from Management to the Minimum Wage Board. I am pleased that Manitoba's minimum wage is among the highest in Canada and equal to that of Quebec, Ontario, Saskatchewan and Alberta. It is also gratifying to note that in Manitoba the minimum wage of \$1.00 an hour that went into effect on the first of this month is the same for the entire province both for men and women. Other provinces are not so fortunate. One thing that bothers me about the minimum wage, Mr. Speaker, is the confusion in the minds of many people that the minimum wage is some sort of an average wage or a substitute for a fair wage. Nothing could be further from the truth. It is not intended to be a fair wage nor is it intended to be an average wage, and certainly not a maximum wage. It is just what it says, it is the very bottom, the floor. It is my understanding of minimum wage legislation that it is the responsibility of the Minimum Wage Board made up of representatives of both labour and management to recommend a basic living wage. It is to be hoped that as many Manitobans as

(MR. STEEN cont'd). possible will deserve and will receive wages far in excess of the minimum wage, but this is not the responsibility of the Minimum Wage Board.

I congratulate the Provincial Government of the establishment, in cooperation with Alberta and Saskatchewan, of the joint Prairie inquiry into the cost of living. I wish the commissioners well in their work and I hope that in the very near future they will have concrete recommendations to make to our government to alleviate the hardship caused by our rapidly rising cost of living.

I also wish to congratulate in advance the principal faculty and Board of Brandon College on acquiring University status, six months hence. This is a most worthy institution which has made great advances in the last few years and has a record of solid achievement of which they can be justly proud. Like all Manitobans I wish them well in the future and I anticipate even greater success to western Manitoba's first University.

I congratulate also the Provincial Secretary upon the white paper that he placed before the House last Thursday evening. The Legislation envisioned by the civil remedies code is among the most exciting ever presented to any Legislature anywhere. It will take the combined efforts of each and every member of this House to iron out the difficulties inherent in such a program; and it will probably take more than one session of this Legislature to perfect laws to give effect to the objectives outlined in the white paper. However, I am convinced that when we have completed our work, the civil remedies code of Manitoba will be a model for many other jurisdictions to copy.

Our Province of Manitoba can be divided and grouped in many different ways, but it roughly falls into three parts: the urban centres around metropolitan Winnipeg, the towns, villages and communities comprising rural Manitoba and the exciting new North. Naturally as a member sitting for a particular constituency in this House I will take special interest in the problems that affect directly those whom I have the honour to represent, but my first duty will be to serve all of Manitoba. When one of the parts of our province moves forward the other parts benefit indirectly but the converse is just as true, when one part suffers, the progress of the province as a whole is impeded, and the prosperity enjoyed by other parts of Manitoba is thus restricted. When all parts of Manitoba move ahead and in unison, none at the expense of the other, Manitoba as a whole will know real progress and prosperity. This is the proposition and this is the goal to which I will dedicate my time of service in this Legislature, the benefit and service of our entire province.

We in Manitoba have much to be proud of but cannot afford the luxury of resting on our laurels or being satisfied with past achievements. Much has been done but there is still much more to do. I thank the people of St. Matthews constituency for giving me the opportunity of making a concrete contribution to the future betterment of our province and Mr. Speaker, through you I thank the House for its indulgence.

continued on next page.....

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, this Throne Speech is one that interests me very much, especially the two lines in the second page which read, "A measure will be placed before you to authorize the use of the French language in public school instruction under certain conditions." I must admit that I was somewhat surprised, but I am surprised, after the amendments moved by you, Mr. Speaker, when you were the Member from Swan River when I introduced a Bill dealing with this principle during the last two sessions, but I am quite pleased that the government has decided to act. If this is an honest statement, and I have no reason to believe otherwise, I will be very happy to do everything in my power to assist the government.

I should perhaps explain what I mean by an honest statement. A few years ago, on February 6th, 1964 to be exact, another Throne Speech also had a statement that was quite vague and because of this statement the resolution of mine was called out of order, although I'm still of the opinion that this was wrongly done. The government did not deal with the question of principle stated in my motion at the time and brought in something completely different. Now, Mr. Speaker, if this statement on French was placed there to kill the Tanchak motion, if no clear and precise legislation is brought in such as an amendment to Section 240 of The Public Schools Act, then I will oppose it quite strongly. Then, in my opinion, it will not be an honest statement. But, Mr. Speaker, I repeat I do not believe that this will be the case. I do not want to believe that it will be the case in this instance. I do not think we should look back on this; I do not believe that there should be any recrimination and I wish to congratulate the government. As I said before I will certainly do everything in my power to help them pass this legislation.

The Liberal Party as well as the Liberal caucus have already accepted this principle as one of their policies and now its with the government. I do hope that the members of the NDP and the lone Social Credit member will unite with the Liberals in supporting legislation, this legislation by the government.

I was pleased and encouraged to hear the Leader of the New Democratic Party speak on this question in the Throne Speech. I agree with him that legislation should not be aimed only to satisfy and segregate a few but rather that it should be legislation that will promote national unity. It would be most appropriate that in 1967, our Centennial Year, this House unanimously approve this principle which could do so much for national unity. It would, Mr. Speaker, indeed be a most fitting Centennial project.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am one that certainly believes in a permanent and independent speaker. My experience in this House in the past certainly would tell me that this is the only thing. Nevertheless I wish to congratulate you on your election to this high post. I know that you will be able to make your own decision and I hope that no one will try to influence you, that they leave you alone; and who knows, Mr. Speaker, you might have the honour of being elected the first permanent Speaker in Manitoba.

Now I'd like to congratulate the government in their victory; their majority is quite reduced and already there seems to be a little less arrogance from that side of the House and I hope that this will continue. I think that we'll progress much better if this is done this way.

I'd like to congratulate the new Cabinet Ministers, the new and the old members and also the mover and the seconder of the Throne Speech.

Now the speech itself, the speech itself, Mr. Speaker, is a cry baby speech; practically half of it deals with very negative deals with Ottawa, tells us what's going on in Ottawa and will try to find somebody to blame, somebody to blame because we are raising the taxes here in Manitoba. Well, Mr. Speaker, we must learn to accept our responsibilities, and I think that this government should learn to accept the responsibility. I don't think that we should always be talking about the Federal, about what's going on in Ottawa, or if we do we'll be forced to remember the sad days not so long ago when the Tory had such a big battle out there and this did so much to hurt Canada and to hurt their party. And it would seem that we're divided right here in Manitoba. Tonight reading the paper we see that they're thinking of bringing one of Diefenbaker's men to lead the government. Now what about the former Attorney-General and the present Attorney-General? They're in the running too, and tonight we're also told that the Minister of Municipal Affairs is quite interested. You know, I think that this government owes some explanation to the people of Manitoba; I think that they should tell us if we should, the people of Manitoba, should stay with Diefenbaker. There wasn't too much said about Diefenbaker when he give us a deal -- we had a special session for this and it wasn't too good a deal. The government

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd.) came in here and asked us to vote for this but there wasn't too much blame then. And now we don't know if this government in front of us backed Mr. Diefenbaker or Mr. Camp.

I remember in the good old days, there's a picture here of the Chief, the First Minister here with the big chief in Ottawa. Oh, Mr. Speaker, if you could only see the admiration in the eyes of the Premier, you'd think a little boy scout who's talking to the chief scout you know - gee let me at him I'm all raring to go for you, Sir. And at the time they made no bones, they told us where they stood, and this was a paid ad placed in the newspaper with a picture of Honourable Duff Roblin, the Premier of Manitoba and it said, "The extract of Premier Roblin's introduction of Prime Minister Diefenbaker on May 23rd, 1962 at the Winnipeg Auditorium," -- that's shortly after he give us this bad deal here in Manitoba. But anyway this, I quote "I profoundly believe that it is in the best interest of Manitoba and Canada as a whole to call for the leadership of John Diefenbaker because he is the best man for the job. John Diefenbaker has given to the prairies and the maritimes an equal place in Confederation, western agriculture has been given a better deal than was ever thought possible. John Diefenbaker" just a minute, there's some more, "John Diefenbaker is the best friend that Western Canada ever had." Oh there must be a Camp man, he's not applauding out there. "We need to back John Diefenbaker to continue (come on) as Prime Minister of our land.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I apologize for interrupting the member at this time but I would say that there is only three minutes. Does he have a considerable part of his address yet to complete?

MR. DESJARDINS: I certainly have

MR. SPEAKER: Well I wonder

MR. DESJARDINS: And I intend to go on tomorrow after my three minutes.

MR. SPEAKER: I wondered if it was agreeable if the honourable gentleman might have leave to continue and finish his speech tonight.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, knowing my honourable friend, it won't be a couple of minutes, it will be indefinite. I would respectfully suggest that we adhere to the rules of the House, that we cease listening to my friend at 10 o'clock and give him the first opportunity tomorrow to go for an hour or so.

MR. SPEAKER: the honourable member carry on for a couple of minutes.

MR. DESJARDINS: That's acceptable to me. I'd be very pleased to come back tomorrow and talk about John Diefenbaker.

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

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