

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Tuesday, December 13, 1966

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions
Reading and Receiving Petitions
Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees
Notices of Motion
Introduction of Bills

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Provincial Treasurer)(Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, I'm going to ask leave of the House to allow this item to stand, if agreeable, until after the Christmas recess. I would like to offer a very brief word of explanation. All the provinces and the officials of Canada met in Toronto only last Friday and there are matters arising from that meeting which require consideration and I'm sure honourable members would wish me to have a chance to digest that information before I present the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: . . . leave of the House? Orders of the Day.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition)(Ste-Rose): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to address a question - I presume it should go to the First Minister - with regard to the financial relationships between the government or the Development Fund and the Northern Forest Development. Could the Minister confirm or deny to the House that a loan or advance has been made to either Churchill Forest Industries or Monoca AG and what the terms of the loan are.

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier)(Wolseley): I think I must confirm the fact that the loan was made because the honourable gentlemen yesterday presented us with the public information, which of course is the same for any lending institution with respect to the fact that a loan has been made. Apart from that, I don't know anything about it.

MR. MOLGAT: A subsequent question, Mr. Speaker; could the Minister indicate whether there has been only one loan, or has there been more than one?

MR. ROBLIN: I'm afraid I have already answered that question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MOLGAT: I presume that the answer is that there has been only one loan. Is that the answer?

MR. ROBLIN: I have answered that I know nothing about it. It is not within the realm of my knowledge.

MR. MOLGAT: Well Mr. Speaker, isn't it correct that these matters have to be registered with the Provincial Secretary and that the Department of the Provincial Secretary does have that information? If it's public knowledge and the government is dealing with these people and if we are going to go ahead with this development, then surely the government has access to the information and should know. Does the government not know?

MR. ROBLIN: No, I'm sorry Mr. Speaker. I think my honourable friend knows very well that we don't know. The information that is available is the information that is available is any transaction where one borrows money and a certain type of security is taken out. These are registered, whether you are dealing with the Development Fund, the Industrial Development Bank, the Royal Bank of Canada, or with a private citizen, and to that extent that matter is public information on the part of any one who wishes to search the records and find out. That is the only information that is available to me.

MR. SAUL M. CHERNIACK, Q. C. (St. John's): Mr. Speaker, may I ask the Honourable the First Minister if I understood him correctly yesterday, that he was going to look into the question of the interest rate and whether or not it was in conflict with the Act.

MR. ROBLIN: Yes, I expect to get a report on that and I'll let my honourable friend know.

HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Minister of Agriculture and Conservation)(Rockwood-Iberville): Mr. Speaker, I just beg leave of the House to table two reports, namely, the annual report of the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation year ending March 31, 1966, and the Manitoba Crop Insurance Corporation annual report year ending March 1966. Thank you.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask a subsequent question to the First Minister on the questions that I was asking. The dealings of the government has been presumably with Monoca AG or with Churchill Forest Industries?

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Chairman, this is the third supplementary question and I don't think I should be asked to take any more. The dealings of the government are set out in the agreement

(MR. ROBLIN cont'd) which was tabled in this House in the last Legislature. That is, the dealings of the government.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I had a question for the Honourable the Minister of Labour. In view of the fact that there are numerous trade unionists now affected by injunctions that have been granted by the Manitoba Courts, could the Minister advise when the Woods Committee will report concerning the use of injunctions in labour disputes?

HON. OBIE BAIZLEY (Minister of Labour)(Osborne): Mr. Speaker, in answer to the honourable member, I cannot. He is aware, as I am and other members of the House, that the Woods Committee have undertaken to study this matter and we look forward to their report in due course.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. I'm afraid that the answer of the Minister of Labour would indicate that the government will take no action until this report is in, and is there anything being done by the Minister to see to it that this report comes to this House so that these matters could be discussed during this meeting of the Legislature?

MR. BAIZLEY: Mr. Speaker, it is not our intention at the present time to take any action or injunctions until we have had a recommendation from the Woods Committee, until we have had an opportunity to study the report of the Commission, Mr. Justice Rand, who is studying this problem in the province of Ontario.

HON. CHARLES H. WITNEY (Minister of Health)(Flin Flon): I would like to reply to questions asked by the Member for East Kildonan the other day re major meat processors, how many are Canada Approved. There are two plants in all processing under Canada Approved. The major manufacturing plants, three of them in the area are all Canada Approved. The numbers not approved - six plants are not under Canada Approved. Safeguards to the public - all the raw products originate from Canada Approved slaughter plants. Further processing is done under the supervision of the local health authorities. Consultant services are provided by the Department on any matters and all of the provincial health requirements are met.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Welfare. When the federal Act that provides the guaranteed income supplement to the Old Age Pension comes into force, is it the intention of your department to reduce supplementary assistance?

HON. J. B. CARROLL (Minister of Welfare)(The Pas): Mr. Speaker, I'll take the question as notice.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the First Minister. Is it correct that at this time the Deputy Minister of the Manitoba Development Authority, which is the key development body for the Province of Manitoba and responsible directly to my honourable friend, is also the chairman of the board of the Manitoba Development Fund?

MR. ROBLIN: I don't know if he is the chairman of the board; he is certainly the general manager. But I'd like to deal with the implications of the question and that is that because this man holds two positions therefore the government will know what he is doing in the other position. I'd like to say as emphatically as I can that it would be quite wrong to draw that assumption. As general manager of the Fund he takes an oath according to the Statute and the Regulations not to disclose the activities of that Fund to anybody, and that includes me, so neither I nor members of the government are informed by him as to what the Fund is doing.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, a subsequent question on the same subject, is not the responsibility of a deputy minister of this government one to advise the government on a course of action that the deputy minister feels should be undertaken, and is the government then not putting this individual in an impossible position by placing him in what is obviously not an arm's length position?

MR. ROBLIN: I don't think so, Mr. Speaker.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, I would like to know from the First Minister or the Minister of Education, was the former Deputy Minister of Education eased out of his position voluntarily?

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Education)(Gimli): Mr. Speaker, I don't think that's a very proper question. The former Deputy Minister of Education has taken a challenge. The First Minister made an offer to him as it was agreed amongst government Ministers and . . . that this man was probably the top man available to the government to put into this very responsible position of looking at the total human resources in Manitoba. His long experience in the north country, with his intimate knowledge of the Department of Education and its function, and with his imagination, progressive mind, all these qualities certainly commended him most

(MR. JOHNSON cont'd) highly for this position, and it was a personal decision of the gentleman concerned to take this greater challenge; and I know, knowing the type of individual he is, that he only did it on one basis - that he could make an even greater contribution to the Province of Manitoba in his mind.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the First Minister. Yesterday, in reply to one of the questions, he expanded and said that the policy followed by the Government of Manitoba regarding no information to the House insofar as the activities of the Fund, was one that was common in other jurisdictions. Would he say that the situation is the same as, for example, in the federal jurisdiction where the Industrial Development Bank comes under the Governor of the Bank of Canada who is obviously not in the same position relative to the Government of Canada as the situation here in Manitoba where the one individual is a deputy minister of the government and the manager of the Fund?

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend wishes to debate. There'll be an opportunity for that later on.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to my honourable friend the Minister of Public Utilities. Have all sections of the new Highway Traffic Act been proclaimed, and if not, what sections are yet to be proclaimed?

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN, Q.C. (Provincial Secretary)(Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, I wouldn't have that detail immediately available. If the honourable member would care to table an Order for Return I would be glad to give him the information as quickly as possible. And Mr. Speaker, while I'm just here, I would like to correct an answer which I gave to the Honourable Member for Gladstone-Neepawa the other day, on Friday last as a matter of fact, in which he asked me how many persons were presently being offered the driving courses in the high schools, and upon checking Hansard I find that I did not give him the correct information. I should have answered his question by informing him that there are presently 22 high schools in Manitoba offering the courses and they have 498 students presently enrolled, and following the new year there will be two additional high schools, that is for a total of 24, and there will be an enrollment of 700 students.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Speaker, I wanted a supplementary question to my first one. I wonder if my honourable friend would not take my question as a notice rather than put an Order for Return. All I'm wanting to know is - and he could give me the information later on - what sections, if any, have not been proclaimed. That's all I want to know - under the Highway Traffic Act.

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the First Minister. During the past while we have had a number of appointments by the government - the Deputy Minister of Education, the Deputy Minister of Tourism, the Deputy Minister of Mines and Natural Resources - and all these gentlemen have come from outside the provincial civil service. Is it the opinion of the government that there isn't adequate men in the department to fill these shoes? It seems to me that this has a demoralizing effect on our civil service when the government frequently goes outside the province and outside their own civil service to fill these appointments, and it would appear to me that it wouldn't have a very good effect on the morale of the staff. Is the First Minister not going to reply?

MR. ROBLIN: I wouldn't care to comment on my honourable friend's opinion. I usually don't agree with his opinions.

MR. DOUGLAS CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, my question is addressed to the Honourable the First Minister and it really is, I think, a point of order because I'm wanting to clarify the answer that he gave to the Honourable Member for St. John's. I understood him to say that he would furnish the honourable member with the information that he desires. My point is that the question was asked in the House; I would like to have the answer furnished to the House. I do not believe in questions being asked openly in the House and then the answers being given privately and not to the House as a whole.

MR. ROBLIN: I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend misunderstood my remark because I agree with him that the answer should be given in the House, and I might point out that what I'm doing, as I said to the honourable gentleman, I'm asking the Manitoba Development Fund if they are complying with the terms of the statute.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to come back to the question that I asked the First Minister and he didn't answer; in view of the fact that it was a statement of his which he made in the House yesterday I would like from him a yes or no answer. He said yesterday that the Manitoba Development Fund operates - and I'm quoting now from Hansard, page 109 -

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd) "operates on the same basis as every other provincial Development Fund in Canada and on the same basis as the Industrial Development Bank." Now, does he really feel that the situation with the Industrial Development Bank is the same as that of the Fund here in Manitoba in view of the one individual having dual responsibilities, one directly responsible with the development of the Province through the M. D. A.

MR. ROBLIN: Of course, my honourable friend is trying to imply here that there is some political shenanigans going on, and I don't really think that that is an imputation, even at the wildest stretch, that should be raised.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I think that it is not in the rules of the House, it is against the rules of the House to impute motives. I imputed no motives. I asked a straightforward question and my honourable friend has no right to impute motives to me in my question.

MR. ROBLIN: . . . won't impute any motives to my honourable friend but I think the position would be clear to anyone that happens to read the debates or listen to what takes place here. What I said yesterday, and what I maintain, is that the question of secrecy with respect to business dealings is the same in all these institutions. I make no claim to say that they are all identically the same. I don't think any of them are the same. They all differ in a number of particulars, but the principle they operate upon is one of confidentiality with respect to financial business and that is the point about which I made my statement.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. In his travels overseas seeking people to fill employment positions in Manitoba, could the Minister inform the House as to the nature of the trades, the types of occupations that he is seeking immigrants for. And secondly, what firms in Manitoba have sought employees and have been unable to attract same with their present wage structures?

HON. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q. C. (Minister of Industry and Commerce) (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, I'll accept an Order for Return for those matters within my knowledge and that are not a duplication of the Order for Return accepted for the Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. GREEN: I guess I couldn't ask the Minister to give me anything without his knowledge. I'm asking him for things within his knowledge and for what he did when he was overseas. The Order for Return, as I recall it, that was given by Mr. Paulley, asks for the numbers of people who have been attracted to Manitoba. Now I'm sure he may have had difficulty attracting people. I'm trying to find out who he's looking for, and for whom.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I think I have asked for an Order for Return. I just would like to assure the Honourable Member from Inkster that there is no difficulty in attracting people to Manitoba.

MR. GREEN: . . . understand the Minister's reply. Mr. Speaker, I just want to know whether he is asking

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I wonder if this matter has been pursued considerably. It seems to go through my mind that it was mentioned the other day and that there is an Order of Return. If that isn't satisfactory, probably it could be added to our other Order of Return put in. I wonder if we're getting anywhere at all continuing this discussion.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Speaker, on another subject matter entirely, I would like to direct a question to my honourable friend, the Minister of Welfare. Is it a fact that the Minister is now advocating to all of those persons on social allowance, or recommending to them, rather, that they use powdered milk rather than whole milk in order to keep within their limited allowance comfortably.

MR. CARROLL: The answer, Mr. Speaker, is no.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture. Who sets the salaries of the members of the Milk Control Board, the government or the Board itself?

MR. ENNS: I'll take that question on notice.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I beg the indulgence of the House; I merely wish to find out from the Minister of Industry and Commerce as to whether he is accepting my question as notice --(Interjection)-- Well I haven't made a motion for an Order for Return.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I informed the honourable member, I've been asked for an Order for Return.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. Adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party. The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave of the House to have this matter stand please. I'm not quite ready with some information that I would like to have.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have leave of the House?

The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. CAMPBELL: Before the honourable member begins, may I raise the same point of order that I have on other occasions, that is, that it seems to me that it's not according to our rules that one private members' time that government motions are considered, and I know we had some discussion about this before. If you rule that it's in order and if the House supports you then there is nothing I can do but lodge my protest, but developing the point of order, it seems to me to be so obvious that it needs no argument, that if we had instead of one bill, which is I think very largely non-controversial, if we had instead of that, several bills here and some or all of them controversial, then the private members' time on Tuesday afternoon could be completely taken up. I submit that -- and I have no objection whatever to this particular matter being proceeded with because I understand there is some urgency, but I certainly do raise the point of order. I think this is in the wrong place on the Order Paper.

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q. C. (Attorney-General) (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, this is, as my honourable friend has observed, a matter that has engaged the attention of the House on previous occasions, and of course a matter upon which there is a ruling by a previous Speaker of this House declaring that the place on the Order Paper in which we find the Committee of the Whole House for third reading is in order. However, in the circumstances -- that is my opinion, my recollection of it, and so I'm equally strong in my assertion that there is no point of argument, Mr. Speaker; that the question is properly there, and I daresay without involving the Clerk in the procedure of the House that he wouldn't have put it there unless it were in order. In any case, I have no objection, Mr. Speaker, to your taking this matter under consideration or suggesting that you take it under consideration to find out yourself what the proper ruling is with respect to this, and for our part we're quite happy to at all times abide by the ruling of the Chair with respect to these matters. There is, however, as the honourable member has said, some urgency to the passage of this bill and two others to which we will be seeking Royal Assent before the House has its Christmas recess, but in any case the matter could certainly stand twenty-four hours adjournment because it will come up tomorrow in the regular course of business.

MR. CAMPBELL: May I ask the Honourable Minister who has just taken his seat a question? If the Honourable the Minister is quite sure that he does not agree with me, would he look at page 10 of the rules and read the portion that says Tuesday and Friday between 2:30 p. m. and 5:30 p. m., that a statement is clearly made that first it's questions written, then motions other than government motions, and would he with his legal mind that I know is very profound, and his study of the Rules of the House, would he explain how he can arrive at that conclusion?

MR. LYON: Quite easily, Mr. Speaker, because I read Section 22 of the Rules at the same time, and then to clinch the matter beyond any question of doubt I referred to the Speaker's ruling of last year on the question which ruled that the matter be on the Order Paper where it is today.

MR. CAMPBELL: Then Mr. Speaker, may I ask the honourable member, is he still going to take the position that rulings of former Speakers even though they have been proven to be wrong, are going to be regarded as precedent?

MR. LYON: I said to my honourable friend, Mr. Speaker, and I don't want to carry on the debate on this question of order, but as I once said to my honourable friend -- and it's so true -- Speakers do not make mistakes; they make precedents. It's quite easy for a lawyer to understand. I'll try to encourage the thought with them during the rest of the year.

MR. CAMPBELL: Could I ask my honourable friend one more question? Is it not a fact that nobody but a lawyer would understand such logic?

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I'm sure a Speaker would understand it.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, on the same point of order. I'm not a lawyer and I

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd) think that the Speaker of last year made mistakes - I don't think there was any doubt about that - and I think this is a mistake. We have to remember, if we want to be fair -- it's all right for the House to railroad something through; we have to remember that with the new rules we have lost Friday evenings for private members. I don't think that any members here would object to have this thing going through by leave of the House, but the question is that are we going to lose our Private Members' Day? We have an afternoon on Tuesday and an afternoon on Friday. We've lost Friday evening now and we know what was left on the Order Paper at one session and the way things went; last year everything rushed at the last minute. We're going to make a mockery of this House. We might as well let the government dictate everything and forget about the private members' bills.

MR. CHERNIACK: Tuesday as well.

MR. ROBLIN: I feel rather apologetic for speaking to the point of order, Sir. I think probably it would be advisable, if you saw fit, simply to accept the suggestion that the matter stand, and then you could rule on it afresh, which I think might meet the wishes of all. I simply must say to the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, however, that it's not only that private members lost time, so did the government side lose time. It was a saw-off. So that while I sympathize with his desire to see that proper attention is paid to private members' time, and I agree with that, I just want to put the record straight in that respect. I suggest we could save the private members' time for the rest of this afternoon if we were to agree to have it stand and proceed.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the House agree to let this matter stand? Agreed. Proposed resolutions. The Honourable the Member for St. John's.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to let this matter stand.

MR. SPEAKER: The second Resolution. The Honourable Member for St. John's.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I want the government to have further opportunity to study the suggestions made and I'd like this matter to stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Honourable Member have leave to let it stand? The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. BEN HANUSCHAK (Burrows): Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to have this resolution stand.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Souris-Russell.

MR. RODNEY S. CLEMENT (Birtle-Russell): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Gladstone, the following resolution: Be it resolved that this House urge the Government of Canada to raise the initial payment for the 1966-67 crop year by .25 per bushel on wheat, .14 per bushel on barley, and .10 per bushel on oats.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. CLEMENT: Mr. Speaker, I think before I get into the actual meat of my resolution, I think perhaps a further explanation would be in order, particularly for the honourable gentlemen who are in the front row across from me, none of who happen to be wheat farmers; in fact, I would suggest in the second row there's perhaps only one who might have a wheat permit and that would be the Honourable Member for Lansdowne.

However, I am very anxious to have full support from this House for this resolution because, Mr. Speaker, the grain-growing farmer today is in an extremely precarious position with the cost-price squeeze, and believe me, sir, if ever there was a time in the history of agriculture in the West when the farmer needs a voice in this Legislature and every other one in the West plus Ottawa, it is now, and if the experience I have had in and out of this Legislature along with farming can help and do something for the farmer, believe me, I intend to try and champion his cause.

Now, first of all, this resolution is not asking for more money for the farmer. What it is asking is for more money at his initial delivery. In the greater part of rural Manitoba, the wheat that is delivered to the elevator is a No. 3 wheat. Everybody talks about one and two wheat, but it is mostly a No. 3 wheat. When a farmer delivers his wheat to the elevator, he gets an initial payment of \$1.26-1/2. A year and a half later he will get his final payment which could be anywhere from 40-50 cents - we'll say an average of 45 cents. It is hoped this year it will be slightly greater. Well now, \$1.26-1/2 a bushel he gets to begin with, and what we are asking is that instead of \$1.26-1/2, a further 25 cents would be paid which would bring it up to \$1.51-1/2 - I've got to think mathematically here for a minute. So the initial payment would be \$1.51-1/2 instead of \$1.26-1/2, and actually all he is doing is getting his own money at the time he delivers his wheat. A further 20¢ or 25¢ I would go along with, but perhaps this could wait

(MR. CLEMENT cont'd) for another year or year and a half if necessary, but, Mr. Speaker, 90 percent of the farmers today have to borrow money from the bank or the credit union or any other source they can get it to carry on their operations where they're paying at least 6 percent interest, sometimes higher, where this money is theirs, the Wheat Board have it, and certainly there is no interest given on this money. So I would suggest that we unanimously ask that this initial payment be increased.

Now, I want to point out for a minute where the farmer is in this cost-price squeeze, and show or point out how the price of wheat has varied in the last twenty years. We are fully aware that nearly every commodity we buy today has doubled or tripled in the last twenty years, but the price of wheat has not. I have here the 1964 - 65 annual report of the Canadian Wheat Board, and Mr. Speaker, for the information of those in this House who are not familiar with it, in 1945 - 1946, a farmer received an initial payment of \$1.25 a bushel for his wheat, a cent and a half less than he's getting today. There was a further adjustment of 50 cents made and a final payment of .084 which gave them a final realized price of \$1.834 a bushel. Now this was in 1945 and 1946.

In 1950 it was the same, only he got an initial payment of \$1.75, which is somewhere along the line that I am asking for today. He got a final payment of .084 which - the price of wheat finally remained at 1.834. Now I should point out also that this is for No. 1 wheat. No. 3 wheat, which most farmers deliver, is from eight to 10 cents a bushel less.

Now, in 1953 - 54 the initial price of wheat was lowered to \$1.40. The interim payment was 10 cents, the final payment .064, which gave the farmer a final payment of \$1.564 a bushel; in other words, \$1.56 and almost a half cent a bushel, which was roughly almost 30 cents less than he was getting ten years earlier, and yet the cost of everything had gone up from 1946 to 56.

Now in 1960 the price of wheat, the initial payment was \$1.40 with interim payment of 10 cents, a final payment of .090, which gave him \$1.59 for his wheat. This is only six years ago, Mr. Speaker.

Now, since then there has been a slight increase in the price of wheat and in 1963 - 64 the initial payment was \$1.50 and the final payment \$1.974. In other words, from 1945 to 1965, a period of 20 of the most prosperous years perhaps this country has ever seen, the price of wheat went up 15¢ a bushel. Now, this No. 3 wheat that the average farmer delivers, is a few cents less than this, and actually when you take the freight rate off, PFAA and dockage, why the farmer with his No. 3 wheat finally ends up with somewhere between \$1.65 and \$1.70 a bushel. Now this to me is not being very realistic due to the fact that everything else has gone up and up and up; and everybody seems to realize the farmer's in this cost-price squeeze but nobody seems to be doing too much about it. I'm not too sure just what all can be done about it unless we can get the price of wheat up, but every segment of industry, they either go on strike or they ask for this and they ask for that and they're getting it, but the poor farmer isn't getting it, so what is happening? The poor farmer's disappearing and is going into corporations that are getting larger and larger and larger, and if this is what we want then if we carry on with what we've got, this is what we'll have.

I perhaps am a shining example of what happens to corporation farming. My brother and I started farming some ten years ago, 12 years ago - 1954 as a matter of fact - and today perhaps we operate the largest farm in Manitoba. There isn't a month goes by, very seldom there's a week goes by, there isn't some farmer coming in to us and say, "Rod or Harold, how would you like to take over our farm? We just simply can't afford to go in and buy new machinery at the cost, so rather than go into debt we're prepared to let you operate our farm and we'll live on the share and we'll live on the share that comes off it." The Farmers Union are fully aware of this. Mr. Andresen accused the government of ducking legislation. Well, farming, gentlemen, Mr. Speaker, farming is very very important to this country. There's several parts of this I'd like to read, but I -- well, if it's all right. "Andresen accused the government of ducking legislation. 'Farmers are not getting a fair deal from the government,' says H. J. Andresen, President of the Farmers Union. He accused governments of not legislating to give farmers an equal opportunity with the rest of the Canadian industry, in a report to delegates at the Union's 17th annual convention at the Marlborough Hotel Tuesday. 'Governments have still failed to realize the farmer's main problem is prices,' he told delegates. 'Farming is a business; it is one of the most important businesses in our economy. Therefore, it deserves the same consideration as any other business in our economy. It cannot operate the lost cost of the production and stay in business. The position of the farmer,'

(MR. CLEMENT cont'd) Mr. Andresen said, 'was a desperate one.' "

And this is right, Mr. Speaker. I didn't become a member of this Legislature for the second time because the farmer was okay. I was elected by the farmers, believe me, and if the honourable member who had represented Birtle-Russell for the last six years had been as interested in the farmers as he was in some other things, he'd have still been sitting over there. Now I'm not being critical of this member, because I think he was probably one of the most honest and sincere and hardworking men who had the opportunity to sit on the other side of this House, but nevertheless he did not keep his ear to the ground and look after the farmers' interests, and this is why I am back here, and in the last six years since I left politics - not exactly voluntarily - but since I've been away I am now in a position that if I can help the farmer I'm prepared to do it. Quite frankly, I'm not sitting in this seat because of the remuneration, whatever it happens to be.

So, Mr. Speaker, everywhere you turn, everywhere you turn the cost to the farmer has gone up. The farmers are getting fewer, the permit holders are also -- I was going to mention the decrease in the number of farmers. In other words, for every man who sells grain today he must have a wheat permit book. In 1953 -54 there were 241,000 permit books. In 1964 - 65 there are 210,900. In other words, 30,310 fewer wheat-growing farmers than there were ten years ago. Now if this carries on, in another ten or fifteen years there just won't be any small farmers, and I believe this is detrimental because in the country areas for every farmer you have he is a good spender, he spends his money mostly at home, and this is what makes these smaller centres successful.

Now why is this taking place? I pointed out to you earlier that the cost of machinery has really gone up, and I want to quote a few figures. Now these are not absolutely down to the exact dollar, but this is from our own business. We're in the farming business; we're in the implement business; and we're in the automobile business. This is from our own records. In 1946, a farmer could buy a five-plough tractor for approximately \$2,500, and at that time he was getting within 15 cents for his wheat than what he is getting today. In 1950, five or six years later, that same tractor cost him \$5,000 and he was getting exactly the same for his wheat then as he was in '46. In 1966, some sixteen years later, a five-plough tractor would cost him between \$8,000 and \$8,500. Now this is triple, over triple what it was in '46.

Now I must say in fairness to the implement people that these tractors have a great number of improvements on them. They've got hydraulics, they've got fancier seats, they've got cabs, they've got far more conveniences, but when it gets down to pulling that old plough behind, it doesn't do it any better; it does exactly the same job as the one its predecessor did twenty years ago.

A combine. In 1956, one of the most popular combines sold in this area could be bought for \$6,000. Now this is a big combine. That same combine today, mind you with refinements and improvements but basically doing the same job, is \$12,000. That is double in ten years.

Swathers. In 1948 you could buy a real good swather for \$600.00. Perhaps I should explain what a swather is for some of the members over there. I see they are kind of wondering. A swather takes the place of the old binder. In 1966 this same swather cost \$1,400.00. Now the only bright spot on the horizon as far as this part of it is concerned is, that right here in our own City of Winnipeg they produce now one of the best swathers that's produced in North America, and this same swather sold through our farm equipment in Russell for \$1,065, which is \$250 less than the normal make. This is built in Manitoba, and perhaps this is the answer to one thing that we can do. The Attorney-General is smiling. Perhaps he knows a little bit about it. Perhaps he'll take up farming when I'm through here.

Now what has helped keep the average farmer going, the better farmers going, is through better farming methods. We use fertilizers, but fertilizers are very costly, Mr. Speaker. A fertilizer costs from \$90.00 to \$100.00 a ton. Perhaps with the new fertilizer plant we have in Brandon - this also should make the Attorney-General smile - this may help the farmer a little bit. But it doesn't matter what you use - better seeds, more fertilizer, better equipment - all this is important, but Mr. Speaker, unless the good Lord deems to give you the sunshine and the rain at the right time, it's all for nothing. Farming, Mr. Speaker, is the greatest gamble there is in this world today. It can be rewarding but it is a gamble and don't anybody think it isn't, and I might while I'm here speak just briefly with regard to the Crop Insurance. If Crop Insurance today would take in individual fields for hail insurance, they would sweep the country, but the way it is today it's only good for the poorer type of land. This is the only type of man who is going to be really interested in crop insurance. Now that's getting off the tract.

(MR. CLEMENT cont'd)

Costs are continuing to rise. Farm labour, when it is available, has really gone up and farm labour today is really a problem. I hope with the new legislation enabling a farm labourer to have unemployment insurance, that this will help somewhat, but everywhere you turn around it has gone up. Taxes have gone up. The taxes on land today, compared to what they were 20 years - and this is something the honourable gentlemen across the way are very familiar with. I only hope that they don't increase these taxes. I only hope that they do something for the farmer with regard to purple gas, and it looks as if they are going to - just what, we will have to wait and see. But there is another part of this thing, the whole of our grain handling system almost is going to have to be overhauled. If we are going to continue to produce 600 and 700 million bushels of wheat and have it ready for the boats and ship it to the countries that want it, when they want it, why something is going to have to be done. Now this is going to involve a fantastic sum of money. Where is this money going to come from? Is it going to come out of the farmer's pocket? I don't know, but it has up to now and I think it's time that we started to take a look at these things. The taxes on an elevator which looks after the farmer's grain, in 1949 for instance was \$310.00; in 1967 it's \$918.00. This is only on a country elevator. These elevators have got to be remodelled and rebuilt, many of them. The facilities at the sea coast, at the lakehead, at Churchill, all these plants have got to be enlarged or improved or both. Now this is something that has to take place. A letter here in one of the papers, "Overhaul of handling system urged by the Grain Commissioner." They realize that. "Elevator tariff rates. The Wheat Board has authorized the Board of Grain Commissioners to increase the price that the elevators charge for handling this grain by one cent, but this has not been okayed as yet by the Board of Grain Commissioners. Now the elevator people need this if they are going to continue to expand and improve their elevators but it hasn't been granted. Perhaps there's some other answer. In a recent address the Federal Minister of Agriculture has said that the Wheat Board may pay handling fees.

Well now, I have every confidence with the present Minister of Agriculture in Ottawa that he will do everything in his power, and I think that if this Legislature here will go along, we, Sir, will be able to help the farmer at the same time.

I realize, Sir, that all the problems of our society are not limited to the rural areas. There are many problems in the urban centres as well, but as far as the urban centres of Manitoba are concerned they are well represented by men who are well educated and in every way possible can take care of these problems. The rural men have their problems. I think that as far as I know -- I have met the present Minister of Agriculture. He is certainly a pleasant fellow. He's a nice chap. He's a young man and this, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest, and I hope he is this man that I'm talking about, but the man with the most qualifications, the most ability in the government side, should be Minister of Agriculture, because without agriculture, where is Manitoba?

Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier, I am a farmer. I was elected by the farmers and I intend to champion the farmers' cause in this House if it is within my ability. Thank you.

MR. M. E. MCKELLAR (Souris-Lansdowne): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Arthur, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. JOHN P. TANCHAK (Emerson): Mr. Speaker, in view of the indication of the government that some action may be taken in this regard, I would like the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand until some further government information is given us. Seeing is believing. The government didn't indicate dealing with (b) part of my resolution. Could I have the indulgence of the House to have the matter stand please?

MR. SPEAKER: May the honourable member have leave? The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I would also ask the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand until we have the further details of the government by legislation as to the exact course of their proposals.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have leave of the House? The Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Speaker, I would beg the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand.

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

MR. DESJARDINS: I beg the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed? The Honourable Member for Carillon.

MR. LEONARD A. BARKMAN (Carillon): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member of Assiniboia,

WHEREAS the present method of returning a part of the school tax to the property owner by a direct cheque from the government has proved to be slow and cumbersome, and

WHEREAS it would be faster, more economical and more efficient to allow the municipal corporations to give the rebate directly at the time the property owner pays the taxes, and

WHEREAS the municipal corporations have indicated their willingness to have the rebate handled this way,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Province of Manitoba cancel the present system of rebating directly by cheque and institute a plan whereby the municipal corporations give an immediate rebate at the time the taxpayer pays the real property tax in the municipal office.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, before you put the question, might I ask whether the honourable member would be inclined to postpone the debate on this until after the Budget is brought down? Perhaps it would be more helpful if it was handled in that way. I'm not at liberty say anything more about it, but I'm sure it would be more useful to discuss it after that than now, in view of what may be anticipated.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Honourable Member accept the suggestion?

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that there would surely be no objection to the House declaring a principle on this matter and if the government wishes to announce now that they will follow this policy, then the honourable member probably would be prepared to withdraw it, but if the government is not prepared to announce what it will do, then I think the member is in order to proceed.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I agree the Member is in order to proceed and I have no objection to his doing so. I merely offer the suggestion in the interests of a little bit of efficiency.

MR. MOLGAT: If the Minister is prepared to announce that they will accept this, we certainly have no objection.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. BARKMAN: Mr. Speaker, in view of what the First Minister has said, I will try to keep my remarks short although I think at this time I would like to say a few things about this Resolution since it has been of great importance to a lot of people. I am happy to present this resolution to this Assembly at this time and I also hope that, as the First Minister indicated, there will be something forthcoming at a later date. In fact, I was thinking with 18 or so new members in this Legislative Assembly that have just arrived, and which adds a lot of new thinking power, and with a new Minister of Municipal Affairs, plus the fact that all of us here today have had a chance to get back to our constituencies and possibly have had an opportunity to rekindle our memories and have found out more so just what the people of Manitoba really are thinking of this school tax rebate.

Well I don't know just what your answer was when you went to the voter last June 23rd when he asked you why it took so long to receive these rebates, when he asked you why this hard-earned waste of dollars or why this Department of Municipal Affairs and Urban Development -- although I possibly pronounced it wrong. I think on the door of the Madam Minister it's Urban Development and Municipal Affairs. This department has had such a good record I cannot see why a department, especially the Department of Municipal Affairs, at all can afford to be branded with the taint of political gimmickry, you might say. I know that a lot of people in the rural and I'm sure it's the same in the City, they wished to keep this trust in the departments in our civil servants, and I feel that to some extent there is a taint of political gimmickry shown by this department handling this rebate this way.

Well I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, that certain facts have been established since the school tax rebate was first introduced. We know by now, as I said a moment ago, that it is just a gimmick - a political gimmick - but I think it could do some good if it was handled right. This government knows by now that the Urban and the Union of Municipalities, for that matter the Secretary-Treasurers Association also have acknowledged that they are ready and willing to accept this responsibility of handling it, for that matter free if need be, and I wish at this time to read the resolution that the Urban and Municipalities presented at their meeting of last September 22nd and 21st.

This particular resolution was drafted by the Rural Municipality of Charleswood. The one

(MR. BARKMAN cont'd) that passed was slightly different than this one but the principle was the same. It goes on to say that "WHEREAS the present system of school tax rebate is inadequate and cumbersome and WHEREAS the present method has proved to be expensive to the Provincial Government and will continue to increase, and the accounting problem will continue to become more involved and confusing," I'll go onto the Resolution to save time. The ending of it is this: "THEREFORE be it resolved that we ask the Manitoba Urban Association, Municipal Secretary-Treasurer's Association and the Union of Manitoba Municipalities to insist that the Government of Manitoba issue legislation to provide that the school tax rebate be credited at the time the taxes are computed on the individual parcels on the tax roll.

Well, Mr. Speaker, if we accept it, this offer, a lot of our problems would be solved. It certainly would be more efficient time-wise; it certainly would be more efficient cost-wise; and much better relations, as I mentioned before, would result municipal-wise; and most important of all the taxpayer would not have to loan his own money to the government for such a length of time without interest. And furthermore, that this extra money they pay to the municipality at the time they pay their taxes does very often not come back until we all know how much later. I'm sure it has improved to some extent but it is still taking too much time. And furthermore, after they have received this, or I should say possibly that I remember the Minister of Municipal Affairs, the then Minister of Municipal Affairs telling us last year that this would all be speeded up and it would be different. Well, it may have speeded up slightly, this is so. But it's still mighty slow. If I, as a taxpayer, or any of you as a taxpayer, would be behind as far as this government is in paying this money back to the taxpayer, I am sure that we would have to pay some kind of a penalty.

But the other point I'm trying to make is this. Many an old couple on pension, or many a widow on widow's allowance who are paying their taxes by the month or as they can, for that matter, could first of all have this worry off their minds of paying the taxes off sooner, and secondly, could possibly have saved the interest they pay to a municipality -- naturally if they do not keep the time element or the October 31st tax payment deadline, this interest could very well be quite a proportion of the school tax rebate they receive some months later. And I believe also that most of you here today are still receiving calls, receiving phone calls or people seeing you that still have not received their school tax rebate from 1965. I realize that quite a few people do not understand the set-up. I realize that possibly some have not even applied. This is quite possible that we have people like that. But my point is this. If it had been deducted right at the time he paid his taxes in the municipal office there would have been no confusion at all. This could have been avoided completely. So why does the government want to use the taxpayers' money without interest? I am indeed very happy to hear what the government will have to suggest in this matter, and I hope it is good because it certainly could stand a lot of improvement.

Mr. Speaker, this kind of maneuver, as far as I'm concerned, is not only time-consuming but it's also misleading, let alone the fact that this method of handling these school tax rebates is far too expensive, I think all the members of this Legislature know what I mean when I say misleading. I doubt if there's any member here, especially any rural member, who is not continually asked to explain why the government, this government of today, is handling it in this way. I think we can give them no other answer but just simply say that the government is using your money for them to get elected. I think the members opposite know this. This is not really right to have this waste, and I think this is exactly as the situation stands.

We heard a lot about figures last year as far as the expenses were concerned - I do not wish to go into that - of what the cost of handling this rebate really might be. Somehow it seems impossible to arrive at any exact figures because of the various departments possibly involved in making this set-up for the tax rebate, but take the lowest figure that the Honourable First Minister mentioned last year, and take the largest or the highest figure that was mentioned in this House, the average would still be nearly half a million dollars. This is still far far too much when it need cost us nothing, as the resolution of Charleswood and so many other people, the Secretary-Treasurers and the Union of Municipalities and the Urban Association, when they're willing to help and practically have told the government that they're willing to even do this for nothing if need be. And I think that if this government wishes to get back more of the taxpayer's own money through a rebate, fine, but let's save some of the taxpayer's money, his own money, by giving him a little say in the matter of spending these tax dollars. So, Mr. Speaker, I ask all the members of this Legislature to consider this matter seriously. If you want to save a half a million dollars or so in handling this rebate, if you want to save time and

(MR. BARKMAN cont'd) handle this matter more promptly and more efficiently, then please vote for this resolution.

MR. SAUL MILLER (Seven Oaks): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Kildonan, that the debate be adjourned.

MR. SHOEMAKER: if my honourable friend would object if I spoke now? You wouldn't? I see.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Speaker, I had no intention of speaking on this particular debate now. I'll qualify it by saying "now". But it was the Honourable the First Minister that prompted me to do so because I fully expected that he intended to make an announcement in regard to this motion but apparently he doesn't intend to make an announcement and so it has encouraged me to speak now. And Mr. Speaker, in all of my eight years in this House, I have never seen a resolution that set out so clearly what is meant than this one here. Now if there is anyone in this Assembly that can't understand or can't comprehend the import of the resolution, will they please raise either hand. Will they please raise - there's one fellow raising both over there. Surely to goodness the resolution is in plain English that anybody could understand in Grade Two. And what does it say? What does it say, Mr. Speaker? It says, "Whereas the present method of returning a part of the school tax to the property owner by a direct cheque from the government has proved to be slow and cumbersome." Now is there anybody in the House that will deny that statement, because that is what lawyers like to refer to as a statement of fact. That is a statement of fact. It is slow and cumbersome.

Now, Mr. Speaker, no doubt you own a lot of property up in Swan River and have made applications in June and come Christmas you wondered where your cheque is. In my office at Neepawa I think there is not a week goes by all year round but that someone doesn't come in and say, "Listen, I made application for my school tax rebate a couple of months ago. When do you think I can get a cheque for my rebate? When do you think? And I said, "I don't know, but I'll drop a line to them and see if they can't hurry it along." As a matter of fact, just yesterday I wrote on behalf of a couple in Neepawa who made application on November 4th and they need the money for Christmas. Now they made application on November 4th and what day is it today? Isn't that slow and cumbersome? And I ended up my letter and request saying that they wanted the money to buy Christmas presents for the kids, to please send it along. So surely it is slow and cumbersome, and what we are saying is, what is so difficult about walking into the municipal office saying, "Listen, I owe you \$100.00 for taxes, you owe me a \$50.00 rebate, you give me \$50.00 and we'll call it a day. Now isn't that simple?

A Member: You just made 150 bucks on that one.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Speaker, they say I made \$150.00. Well if I did why don't they pay me? But you understand what I am driving at, I hope. I'm getting help on all sides here.

Now the second "whereas" says: "Whereas it would be faster and more economical and more efficient to allow the municipal corporations to give the rebate directly at the time the property owner pays the taxes." Now, what's so difficult about all that to understand? Surely my honourable friends understand what the word "faster" means, and they understand what "more economical" means. I wonder, sometimes, but if they don't understand it look it up in the dictionary. And "more efficient" - now maybe "more economical" and "more efficient" are terms that are not understood by my honourable friends opposite. That is quite possible in light of what I have seen happen over the last eight years. Perhaps it is understandable that they couldn't comprehend the meaning of those two words. But surely they know the meaning of the first one, and that's "faster". And I said at the last session of the Legislature, as my honourable friend the Mayor of Steinbach has just said a few minutes ago, that the cost of processing and paying the rebate as it is presently done would likely cost in the neighborhood of \$1.00 per application when you count every movement that is made from the time the application is first made to the time the cheque comes back to him. And Mr. Speaker, I know something about what it costs in this day and age to even write a letter, to write a letter and have it written by an employee. I know something about what it costs, and my guess is that it would be pretty well in the neighbourhood of \$1.00 per application.

Now I know this year that the government are not supplying return envelopes for the application. That is, the first year, to make it rather easy to make it rather easy to make application the government supplied stamps - not stamps; they wouldn't go that far, but return envelopes, and you signed your application for tax rebate and you sent it in. The

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd) They wouldn't even supply the envelope. You know, that's an odd thing that they would refuse to do that because there is a question on the Order Paper -- and you'll excuse me, Mr. Speaker, if I get off the debate slightly, but slightly related to it. In our office we receive six telephone bills and in the six telephone bills are return envelopes, and do you know what we do with the whole six of them? Throw them in the waste paper basket. Why? Because we just walk 99 feet across the street and pay our telephone bill over there, so we heave the six return envelopes into the waste paper basket. But if I want to make an application to get some money back from the government for my school tax rebate, oh no, they won't give you an envelope to enclose your application. But if they want some money, if they want some money, they'll enclose six return envelopes to encourage me to hurry up and get the cheque in, and I don't think this is consistent at all.

Now, Mr. Speaker, here is something new that perhaps my honourable friends would like to see, and I see the Minister of Public Utilities looking at me with that far-away look in his eye as usual.

MR. McLEAN: Admiration.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Admiration? Thank you kindly, thank you. Here is a cheque, all right not a cheque. I'm getting carried away, it's getting so close to Christmas. Here is a return envelope that is supplied. I will read it. It says, "This envelope is supplied with the compliments of the Town of Boissevain and the Rural Municipality of Morton for applications for school tax rebate," and then the address on the other side, to the Provincial Treasurer, Legislative Buildings, Winnipeg 1, and no doubt this was put out because of the fact that the government won't supply the envelopes. Would you like to have it, my honourable friend the Provincial Secretary or Provincial Treasurer? I'll send it over to you just so that it probably will prompt my honourable friend the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer.

Last Saturday, and that's not too far away for even a man of my age to forget, but last Saturday, the Secretary-Treasurer of the town of Neepawa came in to my office and he said, "Have you got any way in the world of finding out how many people in the Province of Manitoba have failed or neglected to make application for school tax rebate?" I said, "Would you mind repeating that?" and he did. And he said, "There's lots of them; there's lots of them that have failed." I said, "Well why would they do that?" "Well" he said, "they don't know." He said, "I've businessmen who think the application -- who think that the school tax rebate applies to their homes only, to their homes only, and so they don't make application." My guess is my honourable friends don't remind them. But I'm warning my honourable friends right now that I have already prepared an Order for a Return that I intend to put in, and it's nearly the same Order for Return as I had in last year asking them this question: the number of parcels of land appearing on the assessment roll for which no application for rebate was made. So they can start looking up that answer pretty soon because I'm going to put the Order for Return in tomorrow along with a lot of other questions.

Now, Mr. Speaker, on this subject of the number that have failed to make application, here is one fellow who certainly didn't fail to make application. I wonder if the House, if my honourable friends know the largest cheque that was paid out last year to any one single individual person or corporation for school tax rebate. You don't know? I'll bet you there isn't anybody here that could even guess close. The biggest cheque paid last year to a firm was \$22,100 for 442 parcels of land, each apparently qualifying for \$50.00, and while I'm not going to discuss this whole principle of the school tax rebate, because that is not mentioned in the resolution, it often makes me wonder this. Now my guess is that this fellow who got the \$22,100 for 442 lots of land, or lots - it says lots here, parcels of land - my guess is that the total assessment of the 442 parcels would not nearly be as large as the one parcel on which a lot of property in the City of Winnipeg is situated - the hotels, Eaton's store, Hudson's Bay. That's a good way to put it, because people know what you're talking about. But if Eaton's store or Hudson's Bay Store or some of these hotels appeared on the tax roll one assessment, they'd only get \$50.00. That's all they'd get. But because he had 442 lots he got \$22,100.

But Mr. Speaker, I'm not, as I said, I'm not going to get into this whole subject matter of talking about the principle of the thing. I'm going to try and stick pretty close to the resolution here. And the next whereas is, "Whereas the municipal corporations have indicated their willingness to have the rebate handled in this way. This is what my honourable friend has said here. He's a municipal man. He said they offered to do it for nothing. Well, if it presently costs about half a million dollars to pay it out the way you're doing it now, and somebody has offered to do it for nothing, what have you got to lose? What have you got to lose by accepting

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd) our recommendations, when somebody will do it for nothing. And do you know, when this business was set up to provide for the school tax rebate, there went out to every municipal clerk in the Province of Manitoba, and others perhaps, a whole brochure on this whole subject matter of school tax rebate dated December 21, 1964, and it came from the Minister of Municipal Affairs' office at that time and it was a whole series of questions and answers to familiarize the secretary-treasurers with the school tax rebate system, questions on the one side, answers on the other; and Question No. 22 was this. It said, "Would it not be possible to have the secretary-treasurer of a municipality deduct the allowable rebate on school levies when taxes are paid before December 31st of the year of demand so a taxpayer would not have to pay this money out?" And the answer over on the answer side, the answer to that was: "While it might have been possible to have handled the school tax rebate through a deduction at the source of imposition of the tax, the policy of the government in respect to the school tax rebate is set forth in the legislation relative thereto and prescribes the manner in which the school tax rebate is to be paid."

Well, what is the point, if they ask the question and they say look, could they not have done it that way and they said yes they could have done it that way but they didn't. That's what they're saying. They could have, and it might have been a better way, but they decided against it. Why? That's what I say. Why did they decide against it, and why can't legislation be changed? There's hardly a day goes by in this House but what there isn't a bill put on our desk to amend legislation, and my guess is that we will get about 100 bills at this session amending legislation, so surely this isn't going to be any stumbling block.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the "Resolved" part of the resolution is quite clear again. "THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Province of Manitoba cancel the present system of rebating directly by cheque and institute a plan whereby the municipal corporations give an immediate rebate at the time the taxpayer pays the real property tax in the municipal office." Now what is so difficult to understand about that? I would like to know.

You know, I'm completely surprised that by this stage in my debate that somebody hasn't said to me, "Well, your friend Ross Thatcher is doing the same thing." Why haven't you said that to me, because I have an answer all ready for you.

A MEMBER: What is your answer?

MR. SHOEMAKER: What is my answer? Because two wrongs don't make a right. Two wrongs never made a right, but my honourable friends often think it does and in Dief's time they thought it was a dandy, that if Dief did it they should do it and two wrongs would make a right. I always take the stand that two wrongs never make a right and four doesn't make it right and forty-four doesn't make it right. I thought I should get that in just in case some guy would think of that.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I don't intend to speak any longer, but gee, I'd be prepared, I'd be prepared to explain further if my honourable friends are having difficulty in comprehending the import of the resolution, and if they really need any further explanation as to what we're driving at, I will be prepared to elaborate at greater lengths, but for the time being — and I know that someone is going to adjourn the debate and probably amend it and that will give me the opportunity to speak if they amend it, so Mr. Speaker, surely to goodness, surely to goodness my honourable friends have listened to us argue this point at the last session and this one, will be prepared to move in our direction.

MR. MILLER: If no one else wishes to speak, Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Member from Brokenhead, that this debate be adjourned.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried. The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, BE IT RESOLVED that the minimum wage in Manitoba be established immediately at the figure of \$1.25 per hour, and BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the minimum wage be reviewed at least every two years.

MR. SPEAKER: The resolution of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia referring to an increased in the established minimum wage rate in Manitoba to that of \$1.25 per hour, is a matter which has been referred to in the Throne Speech, and to quote that part of the Throne Speech: "Although minimum wages are now effective at \$1.00 per hour throughout the entire province, the Minimum Wage Board has been reconvened to consider this matter again in the light of current conditions."

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

In the light of the comments in the Throne Speech as previously indicated, in my opinion this proposed resolution anticipates a matter which will be dealt with. In view of the circumstances outlined and in compliance with rule 31 of the Rules, Orders and Forms of Proceedings of the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba, the proposed resolution is out of order.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I realize that this is not a debatable point but if I may, on a point of order, it seems to me that there is a difference here of basics - the Throne Speech merely says that it is referring this to another body for review and study. Now surely, that doesn't prevent this House from declaring or making a statement that this House is in favour of one certain figure. Whether that Board accepts the figure or not is entirely of course up to that Board, but surely because the Government says it is referring something for study by someone else doesn't prevent this House from declaring itself in favour of one certain figure. Mr. Speaker, I don't know how we get out of this position now, but it would seem to me that possibly this is something if you feel that you cannot rule on now, that you might be prepared to have a look at and see if you couldn't reserve your judgment at the moment and give the matter more thought, because it seems to me if we were to accept this position today that we would find the House really handcuffed in the future on many matters on which the House I think is able and should be in a position to make a definite statement. There is no definite statement in the Throne Speech except it will be reviewed by someone else. So I would strongly urge, Mr. Speaker, that you might take this into consideration and propose another ruling on some later occasion.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party) (Radisson): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate and realize of course that if you have made a ruling it is not debatable, but I do suggest that maybe in this particular instance it may be an occasion where further consideration might be given in the light of the content of the Throne Speech and the terminology of the resolution as proposed by the Honourable Member for Assiniboia. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, in all deference that there is a difference and I would respectfully suggest to you that you may reserve your judgment in the light of the wording of the Throne Speech and wording of the Resolution that we have before us at this time.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I realize speaking to the point of order that we are all in rather an awkward position, the Leader of the Opposition, the Leader of the NDP and myself speaking on this at this time, but I rise to say something that may not be of too much assistance to you, Sir, but I think perhaps there is some merit in the suggestion that has come from the Leader of the Opposition and the Leader of the New Democratic Party, that this matter be looked into because it is certainly a moot point, having regard to the authority of Beauchesne which discusses the whole question of anticipation at Article 131, page 116 of the 4th Edition 1958. I'm sure, Sir, that you are familiar with this section, but it says in effect that in determining whether a discussion is out of order, on the ground of anticipation, regard shall be had by Mr. Speaker to the probability of the matter anticipated being brought before the House within a reasonable time.

Now we know from the Throne Speech that this matter has been referred pursuant to the Statute to the Minimum Wage Board of Manitoba. The only way that that would be brought before the House I presume, that is, after the Minimum Wage Board has dealt with the subject would be by way of report to the Minister of Labour which in time would ultimately be presented to the House. It may or may not be during the session of the House and there might well arise a question as to whether or not that report would be debatable at that time, when the report is tabled.

One other thing that comes to mind of course, I'm going from memory and this is really not too satisfactory in trying to say something of assistance to Your Honour, but I believe there is a section in the Minimum Wage Act which calls for alternative action being taken by the Government pursuant to an Order of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council. I'm sorry to say, Sir, that I'm probably not of too much help to you, except to say that my inclination would be that there may well be merit in the suggestion that has been put forward by the two Leaders opposite.

MR. SPEAKER: I want to assure the members that I gave this matter serious thought. However, certain important detail has been brought out today which I feel should be recognized and as a consequence I am prepared to reserve my decision for a later date. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker I would beg the indulgence of the House to have the matter stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Honourable Member have leave of the House? The Honourable Member for Laverendrye.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, in his absence, may this matter stand, please.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Honourable Member have leave? The Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

MR. PAULLEY: Could we have this resolution stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed. The Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

MR. PAULLEY: May we have this stand, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed. The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to have this resolution stood over.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed. The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if it would save time for me to ask to have the next three resolutions stood over.

MR. SPEAKER: All three, has the Honourable Member leave for all three? Agreed. The Honourable Member for St. John's.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains that:

WHEREAS the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba at the Fifth Session of the 27th Legislature, on Thursday, the 29th day of March, 1966 unanimously adopted a resolution that the Government consider the advisability of establishing a special Committee of the Legislature to examine the statutes and regulations governing professional associations and the licensing, provision of standards and disciplining of professionals in the Province of Manitoba, as set out therein, and to consider the advisability of enacting uniform legislation wherever practical and applicable;

AND WHEREAS pursuant thereto the Legislative Assembly did on the 26th day of April, 1966 appoint such a special Committee with power to hold public meetings and to sit during that session and in recess after prorogation and did authorize the Provincial Treasurer to pay expenses in connection therewith;

AND WHEREAS said Committee never met due to the calling of a General Provincial election;

BE IT RESOLVED that the Government consider the advisability of establishing a special Committee of the Legislature with the same duties and the same powers as set out in the said Resolution passed on the 26th day of April, 1966.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. John's.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I think we are interested to proceed further with our agenda, our Orders of the Day so that we can go onto the Address to the Speech from the Throne.

The matter of professional licensing and all the matters referred to in the resolution was gone into last year and although we do have a turnover of one-third of the members of the Legislature, I don't want to take up the time of this House to review what was said last year. I think it can be fairly said that it was a unanimous decision of this House to proceed with the establishment of a committee as suggested in the resolution. Indeed I was surprised that there was no reference to it in the Speech from The Throne. I have no reason to believe that anyone has changed his or her mind in connection with this matter and I would only mention -- I suppose the quickest way to make this speech would have been to just read out the page numbers from Hansard, so I'll do that Mr. Chairman. In Hansard of last year on page 1304 is the introduction that I made to this resolution, to the principle behind it, and it covers almost four pages and I would like to consider that it has been read to you today, so that it need not be repeated. Anyone who is interested may of course find it on page 1304.

What may be of greater interest to some is the speech made by the Honourable Member for Selkirk who spoke on page 1307 and had much more consideration for this House in that he spoke very briefly. And finally what may be of even greater interest to the larger majority of persons present, was a speech made by the then Honourable Member for Roblin, Mr. Keith Alexander which is reported on page 1386, and although he spoke in the first person in supporting the resolution, he made it clear that he expected that there would be unanimity in the vote, so that if honourable members especially on the government side don't want to take the trouble

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd).....to read the speeches made by the Honourable Member for Selkirk or by me, I do urge them to read what was said on page 1386 by the person who spoke on behalf of the government.

The resolution deals with a proposal that we look at all the Statutes of licensed professional bodies. At the time that this debate was conducted last year there were eighteen such Acts and after that we passed two more, so there are about twenty Acts that should be looked at which have a wide variation as to the qualifications required for different professional bodies, as to the disciplinary measures that may be taken as to the appeal provisions, and I think it was generally agreed, and I think unanimously, that it warrants an examination followed by a recommendation.

I hope that the Government will accept this resolution and will proceed to the appointment of this committee which I think is very important. I see a very important person on the government side, nodding at me so I'm again convinced that I'm taking up too much time. I want only to indicate that as far as the general public is concerned and professions in particular, I believe that this resolution has received a great deal of support. I have had occasion to speak to representative members of a number of the professions and I have heard no quarrel with the idea but only approval of it and I therefore commend it to the attention of members of this House.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q. C. (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, as I did at the last session of the last legislature, I supported this resolution which was introduced by the Honourable Member from St. John's. I still feel that it is a timely resolution and I feel that between the last session of this House and this session there is more reason than ever for pursuing the subject matter of such a resolution and I therefore ask each and every member of this House to give this resolution his and her unanimous support.

MR. DOUGLAS M. STANES (St. James): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lac du Bonnet, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to have the next two resolutions stood over.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Honourable Member have leave of the House that the next two resolutions standing in his name stand? Agreed. The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. LEMUEL HARRIS (Logan): Sorry boys. I beg leave of the House to have this matter stand. It's very nice of you.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Honourable Member have leave to stand the motion? The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. HARRIS: Let the same thing apply, Mr. Speaker. I beg leave of the House to have the matter stand. --(Interjection)-- Oh yes, surely, go right ahead

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. RUSSELL V. DOERN (Elmwood): Could we have this stand, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Burrows.

MR. BEN HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave of this House to have this matter stand.

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

MR. DESJARDINS: May I have this matter stand, please?

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate of the Throne Speech 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 Leader of the Opposition in amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I think that I have about 35 minutes or so left. I don't say that I'll use all this time but I just thought that I would clarify this.

I think that yesterday we had an interesting conversation when unfortunately 10 o'clock came a little too fast. We were talking about the story of Diefenbaker, or I might say how the West was won, and then we were talking after that about the stabbing of Dief. It seems that some of my colleagues when I read certain - I should say advertising because it was paid for, it was in a newspaper - but a statement of the First Minister of this House, some of my colleagues were marking the score to see across from us who was on which side --Interjection-- That's right, some were in Camp's camp and the other were in the other camp. It seems that the Minister of Utilities and the Provincial Treasurer were still on the Diefenbaker camp, very interesting to see, and the Member for St. Matthews, and a few others. There's one that - the member from Souris-Lansdowne was the same as when he was in Ottawa. We didn't know. For a minute he was clapping then he sat on his hands, so we couldn't decide on this one. --(Interjection)-- No, talking about Groves Mr. Speaker, it is very unfortunate rather, as you all know a good friend of mine had to leave the employ of the Conservative Party because of the way they treated the chief. I think that there's some indication now that this Party is rather in trouble. We see in today's paper that they have a picture of "Walter, Walter lead me to the altar" and some people are suggesting that they should go out, people like Groves I think and probably the two that are in Camp's camp -- no, no, Diefenbaker's camp -- I would say would want to go out of the House to get a leader. Oh, I haven't forgotten you at all, Mr. Speaker. I would say that with the indication of most of the people of the House the next leader will probably be the Attorney-General, because I know it was - sure, he was on the Camp's camp but he was cheering yesterday when I was saying all these beautiful things about Diefenbaker, so I think that would be an indication that he would qualify. If he can do this, I think he would qualify as the next leader of this party.

The First Minister, well I don't know, he wasn't in the House. Whenever my colleague or I speak he's out of the House. I think that Joe Borowski heard more of my speeches than the Premier of this House. I understand that he has a speaker connected to his office and maybe he's listening now. I think that he's safer there. If he gets mad he can kick a few buckets out there, and it's safer. But anyway, this is his prerogative - this is his --(Interjection)-- well, probably I was turned off right now.

The First Minister though, Mr. Speaker, gave us a speech that under ordinary circumstances I certainly would have been impressed by when he - well, it was a I'm very pleased that my friend is coming back, Mr. Speaker. I was talking about the speech that he made in this House a few days ago and he was telling us to be candid, to believe a little more, to give them the benefit of the doubt. Well, I think this is very difficult at times. I think that if a government wishes to be respected, wishes to be believed, well then it should act accordingly, it should do everything honest and above board. It seems to me that they would be interested in the people believing that they're doing everything above board. I don't think that we should make a mockery of fair play.

And, Mr. Speaker, how could this Cabinet, how can the Premier speak the way he did a few days ago after what they did, how they raised the cabinet's salary. Just two years ago, this government, this cabinet and especially some of the members of the cabinet tried to railroad through this pension, a very unfair pension, a ridiculous pension, and the people of Manitoba and the people in this House, the Members of the Opposition especially of this Party brought this back as was our duty to the people of Manitoba to let them know what was going on. And this was stopped in time. Well mockery, Mr. Speaker, and it's nothing else but mockery, these people after an election went back and on their own without discussing it with anybody at all decided to raise their pay by 44 percent.

Now what do they say, what is the reason for this? The First Minister explained that the Cabinet Ministers should be on the same level as the leaders in industry, the President at the University and so on. Isn't that ridiculous? A man that's a President of the University

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd). . . . who's come through the ranks, who's worked and worked, received all kinds of credits to get where he is, and because a certain person gets an election, either a merchant, a housewife, a funeral director, a chiropractor, it doesn't matter who they are - a farmer - from one day to the next, they're graduates for this kind of salary. This, Mr. Speaker, is ridiculous. I don't like the way the Premier tried to explain this. I'm not talking about his salary -- and I'll say this right now because I think that a man who is Premier of this province, I don't care what they give him in salary, he certainly earns it. This is a very difficult position. I want to make this plain, that I'm not aiming at himself, his own salary. But for the members of the Cabinet, at least there's some of them that do an awful lot more work and others do very little, others do nothing, but name commissions - they can't stand up and vote for a principle, it's always a commission that will do this. Now this is what we are having, this kind of action by a government and then the Premier gets up and he says well believe that we are sincere, that we are candid, that we want to do everything above board. This is insulting to the members of this House. This thing should have been brought - the wage increase should have been brought right in this House.

Mr. Speaker, do you realize when we say "hold the line"; do we realize, do the new members realize what went on? I have these cards that'll make it a little easier for you and some of the new members to see, Mr. Speaker. See we had a minister who was making \$12,500, then the indemnity as a member of \$3,200, and an expense of \$1,600 which is not taxable, for \$17,300, and now the increase from \$12,500 to \$15,000; \$3,000 expenses as a minister - and this has to be the biggest joke of all. I challenge any minister to get up and tell me where he's spending this money, on what expense. Is he going anywhere on any trip that his department doesn't pay, anything at all. There's more free loading than anything else. There's more free meals, free this and free that. They have their car, they have somebody that'll pick up their car to wash it or warm it up and they have \$3,000 as a Minister's expense, \$3,200, the same as the indemnity that all the members have and another 16, and I add, plus question mark, because I understand that there will be some discussion about increasing the indemnity and the expense of the members. So that would mean \$22,800, plus. Now what does that mean? What kind of increase. Just the increase. An increase on a salary of \$2,500, an expense - and this was represented as just an expense - it was hidden. On the first report it didn't come out at all - it was just an expense - they are just increasing by \$2,500.00. This is not right and we cannot believe that these people across from us, the members in the front row are sincere and honest when they try to hide things like this, and as I say question mark for the members' indemnity, and question mark for the expenses also. So it's \$5,500 plus, that is the increase that we have.

Now in percentage. You know what happened when they tried to get - the people, the railroad try to get an increase - hold the line. Well, we held the line here from \$12,500 to \$18,000, 44 percent increase, 44 percent. A minister now, how much is this - the same people now, we have to wait till a board decides what the minimum wages will be. Now, it's a dollar an hour, \$8.00 a day, \$40.00 a week, about \$160.00 a month - \$160.00 a month. These people on their salary, what they call their salary, what is taxable, \$1,500 a month, \$400.00 expenses, plus - there's another increase, for a total of \$1,900.00. Is that fair? Are we supposed to believe in the honesty and the sincerity of these people across from us? But the worst of all - oh, they say, what are some of the reasons? Well, the other provinces do it, other countries do it. That's true. There's one of these countries, one of these new countries in Africa, the politicians there get 30 times as much in a month as the people make in a year. That's true. Other countries do it. That's a very good reason, very good reason indeed.

Now to top it all, we're talking about taxes; we had a tax on heat; we're going to have a sales tax, and these people are trying to beat the tax. Hoffas's in jail for beating the tax. These people are trying to beat the tax. Do you understand why the people have no confidence in politicians - \$3,000 entity without taxes. That's a very good example for the people of Manitoba. \$3,000 that these gentlemen will not pay taxes on. No, Mr. Speaker, we do not believe in those sermons that are made here until we get a little bit of a better example from the members across from us.

Another thing, we are told about these independent commissions. There has been more commissions and boards named by this same government, this government rules by government and board - it can't stand up on its own two feet and make a decision, and there's usually one or two big commissions going out just before an election, and they are supposed to be

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd).... independent commissions. These same people, they say pay our Ministers well, because they're taking a chance, they're taking an awful chance. The last two Ministers that were defeated were immediately placed on the board, the last one on a very important board, a man that didn't have enough confidence - the people of Manitoba didn't have enough confidence in him to keep him in office, now he's chairman of the Boundaries Commission at \$12,000 a year and he's talking about dragging this thing for four, five, six or eight years. No, I don't blame him, if that's all he's worried about. This is a picture of this commission. Four of them at least are defeated candidates. Four of them. I'm thinking of running against myself in St. Boniface. Every candidate, every Conservative candidate that ran against me had a terrific job; utility board, a commission, vice-chairman of a commission, license board, the University board. This is what goes on. Now mind you, these people were... against time, their time for government. This is fine. Some of them, but not all of them and not only from one side. Then another one, the other one -- there's nothing against them at all. I'm just saying what a coincidence it is. The other one is a brother of one of the Ministers, a very well-known Conservative. Another one was supposed to be a candidate and at the last minute he couldn't be, and I wonder about the others. Mr. Christianson also received some job. If we had one once in awhile, Mr. Chairman, but this is an example of what has been going on ever since the Roblin Government took over Manitoba, and we are asked to believe in the sincerity of these people. Well I, for one, and many many members here in Manitoba do not believe this at all. No wonder there's so much trouble, no wonder the people do not believe in politicians. Oh some of them are smiling or laughing, cozy and they're just looking at me, "What the hell can you do about it?" Excuse me, "what the heck can you do about it?" I can't do a thing. Neither will the people of Manitoba and I daresay in three, four or five years they'll have forgotten. In the meantime these people had a nice raise of 44% plus, and then they're not paying any income tax on \$3,000. As I say, Hoffa's in jail. These people are across from me smiling. This is the difference. This is why we don't believe here in this country, we don't believe in the sincerity of politicians. This is the reason.

In the Throne Speech it brought in other points. I'm not one for instance, that objects to the government listening to the members of the Opposition, so I'd like to congratulate the government. This is the best part of their speech, where they discuss, they talk about some of the suggestions we brought from this side of the floor. I think that this is very good and I congratulate them. The uniform time: I hope, I hope that something will be done about this. There have been about five motions since I'm in the House, sometimes brought in by the Minister and we were told that it was not -- and it was in the Throne Speech but it wasn't supposed to be government policy. Well I hope that the government will have a policy. I hope that for a change the government will have a policy, but I congratulate them.

Then there's been the question of coloured gas. I see that we have way more television in education now. The former Minister of Education said that he didn't believe in that at all a few years ago, and now the government is seeing ahead and they're using this medium to assist us in the field of education.

There will be the ombudsman. There's already one been named in Portage la Prairie so I understand that we might have another ombudsman here in Manitoba. It's easy to talk about other places. The Minister of Municipal Affairs got up and told the municipal men what to do. She thinks -- she has been there for all of two and a half hours, and these are the same people who are crying because of the action of the Federal Government. They don't want to take the responsibility and they don't want to take the responsibility here in Manitoba either on these taxes. Well I won't say too much about that because the First Minister said that there will be some equalization of the taxes. We had another commission that recommended certain things on this, and we did very little about it.

Now there is another suggestion that I made last year that I'd like to make again this year in the Throne Speech. I would like to repeat this thing. It is dealing with liquors. The former Attorney-General again does not agree with me, but he's not too successful because he was against Sunday sports, he was against TV in education, he was against a lot of things, and these are all facts now, so maybe I'll be lucky again in this field. The only thing that he did when he was Attorney-General, I think was establish a crime-buster was done last year. But I think, Mr. Chairman, I think that in this liquor field, I think that it's high time we are talking about tourism and so on. I think that it's high time that we do away with a little bit of this hypocrisy in some of our liquor laws, and I certainly feel that the people should have a chance to enjoy either a glass of beer or a glass of wine or a drink with their meals on Sunday.

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd). . . . Many people only have that day to go out with their family, to enjoy some time with their family. They want to go for a meal and they can't have any. Some people can. If you're well off and if you belong to a club you can. You get chits and pay for those chits on Saturday, or Monday, but you can have your drinks, and I don't think that's fair.

It is ten long years now since we've had a change in these laws. We've had the Bracken Commission and we felt at the time that this would be awful. Even Mr. Potoroka who's been very interested in education in this field, admitted himself that they had been wrong, that they couldn't always be negative. And I would certainly ask this government to look into this, the possibility of changing these laws, of giving everybody a chance to have a drink with their meals. There's nothing wrong with that. The abusers are bad, and I daresay Mr. Speaker, that the abusers are just as bad on Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, Friday and Saturday. Just as bad as on Sunday. I can't see what wrong there is in that.

And while we are looking at the liquor laws, Mr. Speaker, I think that we should take a long look at this Remembrance Day. This is getting to be a joke. The idea behind this is very good, but now it's a holiday for the school children and they just think of a holiday. I think it would be much better if the children attended school all day, and maybe were asked to come a little earlier or to stay a little later after school, to make this sacrifice so then that they will remember that many people gave their lives for their country. This would be more appropriate. And again as I started talking about Remembrance Day, we're dealing with the liquor laws also. If the Legions or any of these clubs are going to be open, everything should be open. We cannot start making privileges for certain people, just have an excuse for certain people. I think that these things are not bad. If they're not bad on ordinary days, they're not bad on a Sunday, they're not bad on Remembrance Day. It's the abusers, and I think that since we liberalized the liquor laws here in our province, I think that we've come a long way and I think that in proportion I think that we probably have less people that are drinking too much than we had at that time, certainly not more, because the people that need to have this liquor, they'll get it one way or another. They will get it at a bootlegging joint or somebody somewhere else if they can't get it on Sunday in a restaurant.

I think it is a very important point also to remember the question of tourism, because this is an important thing. If liquor is allowed on Sundays with our meals - and I see someone across from me that is much more qualified than I am to deal with this and I hope that he will - I think that they can give better service and I think that this is an important thing when you have tourists, especially this year where the people will be travelling across Canada, this our Centennial year, and we'll have Pan-Am Games here, and I think the government should make these changes immediately and I suggest that they will.

Now I'll talk about the jail here in Manitoba. It's a pretty sad case. Practically every week somebody escapes. You have the saga, the romance of Leishman to be pictured I imagine and in a few years they'll be writing the story of the great master with the special guards paid just to watch him, three different shifts of eight hours each to watch Mr. Leishman in this highly guarded jail, to just watch him and nothing else, and all of a sudden he's got a pipe and a piece of wire and he's out. I imagine that we'll be picturing him with a guard handing him the tools. You know - pipe, like the doctor - pipe, wire to pick that lock, and he's away. This man was supposed to be locked and I've seen that jail, that cell. He can be seen from anywhere in this room, and this man was supposed to be sitting on a chair watching him. They pay a special man because they want to make sure he doesn't go out and they open the door and say, well you walk around, you need a little bit of exercise, then somebody leaves a pipe and a wire and, as I say, he's out.

Now there's another thing. Not too long ago there was a - I can't remember the name of this person - was being charged with extortion. He beat up a woman, I think, and then he wanted her to phone her husband to bring in some money. Now I understand that the newspapers have never said anything about this. We've never had any reports. It's been a big joke when somebody here suggested that we hurry up and find out what's going on in these jails - hurry up with this study or inquiry - and I'm told from good sources, and nothing has been said here before, nothing in the papers, that this man tried to take his life. I'm sorry that the Attorney-General is not in his seat because I'd ask if this was true that he tried to take his life with his belt - tried to hang himself with his belt - and I understand that this should not be allowed, that they are usually -- their belts are being removed from them. I was just asking the Attorney-General if it's true that somebody that was -- well, I guess he can read it in Hansard he's not listening. This - for the record - this I think is Mr. Terry Otter, who was charged with

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd).... assault and extortion, but I think that this is something that we should have an answer. Is this true? And there again if it is true and if the Attorney-General wanted to answer, to tell us if Mr. Otter tried to take his life - tried to hang himself with his belt - and if so, why was he permitted to keep this belt. Apparently this is against all rules.

So we've talked again about the minimum wages and we have a motion on this - and you're taking this under advisement - but in the Throne Speech, we certainly can speak on this because it is in the Throne Speech.

I would say that, in the past, one thing that has bothered me on this minimum wage is I feel that there have been some children, some students who sit in a store and study to see if somebody is coming - in the rural points and so on - and it was impossible to pay him the minimum wages. You couldn't give him a job at all. Then there are some people then that are retarded, very much retarded, and some very charitable people will give them some job, a job just to keep them busy and give him a chance to make a few dollars.

Well I think that we should study this, and this might be that the government -- we should have a decent minimum wage. At the very least \$1.25 right now. They say oh 25 cents for everything means a lot but when we talk about the salary increase of the Minister, they say well that's a drop in the bucket it doesn't mean a thing. Maybe these gentlemen across from us would be kind enough to say all right, our salary, our wages are good enough, we'll put this in a fund to help, we'll give this to the Minimum Wage Board. I think that the government across from us can study this and in these cases that I mention, well maybe the government should make the difference. If somebody is employing a retarded person, who actually is not doing very much but you are giving him his pride, you are giving him a chance to do something and he feels that he is earning his own life, and I think that this is very important, and if a person is to be given a chance to do this, I think there should be some kind of an assistance program from the provincial government who might allow the difference and I think that we probably would save on welfare, anyway by doing this.

There is something that -- I hope that the Minister of Welfare will take part in this debate and I would like him to tell us something about what he is going to do for these deserted wives. These wives whose husbands leave them, leave them without any money, leave them with the children and don't do anything about it. I saw an article where he was asked this and he said he was going to look into this, but two, three, four, five years ago he was asked the same thing. This is an important thing, these are the things that I'm interested in, because there is no hope, there is no life for these people. Can you imagine a mother with three or four children and they say we can't do anything about this because your husband's in Alberta and we can't do anything about this. This is more important than your roads, than everything else. I'd sooner see people going out in their car and having a few more bumps and that we help these people. We are talking about the great resources, human resources and what do we do about them? I think that this is something and I hope that the Minister will do something fairly soon.

We are also asked to find money for our hospitals. This might not be very popular but I think we should have some deterrent like some of the provinces have. I think this is one of the things that we need because this is a very difficult department now with these hospitals. You cannot guarantee, you cannot give every single man, woman and child in the province a bed, but we know there is need for more beds. I would also like to see the administration of all our hospitals, for acute care, for the nursing home and all this under the Department of Health and not under Welfare. It might cause some complication because of the grants we get from Ottawa but I think that this should be settled, because right now I say that we are wasting beds. We are building hospitals, we are building acute beds and some of these people that are in these hospitals should be in some old folks home, nursing home or some such hospital and you cannot have that. You have two different departments and one is free - you stay in these expensive beds and the acute bed doesn't cost you anything but if you go in the others you pay, so you are never going to move. They'll have to carry you out and this is what's happening, so I think something should be done and it should be done fairly soon.

Now we'll -- certainly there's a motion on the Order Paper a resolution on the Order Paper about the personnel in hospitals, this is something also that I have been after the government for many years. The Willard Report came in in two different volumes. We start building and building monuments, hospitals and so on and doesn't it seem ridiculous to you, Mr. Speaker, that we are building all kinds of hospitals and in the existing hospital we are closing the beds and wards because we have no personnel; doesn't that seem ridiculous to you?

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd). . . . It certainly does to me and to a lot of people here in Manitoba. How can we keep on saying I know we need more beds - how can we keep on building more hospitals and then close a ward of 5, 6, 10, 20 or 100 beds - and this is what is being done in Manitoba because the government does not worry about the personnel in the hospital. Now, last year, when I brought this again the Minister said, we have a committee that is studying this business of personnel and the nurses and so on. We are afraid to give these people wages equivalent to other provinces and so on, but the members in the front seats gave themselves a 44% increase in salary, these same people. You see how can these nurses believe us that we are trying to do everything we can here in Manitoba. How can the people of Manitoba, the people on welfare, how can those people, the teachers, believe that we are doing everything, and how can we be taken seriously when we say our first thing's priority education and the priority of this government is to get yourself a good pension, stay here for 4, 5, 8 years, get yourself a good pension, get yourself very good wages. This has been the priority of this government. Look after themselves and look after their friends.

MR. SPEAKER: May I intrude for a moment and advise the honourable member that he has about three minutes left.

MR. DESJARDINS: Thanks very much Mr. Speaker. I'm about ready to close. I would just like to repeat to the First Minister and the members across from us that sure we'll play along, we'll go along with you, we'll cooperate, we're giving you some good ideas as we see you're talking about them in your Throne Speech. We'll even believe that you are sincere, that you are trying to do the right thing, but, Mr. Speaker, I say to them, give us half an excuse to believe in you, don't pad your own nest, don't feather your own nest and forget the rest of the people in Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I certainly wish to add my congratulations to your election as Speaker of this House and to simply wish you well in the difficult task you have undertaken. As this is my first occasion to speak to this Chamber I would most certainly like to dwell at some length on the constituency of Rockwood-Iberville which I have the privilege of representing and which I believe to be the finest constituency with the finest people in the Province of Manitoba. However, I will in this instance restrict myself to bring to all members of this House the greetings and good wishes of an absent constituent of mine, namely my predecessor, Mr. George Hutton.

As Minister of Agriculture and Conservation I would like to acknowledge and reply to certain comments made about agriculture by my honourable friend the leader of the opposition and I'm happy to agree with him in his remarks with reference to the general well being of the agricultural industry in this province, this year, and indeed all of Western Canada. In saying so, I and the government I have the privilege of representing are most certainly mindful of those areas in the province which due to disastrous rainfall or indeed lack of rain, or floods, etc. did not share in this prosperity - and I refer specifically to such districts as the Sperling area, the difficulties that my colleague the Member from Brokenhead is so well aware of in the Libau areas and indeed a good portion of the farm lands bordering on Lake Winnipeg.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition made the statement that the cost-price squeeze was still the major problem in agriculture and had he stopped there I could have found considerable room for agreement with him; however, when he went on to say that this is due in part to the lack of sound policies and programs on the part of this government, I find myself in total disagreement with him.

I would submit that this Government of Manitoba has taken all the responsibility that the existing legislation and economic framework permits in the respect of the matters of farmers prices and farmers costs. The framework in which Manitoba's agricultural industry is placed by legislation and economic fact limits the province from getting directly into the fields of controlling and supporting prices and controlling or supporting farmers costs. Both of these matters are obviously largely a national jurisdiction and responsibility.

The cost of farm machinery is a major cost of the farmers and we're well aware of it. Any legislation or policy action in this regard must be taken by the federal government. This legislature did of course, earlier this year, by resolution, request the federal government to institute an inquiry into this matter and we are pleased to hear that the federal government has appointed such an inquiry, headed by Professor Barber, I believe, from the University of Manitoba.

Indirectly Manitoba is doing all it can in providing a suitable environment where a

(MR. ENNS cont'd)..... manufacturing, a farm machinery manufacturing industry can develop and will develop and I am sure we are all pleased to see the success of the Versatile Manufacturing Company and others who are demonstrating their ability to produce farm equipment at considerably lower prices than those available from national and international manufacturing companies.

Taxes in all fairness are a cost in farm production and this government has announced its intention to shift some of the tax load off the land base especially in respect of the cost of education where traditionally the land base has been expected to carry too much of the tax load. Certainly the cost of fuel is another significant cost in modern farm production today, and we noted that the Throne Speech indicated that this government would bring forward certain measures for your consideration in respect to further reducing the gasoline tax paid by farmers. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that on matters of prices and price control it must be recognized that the agricultural industry has to operate within a national economic framework and in many ways must function within a North American economy, and indeed in still others, in a world economy. Recognizing this as I and every other farmer in or out of this House does, it is evident to me that the only government that can take any overt and direct action in pricing is the senior government, the Federal Government of Canada.

We have recognized the need of a study on these problems and have requested the federal government to convene a national conference on agricultural policy and strategy and indeed it is just not so very long ago that my Premier sent a further personal letter to the Prime Minister of Canada reiterating this request. We have reason to be optimistic that the senior government is seriously considering this at this time.

The major role of the provincial Department of Agriculture is to do everything possible to help the farmers take full advantage of the existing economic framework in respect to costs and prices and I submit, Mr. Speaker, that no other government in Canada has done more in this area than the government I have the privilege of representing. The agricultural budget has risen steadily since 1958 and while I do not particularly wish to get caught up in the game of comparing figures from this time to that of any other time, I do believe that in this particular instance in my particular department it is of particular significance in the sense that we are dealing primarily with the same land base, the same arable acres and indeed fewer farmers.

Effective marketing is absolutely essential if the primary producer is to get the most of the final retail dollar for his product. The Manitoba Hog Marketing is an outstanding example of orderly marketing in Manitoba and has significantly reduced the traditional differential between Toronto and Winnipeg prices to the Manitoba hog producer.

The Manitoba Vegetable Marketing Commission was established to bring orderly marketing into the vegetable industry and there is of course, and I'm only too well aware of it, some controversy respecting this scheme. These are currently being investigated and studied by the Inquiry Commission and I think it would be quite improper for me to prejudge the results and recommendations of this Commission; except to say, Mr. Speaker, that it is obvious that there is a great deal of support for the idea of orderly marketing in the vegetable industry and that the current problems largely centre on administrative details and organization by the way in which it is being carried out. It must be recognized that whenever government such as this government exerts its leadership and pioneers in a new field to solve some of the problems of agriculture, there are bound to be some serious conflicts over details. Certainly stability within the agricultural industry in the prairie regions where it is subject to vagaries of climate, disease and insects is a very important factor and contrary to the opinions expressed by the Honourable Member of Birtle-Russell, I believe it is, Manitoba has an outstanding record in this regard in the form of the Manitoba Crop Insurance Corporation. Crop insurance will be available on a number of crops to all farmers in Manitoba; and while recognize, Mr. Speaker, that this is not a new program, it most certainly marks a significant milestone and a tremendous achievement for this government. Largely as a result of the pioneering and leadership that this Government of Manitoba has given in the matter of crop insurance, we now see that almost all other provinces are implementing similar schemes for their farmers.

When this administration came into power in 1958, they found that the credit arrangements were totally inadequate and here again it became obvious that the only solution to the problem was for the province to take firm leadership and the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation was established in 1959. Since its inception the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation has loaned some 30 millions plus to the farmers of this province. However more significance than the amount of money that the provincial credit corporation has injected into

(MR. ENNS cont'd). . . . the agricultural industry is the action taken by this government in providing leadership and showing confidence in investing large sums of money into the agricultural industry and in demonstrating that this is a very sound investment with an insignificant default on payment. This has resulted in a major revision on the part of Federal Farm Credit corporation, not only to the benefit of Manitoba farmers but indeed to all farmers in Canada; and equally important, fresh interest on the part of the private sector in loaning money to Manitoba farmers.

I'd like to mention one or two other highlights of the province's agricultural program. Traditionally the matter of agricultural research was recognized as a federal responsibility, but this government was not satisfied with the ability of the Federal Government to respond to all the specific requirements of research needs of the agricultural industry in this province. Consequently since 1959, or '58 rather, this government has invested well over \$10 million in developing the Faculty of Agriculture at the University of Manitoba to carry out agricultural research, to train scientists, to train students indeed to train the future farmers of this province. This has enabled the Faculty of Agriculture at the University of Manitoba to attract and to hold outstanding thinkers and leaders who have been beneficial not only to the provincial agricultural industry but to the national agricultural economy as well. The faculty has gained national and international reputation and it is now attracting significant sums, research sums from the private sector in the community and interesting to note, attracting further research funds from the Federal Government in this respect because of their ability in research fields and successful teaching programs.

Agriculture is a dynamic industry and new problems are constantly being encountered, many of which can only be solved by intensive research.

To mention only one or two outstanding achievements of this research program, I should like to mention the development of Tanka rapeseed and the soil testing program. The soil testing program has made it possible for the Province of Manitoba to develop the best soil testing program in Canada and it is interesting to note that within this year our sister province of Saskatchewan has adopted the Manitoba soil testing program lock, stock and barrel with respect to charges, techniques and costs. The agricultural policy of this government has recognized that it has a major responsibility in agricultural education. Consequently we have expanded our outstanding Extension Service with top-notch agricultural representatives and home economists out on the front lines in close contact with the farmers and backed up by competent specialist staff complete with program and policy package.

This extension education program assures the research findings are translated and made available to the farmers; and this can't be underlined enough, to what avail the millions in research and in the experimental stations, if these don't come down to a layman's understanding, a farmer's understanding of the needs that he needs on his farm and his home. It also provides the mechanism whereby farmers can quickly and effectively communicate with their government and with the research institutions on the many different problems they feel require action and attention.

It has been recognized by this government that the agricultural industry is a very complex industry today. No other industry demands more skill and managerial ability than that demanded by the industry of a successful commercial farmer. To this end the Government of Manitoba has placed a high priority on farm management training through their farm business group program. In this program all the resources of the Department of Agriculture, farm management specialists and others are placed at the disposal and are brought to bear on the farmer's problems and his training requirements.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, I would submit that within the framework in which Manitoba's agricultural industry is placed, by jurisdiction, by legislation and economic fact, this Government of Manitoba has met its responsibilities in agricultural policy, and further we have no intention of resting on our oars but will continue to develop new and better programs to ensure that the agricultural industry in Manitoba will continue to expand. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, it is this very fact that this government has not allowed eight or nine successive years of office to dull its enthusiasm for new and exciting programs but has continued to approach and carry out its responsibilities to the people of Manitoba in a most vigorous and forceful manner that attracted me to seek office and to serve the people of Manitoba, and in saying so I know that I'm only echoing the sentiments of the new members who are sitting with me for the first time in this House. I thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wellington.

MR. PHILIP PETURSSON (Wellington): Mr. Speaker, I would rise and speak now but I'm afraid that I would go over the 20 minutes that remain and inasmuch as I cannot be in the House this evening, my absence would, I believe, stop the debate at that point until tomorrow. I wouldn't want to stand in the way of some other honourable member getting up to have his say and therefore I would defer to some other man who may wish at this time to take over.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. LEMUEL HARRIS (Logan): Mr. Speaker, this is forced labour, you know. Here this man was going to speak and I have to take over in his place. I have a little bit to say, but first of all, Mr. Speaker, I --(Interjection)-- Pardon me, yes, Mr. Speaker's right. I'm looking across the way and I see Madam Speaker in her place, the last one, you know, and I often think to myself now am I going to address this man politely? But I find that it comes out naturally after all.

Well, Sir, I have a few things to say here. I was going to say them later on in the evening but I suppose the time and place comes in and you have to take the opportune moment.

Mr. Speaker, congratulations on being chosen a Speaker of this Assembly. As we see the ritual of the opening of the House many things and meanings are lost to the people, as I will explain later. My congratulations to both mover and seconder of the Reply to the Speech from the Throne. I listened very intently to the Member for St. Vital, although I didn't agree with what he said, but still that is his privilege to go on and say what he wants.

And also the Member of Fisher. I was all set to welcome my old friend Peter Wagner back but I guess somebody made a wrong count and Peter didn't get here. My congratulations to the three new Cabinet Ministers. I shall certainly miss Madam Speaker. She was very good to me all the way through, but the best to her in her new appointment, as I know she will do a good job. I wish to greet the new members and wish them well, especially my colleagues. They remind me of a battery of big guns. As I sit on this side I see them going like a pom pom gun, bang, bang, bang; bang bang bang! And moreso as time will go along. --(Interjection)-- Yes, you just look out for your turkeys. I certainly know that they will acquit themselves well.

Mr. Speaker, it has been said, the Premier is the most astute politician in Manitoba, if not in Canada -- and I'll say that with all candor because I believe so myself, although he does a lot of things that I don't believe in -- and we of the New Democratic Party can see why he called an election this year. Now I have several things here to show and one of the items was a cutting in the paper there the other day showing that around about four premiers across Canada are taking note of the raise of the New Democratic Party. Why? Because today it goes to prove that the peoples that are down underneath that have to take all this taxation, they are on the move to upset the two major parties; and that time is coming soon, right in this Canada of ours, and you'll see across the west the change as it comes along. We feel now that we can be confident that in Manitoba you are going to see a big change in the rural areas. We can show at all times that we can master the urban areas and I feel that if we had done a little more work in here it would not be the Liberals that would be on my right but it would be the NDP.

Now, a lot of people will say that is just wishful thinking. I don't think so because the trend across the world today is towards this new awakening. They say "Sweep the cobwebs to one side" and that is what is going to be, and the whole thing is going to change.

Why are our young people leaving Manitoba? The province suffered a loss of 15,000 people last year. During the years 1956-'61, the age group 20-24 left at a rate four times faster than that of any other age group. On the average, Manitoba loses 70 percent of its graduates in engineering and architecture; 30 percent of its graduates in medicine and nursing and 10 percent of its graduates in teaching. Manitoba wage rates are the lowest in the country except for the Maritimes. Our Premier is a good salesman but is selling Manitoba a little too cheaply I think, because if we could have got some real deals out of these transactions, we wouldn't be here today looking for more taxes. We would say we have the money now. We don't need to come to the people any more. Our people have got enough now of taxes. A government commission warned that by 1975 Manitoba will need 75,000 new jobs to absorb natural population increases on farm populations moving to the cities. Instead of growth the Manitoba economy in 1965 lagged behind the 1964 rates, especially in the manufacturing. Add to the low economic growth rates, higher taxes, increased medical costs, higher rents and spiralling prices on consumer goods and the reasons are plain why people are leaving Manitoba.

Our Manitoba has become a target for foreign investors who are taking advantage of the slow economic growth to make demands for concessions in return for dubious promises to

(MR. HARRIS cont'd), develop industry. One of the latest grabs in Manitoba is the take-over by Monoca Corporation of Switzerland which has been given 40,000 square miles, one-sixth of the total area of Manitoba, equal to four times the size of Belgium, of forestry land.

Now, if that isn't enough to go on with, I don't know what there is to say further; but I must say, Mr. Speaker, I promise to come back to you. I'm going back now - it was said here the other day by a gentleman I think very highly of in the British parliament about the permanent speaker - I think he said 125 years back. Well, I will go further than that. I will go to 1523 when King Hal, the main character in the Merry Wives of Windsor sends his emissary to the parliament to ask for increased taxes and he was told he couldn't have increased taxes. He wanted increased taxes for war and he was told that he couldn't have increased taxes, so he wanted benevolence from the parliament. The parliament wouldn't concede to his demands. The Secretary of State came into the House and the Speaker of the day grovelled in front of him and called him a high dignitary and an excellency and everything else because he was scared and he knew it, and so were the other people in the House, that he would be beheaded if he wouldn't give into the quests of the Secretary of State. Our parliament has gone ahead, but I often wonder to myself, have we gone around the clock now. We got away from the King and the Crown, dominating parliament, and we've come back to this system. So I say I am in agreement with a permanent speaker. For what reason? - that it shows that the clock has gone around and if a man is sent out from any particular party that is in power, he is naturally going to uphold that party, so if we have a permanent speaker then we should be able to say he is some way independent. I've heard it said that you can't make any man independent. Well naturally not so, but still when a man has no pressure put on him he can become more independent, he can tell the other fellow, well you go to this place, I'll do what I want. That is what a permanent speaker should be.

Going back to 1523 again. When a writ was made for election, the people of the day it was issued to were the nobles and the freemen, and I would like to ask in this Chamber, how many of you people are freemen, how many of you people are freemen of the City of Winnipeg? I'd like to ask the Member for Lakeside that, because he's been in this House longer than any man, if he was made a freeman of the City of Winnipeg.

MR. CAMPBELL: Nothing is free.

MR. HARRIS: Well, nothing is free. That I will prove, but it just shows to you the misnomer of the name. At this particular time the Burgesses and the freemen were the only men that were elected to parliament. You will say, well what of the common people? They had nothing at all to do with any elected body. They were just chattels, hinds in other words. You people have heard of that expression of "hinds", h i n d s - be they knights or hinds or yeomen they shall bite the ground. So that's the way it goes. They had nothing at all to do with this. And what does the King do? There was 200 names put up to him of nominees for the parliament and the King turns them all down and says, "Look, these are the two men I want and these are the two men I'll have, or I'll have your head". So you see how things go along in these various times.

During the last election there was a big outcry in my constituency there. Someone was trying to get smart. The big cry was urban renewal. Well, Mr. Speaker, urban renewal. That is a word - I remember when I came in this House in 1959, and who was fighting for urban renewal? - Dave Orlikow -- and I followed suit with him at that particular time and asked about these various things. And what was I told during this election? What had I done for Logan? Could I fight all you people? Could Dave Orlikow fight all you people? By golly, I seen poor Davy fight like a terrior; and you know that yourselves. So you see, Mr. Speaker, I won't go into detail on urban renewal you might as well send a man out for your supper because you'll be here till 10 o'clock or after. So, Madam Speaker - Madam Speaker! - Mr. Speaker, I think that the time is getting around very close and I won't say any more. Thank you very much.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. EDWARD I. DOW (Turtle Mountain): Mr. Speaker, it's 5:30; may I adjourn this debate till 8 o'clock?

MR. SPEAKER: I was in the process of calling it 5:30, if I may, and will return to the Chair at eight tonight.