

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
2:30 o'clock, Tuesday, March 12, 1968

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

Before I call the Orders of the Day, I would like to introduce to the members of the House our visitors. On my right we have 15 members of the Salvation Army Weston Home League, under the direction of Captain Marshall. This group is from the constituency of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia. On behalf of all the members of the Legislative Assembly I welcome you all here today.

We also have with us 19 students, of Grade 12 standing, from the General Wolfe School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Shafransky. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Wellington. Again, on behalf of all the honourable members of the Legislative Assembly I welcome you all here today.

Orders of the Day

MR. SAMUEL USKOW (Brokenhead): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct this question to the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture. Did the government or the Department of Agriculture make representation to the Government of Canada requesting that value for duty be imposed on U.S.A. potatoes entering Canada in the western zone?

HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Minister of Agriculture and Conservation) (Rockwood-Iberville): No, Mr. Speaker, the answer is we did not.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q. C. (Selkirk): May I direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Agriculture? When may I expect an answer to the series of questions that I asked you last week?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, if it please the House, I am prepared to answer those questions at this time. On January 25th I received a letter from the Manitoba Farmers Union requesting that a meeting take place with Cabinet. I might point out that this has been the procedure in the past. In this instance, however, they asked that the procedure be changed and that the meeting be combined with a meeting of caucus at the same time. We agreed to that request at Cabinet, and as our caucus was assembling later on in February, I waited until I had an opportune moment to broach the subject with my caucus. However, on the 23rd of February I received a second letter from the Farmers Union indicating that a meeting was unilaterally decided upon by the Farmers Union, the date being fixed as March 5th. I replied to that letter two days later, February 27th, indicating to them the reasons why we -- first, initially, the delay in answering the first letter, namely that I had to confer with my caucus members. I indicated again our willingness and our agreement to meet with them jointly. However, I had to point out that March 5th was not a suitable date for us, mainly for the reason being the caucus was coming into the city a few days later, and suggested to them that a date within the first or second week of the Session would be more advantageous to all concerned. I received thereupon one further letter from Mr. Singleton, the President of the Farmers Union, simply stating that the meeting would carry forward on March 5th with or without government participation. Consequently, that meeting took place. I attended the meeting, not in a position to receive the brief or answer to all the positions put forward in the brief. This is a very wide-ranging brief that they always put forward to us, involving the whole government, and certainly I would want the members of Cabinet caucus to be present. I, on that date, once again handed personally a letter to the President of the Farmers Union, once again indicating the government's desire to meet with them. I have affixed that date and transmitted that to the Farmers Union of being on the coming Wednesday of the following week. We await word from them at this time as to whether or not that is suitable date for them; but the point being, Mr. Speaker, that it was only in attempting to make a meeting that is convenient to all, in view of the fact that they had requested that members of caucus be present, that I thought that the time be chosen within the first or second week of the session when all members of caucus are here. Also I was aware of the practice of the Farmers Union that when they meet with our caucus they usually meet with the caucuses of the honourable gentlemen opposite, either the Liberal or the NDP, and it seemed to me that that was the time

(MR. ENNS cont'd.) element they were speaking about, and for that reason didn't perhaps appreciate the urgency of their request.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Speaker, may I direct a supplementary question to the Honourable Minister. Am I correct in assuming, then, that you did not answer the letter of January 25th which you received from the Manitoba Farmers Union until after you received the second letter on February 23rd? On what date, then, did you answer the first communication after February 23rd?

MR. ENNS: My letter in answer was on February 27th or 26th, following the week's caucus meetings that we had during the week of February 20th to the 25th. I was not in a position to speak for the caucus as to when they would be available for this meeting, and if the honourable members desire, or the Member from Selkirk desires, I'd be very pleased to transmit the actual copies of the correspondence that took place in this particular instance.

MR. HILLHOUSE: I would appreciate receiving that correspondence.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable the Attorney-General regarding some concerned calls which I have received as to the present status and capacity of Miss Bertha Rand. Apparently this woman had pleaded guilty to an assault charge and was remanded for sentence, and in the interim she has not been able to have any friends see her and her friends have indicated that they cannot see her and feel that she has now apparently been committed, although I don't have any definite information in this connection, and their concern is that the committal of this woman who apparently to them was a normal person except with regard to her eccentricity in her love for cats, Mr. Speaker, and I admit to eccentricities which are just as bad, myself, but apparently she is now incommunicado insofar as her friends are concerned, and I would wish that the Attorney-General could inform this House as to what is the status of this woman.

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q. C. (Attorney-General) (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, I had a similar inquiry from outside of the government today and my information to date is that Miss Rand was referred by the Court, by the Magistrate's Court, for a psychiatric examination pursuant to the relevant provision of the Criminal Code, I think it was, and the further information that I received just before coming into the House is that that psychiatric examination is apparently still under way and that no order for committal has been made. Now, that is verbal information that was given to me just before I came into the House. If I can get anything more concrete for the honourable gentleman I'll try to do so but that is all I have at the present time.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I thank the Honourable the Attorney-General for his answer and for the work that he has obviously done up until now. May I be advised whether there is any reason why this woman's friends could not see her at the present time?

MR. SPEAKER: I believe the Honourable Minister did answer the question that he would look into the matter and inform the honourable gentleman if there were any further developments. I wonder if there is any purpose in going beyond this stage.

MR. GREEN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would just like him to take up that point.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce. Is the construction of the Churchill Forest Products plant at The Pas proceeding on schedule and are you satisfied with the pace of progress?

HON. DONALD W. CRAIK (Minister of Mines and Natural Resources) (St. Vital): Mr. Speaker, perhaps I can take that on behalf of the Minister of Industry and Commerce since much of this activity has fallen into my area. I think the answer to the honourable member's question will probably be answered more fully at the time when my estimates come forth, but if I can give him an interim answer it is that we expect the target date to be maintained that he, I think, refers to.

MR. JOHNSTON: A supplemental question, Mr. Speaker. How many people do Churchill Forest Products employ at the present time?

MR. CRAIK: I think, Mr. Speaker, that this information should logically be received from the company, and I don't think that questions specifically such as this can be answered by ourselves any differently from any other company.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Health concerning Concordia Hospital. Since there is a great deal of interest in the construction of this hospital on the part of citizens in the area, the hospital administration and the East Kildonan City Council, I wonder if he could indicate to the House when the plans

March 12, 1968

85

(MR. DOERN cont'd.) will be approved for construction and also when the target date for construction will begin.

HON. CHARLES H. WITNEY (Minister of Health) (Flin Flon): Mr. Speaker, I'll take the question as notice.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, following on the questions of the Honourable Member for Portage to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. His reply was that the members should ask the company for the information, but in view of the fact that the announcement was made here in the House originally of this project, and that the government was very directly involved, is it not reasonable that the government should be prepared to give the information here?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I think the question specifically is how many employees they have, and I think there's quite a difference in making an announcement and keeping track on their numbers of employees. I'm sure he doesn't really expect us to know to the nearest man or man hour what the status of this company is.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. In view of the fact that the Manitoba Development Fund has loaned quite a bit of money to this industry and this development, would it not be in the interests of the House that we know that they have "employees?"

A MEMBER: One or more.

MR. CRAIK: Well, I'll assure the Member from Inkster that they have employees, unless of course the ones I have been meeting are well disguised and posing as employees that aren't employees.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, a question for the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. Do I understand him to say that he does not know how many employees this firm has at the present?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I think I have already answered that.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. In early January a report from his department indicated that Manitoba's mineral production rose by \$7 million in value in 1967 to reach approximately \$187 million. Could he indicate to the House what revenue there was to the province from these mining operations, and what costs were involved from the province insofar as mining activity?

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Provincial Treasurer): I think, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member will recognize this is a matter of Treasury concern, and I expect in my budget address to describe the sources of revenue during the current year.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. Could he inform the House whether Churchill Forest Products have over 25 employees or less than that amount?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I believe the Honourable Member for Gladstone will agree with me that possibly that avenue has been reasonably well explored, and I wonder if he would bear with me on that subject.

MR. SHOEMAKER: It has been pursued, your Honour, but no answer is forthcoming. But I will direct one now to my honourable friend the Minister of Health and acting Minister of Agriculture, I think. -- (Interjection) -- He was last year, anyway. It is this: When can we expect to receive -- on concur in the Report on Dental Services?

MR. WITNEY: Mr. Speaker, that report was dead with the last Legislature.

MR. SHOEMAKER: A supplementary question. Then can I assume that it is dead and buried? Is it going to be resurrected and are we going to deal with concurrence in the report? Is it going to be tabled?

MR. WITNEY: Mr. Speaker, the report was tabled in the House here but there will be no concurrence moved because it's a report that isn't before this Legislature.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question: What action, then, is the government going to take on the report? What is the next procedure?

MR. WITNEY: Mr. Speaker, I have legislation under consideration at the present time.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Public Utilities. I understand the Manitoba Hydro supplies power to all trailer parks in Winnipeg and Manitoba, and the trailer parks themselves have to resell the power to the residents in the parks. Is there any reason why the Manitoba Hydro does not supply the residents directly?

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN, Q.C. (Minister of Public Utilities) (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, none that I know of.

MR. SAUL MILLER (Seven Oaks): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Education. Yesterday the Minister announced slight increases in the Foundation Program. Could he now inform the House whether there will be any changes in grants towards Class IV teachers or whether this is the extent of the change in the Foundation Program for 1968?

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Education) (Gimli): Those items which I announced yesterday are the extent of the expansion in the Foundation Program itself for the coming year.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable the First Minister. Has the Privy Council had occasion to overrule any part of the report of the Boundaries Commission with respect to the locations of vocational schools?

HON. WALTER WEIR (Premier) (Minnedosa): Mr. Speaker, I think it might be better if that question was asked of somebody that was privileged to be a member of the Privy Council.

MR. JOHNSTON: May I please rephrase my question to the same person, the Honourable the First Minister? Has the Cabinet of which he is a member in the past year had occasion to overrule the recommendations of the Boundaries Commission with respect to the establishment of sites for vocational schools?

MR. WEIR: Not that I'm aware, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SAUL M. CHERNIACK, Q.C. (St. John's): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to either the Provincial Secretary or the Attorney-General dealing with the report of the Batten Commission which was established to study the question of consumer problems. I understand that the report has been made and highly publicized. I understand that the Government has received some copies. May I ask if members of this House, or indeed parties of this House, will be favoured with copies of the report, and when that will be?

MR. LYON: Yes, Mr. Speaker, we have copies that were received just recently and we will make them available depending on the quantities that we have. I know the Queen's Printer's office has a supply; I don't know the exact number. We will make them available certainly initially to the parties, and if we have a quantity we will make them available to every member of the House.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party) (Radisson): When? Tomorrow?

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with I would like to direct a question to my honourable friend the Minister of Public Utilities. It is briefly this: Has the government's attitude changed in respect to the parking meters on Memorial Boulevard that we discussed last year? Is it quite in order for everyone in the province, and out of the province, to park their cars on Memorial Boulevard and not deposit money in the meters, and be quite free from being prosecuted or fined for doing so? Is it unchanged as of the last five years?

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Speaker, that would be quite all right today. I think in about three days' time it will not be all right.

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Attorney-General. Can he give me a reply to the questions I directed to him last week regarding the telephone tapping devices?

MR. LYON: No I can't, Mr. Speaker, because we are busy -- or the Department is presently canvassing the police forces and, I think, the different departments of government, in order to get a proper answer for my honourable friend.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, before you proceed with the Orders may I lay on the table of the House the report of Internal Economy Commissioners for the fiscal period ended the 31st day of March 1967.

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed I would like to make an announcement to the interest of all members of the House, and that is: between the sessions our recording equipment has been changed from a record type to a tape type and these tapes, as you possibly know, are quite expensive, but nevertheless the suggestion has been made that the tapes can be re-used, and I'm suggesting to the House that possibly we hold the tapes for 48 hours and then re-use them; and in making that suggestion I am requesting the Members of the House to be good enough to peruse the Hansard that is on their desk the next day in view of the fact that they may require some corrections or reference to the tape itself. Beyond the 48 hours the tape will be re-used. I trust this will meet with the wishes of the House.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, it seems to me 48 hours is too short a period of time. I think this should be prolonged.

A MEMBER: ... 72?

MR. SPEAKER: I'll be guided by the House. Are there any suggestions that we should extend it beyond 48 hours?

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, if somebody is going to have to make a suggestion, I would suggest that a week later would be fine, and that means that a person over the weekend could go through his own speeches in any event, and have an opportunity of saying I said that or I didn't say it. It only means that you are going to buy three or four more tapes, depending on how long they last.

MR. SPEAKER: I don't wish to delay the proceedings of the House. Shall we leave it as is for the moment and we can probably mention it again when I have met with various representatives of the party. Needless to say, I am economy-minded and this was my first thought. Orders of the Day.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, at the risk of using up some of the tape, I think I should mention a few items in connection with future sittings of the House that will be of general interest. Members of the House have agreed that there will be no sitting on the evening of Tuesday, March 26th, because of the presence in Manitoba of the Governor-General who will be here for the opening of the Centennial Arts Centre on the evening of the 27th. The Members of the House, by agreement also, will be sitting, however, on the evening of Thursday, March 28th, even though there are outstanding invitations for another event that evening. This again is after consultation and agreement. And the House will adjourn and will not sit on Thursday and Friday the 4th and 5th of April, again after consultation and agreement. As I understand it, I think the Leader of the Opposition could perhaps explain what is on then, but it's of national interest and national importance that a sizeable group of this House will have to be elsewhere -- I hope doing a good job.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I just might on that subject thank the other members of the House for their courtesy in regard to those two days. Those affect the members of my group particularly and I think they are part of our function as a political party, and I appreciate the agreement of the House. I would offer my best wishes and a welcome to all the other members of the House who might want to join us on that occasion.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, on this point I thank the Honourable the Leader of the Official Opposition, the Liberal Party, for his invitation. I think that it is time that somebody went down to that party to indicate to them the rules of parliamentary procedure, so that the introduction of bills are not withdrawn posthaste in order to be revised, to conform with the rules of the House, which have been rules for generations.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: I thank the gentlemen for their brief comments. Order for Return. The Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. PAULLEY: May I have this matter stand, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Honourable Member have leave? Agreed?

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, before proceeding with the Order Paper, again there has been prior consultation and I believe that there is general agreement in the House, Sir, to have you revert to government business on the final page of the Order Paper on Page 4, the adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Address in Reply, to deal with that matter first and then to revert back to private orders to the private resolutions which begin at Page 1 of the Order Paper.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Honourable the Attorney-General have leave with that suggestion? Agreed.

The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Virden, and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. The Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, may I first of all express my appreciation to the members of the House for their courtesy in changing the Orders of the Day in order that I may get off my chest one or two comments which I desire to make in respect of the destiny of Manitoba. This is sincerely appreciated.

May I first of all, Mr. Speaker, as is the custom in this House, say to you that we are pleased to see you - at least temporarily - occupying the position that you are. Of course, you know as well as I do that during the deliberations of the Rules Committee certain propositions

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.) as to a permanent Speaker were considered and at that particular time many remarks of a proper nature were directed to the manner in which you are conducting your august position. I had the opportunity, may I inform members of the House, this past year of accompanying our Speaker on a parliamentary conference in the Province of New Brunswick, and I found that my honourable friend the Speaker of this Assembly, a very able and co-operative travelling companion, and I wish him the best during our deliberations this year.

A MEMBER: Tell us about it.

MR. PAULLEY: I think possibly it would be as well not to mention too much about it. The company was good on that particular conference, and I might say to the honourable former premier of this province, a Liberal, that I enjoyed the company of your wit as well during that period of time. For once in the history of Manitoba at least three political parties were able to get together and to discuss problems on an amiable, amicable basis and we appreciated the fact that the representative of the Liberal Party was there as well. I must confess though, Mr. Speaker, I was a little bit disappointed, because of the fact that there was an election going on at that particular time in at least three provinces, namely, New Brunswick, Ontario and Saskatchewan, that there weren't too many representatives of my political party there, because they were actively engaged at home.

My second congratulation has to be to my amiable friend the Member for Minnedosa who has taken upon himself the onerous duties of leading the present and soon-to-be-ousted government in the Province of Manitoba. You know, Mr. Speaker, I must say to my honourable friend the First Minister that I have always found, as I am sure all other members of this House who know him have found, that he is a decent, amiable, affable sort of a fellow and the fate that is going to be his sooner and later is not going to be the fate we usually give to individuals such as himself, so I say to him now that he has stuck his neck out, though, and accepted the responsibility as the First Minister of this House, that he must - and I am sure that he will - he must and has to accept the criticisms, the barbs and the shots that will in the process of democracy be directed toward him.

Another person on the other side of the House, Mr. Speaker, that I think that I should offer my congratulations to, is the new Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. It was, as the Leader of the Opposition suggested yesterday, predicted at the last session of this House that this gentleman would don a mantle of that of a cabinet minister some time in the future, and I want to say to him he backed the right horse in the campaign for the leadership of the Conservative Party and he is now the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

I think, too, that I should offer my congratulations to another partially new Minister, and that is the new partial Minister of Highways. He has donned the mantle that has been cast aside by the present First Minister, and I don't know if this is the indications of aspirations for the future in respect of the present Minister of Highways. Also, Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the mover and the seconder of the reply to His Honour. I find a lot of fruitful ammunition, may I say, in the remarks of the Honourable Member for Virden and that of the Honourable the Member for St. Matthews. I think that the Member for Virden should be congratulated for his outspoken criticism of his government's spending in education, and if this is just an indication of what we are going to expect when we review the Estimates of the Department of Education, Lord help Manitoba. His remarks in regard to the redistribution of seats indicate an understandable fear on the other side of the House as to the results of redistribution in Manitoba providing redistribution is carried on under the present impartial and independent commission which we have.

I would like to commend my friend on his timely remarks in regard to the Manitoba Development Fund, when he says that the time has come for a review of the operation of the Manitoba Development Fund. I say to my friend the Honourable Member for St. Matthews that, while he was not quite so critical of the government in a general way, he certainly pointed out deficiencies of that administration as they pertain to his constituency: the lack of housing; the lack of care of people, and many other lacks as well; and I suggest to my honourable friend the Member for St. Matthews maybe he is sitting on the wrong side of the House, and if that is not the case may I suggest to my honourable friend that he has a mission to perform and that mission is to try and get his colleagues, the members of his caucus, to accept the suggestions that he made to try and indoctrinate his colleagues into the deficiencies which are prevalent at the present time in the government opposite.

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.)

I say that the remarks of my honourable friend the member for St. Matthews should be taken into consideration, and I suggest to him that if he can't penetrate the minds of those within his caucus at the present time, then he has no right, in my opinion, on behalf of the people of St. Matthews to stay there but to join the fight for justice and for right from this corner of the House.

Mr. Speaker, the other day we were privileged to hear a very capable and well beloved individual, namely, our Lieutenant-Governor, read to us the program of the government for the ensuing year. This is always, of course, Mr. Speaker, referred to as the Speech from the Throne. I'll bet you a cotton-pickin' buck, however, that the Crown, if it could, would divorce itself from this speech. I'd say that it is one of the most unimaginative regressive speeches that has been heard in this Chamber for many a year, and I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that I've heard lots of regressive speeches from the Throne, but I think that this one caps the whole works. In main, it is nothing more than a rehash of jobs still undone and it gives no indication for the future in the Province of Manitoba.

I'd like, Mr. Speaker, to refer to the Speech from the Throne page by page and time will not permit me to deal with all of the matters but I would like to this afternoon because -- particularly after your admonition, Mr. Speaker, of the cost of tapes; but I think that there are parts that we have to give consideration to. On Page 1 reference is made to the average wage in the province, recording one of the highest increases on record. Well, I suppose, Mr. Speaker, if you start from nothing and you get one you're making a tremendous increase. I suppose if you start from the lowest wage rate in the west of Canada, from Ontario west, and have a 10 percent increase on the Manitoba level as compared to an eight percent increase in Ontario or Saskatchewan or Alberta or British Columbia, you can establish that you have the highest on record. Which reminds me, of course, of the story of having beef and rabbit stew. It's 50-50: one cow and one rabbit. And that's the basis on which the Minister of Labour arrives at the highest increase on record. Wage-wise in Manitoba we're still the lowest from Ontario westward.

Then, reference is made to the low level of unemployment in Manitoba. Of course we've got one of the lowest levels of unemployment in the west, but what is the reason for that low level of unemployment? Is it because of the fact that we're increasing our production? I suggest the answer is in another arena; that we're still losing population every year in the Province of Manitoba. And I see my honourable friend the Minister of Industry and Commerce has awakened from his lethargy, or his sleep or his slumber, and now shakes his head. He says that it is not so. His propaganda machine substantiates my contention, and I refer my honourable friend the Minister of Industry and Commerce to the new service bulletin of December 29th. Now it can be, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Industry and Commerce does not know what goes into these bulletins, and it's understandable too, because there are so darn many of them nobody can keep track of them really. But what did the Honourable Minister -- or maybe I shouldn't accuse my honourable friend, because while there is plenty of propaganda and information sent out from the various departments of government there's also indications that the various departments of government don't talk to each other, so it could well be that my honourable friend the Minister of Industry and Commerce didn't know what was in this bulletin. But he cited in one of his speeches that the growth in Manitoba's population is a key aspect of the province's progress during 1967. At January 1st the population was estimated at 959,000. Ten months later, this epistle says, as at October 1st the figure had risen to 966,000, an average increase of 700 people per month. So you did have an increase, didn't you, Mr. Minister?

The article then goes on to state that in the same period of time we had 8,000 new immigrants come into Manitoba which were included in the 700, but what my honourable friend omits to say in this document, Mr. Speaker, that the natural population increase -- that is births over deaths -- in the 12-month period was 9,457 which gave us a net loss of approximately 9,000 citizens of Transcona -- or of citizens of Manitoba over the year. Laugh, that's right; there's many slips of the tongue, and I'm prepared to be laughed at for slips of the tongue. But I want to say to my honourable friend the Minister of Industry and Commerce that while there can be slips of the tongue, let us have factual figures and not the guff that we have been receiving from the department insofar as the progress in Manitoba is concerned, and I insist that I am correct when I say that there was a drain in the population count of Manitoba.

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.) by 9,000 people last year, and the unfortunate part about it all, Mr. Speaker, they were qualified, well-educated people that could well enhance the future of Manitoba, and while I have nothing against immigrants coming into our province, if we're only able to maintain by new citizens coming in and our qualified well-trained personnel going out, it's nothing for the Minister of Industry and Commerce or any minister of government to say the aspect of population increase is an indicator of success in Manitoba. So much for Page 1; it's only partial.

Then we go on to Page 2, and what do we get in reference to Page 2? Reference is made to the growth in mining, and I suppose, Mr. Speaker, it would be relatively unfair of me to tackle the new Minister of Mines and Natural Resources this afternoon. He's a poor little lamb who has to be indoctrinated into the operation of government, and yes, he may have lost his way, I don't know. From some of his comments that I've heard since he was first elected he's right in the right group. — (Interjection) — No, he's not strayed away, he's right in the corral. My friend talks about the growth in the mining industry, and what is the true situation in mining in Manitoba? The only growth we've had, Mr. Speaker, in the last year was due to an increase in the price of copper and of nickel. That's the growth that we had. If my honourable friend the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources will take the time to read the last report of the Department of Mines and Natural Resources he will come to no other conclusion than that I'm right, that the growth is not real growth but only in value because of increases in prices.

Then, too, on Page 2 of the epistle, reference to agriculture. The need for increasing and extending the use of agriculture as an industrial base in Manitoba. I wonder if the Minister of Agriculture has seriously given consideration to expanding the research facilities at the University of Manitoba in order to provide for more trained personnel in the field of industrial production based on agriculture. Here's an area that I suggest, as rurally oriented as the government may be, that they have neglected the agricultural industry in Manitoba. One other comment — I want to go back to the Speech from the Throne and my honourable friend the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources where we're talking of resources development, I note that in the Throne Speech mention is made of oil exploration in the area of the Hudson's Bay. Where did you dig this one up? I ask the government. So I went back over some of the reports of my honourable friend the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources; went back to the report of 1964, when it was indicated that explorations had started in Hudson Bay by Saugapat in 1962, and here, Mr. Speaker, in the year 1968 in the epistle from the Throne, we're going to expand oil investigation in Hudson Bay. You know, my friends, there's lots of other things that you could have included in the Speech from the Throne rather than try to resurrect statements of years gone by, unfulfilled prophecies and advancements, but such is the order of government today.

Page 3 of the epistle. Reference is made to the TED. Target for Economic Development. More guff from the Department of Industry and Commerce. A three-inch thick volume of the epistle of 1962 still gathering dust in the filing cabinets of Ministers opposite. Still many challenges contained in the COMEF report, still not accepted by government. But I suppose, Mr. Speaker, we have to have a new approach in the field of research, a new approach to give us an opportunity not to do anything because somebody is studying it, and that is the general approach of the government opposite.

Mention is made — Page 3 again — of the situation in agriculture. What is the answer of the government to this great industry in Manitoba? To share the plow with the highway. How can this government justify relegating the very important field of agriculture to the sharing of a portfolio in highways? — (Interjection) — Priorities, yes. What are the priorities? What were the priorities of the Minister who now heads this government? At the convention for the leadership of the Party, I believe in November, I wonder if my honourable friend the First Minister has forgotten what he said at that time respecting agriculture, and I think, Mr. Speaker, it would be a pretty good idea to read back into the record of this House what the winner of the leadership race for the Conservative Party had to say on November 25th in the Auditorium in respect of agriculture. — (Interjection) — Pretty long? Yep. I read a lot of it. I read a lot of it in your new speech, my honourable friend, but you didn't put into your new speech what you put into the speech on November 25th in the Auditorium, so I want to read it, Mr. Chairman.

"Manitoba retains her strong agricultural base." Now it shares that base with the

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.) highways. "The challenges facing agriculture in this age of technology are many." -- (Interjection) -- That's right; that's right. Maybe it is a good job that he gave it, but I understood it. "The health of this vital industry warrants the interest and concern of all Canadians. We must consult with our farmers and their different farm organizations in order to explore all the ways and means of overcoming these problems that face this most important industry." And what is the net result? The part-time Minister of Agriculture is very hesitant about meeting the farm organizations that the First Minister said was one of the prime concerns.

And then I go on . . . Then my honourable friend the First Minister said on November 25th: "We understand, of course, that in many instances the solutions to these problems require national policies and for this reason should I become your leader" - and he did - "our government would welcome the opportunity to sit down with the recently announced force in Agriculture in an effort to help in shaping and influencing the agricultural policies that this province and this country needs." And what is the approach? A part-time Minister of Agriculture.

And what about my honourable friend the Minister of Education? He was a contender too. He was a contender too, but he too exhibited a concern for agriculture, and what was his remark? This is what the Minister of Education said at that convention - and if I recall correctly the Minister of Education was supported by one of the other Cabinet Minister's offices - and this is what was said, Mr. Speaker: "We must continue to work to do the utmost to get a better break for our farmers." A better break - on the highway? "While our farm communities are facing serious problems of adjustment, there are real opportunities for improving our situation." Share it with the Highways. "Our farmers will double their value of production again within the next 10 years. I make this point, my honourable friends," the Minister of Education said, "because we must understand the importance of the farmers to the province's economy."

I wonder if my honourable friend the Minister of Education might take his remarks of November 25th and read them to the Acting Minister of Highways and Agriculture so that that honourable gentleman will know of the problems of Agriculture. And my honourable friend went on to say, "No matter how you look at it, Agriculture is our number one industry. We must develop and extend our farm potential" -- and share it with the Highways. And so the epistle goes on -- (Interjection) -- I wonder if you'd like to make the speech.

And so we go on. What about Page 4 of the epistle we had the other day? Reference is made to the question of Northern Affairs. I don't know by the reference there whether we're going to be given an extended version of the concern of the Commissioner of Northern Affairs to the fixing of a few stoves or bridges up in the northern part of the country. I'm sorry that this afternoon the member for Churchill is not present because I wonder how much he read into the development of the north contained within the Throne Speech, and I suggest not very much.

I wonder if the Commissioner of Northern Affairs - or whatever the dickens he's called in this House - followed the remarks of the member for Churchill as he appeared before the Royal Commission on Transportation. But, Mr. Speaker, while the government expresses its concern for the development of the north, is there one item in the Throne Speech dealing with the problems of the Indian and the Metis in the north? Is there any concern there? Not one mention of the concern in the Speech from the Throne in respect of this part of our society. Completely rejected and not considered. Is there any suggestion in the development of Northern Manitoba to provide the Indian and the Metis with the tools to help themselves? The answer is obviously "no". Is there anything contained in the reference to Northern Affairs for the development of the Town of Churchill? Not one word! I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, far better for the government not to mention northern Manitoba at all than to omit the important problems of the north that they did.

The question of housing: Reference of housing is made. The Housing and Renewal Corporation to get some funds. I suggest this is another phony of government. Last year we passed the legislation setting up the commission. Very little, if anything, has been done in the field of housing and renewal. The Throne Speech indicates that now we're going to have a few pennies - and I suggest they will be pennies in view of the pronouncement of my honourable friend the First Minister insofar as finances are concerned - we're going to have a few pennies to put into the pot for housing and renewal. But, Mr. Speaker, if what the First Minister has

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.) already stated as policy of his government before the conference on housing at Ottawa is any indication of what we can expect, there'll be little - very little - in the field of housing in Manitoba.

My honourable friend, according to the press reports, said: "We're a bunch of rugged individualists here in Manitoba that can look after our own housing needs." How can he make such statements when at the same time we're going backwards and backwards and backwards in the provision of housing for Manitobans. Here again - here again, no mention at all in the Throne Speech in regard to housing, of trying to improve the lot of the Metis in respect of housing.

Well, Mr. Speaker, let me be fair to the government. They may have this in the back of their minds that they intend to do something. If they could put in their Throne Speech half of the guff that they've got in here now, let them come forward with concrete proposals.

Page 4 of the epistle also mentions the area of Labour. It mentions that good labour-management relations are possible providing the government lays foundations through legislation to bring this about, and there are still many areas of labour legislation in Manitoba that have to be revised and brought up-to-date. It's all very fine for my friend the Honourable Minister of Labour to call conferences - and I appreciate the fact that the other day I had the opportunity of attending a conference on technology and automation - and may I suggest that this is only because of the resolution proposed by my honourable friend the member for Logan, my colleague, it bore fruit. I want my honourable friend the Minister of Labour to analyze completely the documents that were presented to that conference and inwardly digest them, because I think that he would find them worthwhile. I compliment him on calling that conference if only to receive from outside experts what we in this House have been trying to tell him as to the deficiencies in the field of labour-management in the Province of Manitoba. I suggest also to my honourable friend that it is time that we stopped referring continuously these matters to the Woods Commission; time that we in this House, or you in government, started taking positive action on your own volition. For too long the ranks of labour have had to await the decisions of government pending consideration by the Woods Committee, and it's about time we started dealing with the problems in Manitoba and forthrightly.

Then, Mr. Speaker, I want to just finish the direct reference to the Throne Speech by reference to Page 5 of the epistle dealing with the question of Hydro and Telephones. These are two areas which the New Democratic Party has historically supported in government. -- (Interjection) -- Pardon? Yes, so do the Conservatives. Particularly, may I remind my honourable friend the Provincial Secretary, especially may I say that Conservatives supported public ownership in the field of the distribution of natural gas. Did you? Did you? My honourable friend remains mute, but I want to say to my honourable friend that I remember - I remember the vigorous fight that was put up by the Conservative Party of Manitoba against the proposition for public ownership of the distribution of natural gas, and we're paying through the nose for it now.

But to get back to Manitoba Telephones and Hydro, we're well pleased with the progress that is being made. We have criticism from time to time, it is true. I want to know - and I'll have an Order for Return in a day or so - the terms of the agreement between Manitoba Hydro and tentative plans for export of our power resources to the United States and to Ontario. I want to hear from the Minister of Industry and Commerce, or the Minister of Public Utilities, as to whether or not the investment that we're making in a hydro for power at Kettle Rapids is going to be used for the export of power instead of the provision of power for industrial growth in Manitoba. And I ask my honourable friend the Minister of Public Utilities to make note of that.

I want to ask my honourable friend the Minister of Industry and Commerce what happened to Alcan and its plant in Transcona for the production of wire for the lines between here and Kettle Rapids. My honourable friend the Minister of Industry and Commerce, or his predecessor in this House, with a great deal of gusto a year or two ago pointed over to me as the representative from Transcona and said: "You're going to get a \$3 million plant in Transcona because of our development in the north." And what is the situation today? No development in Manitoba for cable, but the contract of Manitoba Hydro awarded to Reynolds and Company who are going to build a million and half dollar plant for the production of the wire for the Kettle Rapids development in the Province of Quebec. Growing to beat '70? Well, maybe Quebec is.

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.)

I want now, Mr. Speaker, to leave the Throne Speech and talk of something else.

Mr. Speaker, about a year ago, on the 16th of March, the Minister of Health presented for second reading in this House the Medical Services Insurance bill. At that time the Minister went into great detail as to the provisions contained in the bill and recommended that the House approve the measure. In his speech to the House he pointed out objections that the government had to the proposals of the Federal Government, particularly in respect of certain aspects of the plan as to it being universal in coverage. He pointed out that in the year 1962 the Conservative Government, when it appeared before the Royal Commission on Health Services, proposed a universally available plan with premiums within the range of the great majority of the people, but on a voluntary basis. He stated a basic principle advocated by the Conservative Government in the field of social legislation, that the government assistance should be directed particularly to those in need - cap-in-hand need?

At that time in his remarks to the House he said - and I'm quoting from one of the famous or infamous information bulletins of the Department of the Provincial Secretary at that time - I think there's been a change since, I don't know who's responsible now. However, he stated that: "However much the Provincial Government may support these two ideas" - that is voluntary and universal available - "they can only be adopted if the Federal Government would agree." And then he went on to say: "It is not practical for the Provincial Government to proceed on a plan which the Federal Government was not willing to support." Then he went on to say in his presentation to this House almost a year ago, "It became obvious that a province must introduce a compulsory plan."

And then he went on, Mr. Speaker, at that time to propose three questions as to the position of Manitoba. He said firstly, "We can do nothing." I want my honourable friend the First Minister to just take this in between his ears, that his Minister of Health as Minister of Health a year ago and still the present Minister, said, "First we can do nothing." But doing nothing was an extreme that Manitoba rejected in its submission to the Royal Commission on Health Services in 1962. Doing nothing meant leaving in limbo a section of the public that we felt to be in need of comprehensive medical service coverage that they could afford. To do nothing would also mean that we leave on the table in Ottawa the federal contribution which is estimated at some \$17 million annually.

The second proposition of my honourable friend the Minister of Health was that possibly Manitoba could develop a plan specific to Manitoba's needs under which all could be covered. However, he found that the federal authority would not agree to a plan envisioned by this government. He went on to say that if we move without federal aid the cost of such a plan to the provincial Treasury would mean millions of dollars annually, and he said Manitoba residents would be contributing to federal tax revenues in support of medical insurance plans in other provinces while, at the same time, providing a provincial plan without support from these taxes. Proposition No. 2.

His third position as the spokesman for Manitoba a year ago was that we would join the federal plan, benefit from the federal contributions of some \$17 million and raise the other half by premiums and that the province would pay the premiums for those most in need. Then he went on: "Thus, joining the federal plan under its terms and conditions is the only practical choice if we are to provide insurance against the cost of medical services for the people of this province regardless of age or financial circumstances. Thus to meet federal criteria it was our opinion that a compulsory plan be introduced."

But the point that my honourable friends now are forgetting is that, at the present time in Manitoba, collectively the people of Manitoba through premium payment are paying more for coverage for four-fifths of the population than they would under the federal scheme for the total population, for in the year just ended over \$22 million was paid by subscribers to the Manitoba Medical Service which only covers some 62 percent of the people in Manitoba. This is more than the Minister stated we would have to raise by premiums to cover all Manitobans, which he stated as being at \$17 million. The net result of participation in the plan would have been that the present premiums being paid under MMS could be considerably reduced and at the same time the coverage applied to all Manitobans. My honourable friends may turn around and say "Yes, but don't we make our contribution to federal revenue sources?" We do, in part - through income tax and other taxes. But I think it has been established that we receive more back from the federal Treasury one way or another into Manitoba than is

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.) collectively collected by the federal Treasury. This is the stand of my honourable friend speaking on behalf of the government a year ago. Such was the position taken a year ago on behalf of the government by its Minister of Health. Then, after a thorough debate in this House the medical insurance bill passed with the members then present voting 46 to 2 in favour of the bill. Only two members, Mr. Speaker, voted against the bill: the Honourable Member for Rhineland and the former and incoming member for Turtle Mountain.

It is interesting to read back over the record and find that among those present at the time of voting on the bill was the Honourable Member for Wolseley, who once again has vacated his seat, and who is now an outright oppositionist to medicare, and our present First Minister the Honourable Walter Weir. Both of these honourable gentlemen, while very vociferous now in their opposition to the provision of adequate medicare to Manitobans, were mute at the time of the debate in this House. Mr. Speaker, it must indeed be very, very embarrassing for the Minister of Health and other members opposite who voted for the bill, to find that their support for this measure was cast aside outside of this House before the members here had an opportunity of discussing the matter.

During the session a year ago I asked my honourable friend the Minister of Health when he introduced the bill, "Can I be assured," I said, "that the plan will come into effect on the 1st of July, 1968?" And Hansard records my honourable friend as stating - and I quote from Hansard I believe of March 13th - the answer of my honourable friend the Minister of Health: "With respect to the Honourable the Leader of the NDP asking whether or not we are going to proceed by July 1st, 1968, this legislation will be before you and the answer will be, 'Yes, we will'."

There was some consideration at that time as to the possible postponement. You know, the Liberal authority down at Ottawa postponed it. At first we were supposed to have the plan in effect to celebrate the Centenary of our nation on July 1, 1967, but they procrastinated and delayed, but my honourable friend the Minister of Health says, "Not us. We're going to go ahead with it on the first of July 1968. We're not going to be like those Liberals down at Ottawa and push it aside any longer. We're going to advance and unfurl our flag to the mast-head for Medicare." Where now, Mr. Minister? Where now?

What is the reason? What made the Minister change his mind? He certainly didn't consult this House before he changed his mind. All that I have got from my honourable friend thus far is another news release of February 2nd in which my honourable friend says, "Manitoba will defer participation in the Medicare scheme under the Medical Act for at least one year beyond July 1, 1968." He says, "It is our hope that changes will be made during the next year to the formula to come into line with what we have proposed." What you proposed or your government proposed in 1962 and every year since that time have been rejected by the Federal authority. I doubt very much, Mr. Speaker, whether the Federal authority can renege in respect of the legislation that has been adopted by at least two provinces in Canada. And he said in his press release of that time that "it has always been our view that the financial role of the province of Manitoba should be to help those who, because of low income, require assistance in meeting premium payments." He said, "We continue to hold this view." Well, they are holding it all right. They're holding the view but they are doing very little about it.

He said that we remain convinced that medical insurance should be available to all our citizens regardless of their income level, and then went on to say, "We remain equally convinced that the plan presented to us is not the most effective or the most desirous method of achieving that goal." I have been unable to find anywhere any statement from the Premier of our province of a positive nature as to why he changed his mind. He stated that he and his government have always taken the view that financially the Province of Manitoba should help those who because of low income require assistance in meeting premium payments. I wonder if my honourable friend is now prepared to back this statement up by action.

At the end of December 1967 there were 620,000 persons enrolled under the Manitoba Medical Service, about 70 percent in total of Manitobans. Many of these people are finding it increasingly difficult to pay the premiums at the present required of them. Recent calculations indicate that an increase of premiums anywhere from 25-30 percent and upwards are in the offing for those who are subscribers to Manitoba Medical Service. It is estimated that these new increases will come into effect in a month or two when the effective control of the Manitoba Medical Service is relinquished by the doctors. The fee increase for premiums, it

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.) is stated, will be due to increased fees for services demanded by the doctors.

I'm convinced that a great many thousands of our present premium payers into Manitoba Medical Service will be unable to pay the increased premiums. At the present time over 200,000 Manitobans are not covered by any medical insurance, and I suggest this figure could well double as a result of increased premiums under MMS. How stands the government in this regard?

During the debate in this House on the medical services bill, members on this side of the House suggested that the fee schedule for medical services should be written into the Act. The government rejected that proposition. I suggest now, Mr. Speaker, that the chickens are coming home to roost; that because of the inactivity, the negligence, the reluctance of the government opposite to write in a fee schedule into the medical services bill, . . . are going to result in onerous financial burdens being placed on those who are at present in Manitoba Medical.

I ask the Minister of Health, I ask the First Minister how now they stand in this regard. At the same time, however, as the government opposite rejects the federal contribution of \$17 million from the Federal Treasury. Ah, yes. So what if premiums go up in Manitoba; we can still afford not to pick up \$17 million for medicare from federal sources. Mr. Speaker, if the government is going to continue to apply the same yardstick as it has in the past for the provision of medical services for those in need, I fear that the general health of the citizens of Manitoba is going to go down. Does the First Minister know what the present situation is in Manitoba in respect of the provision of Medicare? Does the Minister know that of 61,000 persons in Manitoba who are exempted from the necessity of paying \$2.00 a month in respect of hospital premiums because of the inability to pay and after a rugged means test by the Department of Welfare, that of that 61,000 only 25,000 can qualify for a Medicare card? Is this, Mr. Premier, what you and your government mean when you were going to suggest that you are going to take care of those who have the financial inability to provide for themselves in the field of Medicare? And many people at present on low and fixed incomes are not being covered by Medicare due to the means test applied by the Department of Welfare.

You know, we're hearing a lot of things these days about the progress of Manitoba. Almost every time that we turn on our radio we hear a song something about beating the drums for 70; beautiful choirs, beautiful drummers and the slogan that the Minister of Industry and Commerce has adopted is "Manitoba growing to beat 70". I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that that slogan should be changed somewhat into one which would be "Many Manitobans are not going to reach 70" because of the approaches of the provincial conservative government to Medicare.

I ask you, Mr. First Minister, what is the real reason for postponement? Is it because of finances? It cannot be because of finances, Mr. Speaker. We are a rich province; we're a very rich province. Don't take my word for it; take the word of the Minister of Industry and Commerce. It is that honourable gentleman that says that we're a rich province. It is only the First Minister that says we're poor and cannot afford Medicare, but the Minister of Industry and Commerce says we're a rich province because that gentleman addressing the Sales and Advertising Club of Winnipeg on February 5th of this year is reported in the press as saying "Manitoba is a rich province . . .

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q.C. (Minister of Industry and Commerce) (River Heights): Rich in opportunity.

MR. PAULLEY: . . . that insists on talking poor. It is time he said we stopped being sorry for ourselves and realize the strong position we are working from. Of course it could be, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Industry and Commerce don't speak to the Premier of Manitoba in respect of the financial situation that we have before us at the present time. On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, maybe it is that they do talk to each other and maybe because of the attitude of the Minister of Industry and Commerce that he has convinced the First Minister that we are so rich in Manitoba that we can afford to throw aside \$17 million from federal sources. Rich boy, poor boy. So I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, that the postponement of Medicare cannot be due to the lack of finances in our province. We have hundreds of thousands of dollars to throw away on government promotional enterprises - the majority of it spent under the control of agents and experts outside of the Province of Manitoba. Some fellow by the name of Camp enters into the picture; now who he happens to be I don't know, but apparently he's going to control, according to press reports, some \$700,000 of hard-earned Manitoba

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.) taxpayers' dollars.

But on top of all this we've still got hundreds of thousands of dollars to spend in promotional work of the government, and the latest one, Mr. Speaker, that I find is a new epistle, the epistle of Craik, for here we have a new epistle sent out by the Province of Manitoba Conservation Newsletter by the Department of Mines and Natural Resources. I want to commend the reading of this document to all Manitobans because my honourable friend the Minister, the new Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, just starting out on his new venture has taken a leaf out of the book of the Minister of Industry and Commerce, and, Mr. Speaker, it's the same guff - I caught you nodding - that we've been having in the past. For what does the first epistle from Craik have to say? "People count - people count." My honourable friend nods his head. Well for goodness sake start acting as those people count. He says that we are all concerned not only with our prosperity but other things that contribute to our well-being. But what my honourable friend doesn't say, Mr. Speaker, the well-being of whom?

In his department, the Department of Mines and Natural Resources, collectively the taxpayer of Manitoba spends \$8 million to get back five. At the same time, in the Department of Mines and Natural Resources, one of the firms last year had a net profit of \$141 million, namely INCO. I say that they didn't receive this net profit all in the Province of Manitoba, and this is true, and I trust that my nodding-headed Minister of Industry and Commerce will be able to tell this House exactly how much of that net profit was earned in the Province of Manitoba. People count. Of course people count. We can't afford Medicare for people but we can afford to exceed the revenues returned from our resource development in Manitoba at a cost of at least \$5 million to our taxpayers. So I say the epistles for Craik should really be re-read either by the lower High Poo-h Bah of the Informational Services Department or by some of the Ministers opposite so that we get facts, not fiction, because there's no indication that people count.

But we're a rich province. Of course we're a rich province. The government opposite has said on a number of occasions that we're rich. You know, Mr. Speaker, we're so rich in Manitoba and we're so concerned with helping people that we can reject the propositions of the Carter Commission on Taxation which, if said recommendations were accepted, about 95 percent of the people of Canada, which of course includes this province, could have a reduction in taxes. But Manitoba isn't concerned. We're so wealthy we can turn around and say that we don't need to stop, as suggested by Carter, donations of millions and millions of dollars by the evaders of taxes as Carter points out in his report. We're rich in Manitoba; let them carry on; let the people of Manitoba continue to spend out five or six million dollars more than they're getting in return from their own natural resources. Let INCO, let our insurance companies across Canada, and others, continue to receive the types of profit that I refer to from the depletion of our natural resources that are non-renewable. Let go all of this before we give to the people of our province and our country their rightful participation in a medicare scheme. This our government supports. I suggest that my honourable friend the Minister of the treasures should take a second look at the question of the recommendations of the Carter commission report.

You know, Mr. Speaker, last year when my honourable friends opposite were imposing a five percent sales tax on the taxpayers and citizens of Manitoba, my honourable friend the Minister of the Treasury suggested that among other reasons that he was imposing the tax at that time was because the recommendations of the Carter commission report had not been brought down. And I recall my honourable friend saying, "Yes, yes we could consider possibly the question of a capital gains tax and a few extra taxes here and a few extra taxes there." He said that one of the reasons for the five percent sales tax was because of the rejection at the federal sources of the rejection of the tax structure committee; we'd have to take another look at it, that we'd have to consider a new approach to the field of taxation. "Now we await", his words were, "the report on the Carter commission."

What is the attitude now as contained in the blue book which we got the other day from my honourable friend the Minister of the Treasury, on Page 5 I believe it is. He said that the Carter tax system should not be implemented in the foreseeable future. Fine - my friend nods his head. I don't agree with all of the recommendations of the Carter commission. They have to be investigated and looked at, but I think, Mr. Speaker, that the position of this government should be to take a look at the proposition, not dismiss it as apparently has been done. I think that the author of the Carter commission report was right when he said, according to the

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.) Tribune on December 4th last, that a minority were opposing the tax report. I think Ken Carter was right when he said that, and I say that, as Pierre Berton says, a smug minority at that. Yes, Mr. Speaker, we can reject Carter and his propositions; we can reject a federal contribution of \$17 million from federal sources here in Manitoba because we're rich in Manitoba. Don't ask me; ask the Minister of Industry and Commerce. That's the position we're in in Manitoba at the present time.

Well then, Mr. Speaker, what can we do about the situation as far as Manitoba is concerned? I suggest first and possibly foremost the best thing that can happen in Manitoba is to get rid of the present government. I suggest that we must be prepared to invest new methods of obtaining revenues necessary to conduct the affairs of government and to ease the burden of taxation at the local level. We must do more than just simply beat a drum to improve our economy. We must end the drain of our trained and professional personnel from our province and we must provide the opportunity for all Manitobans to share in the benefits which are possible in this affluent society we claim that we're living in.

Yesterday, Mr. Speaker, we listened with a great deal of interest to the rebuttal of the Honourable the Leader of the Liberal Party with respect to the Speech from the Throne. I want to compliment my honourable friend on the job that he did in his criticism of the government. I support most of the contentions that he holds. He very capably chastised the government for its failings over the last ten years, and I suggest that they have been accelerated within the last year or two. He quite properly established that priorities of the government were perhaps not in the best interests of the people of Manitoba. I can agree with him when he talks of the waste in the propaganda department of the government side. I agree when he talks of the new need for new priorities. I agree with my friend the Leader of the Liberals when he talks of the great wealth contained in the Pre-Cambrian Shield which can enhance Manitoba's future. It will make us rich provided we get our share of it instead of it going into stock-brokers' hands somewhere else outside of Manitoba. And this is your bent my honourable friend - nothing for Manitobans, but let us produce for outsiders. I'll go into that on a different occasion in this House and maybe my honourable friend at that particular time will be able to debate with me.

I agree with the Leader of the Liberal Party when he deplores the non-entry of Manitoba into the Medicare scheme. However, Mr. Speaker, I must disagree with his philosophical approaches in these matters. He suggests more incentives for our natural resources, more aids to private enterprise for the exploitation of our non-renewable minerals. We think that the taxpayer of Manitoba is already paying too much by comparison with the return for the depletion of our resource wealth.

In regard to Medicare, my honourable friend the Leader of the Liberals dismisses the advantages of Medicare to Manitobans as a whole and concentrates on the monetary values. He states he wants a voluntary plan and would work for changes in the legislation - that is the federal legislation - to bring this about. In this regard, Mr. Speaker, his party in Manitoba is really no different than the Weir administration. Where then does the Liberals of Manitoba really stand insofar as Medicare is concerned? Do they really believe in the federal plan or are they only opposed to the action of this government because we will not receive the financial contribution for Medicare? Does the Liberal Party of Manitoba want to reject the present policy of its federal counterpart which states in effect that we are prepared to make a contribution from federal treasury to any province which will agree to provide Medicare by right, not sufferance, to all of the citizens of the jurisdiction concerned. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I agree that this government should be condemned; it should be turned out of office.

However, we can support in general the amendments proposed by the Leader of the Liberal Party but we feel that amendments are necessary and certain changes should be made. I'm going to propose some of those changes in a moment, but before doing so, Mr. Speaker, I want to make it clear that when my Party, my caucus agrees with some of the points contained in the Liberal amendment to the Throne Speech, that we would be supporting the Liberals as an alternative to the present Conservative government for Manitoba. They are no alternative. In most respects they are just like the two proverbial peas, and I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we only have to look to the province to the west of us under a Liberal government to get an example of what I mean when I suggest that the Liberals are no alternative to that gang over there, or in respect of Medicare in Saskatchewan as announced in the recent budget address of the Provincial Treasurer in Saskatchewan. They have announced a deterrent charge of \$2.50

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.) per day on patients going into hospitals; a deterrent charge of \$1.50 per visit to a doctor's office or \$2.00 to a person's home. In other words, the great benefactors of humanity in Saskatchewan, the Liberal Party, are prepared to put a surcharge on the sick.

Concern for the farmers in Saskatchewan, the concern for the farmers in Manitoba which might follow the action - if they were on that side of the House - follow the action of the Saskatchewan government, two cents per gallon on purple gas to help the farmers out of the cost-price squeeze in Saskatchewan, increased sales tax in Saskatchewan under a Liberal administration to help out the poor depressed wage earner and housewife, increases in tobacco, increases in the automobile accident insurance fund, clearly indicates to me, Mr. Speaker, that the Liberals don't really have the interests of the farmers, the sick or the little fellow at heart in Saskatchewan. And here in Manitoba, I understand from press releases that my honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition, the Leader of the Liberal Party, is advocating helping the little fellow out in Manitoba by abolishing the estates tax. Jiminy Christmas, Jiminy Christmas. But anyway, Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend did propose an amendment yesterday dealing with the affairs of Manitoba and I have suggested that we are supporting them in some respects, but we don't think that they know the truth of the situation prevailing in Manitoba and I want to propose some suggested amendments to their resolution.

May I first of all, Mr. Speaker, direct the attention of the House to the first section of the Liberal amendment dealing with long-range programs to deal with the growing problems of urban areas and, in particular, total amalgamation in Greater Winnipeg. I want, Mr. Speaker, for members to take a very close look at that, because as I read it, the resolution seems to imply on one hand that they are prepared to accept total amalgamation of Winnipeg, but all they are doing actually when one looks into the resolution itself, they are only suggesting that the government has to take a look into the problem of total amalgamation for Winnipeg which is a horse of a different colour. — (Interjection) — That's what it says and if my friend meant something else — you know actually what I think my honourable friend was trying to do in that first section of his amendment was straddle two fences. I think he was trying to straddle the fence of St. Boniface and the fence of the rest of Greater Winnipeg -- (Interjection) -- No Sir, it's not total amalgamation at all, it's just the failure of the government to look into the problem of it. That's what we are voting on - that's what I'll be voting on and I'm sure others in this House will as well.

But anyway, Mr. Speaker, I want to suggest certain amendments to the proposition of the Leader of the Liberal Party, and with your indulgence, Mr. Speaker, I would read the proposed amendment to the amendments, and then read what the amendment would be as amended so that the picture is clear. First of all, we suggest that the amendment be amended by adding the following subsections after subsection (b) of the first section; namely, (c) Urban transportation and (d) Urban renewal. And then we suggest, by placing a comma after the word "failed" in the first line of Section 2 and inserting the capital letter "A" -- Maybe, Mr. Speaker, I'll reverse the procedure and give it to you as the amendment would be if adopted as amended, and it would be I am sure more clear because the other contains the technical mechanisms to arrive at the proposition.

So then the amendment as we intend it to be amended would read as follows:

1. After almost ten years in office this government has failed to produce a long-range program to deal with the growing problems of urban areas and in particular

- (a) Total Amalgamation in Greater Winnipeg
- (b) Leadership and legislation in water and air pollution control
- (c) Urban transportation
- (d) Urban renewal

The last two are new propositions, and then

2. The motion would be amended by adding subsection (b). The present motion reads "to alleviate the cost-price squeeze in agriculture in spite of its promise to do so", and adding thereto "that the government has failed to accept its responsibility as a government to ensure producer control, orderly marketing of farm products within its jurisdiction."

Our next suggested change would be on Section 3 of the present amendment to add the following: "That the government has failed to relieve the high cost of municipal taxation which places an undue burden on local taxpayers, particularly those on fixed and low incomes."

We then would delete completely Section 4 of the amendment proposed by my honourable

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd)...friend the Leader of the Liberal Party and offer a proposition for the consideration of the House in respect of Medicare. Our substitute section would read: "The government has failed to accept the principle of the Hall Commission recommendations, namely, that the responsibility for the provision of health care to all Manitobans should be borne by society generally through a comprehensive and universal health plan rather than by the individual."

We then would accept the following, the present Section 5 in the resolution proposed by my honourable friend, and then we would add four other sections to the amendment proposed by the Leader of the Liberal Party which would read as follows:

6. That the government has failed to provide higher education at social rather than individual cost;
7. That the government has failed to introduce adequate legislation for the protection of consumers in particular and the citizens in general;
8. That the government has failed to adopt and to recommend to the Federal Government that it adopt the policy of principles of equity in taxation as suggested by the recommendations of the Royal Commission on taxation;
9. That the government has abandoned the principles of responsible government by insisting that the allocation of public monies by the Manitoba Development Fund are beyond the purview of the Legislature.

So therefore, Mr. Speaker, I wish to move formally, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. John's that the amendment be amended first by adding the following subsections after subsection (b) of the first section: (c) urban transportation, (d) urban renewal. Secondly, by placing a comma after the word "failed" in the first line of Section 2 and inserting the capital letter "A" and a comma before the word "to" in that line, and by adding the following as subsection (B) of Section 2, namely, "to accept its responsibility as a government to ensure producer control, orderly marketing of farm products within its jurisdiction".

3. By adding the following sentence to Section 3: "has failed to relieve the high cost of municipal taxation which places an undue burden on local taxpayers, particularly those on fixed and low incomes."
4. By deleting all of the words in Section 4 and substituting the following: "has failed to accept the principle of the Hall Commission recommendations namely, that the responsibility for the provision of health care to all Manitobans should be borne by society generally through a comprehensive and universal health plan rather than by the individual".
5. By adding the following sections after Section 5 of the amendment:
6. Has failed to provide for higher education at social rather than individual cost.
7. Has failed to introduce adequate legislation for the protection of consumers in particular and citizens in general.
8. Has failed to adopt and to recommend to the Federal Government that it adopt the principle of equity in taxation as suggested in the recommendations of the Carter Royal Commission on Taxation.
9. Has abandoned the principles of responsible government by insisting that allocation of public monies by the Manitoba Development Fund are beyond the purview of the Legislature."

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

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

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

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I believe we now have agreed to revert back to the private members' section of the Order Paper with the first resolution standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Virden.

MR. DOUGLAS M. STANES (St. James): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if this matter could stand. -- (Interjection) -- Oh sorry, beg your pardon.

MR. MORRIS D. MCGREGOR (Virden): Mr. Speaker, I beg the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand.

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. ALBERT VIELFAURE (La Verendrye): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Carillon,

Whereas the Department of Agriculture is equal in importance to any governmental department of the Province of Manitoba; and

Whereas the said Department like the farmers it serves has to adapt itself to continually changing conditions; and

Whereas the Department in order to carry out its responsibilities, deserves and needs a full-time Minister at its head; and

Whereas the present Minister of Agriculture has to divide his time between the Department of Highways and the Department of Agriculture;

Therefore Be It Resolved that this House express its disapproval of this extremely important Department being headed by a part-time Minister.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. VIELFAURE: Mr. Speaker, may I say that I was indeed surprised to notice that one of the first orders of the new Minister after his acceptance of the premiership of this province was to make the Minister of Agriculture a part-time Minister by dividing his responsibilities between those of highways and agriculture. We all know that about ten years ago the members across were very hard in their criticism of the former administration in doing nothing about the cost-price squeeze. After ten years certainly we agree that nothing too much has happened and I do not mean to say here that making the Minister a full-time Minister is what will correct the cost-price squeeze, but certainly making him a part-time Minister isn't going to help.

I cannot understand, Mr. Speaker, why a few days after his appointment the Premier decided to relieve the then Minister of Mines and Natural Resources of his part-time duties as Minister of Mines and Natural Resources by appointing a full-time Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, and at the same time making Agriculture under the responsibility of the Minister who had two departments. Mr. Speaker, certainly agriculture hasn't lost that much importance in the last few years so as to take in my opinion a back seat in the legislative council of this province. If you check the statutes you will find that there are about twelve acts that come under the responsibility of the Minister of Agriculture. Certainly there is a lot of work there to be done and it would need the full time of any capable man.

I see in the Throne Speech that we will be asked to amend the Dairy Act to deal with the matter of synthetic dairy products. This, Mr. Speaker, shows the tremendous changes that are taking place in agriculture today. I am told that there is not only the dairy products that are imitated by synthetic products but even meat. I am told that you can now have a soya bean steak that will taste exactly like ordinary meat. The reason, Mr. Speaker, why I mention these facts is to show the tremendous changes that are taking place in agriculture today. It is no more a matter of taking care of the day to day operation within the province. It is my opinion, Mr. Speaker, that it is the responsibility of the Minister of Agriculture to be aware of all the trends in production and marketing not only in this province, or even this continent, but even the world over. I think, Mr. Speaker, it is the duty of the Minister to be informed of all the production methods in other countries, the new methods that are innovated every day and that certainly can have effects on our own production here.

It is a well known fact, for example, that in this province we could certainly stand some new varieties of grain. Grain for example that would be cheaper to produce and that would certainly benefit the feeding of cattle, hogs and poultry in this province. It is my opinion that this province is losing right now quite a bit of its feeder cattle population because it is being done cheaper elsewhere. I think there is a big job to be done there. I know it is not easy, but certainly it is not by having a part-time Minister that he can devote the time that

(MR. VIELFAURE cont'd). . . . he would like to relieve the agriculture segment of these problems.

Mr. Speaker, these are only some of the fields where I think it is important that the Minister have the time to give the proper consideration to maintain a healthy situation in agriculture. Take for example the information needed in the guidance in the field of marketing. Practically every segment of agriculture today is looking at new methods of marketing. I don't think it is the responsibility of the Minister to tell the farmers exactly how they should market, but certainly, in my opinion, it is his responsibility to find out as much as possible what goes on somewhere else, the new methods that are being introduced, and to inform the farmers of this province as to what takes place. We know what happened a couple of years ago when a commission was appointed by these farmers, the trouble that it has caused, and certainly this shows us that we have to have as much information and knowledge of the situation elsewhere so that it can help us solve our own problems in this province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would not want to leave the impression that my criticism is directed at the Honourable Minister, the part-time Minister of Agriculture. There is no doubt in my mind that he has the willingness and the ability to direct the Department of Agriculture, but in my opinion it is impossible for him to be able to do the job that should be done while sharing the also important Department of Highways.

The Minister is a young man with only two years in the Cabinet and certainly the First Minister could have found somebody else amongst his many backbenchers. I know many of them that have many years of experience in this House and in my opinion they would be well qualified to take either of the departments that the Minister of Agriculture now has to carry.

So, Mr. Speaker, in closing, I ask the members of this House to express their dissatisfaction at the present government in failing to give recognition to a very important part of our society and giving agriculture a back seat in the Executive Council of this province.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Seven Oaks that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I ask the indulgence of the House to have this resolution stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have leave? Agreed? The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for St. James.

MR. STANES: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Matthews that Whereas recreation for children and adults is growing in importance; and

Whereas existing recreational facilities are not always used to maximum advantage; and Whereas there is an increasing need for co-ordination of recreation and recreational facilities; Therefore be it resolved that Municipal Councils be encouraged to give leadership and direction in this essential service to the public.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. STANES: Mr. Speaker, I make no apologies in bringing this before the House. It's in a slightly different form but I think it's a matter of growing importance. I know that I share with many members of the House considerable concern in this whole general subject. Several feel as strong as I do, so I feel that by discussion, by debate perhaps we can come to some method by which this problem in its total can be resolved.

Now I think that one cannot disassociate recreation from physical education, Mr. Speaker. Phys. Ed., physical education, in my view, and I think many will agree, is the method of education through sport, something which I regret is still almost non-existent in our educational system. I do though, realize the reason why this is the situation; it is because our society has got to this very point extremely rapidly. Really, we're not too far removed from a few years ago of getting our exercise by carrying the water and hewing the wood.

And I mention, Mr. Speaker, the question of physical education because it's through our educational system where we expose our children to this very important factor in education that we create a desire for sport amongst them which continues in their years after their formal education.

(MR. STANES cont'd.)

I am particularly concerned, Mr. Speaker, with the lack of use, or shall we say the lack of co-ordination of our facilities that we have already in existence, to the betterment of all the people. Not only am I referring to physical education in our educational system; not only am I referring to organized sport among our children at school and through our community clubs, but I'm also referring to a very important and growing important part of our society, and that is games, physical education, sport, of our adults. We get the situation so often whereby the parents and children wish to go and use a gymnasium in a school, play badminton, and so on, and at 4:30 the place is locked up; weekends it's locked up; summer it's locked up. I contend that these properties belong to the people of the province and therefore, within certain regulations of course, should be used by the people of this province.

This thing came very forcibly to me, Mr. Speaker, when members will recall, that just over a year ago you passed legislation which permitted the Council of St. James to set up a Committee of Council to organize and control some parts of physical education and sports throughout the City of St. James. This of course was centred upon the new and extremely successful Civic Centre where we do have a fully qualified physical director who is, shall we say, the Deputy Minister under complete control of a small committee of Council. The concept here, which I completely agree with, is that education in the future will be as important in our society as the sewer, the water, the power and so on is at the moment. It is a service necessary. I don't mean to imply for one moment that we should completely disregard the many wonderful work presently fulfilled and will be fulfilled by our citizens through many activities, the sporting organizations, through community clubs and so on — No. What I am saying is that we do need professional co-ordination of all this effort. This is working out really quite well in the City of St. James, insofar that the community clubs run their own shows, but is co-ordinated from this central place and the boys and girls know full well that the finals will be played off in the Civic Centre where there is accommodation, people to watch. It's also the honour and glory of playing there and that the facilities will be available there. Also there is the instruction available through this Centre.

But we still haven't gone to a point which I would like to go. I may be wrong but I put it before the House for discussion. I would like to see this extended, extended to the point where the facilities at the schools are available. Primarily they are there for the education of the child but when it's not being used for that purpose there's no reason I see why, with co-ordination and co-operation, it shouldn't be used for the good of all, adult and child. It's a strange thing but it appears to be under our law that two or three children can go and kick a ball around in a school yard — that's perfectly all right, but they can't organize a game — that's illegal.

So, Mr. Speaker, I hope I'm making myself fairly clear that what I have in mind is this, the co-ordination of all our activities. I would imagine too that there are a number of small schools in our rural areas which are no longer being used and these buildings are probably in fair repair, they are the centre of those particular communities; I see no reason why they can't be used by the local council for the good of recreation, square dancing, basketball, badminton, and all the many activities for all our citizens. Therefore I believe, and I stand to be corrected, but I believe that the one way to get this, of the total amalgamation of all our facilities, and the amalgamation of any new facilities, and what those new facilities shall consist of, is by means of a committee of the council with able direction of qualified people, in order to make the maximum use of everything we've got. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Member for Kildonan, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution, the Honourable Member for Inkster,

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I would request the indulgence of the members in the House to have this matter stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have leave? The proposed resolution of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Selkirk,

Whereas the northern and eastern 3/5 of the province of Manitoba lies within the

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd.) precambrian shield, and

Whereas it is in similar areas in other provinces that most of the mining activity is concentrated, and

Whereas Manitoba needs practical incentives for development, and

Whereas northern Manitoba in particular requires further growth in population, and

Whereas in the province of Saskatchewan a "Northern Incentives Program" has been instituted to encourage exploration, prospecting and development of new mines in the precambrian area, and

Whereas a similar program has been instituted by the federal government in those areas under its jurisdiction in the Northwest Territories, and

Whereas this federal program has been successful in promoting a great upsurge in mining activity in the Northwest Territories;

Therefore be it resolved that the Manitoba Government give consideration to the advisability of instituting similar programs of incentives to assist in the prospecting, exploration and development of new mines in - and here, Mr. Speaker, I must ask the indulgence of the House - there were three words left out in the typing of my original motion - I would like leave to add the words "in all portions" of the precambrian shield.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. MOLGAT: accepted, with the exception of maybe that one addition.

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

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, in the debate earlier today we've had some discussion about mining and the future of Manitoba in the mining areas and the Minister of Industry and Commerce in comment during the speech of the Leader of the NDP mentioned that this would be the area that would make us rich. Certainly this is one of the areas which, in my opinion, Manitoba's future does lie.

The government's own publications -- and I'm referring now to the one entitled "Facts about Manitoba" in giving a geographic description of the province, states the following: "The northern three-fifths of the province is of entirely different geographical formation lying within the precambrian belt." Now this is the hardrock mining area, Mr. Speaker, where we can look forward to the greatest potential, in my opinion, for future mines. Now, it's true that there has been some expansion in the areas around Thompson, where some new shafts are presently being opened up; the Lynn Lake operation also has one new shaft going in and in the immediate vicinity of Snow Lake there have been some further exploration. But it seems to me that there are still vast areas of that three-fifths of the province which are not sufficiently exploited.

The Province of Saskatchewan proceeded with a program along these lines back some years ago. The Federal Government have proceeded with such a program in the Northwest Territories and there it has had some dramatic results. One need only look at the expanded production in that area where some very few years ago we really didn't hear about mining in the Northwest Territories; now it is one of the most active areas in Canada and yet, compared to Manitoba, it is not nearly as accessible. We are fortunate at the moment in Northern Manitoba in having a railway that at least traverses a large portion of our north. Good portions of it are accessible by road. More needs to be done, but at least from an accessibility standpoint we are further ahead than are the Northwest Territories. And yet we are not making the growth. We are not having the results in our north that they are having in the Northwest Territories. The figures that I have insofar as the Northwest Territories development is growth in the order of something like \$40 million mineral production in 1966 up to 132 million this year. When we look at Manitoba's production, we are not having similar gains.

The report I referred to earlier in a question to the Minister, the headline was "Mineral Record at \$187 million". Well, I'm very pleased to see the figure of 187. When it says "mineral record" it is a slight exaggeration, at least a different interpretation. It is a record in the sense that it's higher than the year before and higher than ever before in Manitoba's history, true; but it's not a record in terms of keeping up with what the rest of Canada is doing or in fact in terms of actual percentage growth in our own province. Because if we look over the past figures for our mineral growth -- and I'm quoting now from the Financial Post Survey of Markets -- we find the following growth figures: Starting back, for example in the period that my honourable friends across the way like to refer to, 1958 -

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd.) - which is their base point for most of their calculations - in 1958 we find that the mineral production in Manitoba was some \$57 million and it amounted to at that stage to 2.7 percent of the Canadian production. In '59 there was no growth - \$55 million; 1960, no growth, to speak of - \$58 million. Then in 1961 we find the Thompson development getting into production. The plan had been started in '55-56 but the development period took until 1960, and that's when the first results came in. 1961 then was a big change. We moved up to \$101 million from 58 and accounted for 3.9 percent of Canadian production. 1962, again a dramatic increase to \$158 million, accounting for 5.6 Canadian production. But from then on the growth tapers off. In 1963 we moved up to \$169 million - 5.6 Canadian production; 1964, \$173 million, in other words an increase of only some 4 million and our share of the Canadian production drops to 5.1 percent. In 1965 we grow to \$182 million and our share again drops to 4.9 percent; in 1966 no change that I can discern from the figures of this report - 182 million, exactly the same as in 1965, and our share again drops to 4.5 percent. This year the Minister tells us the figures are 187 so that accounts only for 5 million increase over the previous year. If we look at that in terms, Mr. Speaker, of the minerals themselves, we do find that in a number of cases it isn't an increase in production but as the Leader of the NDP indicated, an increase in the price. I don't have the breakdown for all the years but -- for example between '65 and '66 we find that copper production actually dropped by a million pounds; nickel production dropped by 10 million pounds; zinc production dropped by 9 million pounds, and this was only offset in some cases by increases in price. So it seems to me that while this is an area where we can expect dramatic growth, we are not in fact having the amount of growth that we require.

Well how do we go about getting more mineral development in Manitoba? The basic as we know to any mineral operation is exploration. When we were discussing in this House some two years or more now, I guess its four years ago, the Bissett Mining operation, we were told that the reason Bissett was really in trouble basically was that they had ceased their exploration program; that they hadn't continued in as active a way as they should the development of their own exploration in their area. Well at the moment in Manitoba we have really five mining centres in the whole of the Precambrian Shield: Bissett which is not a big one, but nevertheless must be counted; Thompson which is a major one; Lynn Lake, Flin Flon and the Snow Lake area. But there are millions of acres in between those points, Mr. Speaker. The question is to get more exploration in these areas.

I recognize that the big companies Inco and Sherritt Gordon and the Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting are constantly exploring, but we have to recognize as well that these mines that we have in Manitoba were in most cases not found by great big exploration companies. Flin Flon was found by small prospectors; the first Thompson strike was also by individual small prospectors; so I think that we should expand the program here in Manitoba. The government some two years ago did pass a Mineral Exploration Assistance Act based pretty well on the Saskatchewan program. However, it seems that having passed the Act the government then decided that they should not really proceed with it because it took several months before the regulations were passed. We find that in November of 1966 the regulations were put into effect and filed on the 10th of November, and as far as I can find, Mr. Speaker, there have been no further expansions on this regulation. Maybe the Minister can correct me. I have made it a point to call at least three different individuals who are involved in the prospecting business in different parts of the province and I have to report that in each case they told me they knew of no extensions, in fact were not familiar with the program themselves, didn't know that it had been passed. The worst part about the regulations passed though in November was that it included within the program only a very small portion of Manitoba. I realize that this map is too small to show the whole of the House, Mr. Speaker, but the part that was included according to the regulations is just that small portion by comparison to the whole of the Pre-Cambrian Shield, starting roughly at the 50 parallel going up to the 53rd on the East side of Lake Winnipeg. In other words, roughly from the Pine Falls - a line drawn from Pine Falls to the Ontario border, north say three quarters of the way up Lake Winnipeg. It doesn't even go to the northern end of the Lake; so it only touches a very small proportion of the Pre-Cambrian Shield; the vast portion of Manitoba is not covered by the regulation.

Now my friend the leader of the NDP says that isn't what we need. We shouldn't be giving these sort of incentives to people to go in the mining area. Mr. Speaker, I think that

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd.) the basic rules as operated in Saskatchewan as adapted in the Northwest Territories and as in fact contained in the Manitoba Act, are such that they are sensible types of incentives. They are incentives based on - there is a limitation on the amount of money for one thing, it will be mainly for individual prospectors. It's one-half of the expenditure up to \$50,000 and on any one project \$150,000. I don't think that it's the type of project that really is going to hand millions to big corporations but it is the type of project that can get these areas a large number of individual prospectors out searching all the time, out doing the kind of work that did find for us in the past the Thompson development, the Flin Flon development. And furthermore, Mr. Speaker, it's clearly listed in the Act that if they do find something then the province gets its money back. We do in fact I think under the Manitoba Act have a participating interest in the development of any mining deposit found, so I think we have the type of protection that is required. It's a joint program, with private enterprise admittedly, but a joint program that will provide jobs for people in Manitoba.

My friends over here can say all they want about not having incentives, but supposing we didn't have Thompson in Manitoba today, supposing that mine had not been developed, where would the workers who are there now find employment? They wouldn't find it in Manitoba. They would have to go elsewhere. The key to employment is having someone who is prepared to develop something and the key to good jobs is having industry providing the capital and the incentive to establish plants or mines or what is required and to take the position that industry should be shunned, that we should not enter into cooperative programs with them to develop new projects I think is the worst thing we can do for the working men of this province. The ideal is to have plants like Thompson. Sure we should get better salaries there, better wages, the province should get its fair share of the returns from these enterprises. I'm all for that but let's face it -- I ask my friends on my left if they were faced with the position of having a mining development like Thompson established providing employment and homes and a town of some 15,000 people, having that and no direct revenue to the government or not having that sort of a project at all, which would they pick? Would they say let's not proceed and have a Thompson mine, because the province isn't going to get any revenue, if there was a clear cut case like that? I think that there's no choice. We have to go, proceed with the development.

I share completely the view that we get all that we can out of our natural resources, every bit of it, but we have to balance at all times what we get out of natural resources with the development of those resources and the key is to get the development. Now the type of program I am proposing, which is basically in the Bill but which in my opinion is too restrictive at the moment in area, is a type of program that is the joint operation which can lead to further development in Manitoba. So I urge the government, Mr. Speaker, to support my resolution, to expand the program to include all of the Pre-Cambrian Shield instead of just that small portion that is presently included, and more than that, to make sure that they at least write to everyone who's involved in prospecting in Manitoba and advise them the program does exist so that when I find out whether they are using it, they won't have to tell me, "Well what sort of a program is it?" and that they will in fact, put it to work.

I hope that the Minister, and I trust that he will be speaking on it, would be able to tell us what results his program has had so far, in the limited area to which it applies. How many applications have been made and what really has happened in that one area. I think that it's restricted, but at least we should know what results have been in that area. I repeat, I hope the Minister will support a general extension of the whole of the Pre-Cambrian Shield.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker I would move, seconded by the Honourable the Member for Elmwood that debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Carillon,

Whereas housing starts over the past year have decreased behind the minimum requirement as recommended by the Economic Council of Canada, and

Whereas the ownership of real property has been made more difficult in recent years

(MR. PATRICK cont'd.) by spiralling construction costs, high interest rates and high taxation to the point where many citizens of average income cannot afford home ownership, and

Whereas the cost of building materials are a major factor in the building, maintaining and renovating of properties, and

Whereas a reduction in the cost of construction, maintenance and renovation would revitalize the industry and give it a much desired stimulus at the present time,

Therefore be it resolved that the Manitoba Government consider the advisability of rescinding the 5% provincial sales tax on building material, and

Be it further resolved that the Government of Manitoba request the Government of Canada to rescind the 12% sales tax on building materials.

MR. SPEAKER: I should like the Honourable Member for Assiniboia to know that I have given this resolution a good deal of consideration and I notice that the resolution itself refers to taxation under two separate jurisdictions. With regard to that concerning the Province of Manitoba, namely the 5% sales tax, I would suggest to the honourable member that he would have ample opportunity to develop his point at the time of the bringing down of the provincial budget. This consideration is based on the fact that the Throne Speech particularly refers to the estimates of revenue and expenditure that will be placed before the House for its consideration.

In ruling this resolution out of order may I say there appears to be no objection to the honourable member bringing forward a revised resolution pertaining to that tax which is the responsibility of another jurisdiction. I therefore rule your resolution as it presently stands out of order.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I realize that your ruling is not debatable, but I just wonder if on a point of order I might get some clarification from you. It seems to me that this resolution with the wording "consider the advisability of "

MR. SPEAKER: I must remind the Leader of the Opposition that there is the alternative if he chooses to take it; there is no debate on my ruling or there should be no discussion on my ruling to the extent that I feel that he intends to go. However, he may continue with that thought in mind.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I have no alternative in that case but to challenge your ruling if that is the situation. I don't like to do it, but I just don't see the reason for the ruling. I regret I must challenge your ruling.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, would it be in order to suggest that this might be a matter that could be reviewed in your mind. It's so similar to other resolutions that we have had in the past?

MR. SPEAKER: I believe without saying that I made it perfectly clear that this to my mind is a matter of anticipation and contrary to your rule, the rule of the House No. 31. I take it that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition challenges my ruling?

MR. MOLGAT: I regret, Mr. Speaker, but you leave me no alternative.

MR. SPEAKER: Are there any other members of the same opinion? Call in the Members.

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

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

NAYS: Messrs. Barkman, Campbell, Cherniack, Clement, Dawson, Desjardins, Doern, Fox, Froese, Green, Guttormson, Hanuschak, Harris, Hillhouse, Johnston, Kawchuk, Miller, Molgat, Patrick, Shoemaker, Tanchak, Uskiw and Vielfaure.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 28; nays, 23.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the Chair sustained. The proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. TANCHAK: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Portage;

Whereas this House has no standing committee on Education, and
Whereas Education by general agreement is given top priority, and
Whereas the cost of Education is constantly rising, and

(MR. TANCHAK: cont'd.)

Whereas changes in our educational set-up are necessary and inevitable,

Therefore be it resolved that a standing committee of this House be appointed for the purpose of "Education", which committee shall be empowered to examine and inquire into all such matters and things as may be referred to it by the House and to report from time to time its observations and opinions thereon with power to send for persons, papers and documents and examine witnesses under oath.

MR. SPEAKER put the question.

MR. TANCHAK: Mr. Speaker, I notice I only have a few minutes so I'll try to be very brief, in fact I'm going to omit some of my notes so as to have it completed before 5:30. Do you notice that this resolution is exactly the same as the one that I presented to the House just a year ago, that's another reason why I can make it short because I don't think that I should repeat myself. (Interjection)... I couldn't tell you. It will not be the same anyway.

At that time I had the support of my colleagues and I also had the support of the New Democratic Party, also the support of the Social Credit, and I wish to thank them at this time for their support. But the members of the Conservative Party with their combined strength defeated it, the resolution. Therefore I decided to bring it back into the Chamber this year. I was disappointed last year in one of my favorite ministers, as I used to say, the Minister of Education, who had previous to the vote indicated that he liked the resolution that it wasn't a bad one, but later he himself voted against it; and the worst part of it was that he didn't even explain himself, he didn't explain why he did that; I could not see what his reasons were. So maybe today I will probably suggest some of the reasons that I think that he could have given for it. I hope that this time the Minister will support it and give us good reasons why he didn't support it last year.

On March 7th as usual, the custom in this House, the Premier introduces the resolution to establish Standing Committees of the House. Eleven different committees were suggested, but as it was last year, this year, education was not recommended. Why? Is education not important enough? We on this side believe that education is very important and that it merits top priority in our discussions and consideration. Why? Because the members usually use up more time on this department in debating bills, resolutions and questions and so on than they do in any other department in the Legislature; and we know that last year the government earmarked just one-third of the total expenditure for the year towards education. So it must be, in my opinion it must be important.

Now yesterday again the Minister of Education boasted—and I'll quote his exact words because I caught them—of a "substantial spending increase in education", substantial spending increase in education, it's warranted—and that in spite of his backbencher who urged him and gave him a warning that we are already spending too much on education. I will not go along with the backbencher that we may be spending too much on education but I will go along that probably our dollars and cents are not spent properly and that's why our educational bill is so very high. Now if education is so very important, why again this year when the Premier introduced a motion calling for Standing Committees, was education left out? Is it not important enough? Is the government afraid it would take too much time? Is the government afraid to hear what the public, the grass roots may have to say in this committee? I would say it is time that the government paid more attention to the grass roots. If this committee would prolong the session, let it, that's what we're here for, we're here to hear from not only the well versed people or the members themselves but also to hear from the grass roots and I would have liked to hear from them.

Now in order to keep pace with the rapidly changing world of education a committee such as this I think would be most desirable. New discoveries in science, in medicine, technology, are being announced daily, and I think it is very difficult for us to cope with these great changes. The Minister and his advisors don't know everything there is to know about education; I never professed to. Even the Member from Elmwood, he doesn't know everything, none of us(Interjection). I think that all of us and even the public could profit from such a committee, so why turn it down. This committee would not cost any extra money because as usual most of these people in the committees are willing to sit in and I am sure that they would be willing to contribute their time and expense.

The School boards could give suggestions, the different boards, the teachers, inspectors, superintendents and so on. The Council of Higher Learning should report to this committee. What about the Boundaries Commission, they could report, if they are not

(MR. TANCHAK cont'd).....fired before then, but they could. There are many matters that could be referred to this committee - educational TV could be one of them - we hear so much about it now.

It was this government, the former Minister of Education, who would have nothing to do with television before, he didn't believe in it, but the present Minister is beginning to see the screen, so we're happy about that. We consider new classrooms. What about all the classrooms that were built and now are obsolete or not being used? What about the exorbitant transportation costs — and they are exorbitant in many areas. Even sex education which has been discussed quite openly, maybe that could be brought into the committee to discuss. Maybe some could learn what sex they belong to anyway. Education of underprivileged children could be discussed. What about remote areas and the equality of opportunity that this government likes to boast about - taxation...

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I hesitate to interrupt the honourable gentleman, but it's a minute to the half hour. Did he feel that he...

MR. TANCHAK: Just about half a minute, yes. Thank you.

I will just conclude it now and say that just propaganda and simply spending enormous amounts of money does not give us equal opportunity. Equal opportunity in many parts of rural Manitoba is just a far far dream yet; we haven't got it. Maybe this committee would be able to bring it to a fruitful conclusion. I believe that a standing committee on education will do much towards solving some of the problems in achieving their objective and I hope that this resolution will be acceptable to the government and the members.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Logan that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I believe there are three other resolutions on the Order Paper. Unless I'm mistaken, I understand that there is some disposition on the part of the movers to have them stand. If that could be so indicated on the Order Paper then we would be prepared for an adjournment motion if that's agreeable.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed? — Agreed.

MR. LYON: In that case, Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Welfare that the House do now adjourn.

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