

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock Friday, March 12th, 1965.

Opening Prayer by Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions

Reading and Receiving Petitions

Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees

On the proposed motion of the Honourable the Attorney-General, and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable the Member for Rhineland. The Honourable the Attorney-General.

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN, Q.C. (Attorney-General) (Dauphin): Madam Speaker, I think that in this matter we have arrived at a solution to the problem posed yesterday by the Honourable the Member for Rhineland in which we will be able to accommodate his request. It has been agreed to a rearrangement of the proportion of members on the two committees to which he made specific reference, and I think we have an acceptable arrangement. My suggestion now as to the procedure would be along these lines, that if the members were disposed to now defeat the amendment which has been moved by the Honourable the Member for Rhineland because it is too restrictive in its terms to accommodate the arrangements that we are suggesting should be made, and then at this stage the House would adopt or receive the report -- the original report -- of the committee, and that would allow us then to proceed; and when you have entered upon the Orders of the Day, the Honourable the Member for Hamiota will be prepared to present a resolution -- which can only be done with leave of the House -- that is proposed to add the name of the Honourable the Member for Rhineland to the two committees, as he requested yesterday, with certain additions from this side of the House, Madam Speaker, all in accordance with the proportion or number of members from each group as we have agreed on today.

Now I should point out to the members of the House that particularly the Leader of the Opposition has made it quite clear -- and I think it's only fair that I should say it now -- that this is an arrangement for this present session and is in no way to be considered as binding with regard to future sessions, nor is it to be considered as a precedent with regard to the proportion of members on the various committees. He is prepared to agree to the suggestions we are making on the basis that it is without prejudice, as lawyers would say, with regard to the future, and I would assume that the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party, who has also consented, would wish the same sentiment to be expressed, and certainly that is the basis upon which I have accepted their agreement.

Madam Speaker, if I may say one other thing which is not strictly relevant to the amendment that's before the House at the moment, and that is that if the arrangements which we are suggesting are accepted, it would be my suggestion to the Clerk that he might summon the Law Amendments Committee to meet next Tuesday morning at 9:00 o'clock when it might begin its work for approximately one hour and a half, until 10:30 when I believe there is another meeting slated, and that in the committee itself it would be my suggestion to the committee that they might consider Law Amendments as meeting each Tuesday. That will perhaps be of some assistance to the general public who may have occasion to come and will wish to know when the committee will be meeting; and also my suggestion to the Clerk that he might summon the Public Utilities Committee to meet next Thursday morning at 10:00 o'clock, and the Public Accounts Committee to meet on Friday at 10:00 o'clock, all of course, Madam Speaker, subject to the House agreeing to these various suggestions which will be dealt with forthwith.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. DOUGLAS L. CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Madam Speaker, I have no objection to the general position that the Honourable the Attorney-General has taken, but I would suggest that rather than defeating the amendment -- because after all the amendment asks for something that I understand the government is willing to provide; it doesn't seem quite logical to defeat it at this time, and besides it's I think a bit of an indignity to the honourable member who moved it -- wouldn't it be better to give him the opportunity to withdraw his amendment? I notice that he's not in the House at the present time and it would have to stand for that purpose, but rather than defeating it wouldn't that be a better way -- let it stand until he is in the House?

MR. MORRIS A. GRAY (Inkster): Madam Speaker, whether he withdraws it or not, we are supporting the amendment and the comments made by the Attorney-General.

MADAM SPEAKER put the question and upon a voice vote declared the motion lost.

MADAM SPEAKER: The proposed motion of the Honourable the Attorney-General. Are you ready for the question?

MADAM SPEAKER, after a voice vote, declared the motion carried.

MADAM SPEAKER: Notices of Motion
Introduction of Bills.

MR. McLEAN introduced Bill No. 24, an Act to amend The County Courts Act.

MR. McLEAN introduced Bill No. 25, an Act to amend The County Court Judges' Criminal Courts Act.

MADAM SPEAKER: Before the Orders of the Day I would like to attract your attention to the gallery where there are some 100 Grade 11 students from St. Paul's College under the direction of Mr. Hughes and Mr. Mulgrew. This school is situated in the constituency of the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

There are some 47 Russell Air Cadets with Flying Officer Uhryniuk, Mr. Bill Keiper, Mr. Eric Payne, Mr. Ralph Robinson. The cadets come from the constituency represented by the Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

There are also some 35 Grade 4 students from Central School under the direction of Mr. P. Court and Mr. Albrecht. This school is situated in the constituency of the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party.

There are also some 33 Grades 5 to 8 students from Arran School District under the direction of their teacher, Mr. Warkentin. This school is situated in the constituency of the Honourable the Member for La Verendrye. On behalf of all members of this Assembly I welcome you.

I would like to draw attention to the honourable members that the head guard is having some difficulty in trying to seat the large number of school children and others who come into the gallery every day to watch the proceedings here, and it has been requested that the MLAs who get requests from their principals or people from their districts, we are asking you to contact the head guard a week or so ahead so that he may be able to give them a guided tour of the building and seating accommodation in the gallery.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party) (Radisson): Madam Speaker, before you proceed, may I have the consent of the House to present a petition? Madam Speaker, I beg to present the petition of George Copeland and others praying for the passing of an Act to incorporate The Transcona Curling Club.

MR. S. PETERS (Elmwood): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I'd like to direct a question to the First Minister. Yesterday he told us that we would probably be going on a tour of the Brandon Fair on Tuesday, March 30th, and on the way we would be stopping in probably Carberry and at the installations at Shilo. I've been speaking to quite a few of the members of the Legislature and they thought that seeing that they are prepared to give up that day, which is Private Members' Day, to take this tour -- quite a few of them have previous engagements for tonight, Madam Speaker, and we've made pretty good progress on the Estimates. We'd ask the First Minister if he would consider that the committee rise at 5:30 and meet again Monday morning. I know he can find it in his heart.

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier and Provincial Treasurer) (Wolseley): This is what's called instant popularity because I'm going to say that we should give my honourable friend's suggestion very serious consideration.

MR. B. P. STRICKLAND (Hamiota): Madam Speaker, with leave of the House --

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable the Member for Hamiota.

MR. STRICKLAND: Sorry, Madam Speaker, I find I am out of order.

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Education) (Gimli): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I thought I would draw to the attention of the Legislature the fact that New York officials, a New York group, have selected Manitoba as the only Canadian province for a study of vocational programs on the continent. Twelve state directors in training of the vocational field will be in Winnipeg March 17th to 19th for a look at various phases of the Manitoba program. From here they go on to San Francisco. Departmental officials will be meeting with these people during their stay, and the scope and purpose of our program in Manitoba will be related by Mr. C. R. Ford, or Dr. Ford, the Director of the Federal Department of Labour, Technical and Vocational Branch. Next Thursday morning the group will spend at our Manitoba Institute of Technology, with particular interest in the examination of the province's basic training program for skill development which is underway at 442 William

(MR. JOHNSON cont'd). Avenue, and then on Friday the group will visit the vocational educational work at River East Collegiate, and again back to another visit to the Winnipeg Technical Vocational School. I thought that all Manitoba members would rejoice in the thought that this province has been designated as and selected for this compliment by our Federal Department and by the United States authorities.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q. C. (Selkirk): Madam, with the leave of the House, I would like to bring to the attention of the House something which might be considered an omission which I made when I was speaking on a family debt counselling service for Winnipeg on March 9, 1965. When I was speaking to this House I did not mention the fact that there was any such service available in Winnipeg. The reason why I did not do so was because I was not aware that there was any such service, outside of a voluntary service, I think, which is provided by the Welfare Council. I have today received a letter from Credit Grantors Association of Winnipeg, with offices in 201 Scientific Building, advising me that they have been operating such a service, free of charge, for the last three years. I thought that I should bring this to the attention of the House lest any member would feel that I knowingly omitted a reference to this association when I dealt with the question of family debt counselling. Had I known of their existence I would have brought it to the attention of the House.

HON. CHARLES H. WITNEY (Minister of Health) (Flin Flon): I wish to lay on the table of the House the Annual Report of the Manitoba Hospital Commission for the year ended December 31, 1964.

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer. Has his attention been called to the fact that there appears to be a misprint on Page 250 of the Hansard of the House, in that on a table in the honourable gentleman's budget speech there seems to be a misprint in the date in two cases, where March 31, 1964 is I think inadvertently put in as March 31, 1963. Would my honourable friend check on this matter, and if it's correct see that some notice is taken of it.

MR. ROBLIN: Yes, Madam Speaker.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): Madam Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the First Minister. Has he anything further to report on the rumour that a committee has been set up to study the impact of the heat tax on low income groups?

MR. ROBLIN: My honourable friend is quite aware that he is not entitled to ask questions concerning hypothetical matters of that sort.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, is it a hypothetical matter?

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to address a couple of questions to the Honourable the Minister of Labour concerning the Minimum Wage Act, the Minimum Wage Board of the Province of Manitoba. May I ask my honourable friend how many meetings of the Minimum Wage Board have been held thus far; whether it is the intention of the Minimum Wage Board to make a tour of the Province of Manitoba in order to hear representations respecting the matter of minimum wages; and whether the Minister can indicate to the House as to when a complete report by the Minimum Wage Board will be received by him.

HON. OBIE BAIZLEY (Minister of Labour) (Osborne): Madam Speaker, I'd like to thank the honourable member, the Leader of the New Democratic Party, for having given me notice of these questions. I have been advised that the Minimum Wage Board have met once. They have requested the various agencies within the province to submit budgets for their study and consideration. I would like to inform the House that they are required by law to hold such meetings at such times and places as they deem necessary and advisable, and knowing the enthusiasm and vigour with which this board attacks their work, I'm quite confident that as soon as their deliberations have been completed that we will have a report.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, one supplemental question. I don't share with my honourable friend the vigour with which the Minimum Wage Board pursues their activities in order to make a report, as evidenced by past boards, but I would like to know from the Honourable Minister whether or not he has suggested, then, a deadline that the board might work toward in order to give him a report?

MR. BAIZLEY: I have not.

MR. PAULLEY: kindly, then, consider this matter, Madam Speaker, and I ask this of him in view of the fact that it appears that legislation calling for a minimum wage

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd)..... of \$1.25 at the federal level is likely to be proclaimed any day now.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

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

MR. STRICKLAND: Madam Speaker, with leave of the House, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne, that the following members be added to the list of members to compose the Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections: Messrs. Stanes and Froese; and that the following members be added to the list of members to compose the Standing Committee on Statutory Regulations and Orders: Messrs. Mills, Froese and Shewman.

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

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

MR. E. R. SCHREYER (Brokenhead): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Elmwood, that an Order of the House do issue for a return showing: 1. Was a loan extended by the Manitoba Development Fund to: (a) Damascus Steel Limited; (b) Friendly Family Farms Limited; (c) Brandon Eviscerating Company Limited. 2. Are any of the above named firms now in Receivership? 3. What were the amounts loaned to each of the above named?

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce) (Fort Rouge): Madam Speaker, this Order for Return or request is in three parts. Part Number 2 refers to receivership for bankruptcy and that information is available from the official Receiver in Bankruptcy for the Province of Manitoba whose address, I believe, is in the Law Courts. With respects to parts 1 and 3, it is not within the powers under The Business Development Fund Act -- or is it called the Business Development Act -- to provide the information that is referred to in these two parts. And so I shall be forced to vote against the order.

MR. SCHREYER: Madam Speaker, after submitting the Order I realized that perhaps Number 3 might be objectionable, a matter of policy to the government, but I would ask the Minister to elaborate as to the reasons why Number 1 of the Return is objectionable. Why is the first part objectionable?

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, speaking to the motion that an Order of the House do issue for.....

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, may I still enquire whether the debate is closed or whether it is still open?

MR. PAULLEY: As far as I'm concerned, it's still open.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Minister has replied, at least it.....

MR. PAULLEY: Well the Minister -- Madam Speaker, in all due respect to you and to the Minister, the Minister -- Pardon? -- (Interjection) -- He just asked a question of the Minister of the Crown. He didn't close any debate. Surely to goodness we've not got down to such narrow interpretations of the rules of this House that following a question somebody may not partake in the debates in this House, Madam Speaker. But if you rule me out of order this is your privilege; this is your prerogative. After all, you are the guardian of this House and I am prepared to accept your ruling, whichever it may be.

MADAM SPEAKER: The mover asked a question of the Minister. The Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party may proceed.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker. The question before the House, Madam Speaker, is that, of course, of an Order for Return seeking information which is in the hands of the government. My honourable friend says no -- the Minister of Industry and Commerce; the Honourable the First Minister says he's right. But I want to say, Madam Speaker, that both of them are wrong, because the government are directly concerned and represented on the Industrial Development Fund of the Province of Manitoba. And I -- my friend again says this is not true. I want to recall for the edification of my honourable friend the Minister of Industry and Commerce, that we had a similar debate a few years ago, or a couple of years ago, respecting a loan that was awarded to a corporation that was located in Sprague, Manitoba. My honourable friend the Minister of Industry and Commerce says that the government isn't aware

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd). of these things, and yet I believe it was at Steinbäch that my honourable friend -- or some similar town -- that my honourable friend the Minister of Industry and Commerce announced that the development at Sprague was going to be entered into as a result of the active participation of the Industrial Development Fund. This, Madam Speaker, was the first announcement that that particular industry was going to be established here in the Province of Manitoba. And incidentally, of course, Madam Speaker, this particular industry is now owned by United States interests. But apart from that -- but apart from that, Madam Speaker, I reject completely the contention of the Minister of Industry and Commerce and that of the First Minister that they are not aware, the government is not aware as to whether or not a loan has been advanced to the industries as requested by my colleague the Member for Brokenhead. I would pay that he might be in a reasonable position if he were to reject No. 3 of the Order, Madam Speaker, insofar as the amounts are concerned, but surely to goodness, Madam Speaker, it is in the interests of Manitoba to know whether or not a loan was granted to any particular industry, so I say that had my friend said that he was prepared to reject the third question as asked by my colleague, I think that he may have been on a reasonable footing, but to turn around and say, "No, it isn't of any interest to us in this Assembly as to where the monies we appropriate each year are to go," I say he's wrong. --(Interjection)--Oh, certainly he did. I beg your pardon?

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q. C. (Minister of Mines and Natural Resources)
(Fort Garry): He said he couldn't give it.

MR. PAULLEY: He couldn't give it -- well I say, Madam Speaker, that he's in error. He can give it.

MR. LYON: You're wrong.

MR. PAULLEY: I'm not wrong. I'll wager a five-cent. --(Interjection)--I'm sorry, I'm sorry, I was wrong, Madam Speaker. I can't wager in this Assembly. Yes I guess this is out of order. I will say, then, that I am convinced that the information that is being sought by my colleague is in possession of my honourable friend, and if my colleague from Brokenhead isn't entitled to the information then my honourable friend isn't, and I say that there's nothing to prevent it.

MR. EVANS: May I rise on a point of privilege, Madam Speaker? I have assured my honourable friend that I am not in possession of the information. He is bound to accept my statement.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, the same debate took place in respect of the Sprague Plywood Corporation -- I'm not sure of the exact title -- and my honourable friend was in possession of it at that particular time. Do you deny that?

MR. EVANS: If my honourable friend is asking me a question I will answer it -- that the information referred to at that time had been made public previously by the borrower himself.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, if this information can be made public then I respectfully suggest that a member of this Legislative Assembly is entitled to the information that can be made public.

MR. EVANS: go and ask the borrower.

MR. PAULLEY: So I say to you, Madam Speaker, that these are proper questions with the possible exception of No. 3. My honourable friend rejects the Order for Return in respect of No. 2; says my colleagues can go to the receivership court to find out whether this is proceeding or not. How intolerable is a situation like this. If my honourable friend knows it, if the government knows it, why can't they reply openly and not rely -- not rely, as that government has relied so frequently, on the rules of procedure that says that if we want to delve into matters of this nature and the documents of the courts that we can do it, when it's far more simple for the government themselves to do this. So I say, Madam Speaker, and appeal to the government to accept the Order in respect of the first two items at least; and if they don't want to reveal the amounts of money that have been granted to these companies, then I'm prepared to accept that, but a mere answer to the question as to whether or not these companies have been granted a loan, I think should be given to this Assembly and to the members of this Assembly who have to grant monies for the corporation to continue its business here in the province.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, just a very brief word in this debate. I want to make it clear that I think the government is bound, if it possibly can, to answer questions that are put to it, provided they are within the rules and provided that there are no over-mastering

(MR. ROBLIN cont'd), reasons why the information should not be supplied, so we start on common ground, my honourable friend and I, that he has the right to ask a question and we have an obligation to answer it insofar as is proper to do so. I would point out to him with respect to the second of the two questions asked, the one about bankruptcy, that it's quite clear that an oral or written question must not seek information set forth in documents equally accessible to the questioner.

MR. PAULLEY: is equal, though.

MR. ROBLIN: That's right, equally accessible to the questioner. Now that information is accessible to my honourable friend on exactly the same basis that it's accessible to the government. So we've declined to answer that one.

Now, in respect of the doings of the corporation proper, I have to refer my honourable friend to the Act, because it is the Act that is prompting the attitude that we're taking here. I say that if you read Section 26 of The Business Development Act, passed in 1958, I believe -- in the fall of '58 -- you will see that it quite specifically prevents the situation arising where a question, such as the type we have, is in order because it says there that notwithstanding the Legislative Assembly Act, or any other Act or law, the corporation shall not be required to produce to the Assembly or any committee thereof any application for a loan or other information furnished by an applicant or a borrower, or otherwise obtained by the corporation, respecting the applicant or borrower or his business or operation, or respecting any person who has applied for or obtained financial assistance from the Community Development Corporation or any of the books, records, documents of the corporation that would disclose anything contained in an application for a loan or any information to which sub-clause (i) relates. That's the substance of Section 26; so on the basis of that section the Minister is precluded from answering the question.

Now with respect to the allegation that he has violated this rule himself in connection with the at Sprague, that allegation has been quite firmly denied by the Minister. The information that he used was made available previously by persons concerned and was in the public domain, and therefore he had a perfect right to use it, so while I regret the fact that it's necessary to decline the question, I think that we're on solid grounds in so doing.

MR. SCHREYER: Madam Speaker, I would like to also.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Will my honourable friend be closing the debate if he speaks now? Pardon? Well this is a debatable motion, isn't it? Thanks. Well now, Madam Speaker, all of this debate took place about two years ago, I think, when I placed a similar Order for Return, and my honourable friend the Leader of the NDP refers to the Sprague Industries. I thought that I had in mind the amount of money that was loaned to the Simplot Industries at Carberry, but whether it was Sprague or whether it was Carberry it doesn't really matter. It's the principle that's involved here -- refusing to give information that we think we should have. I believe there was a division on the question two or three years ago. I ended up, you will recall, Madam Speaker, re-framing the entire questions and asked whether we could have the number of loans over a million dollars, the number over three-quarters of a million, the number over a half a million, and so on, all the way down, and I got the information. Now, Madam Speaker, I think the government knows that we can obtain the information anyway by getting a Search of Title. I think if you pay \$3.00 and go down to the Land Titles Office you can get this information. I suppose what.

MR. SCHREYER: Would the member permit a question? Did he say that he got the information after re-phrasing?

MR. SHOEMAKER: Madam Speaker, in reply to that question, I forget the Order number -- I can give it to you later -- but the government did give me this information; they said there was one loan over a million dollars or a million and a half, I forget, because I think it was established that Simplot was loaned a million and a half dollars. Then they said there were two loans over three-quarters of a million or something of this kind. I'll give my honourable friend the Order number and the year.

Now, I remember having an argument both in the House and out of the House on whether or not this information should be made available to the House, and I've had people outside of the House argue in the same fashion that the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce argues, that it isn't good business -- this is the argument they put up -- for the public to know to what extent that a person may be indebted and so on and so forth, and they said a bank -- you cannot get this kind of information from a bank. I remember several of the Ministers saying this but I pointed out at that time that there was a distinction here in that a bank is not

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd).....loaning public funds as such. True, it's public funds in that I and other depositors may have it there, but it isn't tax funds. Now, every time there is an industry opens its doors for the first time in this province, generally one of the officials of the government -- quite often the Premier -- is there to open the industry, to cut the ribbon, and if the fund, the Manitoba Development Fund, has made it possible through a loan to bring this new industry into being, the government officials stand up and inform the gathering there that it was only made possible because of a contribution that the government made and so on, indicating, of course, that a loan had been made. Is this not correct?

MR. EVANS: That is not correct.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Well there is an inference there anyway, Madam Speaker.

MR. EVANS: Well you state your facts and keep away from the inference.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Now I think, Madam Speaker, that the public who have bought government bonds on numerous occasions in the past, would be interested in knowing what the government are doing with their money. They want to know whether it is, in fact, safe. I think the resolution before us suggests that presently there is one in bankruptcy, does it not? And if this is so, well then naturally the people are interested in knowing what is being done with the rest of the money. Is it going to suffer the same fate? So, Madam Speaker, I suggest that this is a proper order and the answer should be forthcoming.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Madam Speaker, I would like to address a question to the Honourable Minister, and ask him under what section of The Business Development Act does he claim that this information is privileged--(Interjection)--Section 26. I would suggest, Madam, that Section 26 does not extend as far as the Minister would indicate to this House, that Section 26 says, "Notwithstanding the Legislative Assembly Act or any other Act or law, the corporation shall not be required to produce to the Assembly or to a committee thereof". Now there's no request being made to the corporation to produce anything to this Assembly or to a committee of this Assembly. All that has been asked is -- a member has stood in his place and asked certain questions of the Minister. Now that extension of privilege extends in respect of "any application for a loan" -- the member is not asking anything about an application for a loan -- "or other information furnished by an applicant or a borrower, or otherwise obtained by the corporation, respecting the applicant or borrower or his business or operations, or respecting any person who has applied for or obtained financial assistance from the Community Development Corporation," -- and the latter clause does not apply in this case at all I don't think -- "or (ii) any of the books, records or documents of the corporation that would disclose anything contained in an application for a loan or any information to which sub-clause (i) relates." Now I submit, Madam, that there's nothing in that section which gives the Minister the privilege which he is claiming, and the member is entitled to an answer to his question.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I wonder if I may before -- this matter, Madam Speaker, has been before the House on a number of occasions. The time when it was brought most forcefully was, I believe, in the spring session of 1962, when the government was asking the House to approve the extension of a further \$10 million worth of money from the taxpayers of Manitoba to the fund. We at that time took the position that if the taxpayers of Manitoba were to be asked to do this, then the taxpayers of Manitoba had at least the right to know to whom the money was being lent. We have never sought details about the corporations to whom advances have been made; we are not interested in knowing what their whole operations are; we're not asking for their financial statements; we are prepared to accept the statements of the government that they are solvent and that the security is sufficient and that the interests of the taxpayers of Manitoba is being protected. We are prepared to accept the government's word for this. But we feel, on this side of the House, that the least that we should know on behalf of the taxpayers of Manitoba is to whom money has been advanced. This is public money. This money is put up by the taxpayers of the province. It's their money, and we say, at the very least, the list of those corporations who have borrowed from the government should be made public.

My colleague, the Member for Selkirk, has just indicated that in his reading of the Act that it is not so that the name of the corporation cannot be given. Details of the application, yes. Details of the corporate structure, yes. But no indication that the name of the corporation may not be given, and I submit, Madam Speaker, that the request made today by the Honourable Member for Brokenhead, those made previously by the Member for Gladstone and others in our group, are perfectly legitimate questions. This is public information. It should

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd) be made available to the public and the government should not hide behind this Act and use it for its own purposes. The Minister said that it's not so that he indicated that such and such a corporation got a loan. Madam Speaker, every now and then in the newspapers when a new plant is being opened and my honourable friends over there are there cutting the ribbon, they indicate quite clearly that these corporations are here through the benevolence of the government.

MR. ROBLIN: Nonsense.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, this is public money--(Interjections)-- and I'm quite prepared to bring out news clippings -- I haven't got them here because I didn't expect this debate would come up today, but I have them, Madam Speaker -- indicating quite clearly statements by my honourable friends, and I say it's not their money; it's public money, and the public are entitled to know to whom they're advancing money.

MR. LYON: Madam Speaker, I think before the debate carries on any further we should perhaps return to some of the facts before us. I rise at this time merely because my honourable friend the Minister of Industry and Commerce is precluded from giving any further information which I think should be made available to members of the House in this connection.

We start first of all, of course, with Section 26 of The Business Development Fund Act, which was mentioned by the Honourable the First Minister when he spoke a few moments ago and which clearly indicates that information of this kind with respect to individual companies is, under the law of the province, not available to the Legislature or to a committee of the Legislature of the House, notwithstanding the instant legal opinion that we got from the Honourable Member for Selkirk. I suggest to him, with all deference, that that is the case, and that has been checked by the law officers of the Crown and has been found to be the case, so may I ask my honourable friend merely to accept that as a statement of fact. I happen to know it. That is the case.

Now secondly, my honourable friend says -- my honourable friends opposite say, in unison almost, "Public monies, monies going to public companies, we should know the names of all of these companies". Well now, Madam Speaker, this reveals an interesting trait with respect to some of our honourable friends opposite, because when this bill was going through the Legislature, I for one don't recall anyone suggesting that we should have this kind of information. I don't recall any objection from the Liberal Party at that time that we should have.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, on a point of privilege, does my honourable friend not recall that we voted against voting \$10 million to this government for that purpose on that basis?

MR. LYON: I'm talking about when the Act was originally before the House, Madam Speaker. My honourable friends I know have voted against all of the progressive legislation that this government's brought in, so I don't deny them on that.

A MEMBER: make up your mind which side you're on--(Interjection)--

MADAM SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. LYON: I merely say, Madam Speaker, that I don't recall my honourable friends opposite ever raising any question about Section 26 when the bill was originally before the House, because it's accepted practice that information with respect to credit is not given publicly, as they stand up in the House and try to say it should be given, because if this were the case then I would suggest that they had better -- the Liberals particularly -- had better start talking to their confreres in Ottawa and ask them to do the same with respect to the Industrial Development Bank where they are prohibited, exactly the same as we are here, from giving information with respect to creditors, and that Industrial Development Bank, Madam Speaker, as we all know, deals with hundreds of millions of dollars of public money. It comes from the Public Treasury of Canada.

Now, my honourable friend, I presume will be consistent and if he is asking for that information here then I would like to see the copy of the letter that he writes to the Minister of Finance at Ottawa and suggests that the same thing should be done there, and he will get precisely the same answer from them as he gets from the government here or from any other government that has responsibility for developing a province through this kind of a fund.

My honourable friend the Leader of the New Democratic Party may not be aware of this fact. He may not be aware of the fact but I am told that the Saskatchewan Development Fund is established on exactly the same basis as the Manitoba Fund.

MR. PAULLEY: I don't give a hoot what they do.

MR. LYON: And I'm suggesting, Madam Speaker, that the underlying principle behind it is exactly the same and it's established for exactly the same good reasons, that you can't put into the public domain this type of detailed information with respect to credit matters relating to private industry if you're going to have that industry taking advantage and using the fund for the purpose for which it was established. It's quite clear; it's elementary; it's basic. I think everybody realizes that, and instead of trying to make a political football out of it, I suggest that we all try to settle down and just look at the matter as commonsense people, and we will realize immediately that it would be the most foolish precedent to establish if a person could stand up in this House at any time -- and this really is the burden of what my honourable friends opposite are asking -- if they could stand up at any time and ask for information with respect to an applicant for credit or persons who had received money and so on. This isn't done. This isn't done at all. And think, Madam Speaker, of the way that this would inhibit the purpose for which the fund was set up and established.

MR. PAULLEY: as far as the amounts are concerned, and I've said so.

MR. LYON: My honourable friend wants information. The Business Development Fund puts out an annual report each year and the general information with respect of the fund is contained in it. But surely he doesn't mean that this fund, or the Industrial Development Bank of Canada, or the Saskatchewan Industrial Development Fund, or other government funds should be required, as they are not now presently required, should be required to give specific information with respect to specific applicants.

MR. PAULLEY: We're prepared to accept that.

MR. LYON: If he still holds to that view then I must say that we differ, because this is the kind of information that just is a matter of government policy, and here further, as a matter of legislation, is not and cannot be made available with respect to the operation of the fund. That fund, as my honourable friends know, is set up at arm's length from the government and was set up purposely with that in mind, and I remember the debate that took place when the fund was being established. I remember the Minister being asked if he thought it wasn't too far out, because I think certain members from the other side of the House had some fear that the fund was too far away from government control, and I remember him arguing at the time: no, that's the way the fund should operate, because we set up a board of directors; we invest them with the monies that are required for them to do the job, and we ask them to do the job unhampered by influence by the government or influence by the Legislature. That's the purpose of the fund, and I think all members will agree from looking at their annual reports that the fund has operated extremely satisfactorily on that basis over the seven-odd years that it has now been in existence and doing work for the people of Manitoba.

Well, I repeat again, if any repetition is necessary, that this is a rehash of a debate that took place some time ago. The law has not changed since that last debate, the policy of the government has not changed since that last debate, and I can see no reason why it should change, because the information that is being given is all that can be given, and I suggest that the Industrial Development Bank of Canada -- which is a much larger bank than this fund ever will be -- does not and will not give this information to the public of Canada whose money is invested in it for precisely the same reason that Saskatchewan doesn't give the information and the same reason as advanced here, Madam Speaker, as to why the information is not available in Manitoba and that is, as I say, not only a matter of government policy, it is a matter that is supported by statute. Honourable friends opposite may recall that this matter was commented upon in the Winnipeg Free Press at the time the debate took place in 1962, and the Free Press made this comment at the time, and I don't mind repeating it for what it is. They say, and this is in the bottom of their editorial: "The government is prepared to list the total of loans made and the total arrears. This doesn't answer all of the Opposition's demands but it does constitute something of a check on the fund's operations. As long as the government holds that the removal of the provision for secrecy would impair the fund's usefulness and it seems probable that it would -- the present legislation is about as good a compromise as can be expected." And I think that that's a pretty commonsense attitude to have towards the matter. The Winnipeg Free Press -- I don't advance them as being the be-all and the end-all with respect to knowledge in all matters -- but certainly I think that's a very commonsense attitude. It is the attitude of the government at the present time and it's the attitude that we intend to hold. I don't think there is any question, as the Leader of the Opposition tries to say, of trying to hide behind anything or anybody. No question of that at all. It's a question of what is the best way in order to have this fund operate to the best

(MR. LYON cont'd).....advantage of the people of Manitoba. This was the means that was devised at the time the Act was before the House. It has operated successfully, so far as we're aware, in this atmosphere over the last six years, and we think that it is doing a good job at the present time for the people of Manitoba in pursuance, in following this kind of policy. We think that this is a reasonable attitude and we ask the honourable members opposite to perhaps consider that the attitude of the government is based on policy; it's based on law; it's based on what is best for the fund and what is best for the people and for the developers in Manitoba. With all of these considerations in mind I'm sure they will agree that this resolution should be defeated.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I wonder if my honourable friend might permit a question.

MR. LYON: Yes, sure.

MR. PAULLEY: In the discourse of his remarks, Madam Speaker, I understood my honourable friend said that this matter was debated once, and the inference was that because of the fact we had debated it once that became "it". The oracle has spoken, so therefore, "dare ye, on this side, to raise once again the proposition?" My answer, of course, to my honourable friend is, did he really mean what he said when he said that because the matter had once been debated it was not up to us to raise the question again?

MR. LYON: Madam Speaker, my honourable friend heard more than I heard when I was speaking. I didn't say what he said I said. But in any case, all I'm saying is that this matter was debated. The principles haven't changed. I am sorry to say that their arguments haven't improved to the point where they would be any better than they were two years ago. The policy of the government hasn't changed; the statute hasn't changed; the fund is still operating successfully; so I would think that all of these reasons would be fairly cogent ones for defeating the resolution.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, the question obviously should have been not did the Minister mean what he said, but did the Minister know what he said?

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker, may I ask a question for clarification? Is the Minister refusing the answer to all three questions?

MR. EVANS: Yes.

MR. CAMPBELL: Well, Madam Speaker, I must say that as one who has watched this development pretty carefully, that I thought that the Honourable the Member for Broken-head, who introduced this matter, and the Leader of his Party, were quite fair in saying that they were willing to strike out Clause 3. And I would agree that that question should not be answered, because I think that not only are we guided by any suggestions in the Act, but sound business principles, I think, would indicate that you shouldn't have the corporations' or businesses' private affairs detailed too greatly. But, surely -- surely, Madam Speaker, surely there is no objection to answering a direct question as to whether an individual company has been assisted.

MR. LYON: The Act doesn't permit it.

MR. CAMPBELL: My honourable friend is a great one to confuse the issue, and I could give him the very highest rating in that regard. What the Act says, if I may take the time to explain it to my honourable friend, is that.....

MR. LYON: You're not at your best when you're on law, you know.

MR. CAMPBELL: Well, I must return the compliment to my honourable friend. I don't know of anything he is at his best on, but it certainly isn't law.

MR. LYON: Thank heavens, you're not the judge.

MR. CAMPBELL: If I were the judge my honourable friend would sometimes get a pretty severe sentence. What the Act says, and what it undoubtedly intends, is that this corporation which is set up to do this job, shall not be required to come before this House or a committee thereof, and give the details of loans and produce books and this sort of thing. But I maintain that it does not say, the Act does not say that the Minister in this House cannot answer a question, yes or no, as to whether a certain corporation or firm or individual receives a loan. And this is the reasonable position to take. It wouldn't be fair to a corporation to have them in front of any of the committees of this House and discuss their business affairs to them. But to say that a corporation has received help from this fund that was set up in order to do that job, what's the matter with this? And then the other question, if one of these corporations has gone into bankruptcy, is there any reason why that plain fact should not be stated, because it's been mentioned that it's very easy to obtain the information anyway just as it's quite simple,

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd) if you have a particular business in mind, to find out whether they did or did not receive assistance from the Development Fund by going over to the Land Titles Office and finding out whether an instrument has been registered there attesting to that fact. So, you can't keep this thing secret anyway. And when you can't keep it secret anyway, and when it doesn't violate the principle why would the Minister refuse to answer that question?

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Madam Speaker, I would like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Gladstone, that the debate be adjourned.

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

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

MR. SCHREYER: Madam Speaker, I hesitate to move this motion on the grounds that it might be refused. I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Logan, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing: (a) Whether any cities, towns, villages or municipalities have applied for Centennial Grants for sidewalk building projects, or any other closely related type of projects. (b) The number and names of those municipalities so applying. (c) The number of such applications approved and the names of those municipalities successfully applying.

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

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

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Gladstone, that an Order of the House do issue for a return showing: 1. The number of kilowatt hours of electricity produced each month at the Manitoba Hydro steam plant at Brandon, for the years 1960, 1961, 1962, 1963, 1964 and 1965 to date. 2. The cost and amount of fuel burned each month at the above station in these years. 3. The number of kilowatt hours of electricity produced each month at the Manitoba Hydro steam plant at Selkirk for the years 1960, 1961, 1962, 1963, 1964 and 1965 to date. 4. The cost and amount of fuel burned each month at the above station in these years. 5. The number of kilowatt hours of electricity purchased each month by Manitoba Hydro from outside the Province of Manitoba in 1960, 1961, 1962, 1963, 1964 and 1965 to date, stating from whom purchased. 6. The anticipated number of kilowatt hours of electricity to be produced at Grand Rapids generating station in 1965.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

HON. MAITLAND B. STEINKOPF, Q.C. (Provincial Secretary and Minister of Public Utilities) (River Heights): Madam Speaker, with regard to questions Numbers 1 to 5, I think we can accept them, but so far as Number 6 is concerned, because of the anticipatory question that it is, I'm afraid that we can't accept Number 6.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Surely there must be a projected figure on what the government expects to get from this plant.

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

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

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed? The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Inkster and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable the Member for Selkirk. The Honourable the Member for Brandon.

MR. R. O. LISSAMAN (Brandon): Madam Speaker, I would like to at the outset of this discussion inform the members that I am expressing my own personal views in this matter, and I'm in no way speaking for the Party. The divorce situation in this country is -- as mature people look at it today, is a situation, a condition, which does require the thinking and examining of sensible people. Personally, my own inclination would be, from purely personal experience, to say, well let's leave matters well enough alone. Lately I suppose I doubt very much if my wife could trade me off even if she had the opportunity, and I can assure the members that I am quite content with my mate in life. However, it is rather unfortunate, but it is a fact that legislation must reflect the will of the people, and I have thought for the past several years, with the creeping -- certainly continually -- reducing of the

(MR. LISSAMAN cont'd). standards, lowering the standards of moral behaviour in this country, that this is but one of the many undesirable behaviours of society that we are reaping.

Now, certainly I am at least one generation removed from young people contemplating marriage at this time, but when you compare the atmosphere and environment of two generations, there is not much in common when it comes to the actual formation of moral standards and so on, and right here I would like to say that I have the greatest respect for young people, probably far greater than one of their compatriots, a person of their own age, because I think they face an almost intolerable situation as compared to boys and girls of my youth. I think many of the members here will agree that we -- our first reading started off with Horatio Alger, this brave young lad from the country who came to town and worked hard. It helped a bit, of course, to marry the boss's daughter, but he married successfully and ended up living happy ever after; and there was some value to this. I have heard psychologists run down the value of Horatio Alger as reading matter for young people, but it certainly did give inspiration and an uplift. And then, as we of my generation attended movies and plays, the movies and plays were generally of an uplift nature. You came away from them -- certainly there was the odd tragedy -- but you came away from the entertainment in that day with an uplift, with some inspiration, and a general tendency to feel that the world was all right. Now compared to this, present-day entertainment seems to be a terrible ordeal to go through. It seems that every writer must present you with a psychiatric problem or something. Or if this is not his particular meter, why then he takes you through all the by-ways and alleys of really the gutter-type of living, and it seems that a person, if they want to be assured of having a best seller, why they just need to introduce all the smut that they can.

Now certainly I believe, and I believe other members must feel this way, that a generation of youth today, feeding on this sort of material, formulating their opinions and basing their concepts of how to live on this sort of thing -- true, there are those who will see beyond it, see that these are studies presented to you, and it's wise not to choose this way of life as presented in much of this reading material and entertainment, but there will be many who do not look beyond it, and so I think we can look for a continued reduction of moral standards unless the common sense goodwill of man takes over, and in this manner I would suggest. I myself would be reluctant to agree to any rigid censorship but I do believe that in the type of stuff that is available now on the newsstands and in the entertainment world, that there should be at least the restraint of common decency. Material and situations should not be presented which go beyond the bounds of reasonable decency, and I can assure you that much of the literature that is available does exceed these bounds.

Now, coming back to the divorce situation, you might say, "Well what has this all to do with it?" but I think it does have a great deal, because as the old saying: "As the twig is bent, so inclines the tree," and I think there is a real danger in our present trend of society to the family and the marriage state, but at the same time I think all sensibly mature people, and particularly those who enjoy a happy and satisfactory marriage relationship, have a particular sympathy towards those who have not been so fortunate.

As you are aware, Madam Speaker, many of the citizenry at large do not differentiate between federal and provincial matters. They do not realize the jurisdiction of either government, and I have had several people come to me at different times asking me to help them in some matters of obtaining a divorce, a divorce situation, and I have assured them that there was very little that a provincial member could do, but since people like to unburden themselves I have heard some really disturbing situations described to me and I think all of us would agree that probably nothing could be worse than to be doomed to be living with an individual with whom you had nothing in common, and even beyond this, one possibly irritating the other, so I must come to the conclusion that reasonable and sensible people must agree that there must be more easily available outlets so that these people can be freed of such a situation and be given a new chance.

Now I think that we should certainly look at any degree of relaxation in the divorce laws very seriously, because often even to those seeking divorce, divorce may not necessarily be the answer. If we make it too easily available there will not be the effort to compromise and get along with each other and both parties, once freed, do take along with them some stigma of failure. This applies, of course, in more disastrous ways upon the children, if there are children of such a marriage, and every effort should be made to keep a couple together wherever it is possible, but since this House will not be determining what the laws will be, and in effect even the amendment, supposing the amendment passes by the Member for Selkirk, were

(MR. LISSAMAN cont'd). sent to Ottawa, I am sure this will not be interpreted literally but merely as a request to re-examine and liberalize our divorce laws. And because of this, Madam Speaker, and because of my feelings I have expressed, I find that I will be voting in favour of the motion as amended.

MR. SCHREYER: Madam Speaker, I would like to take a few minutes to speak to this resolution. I believe it's the kind of resolution, the subject matter of which lends itself to extended discussion and debate, but it's not my intention to speak for more than just a few minutes.

The members who have spoken previously have seemed to be of a concensus that divorce laws in this country should be changed, moderated, eased, or liberalized if you like, and I think that in the slow course of events, legislation having to do with social matters, that it is time now to make or to ask for this change. The Member for Brandon, as I understood him, decried or seemed to discern a trend toward lower standards of social conduct and I must agree with him. In my opinion, I seem to detect or discern this also. I don't know if this is common with each passing generation to think that their generation is going to ruination and damnation, but I feel very strongly, after trying to keep up with changing events around me, that there is some trend toward a lowering of standard social conduct, sort of a trend toward licentiousness if you like, etc. etc., but yet at the same time I don't think that this resolution asking for a moderation in the divorce legislation would lend itself, or has anything directly to do with this trend. I think that it is really beastly for the State to prevent by law, prevent people who cannot abide each other, cannot tolerate each other very much in any case, to prevent them from taking their separate ways and trying to find a better life and rearrange it so that they may live more happily.

Now of course a very basic argument is that liberalized divorce will make for a situation of increased divorce and that many innocent children will suffer. There may be something to that, but on the other hand I would submit that children who live in a home where the parents are forever quarrelling or who have no feeling of respect for each other in any case, that the children living in such a home are suffering as much, or at least almost as much as if the parents were separated and remarried and living more happily.

I have here a memorandum that was submitted to the Federal Minister of Justice relative to the question, the problem of divorce, and it is a submission by a group of farm women, and I consider -- this is not to say anything about city women -- but I consider farm women, the kind of women who are busy in farm organizations, etc., do have the highest sense of social conduct, social standards, moral standards, etc., and they are asking for a change, a liberalization in our divorce laws. They are asking for it along the lines proposed by the Honourable Member for Inkster and, not exclusive also, the Honourable Member for Selkirk whose amendment by the way recommends itself very highly to this group.

I think, Madam Speaker, that people, legislators, can go along for years, decades, opposing a certain change in the law, in the case of divorce law for example, and then change in society around them catches up and it becomes manifestly clear to them that it is indeed time to change the law, and I would hope that honourable members here will see fit to pass this resolution which would have the effect of making a formal request to the Federal Government to make or to initiate the necessary changes.

And with that, Madam Speaker, I think I have made my contribution to this particular debate. I certainly intend to vote for the resolution even though I am, like the Member for St. Boniface, a member of the Roman Catholic faith. It's not so surprising that Roman Catholics should vote for a resolution such as this inasmuch as, even though we may find divorce something which we would not ourselves as members of that particular faith wish to avail ourselves of, nevertheless, because we do not choose to does not mean that we must cast our vote in the negative in order to deprive other people who think otherwise of a chance to make something of their life when it has come to a sad state because of incompatibility.

MR. JOHNSON: Madam Speaker, I won't be long on this matter, but I would like to speak to this amendment which I endorse. That is the Honourable Member for Selkirk's amendment of the matter before us. You know, we hear --ever since I came to understand the nature of things, I have come to feel more and more and I hear it almost monthly in the course of activities in our province, why are our divorce laws so archaic? I don't think we are, contrary to what we hear from time to time, that we are a generation of people going to ruination, where social conduct, certainly our exposures are much greater; but I think we tend sometimes too to go in cycles. I have had occasion recently to read some of the sagas that go back a thousand years and in those days, the old vikings used to meet once a year at the Althing and you came to the Althing and if you thought your partner had been unfaithful, you named her and if proven guilty, or named by a second party, she lost her head.

We've advanced a little bit since those days, but in those days of course, they had this most expeditious method of separating partner and spouse. Recently I have had brought to my attention a very sad case of this nature where desertion --a woman had been deserted for a five year period and for three or four years had been trying to get a divorce, chased the other partner out to another province, and through her father and her fiance, or present fiance she has been trying to initiate divorce proceedings. After five years and \$1200 in trying to find him, trying to find all the kind of evidence they need these days, investigators, lawyers and other jurisdictions, she is becoming somewhat impoverished and at that point came to myself. However, this is I think, not uncommon because when in my small orbit I hear of these actual cases one sees the futility of some of our existing laws. I am most heartened especially by the attitude taken by progressive people like the Member from St. Boniface, and the Member from Brokenhead in this regard. I think regardless of our certain matters of conscience and so on, that in the public interest, in our modern society and in our modern way of thought, some real good can come from the kind of resolution by the Honourable Member from Selkirk.

I think however, that it would concern me, I'm sure that in bringing a resolution like this to the Federal Government's attention, I'm sure that the matter of psychiatric opinion should be one of a panel where you don't want one or an isolated psychiatric opinion standing up. I'm sure the courts would, or some regulations governing the laws could cover that kind of event because much like having a pony these days a lot of women have their own psychiatrist and we don't want to overdo or get some rather quick judgments in this regard, in certain areas. I do think though that the desertion and the mental cruelty and the bestiality, and these sections as outlined here, are very good, and I just wanted to rise on this debate to support this amendment of the Honourable Member from Selkirk and hope that it is forwarded to Ottawa and that the authorities there see fit to take action in this regard.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Madam, I'd simply like to thank all the members in the House who have spoken on behalf of this amendment. I would also like to thank the Honourable Member for Inkster for having --(Interjection)-- Yes. Do you want to speak?

MR. FRED GROVES, (St. Vital): I'm sorry. I'd like to adjourn the debate, if he is going to close. . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Is the honourable member closing the debate? The Honourable Member for St. Vital.

MR. GROVES: I apologize to the honourable member. I move then, seconded by the Honourable Member from Winnipeg Centre that the debate be adjourned.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Inkster. The Honourable the Member from St. Matthews.

MR. W. G. MARTIN, (St. Matthews): Madam Speaker, it would be very difficult for anyone in this Chamber to imagine a session without a Resolution in the name of the Honourable Member for Inkster dealing with the Old Age Pension. For long years he has stood in his place and championed the cause of the needy and the handicapped and we are not surprised in view of that, that he was one of the recipients of the Golden Boy Award this year and was also honored at a community banquet given for him in recognition of his distinguished service. He suggested the other day in a speech that he was not seeking re-election. Of course, there are many great artists who have several farewell appearances and are on the stage after that. But if he does retire, and when he does retire, his will be the immense satisfaction of knowing that in his years in the public service and as a member of this Legislature, something worthwhile has been attempted and something worthwhile has been done.

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

We have no quarrel Madam Speaker with the preamble and the various whereases that appear in this Resolution. We are all aware of the fact that the cost of living has risen 34% since 1949 and that \$75 which the old age pensioners receive today will not purchase any more goods than could have been purchased for \$55 back in 1949. It's an interesting point though to remember that back in 1949 the old age pension, if I remember rightly, was \$40, when you could buy goods \$55 equal to the \$75 today. But be that as it may, we are all in complete agreement that \$75 is inadequate for many of our citizens to meet the necessities of life particularly when they are depending upon their old age pension, and that something more, something extra should be done to provide them with the wherewithal whereby they can live a life of dignity and free from hardship. So in this regard, Madam Speaker, the Honourable Member for Inkster was championing the cause of the needy, but then he goes further in the substance of the resolution and recommends an across-the-board increase of the pension from \$75 to \$100 per month irrespective of the financial status of the recipient, \$300 a year increase for the wheat king, or the business magnate, that will be the same as will be received by the poor in a community. Many of us feel that this is not only unjust but it's unnecessary, for there are very many people in Manitoba who are in receipt of the Old Age Pension who do not require an extra \$25 a month to maintain dignity of life or an extra \$300 a year to keep the wolf from the door.

Then the further suggestion is that the Old Age Security should begin at age 65. Well I wonder if my honourable friend has taken time to consider what this is going to mean in dollars and cents for the taxpayer. In Manitoba the population over 70 is 57,000; the population between 65 and 69 is 28,000. Now if we give those who are 70 and over an additional \$300 a year, the increased cost will be \$70,100,000; and then with the 28,000 between the ages of 65 and 69, in that group you have approximately 7,500 who are receiving either Old Age Assistance, who are blind or physically disabled, and it is in all likelihood that if this pension went to \$100 a month, that the old age pensioner would have to be treated in the same fashion, likewise those that are blind and disabled. It may be interesting to the members of the House to know that as far as the Old Age Assistance is concerned, it's a 50-50 arrangement between Manitoba and the federal authorities. As far as the blind are concerned, 75% paid by Ottawa and 25% by Manitoba; and the disabled it's a 50-50 deal. Well when you deduct the 5,000 that are receiving Old Age Assistance between the ages of 65 and 69 at the present time, this leaves you with the balance between 65 and 69, namely 23,000 citizens who will receive, because they are not on the pension now, \$1200 a year, and that means a cost of \$27,600,000. So the total increased cost would be \$46,950,000.00. Madam Speaker, that's more than the budget estimate, the estimate set forth in the budget for health and welfare combined.

But having said all that, and having pleaded as the member did so eloquently for an across-the-board increase, you will notice that his sole argument was in behalf of the needy. When the New Democratic Leader rose he took a similar line of argument. There wasn't as far as I remember one word for universal increase of Old Age Pensions, not a word about lowering the threshold of pensions of 65 years. His great and earnest argument was for the needy. Perhaps it would be well if I just quote from Hansard: "What we deem should be a pension that should be adequate at least for the basic necessities of our senior citizens. This is amply covered, Madam Speaker, in the fourth 'whereas' where we deal with the providing of the means for these elderly citizens to live a life of dignity in the absence of privation. This should be one of our motivations in this day and age." And a little further in his speech he referred to the Budget Speech of the First Minister when he was dealing with the Canada Pension Plan and in referring to this the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party said that the First Minister said he objected in many respects to the present proposed Canada pensions and suggested it would be quite within the means of Canada to provide for an increase in the Old Age Security Pension. If I recall almost directly his words, Madam, he first of all agreed that the \$75.00 was not sufficient. He said that "I would be prepared to increase it to \$100.00 to \$125.00." Indeed if I'm not misquoting my honourable friend, the Provincial Treasurer and the First Minister of the Province of Manitoba, he went so far as to say "Madam Speaker I'd even accept an Old Age Security Pension for \$150.00." So I say I encourage my colleague, the Member for Inkster, to be of stout heart because I say to him in all deference that frequently when he presents his resolution that he feels as though the government was not with him, well I say to my honourable friend the Member for Inkster, Mr. Gray, be of stout heart, this year, with your resolution. We have indications of support from the Conservative ranks opposite and possibly the only amendment that might be forthcoming in this resolution as proposed by Mr. Gray, would be an increase in the basic amount from \$100.00 to \$150.00.

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

Now I think Madam Speaker, that I should just refer to what the First Minister said on this occasion. He was criticizing the Canada Pension Plan. He said what a colossal sum it would mean as far as Manitoba was concerned. He said likewise that the old age pensioner will be left out in the cold, and then he follows --I'm reading from Page 225: "The real question then, and one of which affects every province, as well as the Federal government and affects them now, is not whether we can afford the Canada Pension Plan in isolation but whether we can afford it as it stands in the context of our other needs. Manitoba wants better pensions. We believe that better pensions can be obtained now for those who need them to raise the present system of old age security and assistance to a threshold of \$100 or \$125 or perhaps \$150.00 for those who are in need of these increases can be very well financed by a public charge far less than the product of the Canada Pension Plan levy. And get that, 'far less'. This would involve a conscious decision to raise our concept of need from its present level to one which includes some reasonable amenities."

In those paragraphs that I have read I think that the First Minister, the Provincial Treasurer, mentions need several times and on two occasions he said "those in need". So Madam Speaker, I would like to remind my honourable friend that when he was expressing himself thus, he was giving voice to the stout-hearted policy, and perhaps I would say the warm-hearted policy of the Premier of this Province and an indication of the faith of this administration that top place in legislation should be those things which are interpreted in terms of the human equation.

So I would say to my friend the Member for Inkster and the New Democratic Party Leader, having listened to the words of the First Minister, I would say to them be of stout heart. And then my honourable friend challenged the Member for St. Matthews to be of stout heart. Well, I'll accept it Madam Speaker, and I'll say just this: If the day comes when it is necessary to increase the pensions for needy, elderly citizens, to \$100 to \$150 a month or even beyond that, this government will not be found wanting, and it may be that the day is not far off. So we say to the elderly citizens of this province, be of stout heart, for in that day the government will be with you not only lending a sympathetic ear but following that with outright, forthright and determined action.

The Member for Inkster said that this \$300 increase should be carried out in three stages of \$100.00, reaching the \$300 by Confederation year 1967. Well, Madam Speaker, all I have to say in reply to that is that if our elderly citizens are in need, they can't afford to wait for three years until the banners of Confederation year are flying. Why wait for Confederation year? Do it now! And so Madam Speaker, I would present the following amendment, moved by myself, and seconded by the Honourable the Member for Springfield, that the resolution be amended by striking out all the words in the last five lines of the resolution, and substituting the following: "The Government of Canada be requested to raise the threshold for old age pensions and for old age assistance from \$75.00 to \$100.00 per month for those in need".

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I wonder --as I look at the Order Paper, if we strike out the last five lines as they are printed in the Order Paper that we have before us, I doubt very much whether the amendment would make much sense. I wonder --although I appreciate the intent of the Honourable Member for St. Matthews, I wonder if it might be advisable for you, Madam Speaker, and him, to take a second look at the wording of it in order that it might come into the resolution as it stands on the Order Paper.

MR. MARTIN: Why is it wrong? It takes up five lines.

MR. PAULLEY: Well, may I say to my honourable friend, the last four lines are the "Resolved that the "....." is on the Order Paper today.

MADAM SPEAKER: The honourable member I believe has been working from the Votes and Proceedings where there are five lines in the wording, and whether he works from Votes and Proceedings or from here, some adjustment will have to be made.

MR. PAULLEY: The only reason I'm concerned about it is so that we have it properly before us, Madam Speaker, and I would suggest that rather than an adjournment it be held open and then we can go from there subsequently --unless somebody wants to speak to it.

MR. MARTIN: It's the error of the four or the five. Well, it's the four lines. I'm sorry, I said five.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed to have four in the resolution? Agreed.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

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

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

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

MR. M. E. MCKELLAR, (Souris-Lansdowne): Madam Speaker, I would like the indulgence of the House to let this matter stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for St. George. The Honourable the Member for Dufferin.

MR. WILLIAM HOMER HAMILTON, (Dufferin): Madam Speaker, I adjourned this debate for the Honourable Member for St. Vital.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable the Member for St. Vital.

MR. GROVES: Madam Speaker, over last weekend I was helping my children with some of their homework and one of the things that we were working with was a record and a sheet with the words from the Gilbert and Sullivan Operetta, "The Pirates of Penzance", and I would appreciate it if the Honourable the Member for Brokenhead, I see he is not in his seat, would not ask me to table this. It belongs to my little girl and he can get it for I think it's fifty cents in any record shop. However, --(Interjection)-- in the latter part of this operetta when the policemen appear on the scene and they are about to arrest the pirates, there's a little verse that I thought was quite appropriate, not only to the Honourable Member for St. George's contribution to the debate, but in mine as well. You'll remember the words: "When a felon's not engaged in his employment, or maturing his felonious little plans; His capacity for innocent enjoyment, Is just as great as any other man." So I thought Madam Speaker, in those four lines of the Honourable Member from St. George when he delivered his melodramatic address on the heating tax.

The final few lines of this verse --I'll read the original lines first and then I've interpolated a little: "My feelings I with difficulty smother, When constabulary duty's to be done; But taking one consideration with another, A policeman's lot is not a happy one." So I interpolate that particular part of the verse, Madam Speaker, to apply to myself. "My feelings I with difficulty smother, When a politician duty's to be done, But taking one consideration with another, Defending taxes is not a happy one."

So I listened with interest, Madam Speaker, as I said before, to the melodramatic address which the Honourable Member from St. George gave us on this resolution. Nobody likes taxes. I don't like them myself. But we all tend to forget, Madam Speaker, about the constant pressure that we, as citizens, and as members of the Legislature even, apply to governments at all levels, federal, provincial and municipal, for services that must be paid for, and in the final analysis it's taxes that are called upon to do this job. Criticism of the taxes that were imposed at the last session of the Legislature, at the Special Session that was held last summer, for purposes that were outlined in the debates at that time, I think is fair game, and we expect this criticism from members of the Opposition. In fact if they didn't give this criticism we would consider that they were not doing the job that they were sent here by their people to do. But I think, Madam Speaker, that this criticism must be fair, it must be sensible and it must take into account all things. It must take into consideration all things. And the honourable member's criticism, Madam Speaker, I don't think falls into any of these three categories. The honourable member in my opinion should have saved his energy. If he wanted to criticize taxes, to attack the whole taxation program of the government as it is his job as a member of the opposition. And, at the same time, to suggest seriously what he would do to decrease this whole taxation picture. I think, Madam Speaker, that he is not being fair when he picks out one tax for the purpose of delivering the type of criticism which he did in his address. I listened to his speech with a crying towel and I read it with some incredulity. And I'd like, Madam Speaker, because I must say that in some respects his speech is a masterpiece, and I'd like to reread parts of it onto the record. He starts off by saying, "When I stand here, looking across the floor of this House at that vast wasteland out yonder, I don't know whether to laugh or cry. There they sit, heaven help us, like some vast symphony orchestra made up of men and women who can't read music, don't play an instrument, and happen to be tone deaf". Then he goes on and he calls us a bunch of bucksters, whatever they are, a row of extinct volcanoes, never really active, a ministry of idiocracies, and Napoleon sounding the advance while he was tripping over his own coat tail.

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

Madam Speaker, these are memorable words and I thought as I read them last night that surely when the honourable member was compiling this speech, he must have been hit on the head with a volume of one of Winston Churchill's memoirs. Then, he goes on. "He puts on cruel taxes", he says, "on items that should never be taxed. If the people of Manitoba turn down their heat, they will not just be uncomfortable, they will freeze to death". Well, Madam Speaker, I ask the honourable member what about the federal sales tax on clothing, and on food stuffs, and on building material? The honourable member makes no mention of these. Surely we would also freeze to death if we refused to pay what is the amount that's included in the price of clothing that is federal sales tax. Surely we would starve to death if we refused to pay our portion of the federal sales and excise taxes that are on foods. And surely we would also freeze to death if we refused to pay the federal sales tax on the materials with which we build our homes. The honourable member goes on, he says that "this is the most vicious tax ever imposed by any government in the history of mankind", yet. "That it's the cruelest tax ever imposed by any government. It's grossly unfair because it strikes at the little man". Well, Madam Speaker, the little man does pay his share of this tax, just as he pays his share of most other taxes. But, by and large, this tax is not much different from most of our other taxes --everybody pays according to their means. And I ask the honourable member what about the larger industries in the province that are using many thousands of dollars in fuel each month? They too are paying their share of this tax and they are paying on the basis of their means. --(Interjection)-- The tax, Madam Speaker, is a small item on a person's fuel bill and the honourable member forgets to tell us that if the same people he's telling us that they're going to freeze to death if they don't pay their fuel tax, the same people would freeze to death if they didn't pay their fuel bill, because their supply of fuel would be cut off and that they would also have their light bills cut off if they refused to pay their light bills to the utility company. So, Madam Speaker, I think that we can take with a grain of salt a good part of what the honourable member had to say.

In the debate the other evening, the Premier of the province and the Honourable Member from Lakeside were making some heated comparisons between 1958 and 1964, arguing between them about what had gone up and what had gone down since that time. Well, I have news for both of them, Madam Speaker, because I know of one item that has neither gone up nor gone down since 1958, despite the fact that there was a one cent per gallon tax put on it in 1964. And that's the price of fuel oil in Greater Winnipeg. I have collected from people in my constituency a set of oil bills going back to the year 1958. The price of fuel oil in 1958 was 18.4¢ a gallon and in 1965 as of this month, the price that the consumer pays for fuel oil in Greater Winnipeg is 18.4¢ a gallon. We know that the oil companies, the suppliers of fuel oil, are having difficulties making their products competitive with natural gas, and on July 2 of last year, the price of oil was lowered 1¢ per gallon. So that at least for 40 percent of the people in the Province of Manitoba, because it's considered that roughly 40 percent of them are heating their homes with fuel, the gas tax has not, or the fuel tax, heating tax has not increased their cost of fuel any more than it was in 1958.

Now Madam Speaker, what about Northern Manitoba? If we leave out the larger centres, such as Flin Flon and The Pas, Thompson, what about the Indian reservation, the Metis settlements and a lot of the smaller fishing and logging villages, where many of the real poor people of the province live? Many of these people heat their homes with fire wood, still heat their homes with fire wood. And there's no tax on fire wood, Madam Speaker.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Is that next Freddie?

MR. GROVES: What about the taxes, Madam Speaker, that were imposed on these same people or that will be imposed on these same people, when the Canada Pension Plan becomes law? Will the Honourable Member from St. George also feel that this tax will be cruel and vicious? Because in these cases, Madam Speaker, it will be a matter not of taxes or death, but taxes or no security, or taxes or die in poverty. What about the taxes that will be imposed, Madam Speaker, on these same people again if the Liberal Party after 45 years finally go ahead with their proposed medical plan? Will the honourable member criticize this tax as being cruel and vicious? Because again, to use the honourable member's terminology, in this case it will be taxes or stay sick, or taxes or die without help. Granted, Madam Speaker, --(Interjection)--

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member from St. Vital.

MR. GROVES: Granted, Madam Speaker, that the fuel tax does hit everybody, including the low income groups, and perhaps when alternative sources of revenue are available, this

(MR. GROVES, cont'd). should be the first tax to go. But let's not lose sight, Madam Speaker, of the fact that this is not the heavy burden that the Honourable Member for St. George makes out. In the cases of the real poor people of this province, or the border-line cases to which he referred, in these cases assistance is available to those who find that their needs, including fuel, exceed their income. And furthermore, Madam Speaker, we have to recognize that the real incidence of this tax falls on those who have the ability to pay. Those with larger homes are paying more of this tax than those with smaller homes. What about the apartment block owners and the factories, and the mines, and the pulp and paper plants, that are contributing to the provincial revenues in very substantial amounts because of the fuel tax? So, it's not as the honourable member suggests, the real poor people of the province that are bearing the full incidence of this tax. The honourable member also forgets about the rebate in the school tax that will be forthcoming in 1965; and about the reduction that was made in the provincial income tax. So, when taken on an overall basis, I think that the man on the small income is not really going to be any worse off.

Why isn't there, Madam Speaker, a resolution on the Order Paper from either the Honourable Member from St. George or the Honourable Member from Emerson, or the Honourable Member from Brokenhead, attacking the viciousness of the tobacco tax, or the beer tax, or the tax on alcohol, or the pari mutuel tax? Why aren't there resolutions on the Order Paper from these members criticizing these taxes? Why pick out only the heating tax? Because, after all, Madam Speaker, it's the same people, the same people that the honourable member is talking about who smoke, the same people who drink, and the same people who attend the races, it's these same people that the Honourable Member from St. George claims that we are depriving of their daily bread by only one of the provincial taxes. I don't think, Madam Speaker, that it's fair to consider the heating tax separate and apart from all other taxes that are imposed. And, I'm sorry if I have to remind the members again of the things that I pointed out in the Throne Speech debate. Because, after all, who are the people that are benefitting from the measures which are being supported by the new taxes, including the tax on heating fuel. These are the same people that the Honourable Member from St. George and the others that have spoken in this debate, cry about having to shoulder the burden of this heating tax. Madam Speaker, I ask you and I ask the members of the House, is it not these people who are benefitting from the millions of dollars that have been poured into the hospital scheme in this province, and made available hospital services that heretofore were not available to people in the low income category? I ask the honourable member what about Medicare? Thousands of people in this province can now avail themselves of medical care and dental care, who can receive dentures and eye glasses, who were not able to avail themselves of this in past years? Who, Madam Speaker, but the people that the Honourable Member from St. George was referring to, are deriving the benefit from this government's willingness over the years to participate in its share of increases in the Old Age Assistance. Who else, but these same poor people that the honourable member referred to are benefitting from the millions of dollars that have been put into subsidizing courses at the university and helping to send their children to a higher education through scholarships, bursaries and loans. These services Madam Speaker were not available before. And again I ask the honourable member what about the senior citizens of this province -- the millions of dollars that have been invested in Senior Citizens Homes? These millions also Madam Speaker, have to be paid for by taxes, including the fuel tax; and it's these same people that the honourable member claims to speak for, that are getting the real benefit from many of these major programs.

So Madam Speaker, I'm sorry -- I can accept from the Honourable Member from St. George, criticism of government policies; I can accept from the Honourable Member from St. George criticism of government taxation, I would think that he would be remiss in his duty if he didn't do this -- but I cannot accept his taking out of context one tax, and one of the smaller ones at that, merely because it's popular to take this particular tax, it's one that has not gone down too well with the public, but I think it is most unfair of the honourable member to take this particular tax for those reasons and condemn the whole system because of it. So Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Winnipeg Centre that the resolution be amended by striking out all of the words following "whereas" in the third line thereof and substituting the following: "The cost of heat is only one of many factors to be taken into account in the cost of living in Manitoba; and whereas the tax on heat amounts to about 60 to 90¢ per month for the average Manitoba family; and whereas the government has not instituted a general Provincial Sales Tax; and whereas the government is pledged to a multi-million

(MR. GROVES, cont'd).....dollar school tax reduction on the homes and farms of Manitoba; therefore be it resolved that while recognizing the incidence of the tax on heat, this House regards it as preferable to the institution of a general Provincial Sales Tax."

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

A MEMBER: Are you going or returning?

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member from St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: Madam Speaker, I don't intend to recite any verses today, that reminds me too much of Nero fiddling while Rome burned. I think the Honourable Member from St. Vital made one of the most asinine and ridiculous speeches that I have ever heard in this House. Now Madam Speaker, he tried very very hard to make a joke out of this. First of all, it was brought in before why don't we vote against the pension plan, why don't we do this, why don't we do that? We are talking about one thing and one thing only. Other peoples are elected to look after the affairs of the Federal Government. This is not our responsibility. This is Number 1. Then we were asked why, why did we single out this tax? Madam Speaker we voted against all the taxes at this special session. We voted against this bill. We singled out this tax because this tax is the worse one of all, because this is something wrong.

Can I ask the honourable member why the First Minister of this House did not go ahead with this tax on land transfer? Can I ask him that --why didn't he forget all the taxes, why did he choose that one? He chose that one because there was a lot of pressure by big people, and they were right, but the little people don't count any more. This is why he chose this. What did he say at that time Madam Speaker on this tax --the Land Tax-- he figured this was fine, "well I don't see why it leads to that. Even if it does, 1% charge on the cost of these homes, which is once in a very long time proposition for most people, is something which I think they can live with." This is what the First Minister of the House said at this time. But he didn't bring it in. It was something that happened only once in a very long time. Now we are faced with a tax that happens every day, every week and for many months of every year and it's a hardship tax. It is ridiculous to say why didn't you look at all the taxes together. The honourable member said it is our duty to criticize, as long as we want to be fair, we want to take everything into account. I don't think that he has disproved anything by that ridiculous speech today.

We know Madam Speaker, we know that we have to have taxes. We also know that it is not pleasant, that nobody wants taxes. We realize that. But I say that when we are down to these kind of taxes, it's time we cut something. It's time that we forget about some of those great monuments that they are building for themselves or that we are building for ourselves, and that we try to think of the people. Now this is what we were asked last year, would you rather have more money on the booze.....or would you rather pay tax on your furniture, your household equipment and your car? The First Minister suggests that we go and ask the people of Manitoba. Well I know the answer to that. I didn't ask this question. But I asked some people, would you sooner have an Arts Centre, would you sooner have waste here in Manitoba, would you sooner get the Pan-Am Games at all cost, or would you sooner not pay taxes on your fuel? I don't think I have to give you the answer. I think you know what the answer is, Madam Speaker.

Now the honourable member brought in another point that wasn't much cleverer than the other one: why don't we tell Ottawa about these taxes, about the tax on food --I don't think there's too much tax on food, maybe on certain things that are imported, that people like to have -- but I don't think that the ordinary people worry much about this, this kind of food, and I don't think that this is much of a point. We are here studying one thing --the tax on fuel, which is a very difficult tax to pay. We are also told well the price went down, so therefore you're not paying anything. Well this is not any better. The price might go down on something and it will go up on something else. We are talking about this money that is spent on taxes, not the price of this. We know, we don't have to be told by the Honourable Member from St. Vital that if we don't pay our bills we will not have any fuel at all. We know that. This certainly was very weak. I think that we have to be careful the money that we need. I would sooner see maybe a few miles of bumpy roads and not see this kind of tax. We are talking about priorities. Well that's fine. I think there should be priorities and I certainly don't think that this is a fair tax at all.

We are told, well why didn't you complain? Why haven't you got a resolution, you Liberals, about the sales of tobacco? I for one think this is going a little too far. I think that a human being is entitled to some pleasure out of life. You call it booze. Some people like to

(MR. DESJARDINS, cont'd).....have a drink once in awhile. Is that so bad? But, still, it's not as bad, it's not as bad as a tax on heat, something that you --why we bring it up, because this is something that you have to have. This is not --you can do away-- if you can't afford it you can do away with the booze and with the cigarettes and so on. I think you are entitled to some of this, but you'll do away, you'll still live, but you cannot do without heat, especially here in Manitoba and especially here this kind of winter that we have had. I don't think that this is a laughing matter. Some of the members across from us think this is a big joke.

--(Interjection)-- Who --who's laughing now-- there's the smart alec again --(Interjection)-- Madam Speaker, if he'd like to talk to me I'd like him to at least sit in his chair, so I can see him, I can only see that red hair sticking up.

Now, there's something wrong with this tax also. We are not only paying the same thing. The First Minister said that he paid 60¢ a month. Well gosh he was away on a holiday in Jamaica most of the winter, maybe he doesn't have to pay. And if he's paying 60¢ a month I'd like to see the government send an inspector on Kingsway because I think he's gypping the government, because --I'm paying more than this. Now mind you they'll say I have a big house. Maybe I have. This was the first home that I had, and maybe I'm not too experienced in this. Right now I can tell you Madam Speaker, that I sent my wife away on a holiday to Toronto. I'm paying her trip with the money that I would pay in tax. I keep the heat at 60 or 62 all day, and still this is what I pay in taxes, this is what I pay in tax Madam Speaker --if you think it's a joke-- now up to November I paid \$3.01 just in tax; December was \$8.05, January \$4.99, February \$4.42 --(Interjection) --yes, tax. \$20.47 not counting March, Madam Speaker. --(Interjection)-- That's not a business, that's a house. And anybody that thinks it's not true I'm ready to table this, but I'd like to have them back because I haven't been able to afford to pay this yet. I need the bill back.

Now then Madam Speaker this I'm sure. I can burn wood I think --(Interjection)-- I can go along the river bank and get branches and burn that. I didn't know that. I thank him for his kind advice. I'll try that tonight.

Now there's another thing. We're talking about big business. How do this government tax people on this tax? Well you tell me Madam Speaker if this is right, if this is fair. All right, first of all, what date did we start? Well some people were taxed under the, where is it now, under the Motive Fuel Act, well they started on October 14th, October 19th, they started paying from them. Now the other people, the Revenue Act 1964, December 1st. But that isn't even the correct date December 1st, because they had to have a reading after December 1st and a lot of people started paying from December 28th or so, because the company had sent a reading in November 28th or so. Now is that fair?

Why should some people pay for a few months --pay a tax when others aren't paying? I ask the honourable member from St. Vital, is this fair? Is this what he's talking about a fair tax?

Now those people using their electricity, natural gas and coal pay five percent, so we are talking about a five percent tax. The big business that he's talking about, those that use bunker oil, they pay a third of a cent a gallon and a gallon is eight cents, so that's 24 cents, one cent on 24 cents. All right. Now the people who use propane gas, and some people do --yes, this is what I pay and this is one of the reasons for this cost-- I'm asking is this fair because I pay one cent on a gallon which is 16 cents. From 16 to 24 --can the honourable member tell me this is fair? --(Interjection)-- What is that remark? It must be a real clever remark. I think I'd like him to repeat this remark, Madam Speaker. I'd like to be able to answer it. Oh, he's just giggling again. He looks like Nero fiddling. No, I don't think this is a joke at all when you've got two different acts bringing in some taxes here that you start paying, some people on October 19th and others on December 28th, and when people pay one cent on 16, another one cent on 24, I don't think this is fair, especially when propane and people are penalized-- and oil is the most expensive form of heating anyway.

There's even discrimination in the commission paid to these people. People collecting this propane gas get 1/100 of a cent per gallon of oil or propane. Now the other people under this Revenue Act, it's three percent of the first \$10,000 of tax collected. Well on approximately \$2,000 some people, with all this book work, some people get \$16.00 and the other people get \$60.00. This is fair? My honourable friend is still laughing. He's still laughing. Well, you can laugh at me --everybody else is laughing at you so we're about even. This is fine. --(Interjection)-- Well, I might be full of hot air but I keep it inside of me. I'm not like some people that go around with a fogging machine. I don't run around with this fogging machine creating

(MR. DESJARDINS, cont'd).smoke all the time --the smoke screen we're having around here. --(Interjection)-- No, Madam Speaker, I think that we are looking after the interest of Manitoba --when bringing in a tax like this that is not fair, a tax that was done-- we were talking about a sales tax-- well if this isn't a sales tax it must be a purchase tax. It's the only difference I can see. Well, I don't know, but Mr. Roblin last year said. when he said that so I don't know. He was trying out his French but I don't think he had the right word or the right phrase.

Madam Speaker, this is not a --first of all, as I say, I recognize that we must have tax. I recognize this. I recognize this, that it's not an easy thing, that no taxes are popular. I recognize this. But some taxes are not fair, Madam Speaker, and this is a tax that's not fair. This is something that we have to have --this heat-- and therefore people should not be penalized around here. It's the poor people; it's everybody. This is not a tax that you pay if you can afford it, this is a tax that you pay period. This is not like the income tax, this is not any tax like this at all. This is a tax that you pay. It's not on what you have, what you do, it's what you buy. It's a sales tax, Madam Speaker, and it's a tax that was brought in without proper care, preparation. These people don't know anything about propane or these points. Are we trying to chase these people out of the province? Is this what we're trying to do? This is a tax that's not fair because some people started paying on October 19th and other people started paying on December 28th. This is not fair and I challenge everybody from across there to tell me this is fair and on what grounds. It's not fair when people pay one cent on 24 and other people pay one cent on 16. That is still not fair.

So, Madam Speaker I think we are certainly --I have my fun like everybody else in this House, but I think this is very serious and I resent that people try to make a joke out of this. I think if this is the only way, if this is all that's left, well let's cut down a few things. Let's do away with the Pan Am Games if that's it. I think we can save face -- I'd sooner save face with the poor people, with the ordinary people in this province than save face with Latin America. This is the way that I look at those things. Let's do away with these monuments, these skyscrapers of the Roblin Government that we're going to have around the Arts Centre. Those things are good and I'm not knocking these things, but I think that the first and most important things are the comfort of the people -- food, clothes, and heat in this country.

Madam Speaker, again I repeat that I resent the way this is tried to be made a joke. This is not a political matter. We voted against all of them -- right -- but this is one that should be changed right now. The First Minister, as I say, said he wanted, he encouraged the people to come and air their grievances in the Land Transfer Tax, and as I quoted him before he didn't think it was so bad, it was once in a lifetime or so. But this is not once in a lifetime, and where all these people had more than a session to air their grievances, what did the people of Manitoba, what time did they have to complain about this tax?

We passed this tax at 5:00 o'clock or so on one afternoon; that night around 11:00 we were told there would be a committee at 9:30 in the morning. Is that right or is that wrong? At 9:30 the next morning who had a chance to come between 11:00 o'clock or to hear it? There were no newspapers -- nothing printed. At 9:00 o'clock they were supposed to be there and this thing was rushed through the House. This is most unfair, Madam Speaker, and I for one certainly resent it.

MR. JOHNSON: Will the Honourable Member for St. Boniface permit a question?

MR. DESJARDINS: Yes, I will.

MR. JOHNSON: Has my honourable friend from St. Boniface made the same type of speech and expressed the same resentment to his national leader when he introduced the building tax, or did he consult my honourable member first?

MR. DESJARDINS: I answer this -- first of all, I'm not in that close talking terms of the national leader, and first of all I was elected as a responsibility in Manitoba and I can't particularly care -- I care as a citizen but not as the MLA for St. Boniface -- what happens in the federal policy. If the people don't like it they can elect different people, and I'm not one who will go blindly behind the people of Ottawa because they are Liberals. I can assure you of that and when I'm not satisfied I'll tell him just as much as if it was a Conservative Government.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I wish to say a word or two in this debate and I must apologize to the House that I'm not as flamboyant as my constituent, the Honourable Member for St. Boniface. I also must confess that I am not a poet like the Honourable Member for St. George; and I am not a critic of poetry like the Honourable Member for St. Vital. All that I am is an individual in this House who endeavours to see what's going on in the Province of Manitoba

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) and from time to time offer some comment regarding the same.

I must say, Madam Speaker, I listened with a great deal of interest to the contribution of the Honourable Member for St. Vital to the resolution as originally proposed by the Member for St. George. I would suggest that my friend the member for St. Vital really must have been talking with his tongue in his cheek or that my friend did not look over the legislation at present invoked in the Province of Manitoba and that he did not scrutinize the regulation which accompany many pieces of legislation in this Province of Manitoba, because my honourable friend was saying in his remarks, if I heard him correctly, that this great government of ours -- or his, not mine -- had made such great provisions for such things as Medicare, glasses, dental care; had made provisions for senior citizens' housing; had made advancements in the field of education. He did not say though, particularly in respect of the Medicare, provisions of glasses and dental care, that it was on one of the most restrictive and meanest needs care basis that one can devise; and in this particular regard I say, Madam Speaker, that more will be heard of this as this House proceeds in the consideration of the Estimates of the Department of Health and the Department of Welfare.

My honourable friend the member for St. Vital did not say, when he was dealing with the question of education, that practically the only advance that was made in the total budget in the Department of Education this year was the inclusion of approximately \$10 million in tax rebates which has no relationship whatsoever to a contribution in the field of education at all, but is only in the Estimates of the Department of Education in an endeavour so that the Ministry opposite can, on a percentage comparison, say that we have increased the contribution to education here in the Province of Manitoba over what it was last year and what the percentage comparison is in relation to the over-all budget.

My honourable friend made a point of the fact that we have had here in the Province of Manitoba built a number of senior citizens homes, and I appreciate this very much as I'm sure that the elder citizens in Manitoba appreciate it, but by the same token, Madam Speaker, the present policy of the government in respect of the heating tax is taking back from those to whom it has been given, and this, Madam Speaker, is the inequality of the taxing position that is under discussion at the present time. What this government has done is imposed on those who must use the services rather than take from those who have the ability to pay, and this is what our argument is on this side of the House.

My honourable friend establishes this in my opinion, Madam Speaker, quite forcibly in the amendment that he has proposed to the resolution of the Honourable Member for St. George, because he says the cost of heat is only one of the many factors to be taken into account in the cost of living in Manitoba. Of course it is only one of the many factors taken into consideration in the cost of living in Manitoba, but I suggest that in this instance, when we're dealing with the cost of living, we're dealing with a minimum cost of living, and this is adding to the minimum standard of living and should not be included in any cost of living.

My honourable friend dismisses the effect of the financial aspects of the tax, "whereas the tax on heat amounts to about 60 to 90 cents per month for the average Manitoba family." Madam Speaker, what's the 60 or 90 cents per month mean to the average family in the Province of Manitoba who are living on the low scale? What does it mean, Madam Speaker, in respect of those people who are on Social Allowance in the Province of Manitoba? What does it mean? Is the Honourable the Minister of Welfare prepared to increase his schedule of payments that is being given at the present time to recipients of Social Welfare in order to offset this 60 or 90 cents? It doesn't apparently, in accordance with the resolution prepared by the Member for St. Vital, mean very much.

We in this House have fought continuously with the Minister of Welfare to have him announce increases in the Social Assistance Allowances, to give to those people who are unfortunate enough to be in this particular category a little of the amenities of life, but my honourable friend has desisted in doing so. I say to my honourable -- the Honourable Minister of Welfare says this is not true. I say to him this tax was imposed last August at the special session. I say to my honourable friend has he increased the allowance in respect of The Social Allowance Act to compensate for these charges since? I ask him. He wants to get into this debate now. I ask my honourable friend if this has been done. He's standing to answer me and I hope that it's in the affirmative.

HON. J. B. CARROLL (Minister of Welfare) (The Pas): It's in the process, Madam Speaker, at the present time and is going through . . .

MR. PAULLEY: I'm glad to hear from my honourable friend that it is in the process.

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) August, we enacted the legislation. It became effective, if I recall correctly, in December. So we have December, January, February, March -- four months -- and my honourable friend says, "Madam Speaker, it's in the process of consideration." How long -- until after the winter is over when the heat bills . . . -- (Interjection) -- Is that what it is? Maybe the Honourable Member for Lakeside is correct. We'll arrive at our conclusions when the people don't need it.

MR. CARROLL: Madam Speaker, on a point of privilege, the objection I raised a moment ago was to correct the Leader of the NDP when he said that there had been no changes in the regulations under The Social Allowances Act which would give a higher scale of rents to welfare recipients.

MR. PAULLEY: Aw, come, come, Madam Speaker. Lord love us. this time. My honourable friend, surely he can't be serious when he gets up off of his comfortable chair and makes a statement like that, because of course I know that since 1958 there have been some adjustments in The Social Allowances Act. -- (Interjection) -- Oh no, I said since the imposition, Madam Speaker, of these new taxes that there hasn't been, and my friend substantiates what I said. Of course there's been some since 1958. But I'm going to tell you, Madam Speaker, they've been extracted in a very painful process, more painful than it is when one has their wisdom teeth extracted by a dentist, and we've had to, figuratively speaking, put our knees on the chests of our honourable friends opposite when we've had the forceps in their mouth extracting the teeth in order to get them to make any increase at all in the Social Allowances payments. So my honourable friend, I say, is correct.

But I do say that still their allowances are one of the most miserly allowances which we have. And all -- (Interjection) -- I'll carry on, yes, because as I have mentioned time and time again -- we talk of the field of medicare that my honourable friend the Minister of Education was at one time interested in, Madam Speaker. If a soul is fortunate enough to have as cash asset \$201.00, they cannot be a recipient of a medicare card here in the Province of Manitoba. If they've got \$199.00, then the benevolence of the Honourable Minister of Welfare in this government will permit the issuance of a medicare. Magnificent? Generous? On the basis of needs? I say, Madam Speaker, absolute poppycock. It just ain't so.

And to carry on, Madam Speaker, with the resolution as proposed by my friend the Member for St. Vital, "and whereas the government has not instituted a general provincial sales tax," I say to the Government of Manitoba, as I said at the special session, if you were only honest with yourselves and were honest with the people of Manitoba you would have had sufficient intestinal fortitude to impose a sales tax. But, Madam Speaker, the government did not have that intestinal fortitude. They skirted around it; they're still skirting around it. Sure I would have opposed it. I surely would have opposed it. But, Madam Speaker, I say in all frankness and all honesty, I would have preferred it to these inequitable taxes that are here and on us at the present time.

This government -- this government and its tax policy, while imposing this innocuous fuel tax, even though it is a measly 60 or 90 cents -- and I suggest that maybe measly is a correct adjective to describe this in connection with government policy, I think it very compatible to use the word "measly" -- at the same time as that government was imposing this measly 60 or 90 cents a month in position in relation to the fuel tax, they were absolving those who have the ability to pay on a basis of income tax of about a million dollars a year. Is this the sign of a government that has the interest of the general people of the Province of Manitoba at heart? I say not, Madam Speaker. And I say again, and I repeat, I surely would have fought you on a general sales tax, but possibly less vigorously than I am insofar as this particular imposition is concerned which is accompanied as it is by a reduction in income tax.

What does this mean? What does this mean? Well I can say what it means to me, Madam Speaker, as an individual who does pay income tax, that I am going to pay this miserly 60 or 90 cents a month but I am bound to get back, because of the reduction in the income tax, far more than I deserve in relation to my income. I regret very very much that by the same token as I'm getting this reduction, I know many people, including those at the present time, Madam Speaker, who are on Social Allowances, in effect have to pay this lousy miserly 60 or 90 cents a month payment, because to give them the credit, the Honourable the Minister of Welfare has said we have this under our consideration and that we're going to do it, he hasn't said when. He hasn't said that we'll take it into consideration and make it retroactive back to the day when the tax was first imposed.

MR. CARROLL: On a question of privilege again, I said it was in the process of going

(MR. CARROLL cont'd) . . . through at the present time.

MR. PAULLEY: Exactly what I said, Madam Speaker, and if my little friend the Honourable Member for The Pas wants to cheep -- butting in and telling me what the future policy of the government is prior to its being announced, that's fine. I say it's fine, Madam Speaker, because quite frequently, quite frequently the horse is on the other side of the road -- or the other side of the stable. We have to try and get from them an enunciation of policy from the government.

So I want to say to my honourable friend the Minister of Welfare, boy oh boy, I'm glad that you, of all the members of the Treasury Branch is most anxious to impart to the Legislature what the policy of the government is, and I respectfully suggest that it's darn near time that he said the same thing to his colleagues in the Treasury benches, Madam Speaker, so that the resolutions that we have standing continuously on the Order Paper may be proceeded with when we know what they're not going to do. And then . . .

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker, may I ask the Honourable the Leader of the NDP a question?

MR. PAULLEY: Sure, go ahead.

MR. CAMPBELL: Does he still insist he isn't as flamboyant as the Honourable Member for St. Boniface?

MR. PAULLEY: Oh, definitely, Madam Speaker, I only wish that I had the capabilities and the qualities of my dear constituent in the Constituency of Radisson, the Member for St. Boniface, because I am sure -- I'm sure, Madam Speaker, that if I had his flamboyancy I would be able to deliver an address to this Assembly that would -- (Interjection) -- Yes, it would be earth-shaking. I haven't the weight for that like the Honourable Minister of Agriculture or the Member for St. Boniface, but I only wish that I had that . . .

MR. DESJARDINS: On a question of privilege, Madam Speaker, I'd like the honourable member to know that I've lost 40 pounds these last few days.

MR. PAULLEY: Yes, and Madam Speaker, if I was as flamboyant as my honourable friend, my constituent, I would lose 40 pounds as well.

MR. DESJARDINS: You would be transparent then.

MR. PAULLEY: However, Madam Speaker, then in their sub amendment my honourable friend the member for St. Vital goes on again, and what does he say? "And whereas the government is pledged to a multi-million dollar school tax reduction on the homes and farms of Manitoba." Madam Speaker, I regret very much having to say some of the things that I'm saying to my friend the member for St. Vital, I say regret, because I share the responsibility with him of representing the City of St. Vital and I don't want it to appear as though our House is divided, but I want to say to my honourable friend I don't think that the vast majority of the people of St. Vital would agree with him that that government -- that government -- is pledged to a multi-million dollar school tax reduction on the homes and farms of Manitoba. Why don't you be honest with yourself? This is what I say to the Government of Manitoba. Instead of the Honourable Member for St. Vital saying that the government is pledged to a reduction through its tax rebate policy, why doesn't this government be honest and say we are over-charging you on a basis of taxation \$10 million and our conscience is bothering us and we are going to give it back to you.

A MEMBER: Returned as an overcharge.

MR. PAULLEY: An old biblical expression I believe that is said in funeral services, "The Lord hath taken . . .

A MEMBER: The Lord gave and the Lord Taketh away.

MR. PAULLEY: The Lord gave and the Lord -- The Lord hath taken and the Lord gave back, or something to that effect, and this, Madam Speaker, is exactly what this government is doing.

MR. DESJARDINS: Try another chapter on them.

MR. PAULLEY: While my biblical information might not be quite as accurate as it should be, Madam Speaker, I make no apology for the fact that my assessment of that government is accurate. While I can't quote accurately from St. John I can quote accurately and stay accurate as to the policy or lack of policy of this government here in the Province of Manitoba.

"And whereas the government is pledged to a multi-million dollar school tax reduction on the homes and farms in Manitoba." In the first place it's inaccurate because in the Budget Speech of the Provincial Treasurer, he frankly admitted that only about 65 percent will get the full rebate; and in the second place, it's more inaccurate than that, in that it is not government

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) money they are giving back but the peoples' own money, which bears absolutely no relationship at all to the cost of education in the Province of Manitoba.

Then boy, the final paragraph -- the final three sentences really take the cake -- Amen. "Therefore be it resolved," Madam Speaker, "that while recognizing the incidence of the tax on heat, this House regards it as preferable to the institution of a general provincial sales tax."

MR. DESJARDINS: How weaselly can you get?

MR. PAULLEY: How can you on that side of the House, any one of you, share such a sentence from anyone on that side of the House, or this side, "while recognizing the incidence of that tax on heat." Members in this Assembly, Madam Speaker, have been attempting to get the Provincial Treasurer, the First Minister of this House, to recognize the incidence of the fuel tax. I say to the Honourable Member for St. Vital: okay, you said it, tell Premier Roblin that you recognize the incidence of the fuel tax on the people of Manitoba, because he hasn't recognized it.

While I don't want to take any credit for what the Leader of the Official Opposition has said, he has asked on numerous occasions as to whether or not the First Minister is going to enquire into the incidence of the fuel tax on the people of Manitoba. He has asked him whether or not he's going to set up a committee of investigation or something of this nature and my honourable friend is mute, and yet, however, one of his -- the provincial organizer, as I understand it, for the Conservative Party here in the Province of Manitoba, the Honourable Member for St. Vital, tells us this afternoon, Madam Speaker, that the Government recognizes the incidence of the fuel tax on Manitoba, then he turns around and says he regards it as being preferable to a provincial sales tax. What does this mean? They have now recognized the incidence of a fuel tax on those least able to pay in the Province of Manitoba and they say that it's far preferable to a provincial sales tax.

I say, Madam Speaker, that this government tonight -- as I understand they're going to be free, we're not going to meet in the House -- and may I suggest to them that all of the members of the Conservative Party, now that they don't have to be in this House tonight, should caucus, should listen to what the honourable member has said in this resolution and really consider it and let us, when we return next Monday, hear from them a full recognition of the error of their ways; and let them then come to this Assembly and through this Assembly say to the people of Manitoba; we have been wrong but we are now prepared to consider what members in opposition have had to say of this iniquitous fuel tax, the lack of equality in taxation -- or rather the inequality in education, and announce in this House the fact, Madam Speaker, we are sorry for all these our misgivings, please forgive us. And I, as the Leader of the New Democratic Party, will be one of the first to stand up in this House, Madam Speaker, and say to them I forgive them because they knew not what they did.

MR. JOHNSON: Madam Speaker, in the few minutes remaining I would like to get into this debate, especially after hearing the Leader of the NDP, whom I've always had a very high regard for, put his finger out and with his flush up, lean over here and call us a bunch of gutless wonders lacking intestinal fortitude. Well I'll tell you -- I want to tell the honourable member he said we were lacking in intestinal fortitude. . . .

MR. PAULLEY: That's right, that's correct.

MR. JOHNSON: . . . because we didn't put on a sales tax. That's what he advocated in this House.

MR. PAULLEY: If you haven't got any guts, you haven't got any intestinal fortitude.

MR. JOHNSON: Madam Speaker, it was when this government came to office that we even raised the sights of my honourable friend sitting opposite and some of his colleagues to the west of us. They never realized what welfare really was all about. They were recommending ten bucks across the board on the means test when we came in.

MR. PAULLEY: Who?

MR. JOHNSON: You were.

MR. PAULLEY: I was not.

MR. JOHNSON: Supplementary allowance -- we introduced the concept of need in The Social Allowances Act. I wanted to correct him because he inferred that that kind of Act existed in 1958, which it didn't, and I just -- (Interjection) -- well he goes all over the field here and the Honourable Member from Radisson, the Leader of the NDP can call me anything but he won't say I'm lacking intestinal fortitude or anybody on this front bench.

MR. PAULLEY: Oh, I won't eh?

MR. JOHNSON: You sure won't.

MR. PAULLEY: You are darn right I will.

MR. ROBLIN: . . . I ask the honourable members opposite to please respect the reasonable rules of decorum here.

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Minister of Education has the floor.

MR. JOHNSON: It's all right for my honourable friend to make wide sweeping statements like that, but he's got to back them up, Madam Speaker.

MR. PAULLEY: I'll back them up.

MR. JOHNSON: You just try, because he still doesn't understand the broad benefits which that legislation has brought. It just doesn't give across-the-board or meets need on an individual basis as it does, it means large expenditures -- over \$100 in instances of real need. This is the strength of the concept of Social Allowances, and that Act has done so much good for the people of Manitoba and our Senior Citizens.

Well, Madam Speaker, I just felt when I heard my honourable friend as an ex-constituent -- he used to come to Gimli and I have another ex-constituent from St. Boniface -- that obviously the matters didn't brush off when they were in our area. But I do feel this, that when the Leader of the NDP stands up in this House and says that we are lacking the fortitude to proceed with a sales tax, and then on the other hand -- and to fall prey to this picayune attitude and nit-picking, of going and picking on this tax or that tax, especially after the history of his party in Saskatchewan with the sales tax, I just say that he hasn't got the wherewithal to back it up.

The Social Allowances Act that he condemned so roundly this morning was something that they didn't visualize, that the concept of need -- when people are in need they are in real need and ten bucks across the board doesn't solve their problem in individual assessment, placement in homes, placement in alternative care facilities of various kinds, and this of course led to the development of The Elderly Persons' Housing Act and broad concepts of rehabilitation. These are things that legislation has done in this province, and when this government wants to go on and give greater benefits in the field of education and in human betterment, it has to pick its slate of priorities.

Because we made a decision on this side to follow this course of action, surely, Madam Speaker, it doesn't mean we are lacking in fortitude of the intestinal nature. We are not lacking in fortitude; we have placed our cards on the table. We have admitted frankly we don't like taxes any more than anybody else. We have attempted, and are the only province outside of Alberta now not to have a sales tax. My honourable friend forgets to tell these pensioners that he's fighting for what a three percent sales tax means to them and the little home owner throughout the province, and what it would mean to the old people in the Old Folks Homes across this province. He forgets to mention that it will apply to practically everything they use.

Well, Madam Speaker, I know it's 5:30 but I just wanted to put on the record that I was a little disturbed to see my former, the man who I think has had such real concern in the field of human betterment, get up and make such sweeping statements as he made today in recommending a sales tax to the people of Manitoba.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Madam Speaker, if no one else wishes to speak, I would move, seconded by my honourable friend the member for St. George, that the debate be adjourned.

MR. MARK G. SMERCHANSKI (Burrows): Madam Speaker, if we're going to adjourn until Monday, I won't speak, but if we're going to assemble tonight I'd like to speak to this.

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

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce, that the House do now adjourn.

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