

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
2:30 o'clock, Friday, February 26th, 1965.

Opening Prayer by Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions

Reading and Receiving Petitions

MR. CLERK: The petition of the Ice Club of Greater Winnipeg praying for the passing of an Act to amend an Act to incorporate The Ice Club of Greater Winnipeg.

MADAM SPEAKER: Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees

Notices of Motion

Introduction of Bills

HONOURABLE STEWART E. McLEAN, Q. C. (Attorney-General) (Dauphin) introduced Bill No. 12, an Act to amend The Arbitration Act.

MR. McLEAN introduced Bill No. 36, an Act to amend The Manitoba Evidence Act.

HONOURABLE ROBERT G. SMELLIE, Q. C. (Minister of Municipal Affairs) (Birtle-Russell) introduced Bill No. 41, an Act to amend The Official Time Act.

MR. WILLIAM HAMILTON (Dufferin) introduced Bill No. 44, an Act to incorporate The Dufferin Racing Association.

MR. JAMES COWAN, Q. C. (Winnipeg Centre) introduced Bill No. 46, an Act to incorporate Manitoba Museum of Man and Nature.

MR. D. M. STANES (St. James) introduced Bill No. 45, an Act to amend an Act to incorporate The Convalescent Hospital of Winnipeg.

MR. SMELLIE: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Labour, that Madam Speaker do now leave the chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the resolution standing in my name.

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

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

MR. CHAIRMAN: The resolution for consideration is: Resolved that it is expedient to bring in a measure to amend The Municipal Board Act by providing, among other matters, that the number of members of the Municipal Board may be increased to more than five members.

MR. SMELLIE: Mr. Chairman, at the present time The Municipal Board Act provides that there shall not be more than five members of that board. If this board is to undertake some of the additional responsibilities that are suggested in the Michener Report, it will be necessary to increase the size of the board in order to handle the volume of work that will be entailed. There is no intention to increase the size of the board immediately but we felt it would be advisable to have the legislative provision ready so that when it does become necessary we have the authority to do so.

MR. DOUGLAS L. CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister a couple of questions. Would he give to the committee the personnel of the present board. Are they up to the number of five now? And while he is answering those questions, perhaps he would comment on another matter. Hasn't it been demonstrated by experience now that it would be better to have the two boards combined as they used to be rather than having them separated? In other words, is it not a fact that the overlapping is so great that it would be better if you need a larger board, perhaps you would -- to have your larger board and have them handle both the municipal matters and the public utility ones.

MR. E. R. SCHREYER (Brokenhead): Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister if one reason for the increase of the staff, if it has to do with some sort of proposed giving to the board of the direct planning, town planning function? Is it the intention to give the board somewhat of a town planning function in the future?

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party) (Radisson): Mr. Chairman, I was intrigued by the remarks of the Minister. In effect, what he is saying to us of this Legislature: "Give me authority, or the government authority, to increase the personnel on the board, based on the preposition that this Assembly may adopt certain recommendations of the Michener Commission, because we might in our deliberations during this session adopt some of the recommendations of the Michener Report, which might require additional personnel on the committee", and I suggest, Mr. Chairman, the proper course for the Honourable Minister to

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) . . . have taken would have been to lay before this Assembly the propositions of the government respecting the Mitchener Commission and having done so, and having them adopted, or rejected, then say to us: "Now because this has been done we require more personnel than we have at the present time on this board." I think my honourable friend is putting the cart before the horse. He's asking us to approve something that may or may not be approved by this Legislative Assembly, because if I understand his presentation correctly, we want the authority to increase the personnel of the municipal board because of the fact that we "might" be adopting certain recommendations of the Michener Commission, so while I certainly am not going to oppose this, I do think however, Mr. Chairman, in fairness to the members of this Assembly, that this particular resolution might have awaited the adoption by this House of recommendations from the Michener Report and Commission which might entail the necessity of increased personnel.

My honourable friend the Minister, if this resolution is adopted, will be receiving approval for increasing the personnel, without us actually first of all having been given the opportunity of deciding whether or not such a step is necessary, so I suggest to my honourable friend that at least for the future, or in the future, that he put the horses in their proper position with the old democrat and not ask us to approve resolutions like this until he establishes reasons for doing so.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Mr. Chairman, I concur in what my honourable friend the Leader of the NDP has just said. I have before me a press release of February 2nd-- that's not too long ago -- headed "May order councils to reassess their land," and it says, and I'm quoting, "Government officials and a group of their municipal advisors are now planning an extensive program to increase the efficiency of Manitoba's assessment system. The program which could be unveiled at the 1965 Legislative Session will likely force municipalities to undertake complete reassessments at regular intervals." And then the article goes on to say that this was all unveiled to the Tory caucus at a meeting that they had. --(interjection) -- It wasn't? Well, my honourable friend can reply. It says, "This and other government measures will likely be outlined to Tory MLAs on Saturday when they attend the second part of the two-day caucus in the Legislative Building." Now if, as my honourable friend has said, if it is the intention of the government to unveil this very extensive program shouldn't we hear it first prior to this bill?

MR. J. M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Chairman, just one or two questions. I would like to know just how much time does this involve and how much time is consumed by the members of this board in their duties. Secondly, is it the intention of the government to appoint people that are presently on staff, or will this be independent outside members?

MR. SMELLIE: Mr. Chairman, I neglected to inform the House that His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor having been informed of the subject matter of the proposed resolution recommends it to the House.

The Honourable Member for Lakeside asked what is the present personnel of the board. There are four members of the board at the present time: W. J. Johnston, Q. C. is the chairman of that board, and the other members are Mr. Bailey, Mr. Argue and Mr. Fletcher. There is room for one further appointment under the present legislation but there is no intention to appoint any further members to the board immediately. So far as I am aware, there has been demonstrated no desire to re-unite the two boards as one. Their functions are quite different and both boards have sufficient work to do in their own particular spheres without combining the Public Utilities function with the Municipal Board function.

The Honourable Member for Brokenhead asked if we weren't changing the purpose of the Municipal Board to one of town planning. The board does have a considerable function to play in planning, both in the Metropolitan area and throughout the other areas of the province where planning schemes are in effect or being brought into effect. But this is only one of the responsibilities of the board.

The Honourable Leader of the NDP raises the question of the order of precedence, and really this is just a matter of presenting to the House the bills as they are ready for distribution in the House. All of the legislation which we are concerned with here, with one exception, has been sent to the printers and as they are ready for distribution we are putting them on the Order Paper for presentation to the House. I would assure my honourable friend that I'll have the rest of the bills dealing with the related matters before the House as soon as possible.

The Honourable Member for Gladstone suggests that it's the government's intention to go into a massive program of re-assessment and force the municipalities to undertake assessments.

(MR. SMELLIE cont'd) . . . I would assure you, Mr. Chairman, that this is not the government's intention at all. In previous years, when the government was bearing a large part of the cost of assessment it was right and proper that the government should determine the program of assessments, and in spite of the fact that the Act says that no assessment more than six years old should be used by a municipality, the assessment staff have been unable to provide assessments that recent, and in some municipalities assessments are still being used which are as much as ten and eleven years old. There have been spot revisions in those assessments where there have been areas that have needed attention, but there has been no new assessment in some municipalities for periods of up to ten or eleven years. This year, when municipalities are paying the full cost of assessment, I believe that it was our responsibility then to have the Municipal Advisory Committee advise us as to the rate at which we should proceed with the re-assessment program and we reconstituted the Municipal Advisory Committee and asked them for approval of the program which we proposed for the year 1965-66. The Municipal Advisory Committee has gone over this matter and they have recommended approval of the program which we suggested, but they did indicate to us that they felt this program was insufficient and that they agreed with the recommendation in the Michener Report that we should increase the activity of the assessment branch in order to provide more frequent re-assessments for all municipalities. This is not something that you can do overnight because you can't acquire a properly trained staff in the assessment branch so that you could go into this greatly increased program immediately or even next year, but as a result of their advice we will attempt to increase the program as soon as we can get the staff to look after it.

The Honourable Member for Rhineland asked how much time is involved in the Municipal Board. I would tell the House, Mr. Chairman, that in the last year the Municipal Board held 250 separate hearings. These were scattered throughout the Province of Manitoba and these involved mainly the hearing of appeals from assessment, objections to proposed planning schemes, or revisions of planning schemes, and other matters relating to disputes between municipalities. If the board is to undertake any additional hearings for other matters related to the recommendations of Michener, we may have to make provision for a deputy chairman and for breaking the board into two parts so we could have two simultaneous hearings. That's the reason why the request is being made for a possible increase in the personnel on the Municipal Board. None of the members of the Municipal Board, with the exception of the chairman, are full-time, nor are they employees of the province in any other capacity than as members of that board, and there would be no proposals that the members of this board should be civil servants.

MR. SCHREYER: I admittedly asked the Minister a bland question and he gave me an innocuous answer. Of course I know that the Municipal Board has a planning function of sorts but my question was, "Is it the intention to increase the planning function of the Board?" More specifically, the reason I asked this is because -- and I believe the Minister is aware of this -- there are municipalities and municipal residents living in the exurban fringe around Winnipeg that feel very much dissatisfied with their being under Metro planning when they have no vote and no voice in Metro Council. It's a case, as they put it themselves, of planning control without representation. It's a pretty fundamental principle. I made this clear to the Minister last session. He had no real answer except to say that the planning machinery of the provincial department was inadequate. Well, I'm asking him, is this resolution an indication of intent to do something about it? I suggest to the Honourable Minister that there is great dissatisfaction with this situation for just reason, and I am sure he must have received some formal resolutions by now from some of the municipalities on the periphery of Winnipeg asking for dis-engagement. Is this resolution coping with that request?

MR. SMELLIE: Mr. Chairman, this resolution has nothing whatsoever to do with that, and if my honourable friend understood the planning process he would know that the Municipal Board has nothing to do with the planning process except in a semi-judicial capacity where there are objections to a proposed planning scheme proposed either by the Metropolitan Corporation or by some other municipality responsible for planning.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, I don't have to be told by the Minister that the Municipal Board sits in a sort of an appellate jurisdiction, but I asked him in my first question whether it's the intention to give it by means of this resolution some direct planning function. "Direct" doesn't mean "appellate".

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): Mr. Chairman, is this the board that John Christianson was a member of?

MR. SMELLIE: Yes.

MR. GUTTORMSON: When did he resign?

MR. SMELLIE: In August of 1964.

MR. GUTTORMSON: What reason did he give for resigning, if any?

MR. SMELLIE: The reason given to me was that he had not sufficient time to devote to this and other activities in which he was engaged and he wished to be relieved from the responsibility of sitting on the Municipal Board.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I thank the Minister for his reply to the question and the point that I raised so far as asking for this type of legislation before we knew what we were going to deal with, namely, what recommendations which the government might be proposing as a result of the Michener Commission to this House, but I want to say, or ask the First Minister, or maybe I should be directing this to the Attorney-General who I understand is charged with the responsibility of piloting legislation through this House, that he doesn't do in other legislation what the Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs tells us is happening in this particular case, because the Minister has told us that we have this particular bill before us because it happened to be one of the first ones printed by the Queen's Printer, and this is his reason apparently for asking us for approval at this time. Now if this sort of an arrangement is carried through and we receive the budget before we receive the estimates, and if we receive other bills ahead of some that are more important although maybe correlated, we're certainly going to be in a turmoil in this House in the present session. So I suggest to the Attorney-General, if I am correct in presuming that he is charged with the responsibility of piloting legislation through this House, that he undertake to put, as I mentioned before, put the cart before the horse in future propositions to this House, and that we don't have to embarrass -- as indeed I am sure he must be embarrassed -- a Minister like the Minister of Municipal Affairs, to explain to this House -- who after all are charged with the responsibility of investigating into all aspects of the conduct of legislation in this province -- the only reason that we have this before us is because of the fact that the Queen's Printer got the bill ahead of other bills; and also this indicates what apparently the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs feels is a truism, that it doesn't matter really whether we get this legislation to set up a board before or after as this House has dealt with the question of legislation which may be following. In other words, my interpretation would be that the Minister of Municipal Affairs has in effect told us in this House that irrespective of what the timing or manner in which we receive this legislation, it's preordained or pre-saged that legislation that follows will of necessity be adopted by this House. And it might be true, Mr. Chairman, it might be true that notwithstanding what we think on this side of the House of legislation that it's already a foregone conclusion it will be passed. But let me respectfully suggest to members opposite that those of us who hold dear the traditions of democracy and are members of this Legislative Assembly are at least entitled to feel that we are part of legislation when we have it before us for consideration, and not in the manner in which we are receiving this bill because of something that is going to follow goodness only knows when -- next week, next month, or some other month.

So I ask members opposite, particularly the chap who is charged with piloting legislation, particularly the First Minister of this House, that while to some degree we may be inconsequential on this side of the House, that democracy demands that we be part of legislation, and that we have an opportunity of considering the "why's" before we have to consider the "whyfors."

MR. SMELLIE: Well Mr. Chairman, I can't let that go without making some comment. I wouldn't want the members of this committee to think that I suggested at any time that any bill I introduced in this House was guaranteed passage. No, I didn't intend to infer that and if that was the inference you took from my remarks, I apologize to this committee, Mr. Chairman, because it certainly was not my intention.

MR. PAULLEY: You inferred that.

MR. SMELLIE: It is of course only possible for a Minister to introduce two bills on one day, and I think we have a duty to get the legislation before the House as rapidly as we can, and certainly we have had some criticism from my honourable friend at times in the past, when there was some delay in introducing legislation. It's true, I could leave this and introduce it in the dying days of the session after all these other points had been decided, and then I think I would be entitled to some criticism from my honourable friend; but when legislation is introduced at the beginning of the session, as we are attempting to do here, then surely the House has a chance to look at all of the bills together and certainly it's going to be some days before this or any other bill goes to committee. So that I think my honourable friend will probably have plenty of opportunity to examine not only this bill but the rest of the package as well. And I

(MR. SMELLIE cont'd) . . . would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that in the interests of the business of the House we might get on with it by approving this resolution.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Chairman, in light of what has been said, I must say this, that my honourable friend the Minister certainly inferred that the reason the bill was on our desk today was because of the efficiency of the Queen's Printer, or something to that effect, and that henceforth and forever more at this session, the bills would land on our desk as they arrive from the Queen's Printer. That is, the Queen's Printer would more or less dictate priority. Now that was the inference that was given to me and certainly by . . .

MR. PAULLEY: You're right.

MR. SHOEMAKER: . . . by my honourable friend the Leader of the NDP. This is what he said. This is what he said. You can read Hansard tomorrow. And I think if he would get up and say, "after all we do have priorities and it won't happen again," instead of -- this was certainly the inference that was left.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition)(Ste. Rose): Mr. Chairman, before the passing of this resolution I would like to ask a further question of the Minister. Could he indicate what the basis of payment to the members of the commission is, and whether there is any intention to change it when he changes the size of the commission?

MR. SMELLIE: The basis of payment at the present time varies with the responsibilities of the different members. The Chairman of the Board is paid roughly the equivalent of a Deputy Minister, which he formerly was. Mr. Bailey is paid \$6,000.00 per annum. The other two part-time members are paid \$3,000.00 per annum, with an expense allowance. There is no intention at the moment to make any change.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution passed? Committee rise and report. Call in the Speaker. Madam Speaker, the Committee of the Whole House has adopted a certain resolution and has directed me to report the same.

IN SESSION

MR. COWAN: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Pembina, that the report of the committee be received.

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

MR. SMELLIE introduced Bill No. 5, an Act to amend The Municipal Board Act.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I think the members of this House would like to take this opportunity to extend congratulations to the Peggy Casselman rink of the Wildwood Club and the other members of her rink - Third, Val Taylor; Second - Pat McDonald; and Lead, Pat Scott; who won the Dominion Ladies' Curling Championship and the Dominion Diamond D Trophy by beating Alberta 8 - 7 in the final last night. This is the first time that a Manitoba rink has won this very elusive trophy, and I am sure that everybody in this House and the rest of Manitoba is justly proud of this rink. I hope that -- I'm sure we'll all hope that the Terry Braunstein rink which will represent Manitoba in Saskatoon on Monday will have the same success.

MR. SMELLIE: Madam Speaker, yesterday the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition asked me a question concerning school tax rebates as the people of Pine Falls might be affected. I didn't have the answer for him at that time but I promised to get that answer. I would tell him now that in Pine Falls there is a unique situation where the Department of Education pays a per diem grant for each approved teacher to the Manitoba Paper Company who run the school, and that there are no school taxes charged against properties in Pine Falls, and there will therefore be no school tax rebates because you can't rebate something they don't pay.

MR. LEONARD A. BARKMAN (Carillon): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs. Since there are a lot of municipalities starting or repairing their budget at this time, I would like to ask him if he could tell me if there is any intention of dropping the grants per capita grant to municipalities for 1965.

MR. SMELLIE: No intention whatsoever, Madam Speaker.

MR. SCHREYER: Madam Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Education. I would ask if the Minister is aware that while some private and parochial schools are flying our new flag, and while some private institutions are flying our new Canadian flag, that the public schools of the Province of Manitoba seem to be flying the flag that is no longer ours. I would ask him simply if they are doing so because of any standing instructions from

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) . . . his Department or from his office.

HONOURABLE GEO. JOHNSON (Minister of Education) (Gimli): Madam Speaker, until such time as The Public School Act is amended, the schools have been told that -- I have no authority to suggest they fly other than the Red Ensign. Legislation will be brought forward as quickly as possible at this session to provide for the flying of Canada's new national flag.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I would like to address a question to the Minister of Health. This relates to certain activities of his while he was the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. Did he meet with the late Donald H. Bain at his residence on Eastgate Street prior to August 1962, that is, prior to Mr. Bain's death?

HONOURABLE DUFF ROBLIN (Premier and Provincial Treasurer) (Wolseley): Madam Speaker, I think all matters in connection with the point raised by my honourable friend, including this one, will be dealt with before the debate on the Throne Speech concludes, and I think that would be the appropriate time to deal with my honourable friend's question.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I submit that the question I asked is a perfectly valid question. The government has had now some four days to reply to the charges I made. They have said nothing at all in this House and certainly I am entitled to ask the question I have asked. -- (Interjection) -- . . . a question of a Minister of this government and I think I should get an answer. My question is very straightforward, very simple.

MR. SCHREYER: Madam Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Attorney-General. I'm sorry I didn't give him notice and he may take this as notice. I would ask him if he has received any formal request, resolution or submission from the Municipality of Brokenhead, the Town of Beausejour, or any other association of that area, protesting the removal of the County Court District from the centre of Beausejour.

MR. McLEAN: The answer is no.

MR. MOLGAT: I would like to ask a question of the First Minister. Is he instructing his Minister of Health not to reply to my question?

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, the Minister of Health can speak for himself but it is the government's intention to deal with all these points in the course of the debate.

MR. MOLGAT: In that case, Madam Speaker, is it the intention of the Minister of Health to answer my question?

HONOURABLE CHARLES H. WITNEY (Minister of Health) (Flin Flon): Madam Speaker, the question will be answered during the course of the debate.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I would like to ask a question of the Minister of Agriculture. Was he present at a meeting at the residence of Mr. Bain prior to the 15th of August 1962, which he discussed with Mr. Bain?

HONOURABLE GEO. HUTTON (Minister of Agriculture) (Rockwood-Iberville): The answer will be given in the course of the Throne Speech debate.

MR. SCHREYER: I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

MR. SCHREYER: I'm sorry, Madam Speaker. I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. I would ask him if he has received any formal resolution or request from any municipality around Winnipeg asking for disengagement from Metro Planning.

MR. SMELLIE: I haven't received any written resolution from any municipality but I have entertained a delegation who made this request.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Madam Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Provincial Treasurer. On Page 234 of Public Accounts, there's a note there of a payment of \$20,000 to a firm called Octave Enterprises Limited, spelled O-c-t-i-a-v-e. Is this the same firm Octave Enterprises spelled O-c-t-a-v-e which sold the Bain Estate properties to the government?

MR. ROBLIN: I'll take the question as notice, Madam Speaker.

MR. JOHNSTON: A supplementary question, Madam Speaker. What purpose was the payment -- for what purpose was the payment made?

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q. C. (Selkirk): Thank you Madam. I listened with a great deal of interest to the Premier the other evening speaking on People in Politics, and I'd like to get a clarification of a statement which he then made and which is reported in the Tribune of February 25, 1965. While the Honourable Minister was speaking about hospital premiums he referred to the fact that the hospital premiums of Manitoba in the year 1964 were the same as they were in the year 1958, giving as the reason therefor the fact that special grants were being made by the government. The question that I'd like to ask the First Minister is this: Were

(MR. HILLHOUSE cont'd) ... those special grants the six percent income tax collected from the people of Manitoba?

MR. ROBLIN: I think in general the answer is yes.

MR. HILLHOUSE: How can the Honourable First Minister refer to the fact that the hospital premiums of 1964 were the same as they were in 1958 when in 1958 I paid \$48.00 for a hospital premium, and in 1963 I paid \$329.69?

MR. ROBLIN: I congratulate my honourable friend on his high income.

MR. MOLGAT: A subsequent question though, on this subject, Madam Speaker. When The Income Tax Act was introduced in this House at the Special Session in the Fall of 1961, was it not then brought in here as hospital tax? Does the bill not specifically read -- admittedly not within the body of the bill but as one of the headings: - "Hospital Tax"?

MR. ROBLIN: If I recollect correctly, Madam Speaker, I think there was some suggestion on the other side of the House that it should be earmarked for hospital purposes but we declined to do it. We refused to earmark it officially for hospital purposes although we did say that an amount equal to that would be appropriated for hospitals.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, is it not correct that the bill did say, as part of it, "hospital tax"?

MR. ROBLIN: My friend will have to look it up. He can look it up as well as I.

MR. MOLGAT: I beg your pardon? I didn't hear the answer.

MR. ROBLIN: My friend can look it up as well as I.

MR. MOLGAT: Well, I'll be very happy to look it up, Madam Speaker, if someone will bring me the Statutes of 1961. I'm satisfied it will appear there.

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker, while this matter is being further considered, I have been waiting patiently for the appearance of the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources in order to direct a question to him, but as he has not appeared I would direct my question to either the First Minister or the Honourable the Attorney-General. It's in connection with the proposed park in the Pine Ridge area and I'd like to ask this question. Is the Minister, or in this case the government, of the opinion that the Pine Ridge landowners have received proper legal notice of expropriation?

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, this comes within the purview of the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources and I think it's best to leave the question for him to answer.

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker, I would direct my question then to the Honourable the Attorney-General. Has the Honourable Attorney-General recently been requested to render a decision in that regard?

MR. McLEAN: No.

MR. ARTHUR E. WRIGHT (Seven Oaks): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Public Utilities. I'm prompted to ask this question because of an advertisement we all received today in the Retail Merchants Association Magazine. This came today, which is the last practical working day of the month, and it has a notice to car owners to be sure to get their plates on by tonight. In looking through it I also find two more government ads. I also found out that with the circulation at 1000, the cost is approximately \$160.00. I'm just wondering if it's the policy of the government to award this type of advertising to all periodicals with 1000 circulation or more? I hope it isn't to curry favour with the Retail Merchants Association because on the front page it says "How lucky can you get living in Manitoba without a sales tax?"

MR. McLEAN: Madam Speaker, may I place on the table of the House the Annual Report of the Legislative Library of the Province of Manitoba for the year 1964. May I also place on the table of the House a copy of each regulation filed under The Regulations Act of Manitoba on and after the 6th day of February, 1964, and before the 22nd day of February, 1965, being all of the regulations made during that time. And may I inform the members of the House, Madam Speaker, that they will receive today each a copy of the Report of the Tallin Commission.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I wonder if the Honourable the Provincial Minister of Public Utilities is going to answer the very pertinent question and not impertinent question which was raised by the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks respecting policy in advertising of the government and his department in particular.

HONOURABLE MAITLAND B. STEINKOPF, Q. C. (Provincial Secretary & Minister of Public Utilities) (River Heights): Madam Speaker, I think the answer is pretty obvious. It isn't the policy to do what the honourable member asked.

MR. PAULLEY: I wonder if the Honourable Minister might repeat, Madam Speaker.

MR. STEINKOPF: The answer is no.

MR. PAULLEY: Is it the policy to advertise on the basis of \$160.00 per thousand copies? Is that the answer?

MR. STEINKOPF: The answer is no to the question that was asked.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I have now before me the Statutes of Manitoba of 1961, Second Session, Chapter 1, and the heading above Section 6 is "Hospital Services Tax". I submit that when this was presented to this House it was presented on that basis and the statements made by the First Minister on TV were completely false.

MR. JOHNSTON: Madam Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture. In connection with the Portage Diversion construction this summer, is it the intention of the Minister to have Lake Manitoba's present level made still lower by manipulation of the Fairford Dam Works?

MR. HUTTON: I would say offhand, no, but I would like the opportunity to consult with my engineers on this question to see if there is any such possibility. From what I know there's no such intention but I'll check and make sure.

MR. JOHNSTON: A supplemental question, Madam Speaker. Is it true that the test dyking through the Delta Marsh experienced difficulties because of the water level?

MR. HUTTON: I am not aware of this.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I'd like to ask a further question of the Minister of Health and the Minister of Agriculture. Subsequent to their visit with Mr. Bain did these two gentlemen accept his invitation to go and see the Delta property as he requested?

MADAM SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. JOHNSON: Before the Orders of the Day I would like to lay on the table of the House the following Annual Reports: The Annual Report of the University of Manitoba Board of Governors for the year ended March 31st, 1964, and the Annual Report of the Department of Education for the year ending June 30, 1964, which includes the Annual Reports of the Advisory Board, the Collective Agreement Board under The Public Schools Act, and The Teachers' Retirement Allowances Fund. Copies of the Annual Report of the Department will be distributed to the members of the House.

MR. S. PETERS (Elmwood): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to ask the Leader of the Opposition if he was at this meeting with the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources and the Minister of Agriculture.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, no I wasn't but I would like to tell the member that the two members were that I'm referring to.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I wonder if I might ask the Honourable the Minister of Education when the Committee's Report on Shared Services may be before the House?

MR. JOHNSON: In due course, Madam Speaker.

A MEMBER: That's another five years.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MADAM SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. -- (Interjections) -- Order, please. The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Brokenhead.

MR. SCHREYER: Madam Speaker, I would ask to have this resolution stand over.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed? The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Inkster.

MR. MORRIS GRAY (Inkster): Madam Speaker, with the permission of the House, I beg leave to move to let the matter stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed? The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Inkster.

MR. GRAY: Madam Chairman, I intend to proceed with this resolution. I beg leave to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Logan: Whereas the cost of living has increased by 34 percent since 1949, and whereas the present Old Age Pension of \$75.00 a month will purchase only the same volume of goods that could have been purchased by \$55.00 in 1949, and whereas this level of purchasing power is inadequate as a means of subsistence for elderly citizens with no other form of income, and whereas providing of the means for these elderly citizens to live a life of dignity in the absence of deprivation should be one of the most worthwhile and meaningful objectives of our centenary program, Therefore be it resolved that the Government of Manitoba give consideration to the advisability of recommending an increase in

(MR. GRAY cont'd) ... the Old Age Pension to be carried out in three stages to the amount of \$100.00 a month by our centennial year and that this pension be payable at age 65.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. GRAY: Madam Speaker, the general principle of this resolution has been recently adopted in Ottawa but we have been waiting from Ottawa action for nearly ten years and every year they were discussing, considering the old age pension situation in Canada and so far we haven't got any definite concrete evidence that it's going to be done, and if they do, then this resolution probably becomes non important because they are not going to get one pension here and one pension in Ottawa, although Ottawa pension maximum is \$75.00 but they are very sympathetic in reducing the age to 65.

The reason for this motion is that they intended action will not come until 1970, if it comes, but this resolution is covering in the meantime. Should the old age pensioner in the meantime live on less than he received several years ago due to the extremely high increased cost of living, that's what we have to do and that's what we have to consider. This is a recommendation to the Federal Government. I realize that we cannot do it ourselves, but I think it would be a very fine act on our part if this resolution is passed and forwarded to Ottawa, and perhaps Ottawa with their recent generosity to the old age pensioners may receive it with grace.

My argument has always been the same -- that the people who built the country which we are celebrating in a couple of years the Centennial year deserve to live out their last years in better dignity. It is true that the old age pension has been increased recently but definitely not sufficient. In 1927, \$20.00 a month pension was acceptable, and at that time they purchased more commodities than they do now on the \$75.00, so the justification of increasing since 1927 from \$20.00 to \$75.00 in my humble opinion is the same today if not more. The result is that the relative income of people on pension has declined and this argument is being supported by Ottawa, and the reason I mention this is because if it is passed it will have to be forwarded to Ottawa with our warm blessing. Meanwhile the Centennial year celebrated in 1967 will not be complete, in my opinion, if those who have built Canadian life will not be compensated for their efforts. We have increased pension but definitely not sufficient. The need is there. The Government of Canada and the people have admitted they have good reasons for asking for it. Now let's express our sympathy and our thanks and our appreciation to the Federal Government for what they have done and intend to do, but the question is when. Another question is, in the meanwhile what are they to do?

We are all proud, everyone who is a true Canadian, whether born in Canada or elsewhere, they have taken out naturalization certificates which gives them the full right of any other citizen in Canada and I venture to say that half of the population in Canada today are of the immigrant class who have made great contributions under very trying circumstances. They worked for ten cents an hour and fifteen cents an hour. They have built railways, sacrificed their lives in going through the tunnels and the prairies and the rocky mountains in order to bring more progress and a better life for all of them. They are entitled not to be neglected and I venture to say that this is just as important, if not more, an institution as all the buildings that are being built or planned to be built for the Centennial celebration. We are proud of the institutions that are being planned to be built in Manitoba and elsewhere. Let us be proud of the thousands of the old timers. I don't know what's going to happen 25 years from now when the young, our young people will get old. But in the meantime we do know the contribution of those who have started their lives in misery and hardship fifty years ago and today they are being thrown out of employment. Nobody wants an old man. The young ones take their place and rightly so. What are they to do? We owe them a debt by paying them more wages. We owe them a debt by them going through hardship. They were underprivileged, they have made an investment in Canada, let us pay them back a little bit of the wealth that they have created. So I appeal to each and everyone, don't take it from the point of view of a political expediency. We are dealing with human beings and believe me, while speaking on behalf of my group we don't want the credit we want the cash for the old aged. We do not want the credit politically. I appeal to you as honestly as I could be, please pass this and put in another chapter, a bright chapter in the history of the Legislature in Manitoba.

MR. W. G. MARTIN (St. Matthews): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Springfield that the debate be adjourned.

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

The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Leader of the

(MADAM SPEAKER, cont'd)... Opposition.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Madam Speaker, may we have the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand, please.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed. The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for St. George.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for St. Boniface, whereas average temperatures for the Province of Manitoba are lower than in most provinces in Canada, and whereas the imposition of a tax on heating becomes a penalty on the people living in this province, especially those living in Northern Manitoba, and whereas the burden of this tax falls most heavily on those of fixed income and on lower income groups, therefore be it resolved that this House request the government to rescind the tax on heating.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Madam Speaker, 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 to 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. Perhaps I am wrong to think of this bunch of buskers as a symphony orchestra. Disraeli once looked across the floor of the British House of Commons and described those he saw as a row of extinct volcanoes. I might be tempted to use the same comparison for of the all too painful fact that the gentlemen who occupy the government benches were never really active. Let us say rather that we have been dealing for what seems like a lifetime with a ministry of idiocricies led by the First Minister, a man now so barren of the ability of generalship that in the past few months we have been exposed to the spectacle of this mid-Canadian Napoleon, sounding the advance while he was tripping over his own coat tails in a headlong and frantic retreat. -- (Interjection) -- Thank you. I am glad to think it's that well.

It has been said, Madam Speaker, that in this province nothing is sure but Duff and taxes. The First Minister in this province, as we all know, posed for a long time as the friend of the little man. Higher taxes? Not while Uncle Duff was in control. We heard talk of solemn pledges, noble promises. To hear the First Minister talk it was a golden summer for the Manitoba taxpayer. But the winter of our discontent, however, was not far behind. Last summer we had a special session and the Premier lowered the boom. He lowered it so quickly in fact that we soon discovered, as he did himself, that he had gone off half-cocked. The Premier's pocket sales tax in which he gave the impression he was filling one pocket while he was actually picking the other, resembled the House that Jack built. And I refer to the tax on bunker fuel which was so preposterous that it had to be withdrawn when we complained about it, and the Land Tax which has not been proclaimed because we were able to show the iniquity of this tax. Unfortunately we didn't have the same success with opposing the other taxes levied on the people of this province. Richard Brinsley, the British politician, might have been thinking of the House that Duff built when he attacked taxation -- careless taxation in the British House of Commons some 200 years ago. And this is what he said: "There comes the act imposing the tax; next comes the act to amend the act for imposing the tax; then comes an act to explain the act that amended the act imposing the tax, and next an act to remedy the defects of the act for explaining the act that amended the act, and so on" ad infinitum.

The Tax Bill is like a ship built in a dock yard which was put out to sea on its first voyage before it was discovered that it didn't have a rudder. After every voyage it revealed some new defect which had to be remedied. It had to becaulked, then to be new planked, then to be new rigged, then to be careened, and after all these expensive alterations, the vessel had to be broken up and rebuilt. The Premier is in fact old-fashioned in more ways than one. Not only does he carelessly impose tax bills, he puts on cruel taxes on items that should never be taxed. In the old days people used to pay taxes on their windows, so it was that windows were bricked up and the people wouldn't have to pay the tax. People needed light, but to get too much would ruin them financially. Now the Premier has imposed a tax on heat. In the old days people could brick up the windows and still live. If the people of Manitoba turn down their heat, they will not just be uncomfortable, they will freeze to death.

Madam Speaker, the heating tax imposed by the Roblin Government is the most vicious tax ever imposed by any government in the history of mankind. They can chuckle and . . . at the back but the fact remains it's the cruelest tax ever imposed by any government. Not only is the tax vicious and cruel, it is grossly unfair because it strikes at the little man. In all too many cases the person of average, or below-average means, lives in a home which is poorly insulated and consequently he requires more heat, more fuel to heat his home. It is also

(MR. GUTTORMSON cont'd) . . . grossly unfair because the tax hits some residents harder than others, depending where they live. People in Manitoba north of the 53rd parallel live in a climate which is 19 degrees colder than Winnipeg, Thompson and Churchill are even colder.

And did you know Madam Speaker, that Winnipeg is the coldest city of its size in the world - excluding a few in Siberia. Why the average temperature in Moscow during January is 16 degrees warmer than Winnipeg. It's appalling to think that the members of the Roblin Government who used to pretend that they were working for the good of the province actually voted unanimously in favour of the heat tax which is victimizing the residents. And if it isn't bad enough that the members representing the constituencies in the southern part of the province supported this tax, it was shocking to think that members representing the northern constituencies which is so discriminatory to their constituents. Can you imagine the Member for Churchill, who represents the coldest part of the province and one of the coldest areas in the world, supporting this tax? Can you imagine the Ministers of Health and Welfare who represent Flin Flon and The Pas, in the cabinet, and actually devising this tax which is so discriminating to their people? And to think that the Members for Lac du Bonnet, Swan River, Fisher and St. Matthews had the gall to stand up in this House to say they agreed with this ruthless tax after it had become so evident and so obvious what a hardship it was imposing on the people of Manitoba. Can you imagine the Premier having the affront to say, when he was introducing this tax at the last session, "None of these new proposals will bear heavily on those who cannot afford them." I ask the First Minister who does he think he is kidding? I would like to remind him and the other members of the government of the words of the late Abraham Lincoln in his last public address in Washington on April 11, 1865. And this is what he said, "You may fool all the people some of the time. You can even fool some of the people all the time, but you can't fool all the people all the time." Madam Speaker, I suggest that the people of Manitoba will not allow themselves to be fooled any longer by this Government.

The Premier appeared on television the other evening and spoke of what his government was doing for human betterment. If the heating tax is a sample of his policy of human betterment, the people of Manitoba certainly don't want any part of it.

Before I conclude my remarks I want to make it abundantly clear that because I have only requested the abolishment of the heating tax in this resolution, that I don't approve of the other taxes imposed by the government at the last session. None of these taxes would have been necessary if the government had acted in a prudent and businesslike manner. But what has happened? The government has wasted millions of dollars by bad management. To cite but a few cases: I refer to the \$137,000 wasted in the purchase of the Arts Centre. More than \$100,000 in the purchase of the Bain property; approximately \$2 million in the Grand Rapids Haulage Contract; and thousands of dollars in the last session which wasn't needed and accomplished nothing. But of all the taxes imposed, the heating tax is the most vicious and cruel of them all. In this province where we experience such severe temperatures, no one can escape paying this tax if he wants to live. As I said before, it's either death or taxes. Any member of this House with any sense of fair play and understanding, has no alternative but to support this resolution calling for the abolishment of the heating tax.

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

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

The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Portage, whereas the protection of the individual is one of the prime responsibilities of government, and whereas it has been demonstrated in the Scandinavian countries and in New Zealand that the institution known as the "Ombudsman" or "Grievance Man" is practical in protecting citizens, therefore be it resolved that this House recommends the establishment of a "Public Protector" or "Ombudsman" for Manitoba.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion . . .

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, on a point of order may I raise a question before you place this motion which has been introduced by the honourable member to the Assembly.

MADAM SPEAKER: I would like to proceed and . . .

MR. PAULLEY: As long, Madam Speaker, as we will have an opportunity of raising a point of order if indeed such becomes necessary.

MADAM SPEAKER: Presented the motion. In considering this resolution of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia, I would like to draw the attention of the honourable member to the reference in the Throne Speech which reads as follows: "Policy respecting highway safety, a racing commission, legal aid to indigents, the constitution, ways and means of safeguarding individual rights vis-a-vis the state, the Canada Pension Plan, and certain business legislation, are among the other matters with which you will be asked to deal." The proposed resolution of the honourable member anticipates the announcement made in the Throne Speech and contravenes our rule No. 31, Rules, Orders and Forms of Proceeding of the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba and in my opinion it is out of order.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, it seems to me that the reference in the Throne Speech is so vague and that it has not been followed at this stage by any statement whatever from the government, that surely the resolution presented by the Member for Assiniboia is in order.

MADAM SPEAKER: . . . call for order here. I must remind the member that my ruling is not debatable.

MR. MOLGAT: It is merely on a point of order Madam Speaker that I would suggest that if the government is going to take that position, that they should make their intentions . . .

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please. The government is not taking the position, I am giving a ruling.

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker, did not the Honourable the Leader of the NDP just make the reservation, while you were making the motion, that he wanted it held open for discussion of the point of order. Did you not agree?

MR. PAULLEY: Actually Madam Speaker, I was going to raise a far different point of order than Madam Speaker has, and that was dealing with priority of resolutions that stand on the Order Paper. May I respectfully suggest to you Madam Speaker, that you might consider your ruling that you have suggested respecting the second resolution until the prior resolution is suggested for consideration of the House, and may I suggest to you that I am basing this point of order on the fact that a resolution is on the Order Paper in the name of my colleague the Honourable Member for Brokenhead. By agreement of the House this resolution was allowed to stand and as such still retains its priority on the Order Paper, and I would suggest that that being so, because of the possible conflict in priority it would be proper at this particular time to defer Madam Speaker's decision on a second resolution because as was pointed out by the Honourable Member for Lakeside, I was raising a different point of order prior to that Madam Speaker that you have ruled on at this time. So I respectfully suggest in all deference to Your Honour that you may defer placing the question of your ruling on the second resolution until such time as the prior resolution in the name of my colleague from Brokenhead is properly before this Legislative Assembly.

MADAM SPEAKER: I will hold -- (interjection) -- I will take this under consideration as to whether I should hold this resolution in respect to the other.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, on that point of order, with all due respect to the Leader of the NDP, I submit that the resolution of his colleague is not before this House. The resolution is not before this House until it has been moved and therefore his motion not having been moved, it has no priority over the one that has been moved. It can only have priority in the sense that it was on the Notice of Motion and had it been moved obviously would have priority; but it was not moved, therefore it lost its priority, because it is not at the moment before this House. And I would refer to Beauchesne, Rule 193, Page 164: "No motion is regularly before the House until it has been read from the chair." So to say that a motion that is on the Notice has priority does not stand up. It is not before this House. There is one motion before this House and there is no question of priority when the other one was not moved.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker if I might join on the point of order that's just been raised, I must say that I agree with the Leader of the Opposition when he contends that the motion of the Honourable Member for Brokenhead is not before the House and yet I must say I am a little troubled to think that we would accept that position on its face value, because I think our understanding would be that the feeling of the House would be that the member had not lost his priority because he had not moved his motion. Although I would have to agree that if one took a legalistic view of it the Leader of the Opposition's contention is probably the right one.

However, I want to say, if I may, that I agree with your ruling with respect to the Member for Assiniboia that his motion is out of order on grounds of anticipation, and that really settles the whole problem.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, if I may be permitted an additional word dealing with

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) . . . the point of order that was raised by the Honourable the Leader of the Liberal party. I agree with him insofar as the ruling and the reading of Beuchesne is concerned, but may I respectfully suggest that within our own rules here in the Province of Manitoba there is another ruling that takes precedence over Mr. Beuchesne -- and that is past practice. It has been the past practice of this House to allow as a courtesy, as a courtesy, resolutions to stand, and this House in effect, when by unanimous consent because there was no opposition to allowing the resolution to stand, of my colleague from Brokenhead, in effect says that we will take this up the next time we come to it on the Order Paper, notwithstanding Beuchesne.

So again I suggest to you Madam Speaker, and I say that I think this is a valid position for me to take on behalf of my colleague, that you take under advisement the whole situation we have before us at the present time, notwithstanding the suggesting of my honourable friend the First Minister that your ruling was correct insofar as the second resolution is concerned.

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Madam Speaker, on the point of order, not on the priority, but following what's been said by the Premier. I think that the idea is -- that we shouldn't anticipate the Throne Speech, but I don't think it was ever meant for the Throne Speech to block anything. Now last year Madam Speaker, I was out of order on the same thing. I asked for a principle and I was just blocked and the Minister himself said this was nothing to do with any principle, it was a planned committee to study shared services, and this is the same thing. My colleague is asking for a principle and this is the same, because if this is the case the Throne Speech will stop everything, and then especially when we are faced like last year, at the last minute they decide to forget two or three resolutions on the Order Paper. I don't think that this is the democratic form of government at all.

MADAM SPEAKER: I would like to remind the House that I have allowed considerable debate. I again say that in speaking to my ruling it is not debatable. I again say that I have taken under consideration the request of the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party.

The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Ethelbert Plains.

The House agrees to have the matter stand. Agreed?

The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Emerson.

MR. JOHN P. TANCHAK (Emerson): I would like the indulgence of the House to have this resolution stand please.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed? The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. HILLHOUSE: With the permission of the House Madam I would like to have this matter stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed? The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. JOHNSTON: Madam Speaker, I would like to move, seconded by the Member for Assiniboia, whereas in recent years, there has been a large increase in the amount of land expropriated or bought by the Government of Manitoba, its boards and commissions, and whereas the government, when engaged in business activities, should set a good example to the public through fair dealing, high ethical standards and sound business principles, and whereas fair dealing, high ethical standards and sound business principles require that in land acquisition, the taxpayers who supply the money must not be penalized by excessively high price being paid or the landowners victimized by an unfairly low price being forced upon them by an arbitrary use of government power, and whereas there is continuing and recurring doubt in the minds of the public whether undue hardship has been caused by government action in cases of undervaluation of property forcibly taken by the government from private citizens and in other instances, unconscionable profits being made by speculators dealing on a negotiated basis with government representatives, and whereas the public interest demands that the present unsatisfactory and inconsistent methods of land acquisition by the government and its agencies be replaced by a sound and uniform system in which the public will have confidence and by which both taxpayers and landowners will be fairly dealt with, therefore be it resolved that an Independent Land Court be established to be responsible for all property purchases and sales on behalf of the Government of Manitoba, its boards and commissions, and that said Court shall make an annual report to the Legislature giving full details of all its transactions.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

(MADAM SPEAKER cont'd) . . .

In giving consideration to this resolution standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie, I would refer the honourable member to the Throne Speech where it is stated and I quote, "Legislation providing for the reorganization of the procedure for the acquisition of property, required for public purposes will be introduced." Our Rule No. 31, Rules, Orders and Forms of Proceeding of the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba dealing with anticipation applies and therefore I must rule this proposed resolution out of order.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, on a point of order, I wonder if I might just say something. In view of the fact that the government proposals are not clear as to what they wish to do, and it may turn out that what the government will be proposing will not really be the same as what this resolution suggests, would it be possible to have this type of resolution stay on the Order Paper until such time as the Government proposal comes out and then if it is a clear case of anticipation, if we know definitely that the government proposal is something that would rule this one out, then we would accept to have it removed voluntarily, but at the moment we don't know exactly what the government proposes -- (interjection) -- and I would suggest that it be left on the Order Paper on that basis.

MADAM SPEAKER: I have given my ruling.

MR. CAMPBELL: On a point of order apart from your ruling, I would like to suggest to you that you would follow the practice of former Speakers in this House and of the Speakers in Ottawa, who indicate to the House that they are prepared to hear discussion on the point of order, before they give their ruling, then they do not place themselves in the position of breaking their own rule about the rule not being debatable. I think you will then find that the clear practice of this house in the past has always been, including your incumbancy of the chair, Madam Speaker, that argument on the point of order has been, if not encouraged, at least allowed and the same practice is concerned at Ottawa. I would suggest to you that that's the proper practice to follow, because I think it's a new and undesirable practice for the occupier of the chair to simply say, "I have given my ruling, it is not debatable." and it places anyone who wishes to raise a point of order in the position of being out of order if they even rise to their feet and I suggest that for the proper conduct of the business here, we should carry on the tradition that has obtained here, all the time I have been here and that has obtained all the time that I have paid any attention to Ottawa, that still obtains. While I'm discussing that matter, Madam Speaker, let me say once again that I understood in the former ruling, that you had agreed with the Honourable the Leader of the NDP in this House that you would hear discussion on the point of order and before I got an opportunity to speak on that point of order you had already given the ruling once again that your ruling was not debatable and we were -- I was denied, at least, the opportunity of expressing my point of view. Now I don't like breaking the rules of the House and I admit that what you say is correct, but I suggest as well that it's not in the best interests of the conduct of the House if the arbitrary position is going to be taken without any attempt, without any opportunity being given to discuss the point of order before the ruling is given.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I don't want to prolong the discussion, but it seems to me that when we are faced by statements in the Throne Speech that are now absolutely clear statements and were not presented by the government with any definite legislation or a statement by a Minister indicating exactly what he intends to do, that it would be in the interests of the House that such resolutions be allowed to stand until such time as the government presents its legislation. If then, it's out of order, no questions but to rule it out of order now with absolutely no indication of government intentions, I submit is not fair.

MR. ROBLIN: I cannot agree with my honourable friend. I think that in the Throne Speech there is a pretty clear indication that there's going to be legislation dealing with this topic and that will be forthcoming and will be available for full debate in the Legislature. Now if the legislation that is forthcoming does not suit honourable gentlemen opposite they can amend it, or when they see it they can introduce resolutions of their own on various aspects of the matter. But I think that the ruling that you have given with respect to anticipation is a fair one and that we ought to accept it. The government will bring down its bill in respect of this matter and members opposite can then take whatever action they feel is necessary to express their views in respect to the legislation even if it involves bringing in other resolutions at a later date. But otherwise I don't see how we can operate unless we follow the rule about anticipation and drop the item until such time as the government's legislation is forthcoming.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, if I may be permitted on this point, and I must vehemently disagree with the stand just recently taken by the First Minister and lend my support to

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) . . . the very valid point raised by the Leader of the Opposition, where- in he suggests to you, Madam Speaker, that you might allow the resolution to stand on the Order Paper until such time as this House has had an opportunity of viewing the legislation as proposed by the government.

May I suggest to you, Madam Speaker, that there has been in this House, a precedent established for this situation within the last two years. Memory may not serve me absolutely correctly but I think that I can recall the Honourable Member for Emerson had a resolution before the House last year or the year before, dealing with the question of grants in respect of schoolrooms or school classrooms. The Minister of the Crown said to you, Your Honour, that they intended to introduce a resolution or a bill dealing precisely with this matter. I believe the Honourable the present Attorney-General was then the Minister of Education and made this statement. On receipt of the information from the Minister, I believe I'm correct in stating Your Honour, that you said we would allow, and it was agreed by all members of the House, that we would agree that the matter remain standing on the Order Paper until such time as the legislation was forthcoming from the Minister of the Crown. When the Minister of the Crown introduced his bill, and it became obvious that it did deal with the point that was raised by the member in Opposition, he, Madam Speaker, withdrew his resolution and accepted the position that the government measure had precedent.

I'm sure Madam Speaker, that you cannot help but agree with our contentions at this time that the mere mentioning of a word in the Throne Speech could obviously prevent we on this side of the House raising almost any resolution. So I beseech you again to take under consideration the valid point just raised by the Leader of the Opposition to allow these matters to stand on the Order Paper pending government introducing their legislation and if then there is a conflict, Madam Speaker, I'm sure that the members on this side of the House -- I can speak for my own, of course, and not those of the Liberal Party -- will be prepared and contented to withdraw our resolutions in order that the government's proposals will be adequately debated by this Assembly.

MADAM SPEAKER: . . . direct to the House that if this is their wish that when I call their resolution they request that it stand.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, if I may on that particular point, we don't know whether you may be in conflict with us until they have been presented so rather than just having them stand, may I suggest you might accept them as being read or proposed and then saying that this is in conflict with what you -- or that you suggest to them that this might be stood pending government introduction of legislation, or something along this line.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I urge you to give no hasty consent to this proposition because I think it's unnecessary; it's superfluous and completely irregular. I would suggest that in connection with the reference to the Honourable Member for Emerson the point was there that he had full priority and right-of-way because no mention had been made in the Throne Speech of the item in which he was interested and he as a matter of courtesy, which we appreciated at the time, agreed to let his motion stand because the Minister said he was going to bring in something to deal with it but it's not on all fours with the present discussion at all. It's a different proposition and while my honourable friend the Leader of the NDP is an eloquent and persuasive man and I for one would like to oblige him, I feel that we should not make any such -- we should not likely establish a position here which in the long run might turn out to be unsatisfactory.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, looking at this from the overall operation of the House, a number of these resolutions were presented to the Clerk prior to the opening of the House. The government has made some general statements in its Throne Speech. On that basis of very general statements they could stop almost any resolution coming from this side. The Member for St. Boniface indicated, for example, his position last year when he was bringing in the question of the principle of aid to separate schools. His motion was ruled out of order because the government had said something in the Throne Speech. Well, what the government did had nothing whatever to the principle of aid to separate schools. It was another principle. They were talking of shared services. Not at all the same principle as the member was presenting. And yet his motion was ruled out of order. Surely this isn't the intention of the rule. The intention of the rule is not to have motions that are in clear conflict come up but if it is a motion that deals with another aspect of the same question, surely it's not intended that it should be ruled out of order. And I suggest to you that it would be the easiest way insofar as the House is concerned where you feel there is a conflict, simply ask if the member is prepared

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd) . . . to have it stand. I can assure you that as far as we are concerned you will have our approval to stand such resolution if there's a possibility of conflict until such time as the government legislation comes forward.

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker, before this debate ends, I would like to say that I'm speaking on the point of order and I want to agree with what the Honourable the First Minister stated a moment ago that the suggestion here is not on all fours with the situation that arose in connection with the resolution of the Honourable Member for Emerson a year or two ago. The First Minister stated it correctly. At that time the Minister stood in his place and said that legislation was being brought in. Madam Speaker, that is the thing that really has much more force than a general suggestion in the Speech from the Throne. A Minister standing in his place does, does come right within the question of anticipation if he states that the government is bringing in legislation on this matter, that's a definite undertaking but a general statement in the Speech from the Throne is not of the same consequence at all. So that the precedent that was established is in my opinion, a much stronger one than the present one, that's being established.

MADAM SPEAKER: Is it the wish of the House to proceed?

The proposed resolution

MR. MOLGAT: What is the decision on this Madam Speaker, will it be allowed to stand?

MADAM SPEAKER: I gave my decision.

MR. MOLGAT: Then, Madam Speaker, I regret that I must challenge your ruling.

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the members.

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

YEAS: Messrs. Alexander, Baizley, Beard, Bilton, Bjornson, Carroll, Cowan, Evans, Groves, Hamilton, Harrison, Hutton, Jeannotte, Johnson, Klym, Lissaman, McDonald, McGregor, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Mills, Roblin, Seaborn, Shewman, Smellie, Stanes, Steinkopf, Strickland, Watt, Weir, Witney and Mrs. Morrison.

NAYS: Messrs. Barkman, Campbell, Cherniack, Desjardins, Froese, Gray, Guttormson, Hillhouse, Johnston, Molgat, Patrick, Paulley, Peters, Schreyer, Shoemaker, Smerchanski, Tanchak, Vielfaure and Wright.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 33; Nays, 19.

MADAM SPEAKER: I declare the motion carried.

The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, Throne Speech may I have the indulgence of the House to allow this matter to stand?

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed? The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. PAULLEY: The same, Madam Speaker, if I may.

. . . . continued on next page

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the Member for Lac du Bonnet and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition and the proposed amendment by the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party. The Honourable the Member for Rhineland.

MR. MOLGAT: Before, if I may, on a point of order, referring to the Orders of the Day, immediately after the notation "adjourned debate," this is indicated as the fourth day of debate. I believe that it should be the third day of debate, should it not? Because if it's the fourth day of debate, it means that this must come to a vote today. I think that reading the rule book indicates that in view of the proceedings this year we really have one more day.

MR. ROBLIN: Would you explain that to me because I scrutinized the same rule and came to another conclusion, that it was the fourth day.

MR. MOLGAT: Well, I must admit that the rule isn't very clear and possibly the next time we revise the book we should clarify this, but as I read it -- this is rule 34, which says the proceedings on the Order of the Day for resuming debate on the motion for reply and any amendments proposed shall not exceed seven sitting days. On the fourth of the seven days, if a sub-amendment is under consideration -- well, it seems to me that the sub-amendment came in on Wednesday. Correct? The amendment was on Tuesday, but the sub-amendment -- (Interjection) -- But not on the sub-amendment.

MR. ROBLIN: No. Well of course if my friend will read it carefully he will see that subsection (1) says "shall not exceed seven sitting days from the beginning of the debate", and the debate began on Tuesday. This is the fourth sitting day. It has no reference to the timing of the subamendment but refers to the beginning of the debate. So on that calculation today is the fourth day, and at 10:30 tonight, if not before, we should have a vote on the sub-amendment.

MR. MOLGAT: Coming back to subsection (1), it says, "shall not exceed seven sitting days from the day that the debate is resumed." Is that correct? Well now, the debate was entered into on Tuesday, not resumed on Tuesday. It was resumed on Wednesday, was it not? Tuesday was the opening of the debate; it was resumed on Wednesday.

MADAM SPEAKER: that it has been the consideration of this House that we count the first day of debate when the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition takes part in the debate.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, the motion was proposed that day. It happened that I spoke that day when I don't normally speak that day, but that doesn't change the picture. Surely whether or not I speak on the day that the motion is entered into doesn't change the number of days that we're allowed to speak. I carried on the debate that day, I didn't resume the debate. It was carried on that day. It was resumed the following day.

MR. ROBLIN: It could be equally well argued it was resumed when my honourable friend started to speak, but as far as I'm concerned, I think it's a matter that we can leave to Madam Speaker to settle. I'll abide by her ruling in the matter.

MR. CAMPBELL: Well, Madam Speaker, the rule is clear. We had a lot of discussion on this in the committee when the rules were revised and this rule was changed, against the wishes of some of us it's true, but it was changed and it's the rule. But what's the object of the rule? The rule was to cut down the time that the Speech from the Throne had been taking in past years. This would cut it down to seven days, and we set out certain methods of cutting it down and the program was arranged. It's quite clear to me that this section of our rules is that when the debate is resumed is what counts as the first day. Now His Honour reads the Speech from the Throne. The Speech from the Throne is before us on that day. The First Minister makes a motion that the Speech of His Honour be taken into consideration the next day, and the next day it's taken into consideration. That begins the debate on the Speech from the Throne and the day after that it resumes. There's no question about this. It was understood in the committee that we're talking about. For my honourable friend, Madam Speaker, to suggest that you count it by the time that the Leader of the Opposition takes, that was all right when the Leader of the Opposition adjourned and spoke on the next day. But on this occasion, it was one of the reasons the Honourable Leader of the Opposition spoke on the same day that the debate commenced, not resumed, and there's no question I'm sure, Madam Speaker, if you will consider this question that you will come to the conclusion that this is the third day. Wednesday was the first; Thursday was the second; and Friday is the third day. Now, let's not get this one misinterpreted.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Madam Speaker, on this point of order, could we not have a definition of the word "resume"? I understand that in order to resume anything there must be a break, and then it is resumed. Now you recall, Madam Speaker, that our Leader spoke immediately. There was no resumption. It was a continuation, and surely if we have a definition of what resume means, this whole question can be resolved. I maintain that there was no resumption, it was a continuation when my Honourable Leader spoke, and therefore the debate was resumed the following day.

MADAM SPEAKER: If we do not take into account the day that the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition spoke, then we do not have his amendment before the House. Therefore, the day he spoke and his amendment came before the House is counted as the first day, and this is the fourth day of debate.

The Honourable the Member for Rhineland.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, before the member speaks, I'm sorry but I must appeal this position. This is one that is going to affect our debates of the future.

MADAM SPEAKER: Shall the ruling of the Chair be sustained?

MADAM SPEAKER put the question and after a voice vote declared the ruling sustained.

MR. MOLGAT: Yeas and Nays, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the Members.

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

YEAS: Messrs. Alexander, Baizley, Beard, Bilton, Bjornson, Carroll, Cowan, Evans, Groves, Hamilton, Harrison, Hutton, Jeannotte, Johnson, Klym, Lissaman, McDonald, McGregor, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Mills, Moeller, Roblin, Seaborn, Shewman, Smellie, Stanes, Steinkopf, Strickland, Waft, Weir, Witney and Mrs. Morrison.

NAYS: Messrs. Barkman, Campbell, Cherniack, Desjardins, Froese, Gray, Hillhouse, Johnston, Molgat, Patrick, Paulley, Peters, Schreyer, Shoemaker, Smerchanski, Tanchak, Vielfaure, and Wright.

Resolution: Yeas, 34; Nays, 18.

MADAM SPEAKER: I declare the ruling sustained. The Honourable the Member for Rhineland.

MR. J. M. FROESE (Rhineland): Madam Speaker, may I first of all congratulate you in the conduct of the business of the House. I think it is a job ably done and I hope that you will be able to steer the session quite well, since we have already run into some trouble today.

I also wish to congratulate the Honourable Minister the Provincial Secretary and Minister of Utilities on his re-election and also his re-appointment. Then too I wish to congratulate the Honourable Member from Lac du Bonnet who gave us a very good description of his constituency. It must be a most wonderful constituency from the description that he gave. Then also I would congratulate the Honourable Member from Fisher on his talk that he gave us in seconding the motion to the reply. I think the Honourable Member for Fisher should be recognized in another way, since he was recently honoured at the Beet Growers meeting for being one out of nine citizens in this province who had continually grown beets over the last twenty-five years. This was a special celebration of the Beet Growers Association. It was their silver anniversary year and they made special recognition of these growers, and I would personally congratulate the Honourable Member for Fisher in this connection.

Madam Speaker, the throne speech that was placed before us is quite lengthy. I have read it and perused it and there are many pieces of legislation to come forward. I certainly don't want to mention them all, but there are some items that I think are worthy of mention. They mentioned the expansion of the Manitoba Water Supply, and certainly we in this province need an expansion of this industry, or of this service. I have towns in my constituency that have made application and I'm sure they would like to be serviced by the water supply board.

Then also mention is made that "the ministers view with concern recent trends in the price of wheat as a threat to the provincial economy. You will be asked to consider policy dealing with this subject." I feel very strongly on this matter. I have voiced my opinion on this very matter from year to year in this House and I congratulate the First Minister for coming out at long last and speaking up on behalf of the farmers of this province. Surely the reduction of the price of wheat is something that we should be concerned with because this reduction is not just a reduction in price, it means that this is a reduction in the margin of the earnings that the farmers will be making and this will reduce their net income. The

(MR. FROESE cont'd.) papers carry articles on this matter and report the figure of between \$50 and \$75 million that could be involved, so certainly when this matter comes up in the House I will be participating in it and I hope something fruitful can come forward.

There is also mention being made of dividing the Public Works and creating a new Highways Department. At the summer session I requested the map or a list of the roads designated as provincial roads and also of provincial waterways. At that time I think it was reported -- or I received an answer to the effect that this list was not available. If the list is available now I would certainly appreciate getting one, because it is certainly of interest to us as members of our local constituencies just what roads are being taken over and what waterways are being taken over by the province, because we will want at least equal or better service on these roads than what we have had in the past.

There is also mention being made of the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund which will be improved to provide for property damage covering certain limits. Here I think considerable improvement could be made in the legislation so it wouldn't be quite as involved for persons who have accidents and are making claims, that it shouldn't be so involved. It should be easier to make those claims.

Then I find that towards the tail end of the throne speech mention is made of the Canada Pension Plan and that we will receive legislation, or legislation will be put forward in this House in connection with the Canada Pension Plan. Well, Madam Speaker, I have a report here of the Bill that is being considered in the Federal House on this matter. I haven't read it but I have looked into the Bill and its provisions, and I for one cannot support a Canada Pension Plan as outlined. This is a matter of forced savings on behalf of the people of this province and the wage earner will be forced to make or set aside savings. He will have no choice as to where he invests those savings. They will have to go in this plan regardless of what his desires might be. It will also take away millions and millions of dollars of purchasing power from the people of this province and this continent. Many of the provinces will have large funds at their disposal as a result of this. I am told that some provinces will have billions and billions of dollars placed at their disposal as a result of the implementation of the Canada Pension Plan.

In my opinion this will result in more stateism. The funds will be used by the provinces for purposes which might not be to the best advantage. We have today a Regional Development Association and most naturally they will want to develop certain projects, and I feel that this is a source of funds that will be tapped for that purpose. And what will this mean? Will it mean that the government will be in business all over the province as a result of it. Certainly we already have two other crown agencies dealing with credit. Are we going to set up a third? We have the Credit Corporation; we also have the Development Fund; and if the funds of the pension plan are going to be made available in this way, it will be a third agency or at least a third pool of funds available for this. These regional development organizations in my opinion are I think superficial or not even necessary, because if the economy was such -- the climate was such that business would want to come in, they would come in regardless of any help from the government in this way. I think what it could develop into is a political front organization and this I would hate to see happen.

I think all members are aware that these associations are being supported through tax revenues, through funds from the municipalities, and that we might be asked to put up further funds in this way from the taxpayers' money. I feel that the Canada Pension Plan is necessary, that funds for pensions should be taken from current revenues. Why build up these large funds to pay out pensions? Certainly if the people are both to continue paying into the pension plan they will have to have earnings in future years, and if they have earnings in future years we can collect it at that time. To me it seems that this could be a crippling taxation deal which will harm democracy.

In looking through the various resolutions I also find that advances are made in setting up Ombudsmen, to have citizen advisory boards, a public defender and consumer councils. While they might serve a purpose, I feel that in allowing these things to come forward is an admission that democracy is failing or has failed, and in my opinion they shouldn't be necessary. And why have they failed? I think it is because of the legislation that has been passed and brought in from time to time which is socialistic in nature, because people lose their rights because of the legislation that is being passed and therefore we now find these requests coming forward.

We find that our rights are being deprived of as individuals in various ways. I am a

(MR. FROESE cont'd.) member of the Vegetable Growers of this province. I attended their session at the university, an annual convention this year, and heard the chairman of the new Potato Marketing Board -- I think that's what they call it -- speak, and I was just wondering whether I was still in Canada when he spoke, because the way he put it forward it was as though we were in a police state, that we had to act a certain way, and we wouldn't be growing which crops that we please. We would be designated a certain quota and any new growers who would want to come in afterwards would just have to take a chance whether they could get a quota at all. I feel that this legislation is robbing us of our rights. Certainly we as farmers in this province should have the right, and retain the right to grow whatever crops we like, and should have the right to dispose of them, to sell them, whether it be to our neighbours or to some agency that is in the business dealing with those. Now apparently this will not be the case as far as potatoes are concerned.

Then too I feel that the regulations that are being set up should be looked at very keenly by the members of this House, because I feel that we are delegating authority there that should never be delegated. Certainly when the chairman of a board like that says, "You do this or do it this way, or else I'll put you in jail," I think that is being said too much by the chairman of a commission like that, or an individual should have that right.

Another reason why we're losing rights, I think, is because we have too much government in business. We have over the years set up many Crown Agencies. We have, first of all, the Development Fund and the Credit Corporation which I already mentioned. We have crop insurance set up as an agency. We have the utilities such as the Hydro, telephone and water supply. Then we set up an Export Credit Corporation Design Institute, and I think there was one other one. Last year we legislated a Hog Marketing Commission into existence. This year we are going to set up a Horse Racing business, so where is this going to end? We're getting into too much business as a government, and what is very often the case is that when the government goes into business they will not tolerate any competition. It has to be a monopoly in order to stay in business as a government agency.

I think we are also failing in other areas. In my opinion, we are also failing in the education field. Even with all the reorganization that is taking place, I feel that there is a certain loss of parental rights that are being handed over to the state. I see this happening through the introduction of the new General Course. It is now not a matter of just one course for our school children in school but there will now be a second choice. And it will not be up to the parent to decide what course the child chooses, it will be the teacher who designates or decides for the child. And when we are told that only about 30 percent of our students will go into the matriculation course, I think this is much too severe. I don't think this is just foolish, I think it is downright stupid. And what is going to come out of this will be a demand for more private schools, because in our private schools we will be able to offer the course we wish and the students that want to take the matriculation course will be able to do so, whereas he might be barred doing so in the public school.

I would also like to refer to this school -- I think it was in St. Boniface -- the parish or parochial school that quit last year and as a result the government took over. They had their board take over and they engaged all the teachers, the same staff, and now they are paying for everything. Yet before they wouldn't pay them a cent as long as it was a private or parochial school. Why can't we come to some agreement? Why can't these people get some assistance? Surely this is something very wrong and that we must be way off base. Saskatchewan passed legislation in this respect the year before. We didn't see any squeal there and we didn't see the papers with big headlines. Why does Manitoba have to have such a row when this thing is mentioned? I'll be very interested to see the report on the Shared Services. I haven't been a member of the committee and therefore I am not aware of what has gone on.

I already mentioned wheat prices. I think it should be repeated here that the lowering of the wheat price will have a very serious effect on the economy of this province, on the income of the farmer, and it will have an effect on the family farm unit. And here I just wonder what is this government doing to retain the family farm? Last fall I had occasion to be at a panel discussion sponsored by the Winnipeg Chamber of Commerce and they had a panel which defined the family farm unit and the outlook for the family farm as such. And Mr. Ralph Hedlin being one of the panelists, provided us with the brief outline and I would like to quote from this outline as to his definition of a family farm unit. His definition is that a family farm is a unit in which (1) the operator makes all or most of the management decisions; (2) most of the labour is provided by the farmer and his family; (3) it is a farm unit with sufficient

(MR. FROESE cont'd.) resources, land and capital to provide the family with an adequate minimum standard of living; and (4) there is a reasonable security of tenure. These were the basics on which he based a family farm unit.

Now later on in the discussion it was pointed out that in order to be an economic unit it had to be a farm of between 700 and 800 acres. I just wonder is that the government of our province accepting that as a family farm unit that should be encouraged? Are we discouraging all other units that are below that? Apparently this was also agreed to by Mr. Clay Gilson from the University of Manitoba. He had presented a paper at a conference "The Resources for Tomorrow" in Montreal in 1961 where similar statements were made. Certainly if that is the case then more than 90 percent of the farmers in my constituency are not economic farm units or are not farm units that should be encouraged or retained, and I for one certainly don't go along with that.

When they state here that the farm unit should have sufficient resources, we know that today people don't have all those resources. They don't have all the capital necessary to purchase a farm unit like that because this takes thousands and thousands of dollars. If you have seven hundred acres of land, land in our area would sell for \$150, and to get the machinery with it, it would mean a large outlay in capital. So here again I would like to know from this government what is their position? What are they doing? What are they recognizing as a family farm unit?

It was mentioned at this particular meeting that there are depressed areas in Canada and that presently ARDA is conducting surveys -- they've made surveys in the Maritimes, in Quebec, and that large numbers of family farms or farm families have incomes below \$2,500.00. Apparently this is almost the case all over the Maritimes, so there comes another matter into this and that is ARDA. What is ARDA doing in Manitoba? We heard of a project being contemplated or started up in the interlake. I haven't heard as to how it is proceeding, but I'm afraid that we might just be encouraging rural slums through ARDA, because if we go into areas that we know before we start that they are unable to carry farms that can be made self-supporting, why should we go into these areas? I think we should restrict ourselves in the ARDA program to areas that we at least have a reasonable assurance that the project will be of benefit.

Then too I would like to congratulate the minister, the First Minister, last fall when the matter of opting out in the case of ARDA, because we can, as a province, be put into a straightjacket having to follow programs outlined by the federal government, whereas we here might think that the money could be put to much better advantage. While there are certain restrictions in the federal ARDA legislation, which in my opinion aren't too good, we can opt out, but apparently we are supposed to set up a program that will at least give the equivalent to what they are proposing. These are a few things that I felt I should mention.

Coming back to the Canada Pension Plan once more, I feel that the people of this province will be robbed of a certain amount of purchasing power which they require on their own and which they should be able to keep and not have to put into forced savings.

Then another matter that I would like to touch briefly is the encouragement of industry and bringing industry into this province. I feel that we are off base in the first place because business will go to areas where taxes naturally are lower. We've seen certain national companies leave this province as far as their head office are concerned and locating in other provinces, and I think we will see more of this as time goes along, because why should these companies come in here and pay for all the borrowings that we are creating these years while we are going into debt. Surely this debt has to be paid and these companies, when they locate in this province, naturally have to take on a certain amount of that burden. So I feel that here is a point that we should keep in mind. We need a change in policy in this province as far as our financial business is concerned in this government. There should be first of all no more borrowings; secondly, I feel we should be on a pay-as-you-go basis in order to get out of the hole that we are in at the present time.

Interest costs are tremendously high. When I first came into this House our estimates showed that after applying the revenues from the utilities such as Hydro and Telephones there would be a net of \$1,000 which would have to come from the Consolidated Revenue Fund. Last year I think this figure was over twelve, or close to 14 million, and I have no doubt that this will be much higher this year because we are continuously borrowing. This is another item that has to be corrected if we want to draw in business and attract more industry.

(MR. FROESE cont'd.)

Then also the funds that the Canada Pension Fund will provide will certainly not reduce interest rates in my opinion, because as I understand it these funds will require a certain return of interest and therefore we will not be able to get this money at a low price. This leads me to the matter of advocating why not use the Bank of Canada for our provincial borrowings if they have to be made. Surely this should be tried. After all, the Bank of Canada made a loan to Great Britain for 200 million at no interest rate -- no interest rate was quoted.

Then also I would briefly like to read from Hansard and from a statement that was made by the Honourable Mr. Gordon, Minister of Finance in the House of Commons, and I quote -- this is in connection with questions that had been put earlier by the MP from Red Deer and also the MP from the Caribou. The first question -- and I quote now -- the first question he asked was: "To what extent has the Bank of Canada purchased government bonds? Might I say in reply that as at June 30th, 1964, the Bank of Canada owned a total of two billion, nine hundred and twenty-five million Government of Canada direct and guaranteed securities, the breakdown being as follows." Then he gives the breakdown and I read on, "These holdings comprise 14.6 percent of the total government securities outstanding as at June 30th, 1964."

I go a little further down to the third question. The third question was: "How much money is actually paid to the Bank of Canada in interest on these bonds which the Bank of Canada holds? What portion of these charges is returned, this accrue of interest charged on the government bonds held by the Bank of Canada to the Consolidated Revenue Fund?" These were the questions asked. "In reply I would point out that the Bank of Canada pays over the surplus available from its operations to the Consolidated Revenue Fund each year. In 1963 the income of the Bank from investments, which included income from interest on bonds and treasury bills, totalled \$127,407,000. The total income of the Bank was \$127,851,000, and the net income paid to this Consolidated Revenue Fund was \$116,386,000."

So it is quite clear, Madam Speaker, that with the exception of operating costs and that sort of thing, all of the interest paid, all of the interest which is paid to the Bank of Canada is paid back again in the form of profits to the Consolidated Revenue Fund. In other words, this portion of the debt held by the Bank of Canada does not cost us a cent, except to pay for the operations of the Bank. So why can't we as a provincial government obtain our funds from the Bank of Canada? Both the other two Social Credit provinces in Canada do not borrow, as a result they've never asked for this. But certainly if we in Manitoba continue to borrow funds, let's go to the Bank of Canada and get our funds from there. If we have to pay an interest rate it will go back to the Consolidated Revenue Fund in Ottawa and will mean less taxes to the people of Canada.

I have a few other items that I would like to deal with but I think I'll wait for those until next week because I am short of a few figures that I would like to obtain in the meantime. However, before I sit down I think I would just like to mention our objectives as far as Social Credit is concerned. Our objectives are that the Social Credit Association in Canada is a reform movement. Its efforts are designed to eliminate the abuses of capitalism and to give all people greater individual freedom and a higher standard of living. Its main objectives are: (1) to establish in Canada a national economy based on individual enterprise and in which abundant production of all wanted goods and services obtained by inducements; secondly, provision is made for efficient and equitable distribution of all total production; thirdly, cycles of booms and depressions will be eliminated; fourth, a maximum of opportunity is afforded every individual to engage in gainful employment; and fifth, each individual is assured an equitable share of the aggregate financial credit of the nation; the adoption of a sound and scientific basis for international goodwill and world peace.

These are the basic objectives and I hope at least to follow and abide by them. In my opinion, we in this House enact too much legislation that robs us of our freedom, that robs the individual of his choice in many instances, and I feel that we should revert back and pass legislation that will not do this in the future. As I have already mentioned, I expect to be speaking further some time next week on a suitable occasion.

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker, I had planned to follow the Honourable the Leader of the Social Credit Party but I am afraid I will be a little more than fifteen minutes. Would the Leader of the House be willing to call it 5:30 now because I assume we are intending to go this evening.

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce) (Fort Rouge): Yes, I think it is planned that we should meet this evening and I think it would be -- unless some

(MR. EVANS cont'd.)..... other honourable member would care to say that he would be finished by 5:30 -- I think we could meet the honourable member's wishes and in that event perhaps you would care to declare it to be 5:30, Madam Speaker.

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