

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

8:00 o'clock, Tuesday, April 5, 1966

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the First Minister, and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition and the proposed amendment to the amendment by the Honourable the Member for St. John's. The Honourable the Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Madam Speaker, I didn't realize that would be on the first item on the program tonight. There were some bills left. However, I will proceed with what I had to say in connection with the Budget that has been placed before us by the First Minister for the ensuing year 1966-67.

First of all, Madam Speaker, I am pleased that we have been presented with a balanced budget and that we will not have a deficit. However, if you take a close look at the figures and the revenue figures that he expects for the year, they're way above what was expected a year ago from the various acts, that is from the federal government, the various revenues that we generally receive from these sources. They are up I think in every case and I'm just wondering whether because we had a, or will have, a surplus as at March 31st, 1966, and that we will have a substantial carry-over to take into the next year account, which is to offset the budget that we are now discussing, but I think the revenues that are listed here are too large and too high for what we will get and I think we will end up with a deficit next year. This is probably what he is asking for because he definitely wouldn't like to show a deficit and also he would not like to increase taxes at this time; so far as revenues are concerned that he expects and in this way balance a budget. But I wouldn't be one bit surprised if he would have to impose, the government, further taxes a year from now because there will not be sufficient revenues to meet the large expenditures that they are proposing. On the other hand, there is also other ways out naturally, a situation that we have been following for a number of years and that is just under-spending, that we are not spending the amounts that have been allocated to the various departments especially to the matter of construction in roads and so on.

I have always been an advocate of a pay as you go policy and I for one, do not recommend increasing the debt of this province. Now we have been told that there will be no increase in this debt, that he will not call for any capital requirements - that all requirements that will be met out of current revenue, and I hope that this will be the case. But I would also ask the First Minister who is also the Treasurer, that we should try and reduce our debt more fastly than we have. I think we are going at too slow a rate in reducing the debt of the province. The interest that we're spending annually on the provincial debt is growing every year and for the money that we spend in this direction we could certainly provide many and varied services that we cannot give today.

Certainly the provinces to the west are doing this very thing. They have increased pensions for the pensioners at a provincial level. B.C. for one pays a pension of over a \$100 whereas in Manitoba are paying \$75, that is the federal government. So here again is another reason why our people are leaving for the west coast when they get to retirement age and many leave before they get to that age because of the prosperity out there, some of them because of the climate no doubt. But others naturally too for the higher old age pension that they will be receiving and the decrease in taxes out there because we know that B.C. has a \$110 home-owner grant by now. We in Manitoba are trying to copy them in giving a \$50 school tax rebate but which I think is far from what the people out in B.C. are doing because we have increased taxes in order to give this rebate, whereas they get these additional funds from their natural resources and do not have to collect taxes in order to do it. In fact, they have reduced taxes this year whereas a good number of other provinces are increasing them. We just need to take a look at our neighbour to the east, Ontario. They had to increase their taxes considerably in order to meet their budget. We did so a short time ago and most likely will have to do it again if we keep on spending the way we do and not get our economy going in this province.

We certainly need to do something to our agricultural economy here in the province to stimulate it. What this government has done over the last number of years is just provide sources for borrowing for these people, which in a way probably is very essential but that isn't helping them. It is just giving them a chance to get into debt further. What we need is revenues to these people so that they too can prosper, so that they can in turn pay their hired men, their labourers, better wages.

(MR. FROESE cont'd)..

We have had resolutions before the House and I think is still before the House to increase the minimum wage. I would certainly be in accord with this; however, if we want to increase the minimum wage we should also see to it that these people have the necessary revenues - perhaps necessary income from their farms in order to pay these people higher wages. I think these things go hand in hand and we should do something about it. Certainly the money that we are spending on interest in this province would go a long way to give these people a boost. I think for that matter we could give them 25¢ on a bushel of wheat for the money that we are spending on interest. Probably we would have to put a ceiling on it - \$500 per farmer with a maximum, but certainly some of these things could be done for what we now pay in interest.

I too feel that we're lacking in our plant breeding program, that we have not produced the varieties - new varieties of grain and special crops that our farmers need in this province. For all these years and we have not developed one strain of soya beans that our farmers can use in Southern Manitoba. All the beans that are being crushed at the Altona Plant have to be imported. This has gone on now for years and years, and yet this government does not make available the resources to get a new strain of soya beans that we can produce here in order to provide the necessary raw product that goes into that industry. I think this is a shame and certainly something could have been done about it over these many years that the plant has been in being.

I would also briefly like to comment on our educational department because here too we are lacking, especially so in the technical and vocational field, and which is also pointed out by the Leader of the Official Opposition in his amendment to the budget motion. As I pointed out the other day we're spending a mere \$6 million and out of this \$6 million better than \$4 million is being contributed by the federal government, so that all we're spending is around \$2 million as a province. I think this too is a shame and that we should be doing more in this area than we're doing.

Now we find that they're going to set up a board to look into the matter of establishing boundaries and that same board will also decide on the location of these technical schools and this is all being done having in mind the federal program which requires that a student population count of 500 to 700 has to be met. I think this should not be the requirements set down by this province; even if the federal government requires that, certainly we don't have to use that yardstick for our province because this yardstick has been set up for the eastern provinces of Ontario and Quebec where you have many more larger centres and which have the population count to set up technical vocational schools in those centres. We in our rural part of our province have not got the population and therefore cannot meet these requirements, at least not to our satisfaction because the schools will then be too far and wide apart. We need more of these schools; we need one especially in southern Manitoba because we have many young rural people there who would like to avail themselves of these courses if they could only attend. I feel that we're sadly lacking in this area. These could no doubt be tied in with our secondary high schools and many of our high school students could avail themselves of these courses and attend them as they - and probably integrate them so that they could avail themselves of these facilities.

I think we too have too much restrictions placed on school divisions and school boards by governmental department committees and so on. Here again I think we have far too much red tape and that if people decide on an issue, if they want to build a new school let them go ahead and build one. Why we should tell them when and where and what kind of a school you can build. I think this should be left up to the people to decide. After all they're the ones that are going to use it and they should have some say in this matter.

I would also like to see that we extend grants to teacherages for our division schools. Many of our teachers are not available to these areas because there's lack of accommodation, there's not proper accommodation for these people to move into, and very often they haven't got the means - when they start out early in life they haven't got the means to buy a new home and hesitate to do so in an area that they don't know, and probably just intend to go in and find out what the community is like before settling down in such an area. So that if our divisions could construct or get the grants for teacherages this would certainly assist them in many ways in attracting better teachers and in this way have better schools. Here we too are lacking very badly.

Bill 39 was passed last year; nothing has come out of it so far, but I for one am for voluntary consolidation and not by force in any way. I think that people have shown that they are forward and that they will see to it that we get the necessary schools, that we get the necessary advancement as well as have the means whereby we can do so. So that we do not need to force them into situations.

(MR. FROESE cont'd)...

Another matter that I wish to touch on has to do with investments. Now that the Canada Pension Plan is in effect this province will receive monies that are being paid in by salaried people all across this land and we will be receiving large sums of money as a province to work with, and naturally with which to invest in. And here I find that we might embark on a situation that would not be too good. I would like to put out a warning that we do not go in for wholesale social works, because I think this money will lend itself to that very rapidly if we embark on such a program and while we have set up an authority whereby we will make loans to school districts, divisions and so on for the purpose of building schools and facilities - no doubt this probably will be extended to hospitals in the future and other areas of this type - but certainly we should stay clear of investing in such ventures that would compete with private enterprise in this province. I think this should be avoided at all cost.

Recently I saw on TV the Honourable Mr. Kierans of Quebec and he discussed this matter of investment, and he just showed how investing was being centralized more and more in this country and that governments were controlling the field of investment more and more. We find this to be the case with insurance companies that have large funds of money at their disposal for investment purposes and that they're restricted as to how much they can put into growth ventures, that they're more or less obligated to invest in the debt of this country. I feel this is a wrong approach. We should invest in growth ventures so that we would have more prosperity rather than to invest in the debt of this country that the Federal Government and the Provincial Government are creating.

I would also like to see a way for the very people that are contributing to The Canada Pension Plan in some form to be able to invest jointly into business ventures. Surely a scheme could be worked out in a way that this could be done, that where we have a relatively larger industry and the people working in that industry naturally contribute large amounts to The Canada Pension Plan. Why not devise a plan where these people could then draw back these monies and invest it in that plant. This could be done very easily and I think this would be a way of using the funds to advantage rather than to invest in the debt of this country and province.

I have already commented on the agricultural scene in regard to farm help but I think I should touch on it once more because this is a very important matter and which we should not discard lightly because we will be needing more and more experienced help on the farm. There is a very serious shortage right now and were it not that we had had people immigrating into this province we would have been much worse off than we are today. We also know that the Indian people from the north have helped us a great deal in the agricultural field in this way.

We still have not yet got unemployment insurance for our farm workers and while we expect legislation, federal legislation to come forward, I think this government should make representation and make sure that this will be available to all farm help and not just to special groups as has already been mentioned. I think it need not be compulsory; let it be optional; but let's make sure that this will be available to all the people that want it in the agricultural field.

Recently we had the matter of the Nelson River project introduced in this House and as a result we've had several meetings in committee where we were able to question the people of Manitoba Hydro and got a good number of answers, got additional information that we requested and I personally would thank the minister in charge for arranging this so that we could get the information, get it on transcript so that we could check it afterwards. This is a good arrangement and I hope that this will also be the case when other agencies are set up of this kind. But I was alarmed when it was disclosed that the cost of financing this project will cost three out of the four mills of the cost of power. This is very large when we consider that three mills out of four mills will go to pay for the cost of financing the project. And also that the plan is to pay for this project over a 50-year period. This means that we will pay for the project three times over and some. Surely there should be a means of getting the financing at a lower cost, and I think we should make representation to the Federal Government, to the federal authorities that this be done. After all they have already demonstrated that it can be done, because the government, the Federal Government through the Bank of Canada has on previous occasions borrowed money at interest rates but when the interest is then paid it goes back to the government coffers and this means that there will be less income tax or less taxes be paid by the citizens of Canada, so that in fact the monies borrowed this way do not cost us anything. We do not have to pay anything except for the operation of the bank itself, and this has to be paid regardless. So this is an area that should be definitely gone into and find out whether the Federal Government would not come across.

(MR. FROESE cont'd)...

This was started under the Diefenbaker era and has now been continued by Mr. Pearson. The year before I think the Federal Government received in this way in its federal treasury well over \$100 million of revenue from interest accrued on these bonds and which naturally went into the coffers and as a result the people had to pay that much less in taxes in order to provide the services that we get from the Federal Government. This is nothing new, this is practiced today and I for one would ask that we make representation to the Federal Government to have this extended. After all the Bank of Canada is owned by the people of Canada; the Canadian Government is a shareholder, and the only shareholder, and we the people of Canada should make more use of it.

Madam Speaker, I had a good number of other things lined up, but being one of the latter speakers in this debate many of the things have already been said. I was going to point out just how we as a province are low income yet a high tax province in Canada. The figures have already been used by the Leader of the Official Opposition, in pointing out just what the weekly wages are compared to other cities and other provinces in Canada, where we are the lowest weekly salary province west of the Maritimes and yet when it comes to taxes, because of our economy going down hill all the time, we are fast becoming a very high tax province and we should do everything to try and reverse this trend to see to it that we get more prosperity and as a result we will develop our natural resources so that this will be a paying proposition, then we should be able to get revenues in this way. But it seems to me that even the new industry that is now coming in will certainly not add very much to the revenues of this province, as was pointed out by the Honourable Member for St. John's the other night that all we could expect in revenues was roughly some 18,000, if I'm correct, and he can correct me. I think this is what he had figured out. Certainly this doesn't add to very much. And when we find that our Natural Resources Department is still spending more than what we receive in natural resources, I think this too is a shame. Certainly there should be ways and means of increasing the revenues for our government and for the services that we have to give to our people.

So, Madam Speaker, I have the resolution of the Honourable the Member for St. John's before me. I certainly could go along with the preface of this amendment "that the government has failed to utilize the financial resources of the province to promote the economic growth of the province." I am in full accord, but as to the procedure of how this is to be corrected, I certainly would have to differ with him, because he says that by establishing industries by public funds where necessary, and I think if this is for the government to do I could not go along because I feel that this should be done by private industry, by people on their own initiative and not be government control led and directed.

Then he goes on on the second point "that the government has agreed to permit outside financial interest to exploit the natural resources of our province for private gain rather than for the well being of the citizens of Manitoba." Here I could go along, and I think this is what is happening up north if this industry does come in. I think we will be spending more in the services that we will be providing for these people than what we will get as revenues from this industry and that we are just going to subsidize it.

The third point that he mentions is that the government has failed to produce a blueprint for the future which would ensure each Manitoban with a reasonable standard of living, a reasonable standard of health care and has failed to provide the necessary educational opportunities to enable our citizens young and old to develop their talents based on ability to absorb knowledge." Certainly I subscribe to the last part of that paragraph. However I will find it difficult supporting parts of it and not subscribing to other parts.

So, Madam Speaker, these are a few words that I had to voice here tonight. I felt sorry that some of the things that I had intended to say were in part said by others, and therefore had to do it in the best possible manner I could under the circumstances.

Now at noon today I was going to discuss a matter in connection with the flooding that is taking place in the Gretna-Hockstadt area. I put a question or two to the Honourable Minister but I was unable to discuss it properly. Now I had some material with me before but I think I'll have left some of it at the hotel, but I would like to make a few more comments in connection with this. I was informed by the people of this area that the flood waters had gathered on the southside of the Canada-U.S. border and that the people on the south side would not do anything about it. They would not open any of their dikes or their roadways, but when it came to opening up, they requested that this be done, that the dike be cut and have the flood waters come into Manitoba. I was also informed that if these waters had been given a chance they would have diverted back into Pembina on its own if they'd just been given a little more time. Now we find that

(MR. FROESE cont'd)... these farmers are in real difficulty. There was no warning given, and not knowing that this would come about they had not made the necessary preparations, and now they are in serious difficulty in places.

The cut that was made is much larger than what was reported. The picture in the papers just shows a very small cut, yet the actual cut that is there and was made was 30 feet long and about 4 feet deep, so that once water starts rushing through a channel like that there is no holding, and you can't hold it back. If this blasting had not been done the waters would at least have stayed at the level to the top of the dike, and the water could have run off more slowly and would not have caused the damage that we now see taking place in that area. I was also informed that the blasting had been done by the Americans, and I think the Minister told us this as well, and this was not done by the Canadians, but it was done under the authority of the Minister of this province. I think the matter should have been brought to the attention of the Council or Council members. One of the Council members had been there until 11:30 that night in the company of the two of the Canadian people and there was no mention of blasting the dike at that time yet a short time after this took place. I feel that in a case like this where authorization is given certainly the least we could do would be to inform or advise these people that this was taking place, and that they could expect flooding and that they could prepare. As a result no doubt there will be losses, and these are the very people that have had losses for three or four years now because of flooding from U. S. waters before, and when they made application for assistance from the Provincial Government here, they were advised that this was an Act of God and received nothing. This has happened several times now and I feel that this is wrong too; that these people should have received assistance. Especially now I would like to have assurance that assistance will be coming forward once the damage is assessed in this area.

I am unable to say just how large an area is flooded at the present time but it is a large area I am informed. The blasting too had a deafening effect and we were more or less led to believe that this was a minor nature and not much in the way of effect was felt; however this is not the case. Certainly anyone knows that if the waters are high and if you just need a small cut for that matter, once you have a cut that the cut will enlarge and widen and very fast, and in this way will enlarge and as a result you will have serious flooding.

On the American side too there was vacant land, there were no farmers in the immediate area. They wouldn't have suffered any losses, nothing whatever. However, now that the cut was made on this side of the border we have many farmers in the area and who will be affected. Had the waters been left on the American side and given a chance to run off - and this would have been the case - it probably would have taken some time, probably some of the water would have gone over the dike this way, but certainly we wouldn't be blamed in this way now.

So, Madam Speaker, these are some of the comments that I wanted to make and I hope that everything will work out to the mutual and best advantage and that this government will see to it that where losses are suffered something will be done about it.

MR. LYON: Madam Speaker, after listening to the Honourable Member for Rhineland for the past 35 minutes I thought this might be an opportune time to say a few words on behalf of the government with respect to some of the debate that has transpired over the past few days. While much of the rebuttal has already been given by those who spoke previously I suppose there are a few areas that I could touch on lightly, and at this time I should in conformity with the rules advise you, Madam Speaker, that I am speaking on behalf of the government at this time, and if by any chance I happen to exceed the 40 minute time limit you will know that I have the authority of my honourable friend on my left to do so. (Interjection) One fall every 40 minutes he says. I'll probably have more than that by the time I finish.

I couldn't begin my remarks tonight, Madam Speaker, dealing with the Budget of the Province of Manitoba, the whole financial fiscal and economic situation of this province, without paying some attention at the beginning of my remarks to the situation in which the province finds itself today with respect to flooding on the Red River. I had perhaps hoped, but that was a hope obviously in vain, to have heard something from the previous speaker of the general nature of this growing emergency which faces a good portion of the people of this province; but as I say, my hopes were in vain. Instead, tonight, as was the case this afternoon, we are treated to a dissertation by the honourable member on certain allegations that have been given to him, and which he is entitled to believe, although not necessarily spread all over the face of Manitoba, in connection with a small bit of flooding that is occurring in his constituency, and which he alleges -- falsely, so I am told by the Minister of Agriculture and as he said today on the Orders of the Day, was caused by forces from outside of this country.

(MR. LYON cont'd)...

I sometimes wonder in this Legislature if it ever occurs to honourable members, including the Honourable Member for Rhineland, that we are here to represent all of the people of Manitoba with respect to all of the problems that they face. Here we are on this date today, the 5th of April, 1966, because of the flood situation that has occurred south of the border and that is now occurring north of the border, unfortunately, we have had to issue yesterday a stand-by order of evacuation for three of our major towns in the Red River valley; Emerson, St. Jean and Morris, and hundreds of people in those towns tonight, while we're sitting here listening to my honourable friend from Rhineland are packing their bags, moving out of their homes, going to other places of accommodation. It's nobody's fault, it's the fault of the river. But this is something that is assuming proportions of some severe emergency for these people. Several hundred; a few thousand. We hope the figure won't have to go too much higher.

The First Minister of this province went on television tonight at 5 minutes to 7 and announced that we would have to raise by a foot and a half to approximately two feet all of the primary dikes in Greater Winnipeg because of the most recent flood forecast that had been given to us, and assured all of the people on television and radio, as I assure you now from the information that we have, that this is being done as an extra measure of security for those people living behind the primary dikes. But it is a massive undertaking to put another two feet of earth fill on something like 56 miles of primary dikes within the Greater Winnipeg system that now have to be built up to this extra level to accommodate this anticipated further flood water. And in general terms this is the situation that we face tonight. No reason for panic. We have preparations well in hand as I think all members on all sides of the House appreciate. May I say that the absence of critical comment from all sides indicates that there is a general assumption, I presume, from all parts of the House that the general plans that have been taken thus far are satisfactory. We are lucky to have had the lead time that we have, and we have made preparations that I think will protect not only the lives but the property of the bulk of the citizens of Manitoba in the Red River Valley.

These are rather massive undertakings that have been going on in the last two or three weeks, Madam Speaker. Hundreds of thousands of cubic yards of dirt have been moved right within this city. I'm not going to invite honourable members to go out and take a look at the dikes because they might be classified then as sight-seers and we are trying to encourage sight-seers not to get into these areas. Numerous meetings have been held by provincial authorities, federal authorities, municipal authorities. In my own municipality, the mayor, the council, the municipal engineer, in a municipality where we have 15.5 miles of primary dike to raise up to the 30 feet level (that's all been done, by the way) have been going around the clock now for something like two weeks, trying to get everything in preparation for the impending crest. There has been the utmost of co-operation from all authorities in dealing with these matters.

I hesitate to do this but he is here, and I do it in his presence; I pay a word of commendation to the Minister of Agriculture and Conservation who has been filling in for the past ten days for the First Minister during his illness, and giving the over-all direction to these flood preparation plans which have materialized and which I think will be responsible, God willing, for the protection of property and for the protection particularly, of people when the forthcoming crest does arrive. This is the background. And I want to say, Madam Speaker that faced with this kind of a situation, -- we've gone through it before and I'm sure we'll come through this one with our flags flying -- but faced with this kind of a situation where there is a limited emergency in these communities in the southern part of Manitoba, great preparations going on in this great Metropolitan area with 500,000 people, it makes one wonder when one has to be treated to something like 10 or 15 minutes of debate by an honourable member who's complaining about an alleged flooding of a municipal road in part of his constituency. I would hope that that will be all that he will have cause to complain about after the flood waters have come and have gone from southern Manitoba. And I would ask for his indulgence in trying to look at the broad picture that is affecting the people of the Red River Valley today and to try to take a broader view of the kind of emergency that is facing all of southern Manitoba today. Parish pump politics, Madam Speaker, has its place and its time but this is neither the time nor the place for parish pump politics.

I turn now, if I may Madam Speaker, to the remarks of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, and it's not an unusual situation. I don't find that we agree on all matters. I have been sitting on this side of the House now for some eight years. My honourable friend was

(MR. LYON cont'd). . . elected some few years before that so he has had the advantage of sitting both in government and in opposition. I've heard him respond to the budget speech for something like six years now as Leader of the Opposition, and I always enjoy his remarks because he makes a good speech - a good peppy speech. And he's a good headline grabber and I commend him for it because that's part of his business, but I want to say Madam Speaker, that after listening to these six years of speeches I do wish that he would begin to change his text, because we have had quoted back to us for each of these six years that I can remember - and prior to that by the former Leader of the Liberal Party of Manitoba - a rather stale quotation from the Honourable the First Minister which occurred, so we are told, back in 1952, and then of recent years we've been treated to the Canadian Tax Foundation and their comments, properly excerpted to suit the convenience of my honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition, not always quoted in full context, to indicate to this province he's riding a pole backwards on the road to ruin.

Well, these are the two texts. We have the one quote from the Premier, 1952, and then the Canadian Tax Foundation. And you know, the first time that my honourable friend spoke I got up and paid some attention to this Canadian Tax Foundation. I'd been receiving that document for a number of years and reading it, and I started to read it a bit more carefully after he started quoting so voluminously from its pages, and, I began to find that all the Canadian Tax Foundation was saying was that if every province in Canada kept their books the same way as Ottawa, this is the way the situation would be. An understandable thing but a hypothetical situation because all of the provinces in Canada don't keep their books the same as Ottawa, and far from going on to say that all of the provinces in Canada should keep their books the same as Ottawa, which is what my honourable friend implies, they merely say that some day there might be some rationalization of this bookkeeping scheme as between provinces and the federal government, but until there was, they would adopt one standard formula, which was the federal formula, for indicating such matters of great concern to the Opposition as Debt - Debt with a capital D - and other matters that they are wont to refer to on so many occasions.

So there we have the text - the lesson for today. The Premier's speech of 1952 - three sentences I think it was - and the Canadian Tax Foundation; and I want to ask my honourable friend from the Liberal Party, Madam Speaker, that if the Canadian Tax Foundation were to go out of business tomorrow, what would they do for a budget speech next year? I don't really know. I search and I search in vain for a of an original thought on behalf of the Opposition of this province.

Now the Opposition has a greater role than just that of opposing. This is a theme that has been spoken of before. The Honourable Member for Assiniboia is familiar with it. The Opposition have a role, Madam Speaker, to present themselves to the public of Manitoba as a viable alternative to the present government of Manitoba, and if you're going to be a viable alternative to anything then you must have some ideas of your own. It's not good enough to say because the Tax Foundation says this, we say "me too", or because Mr. Roblin said this in 1952, isn't that dreadful and why is he Premier of Manitoba today? That isn't quite good enough in 1966. What is good enough in 1966 is for an opposition party - and here I doff my hat, at least partially, to the members of the New Democratic Party - to say, "Not only are you wrong here but here is at least a suggested alternative." We may not agree with the alternative. The public of this province may not - and I hope not - will not agree with the alternative, but at least they present us with an alternative, and here, Madam Speaker, is the great dilemma in which the Liberal Party of Manitoba finds itself today: opposition for the sake of opposition, quotes from newspapers, Canadian Tax Foundations, old and forgotten speeches; but an original thought - never. An alternative - never. Some idea of what the future of this province is - why, never. Picking over the picayune, small tidbits, that in their day I suppose were good enough for the people of Manitoba, according to their standards of judgment, but which today - and by "theirs" I mean the Liberal Party standards of judgment - but which today do not measure up to the hopes and the ideals and the aspirations of the people of Manitoba, who know that they are in a province which is developing, who know that they are in a province which is achieving gradually albeit, but achieving its place under the sun, in the economic and other suns of this country.

So I say by way of general introduction to what my honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition said that I would hope that should fortune favour him to be around to make the comment on the next budget speech in Manitoba that he will choose for his text something new, something different, some alternative, some original ideas, something better than has been the rather tired and chewy old fare that we've had over the past few years.

(MR. LYON cont'd)...

But I think I know the problem that afflicts the party, the Official Opposition Party, and as is manifested by the speech made by its leader. The Liberal Party of Manitoba today, Madam Speaker, for better or for worse - I don't say this in a derogatory fashion - is the philosophical disciple of what went before it. It's the philosophical disciple today - and its leader manifests this in his speeches - of the debt-depressive attitude which governed this province under its leadership for so many years. Philosophically I think my honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition believes what he says about debt. I think he is concerned about it. I really don't think that he understands the difference between dead weight debt and debt that is self-sustaining. I think he is concerned more about the word "debt" than he is about any of the distinctions that can be made on this or any other side of the House, or by talking to anybody who has kindergarten knowledge of public finance today. And as I say, I say this not in a derogatory sense because I think this is part of the dilemma that faces the Liberal Party today. And who among my friends in the Liberal Party, who was it among them who said after the recent political debacle that they suffered on the 7th of November in 1965, who was it among them who said, "We're going to have to work like heck just to keep where we are in Manitoba?" I don't know which one it was, but I want to say that they have a man of long vision in their party. I don't know if he wants to identify himself or not. He has certain Cassandra-like attitudes but nonetheless I think he is directly on point. I don't have the article in front of me - I think it was by-lined under Peter Liba in the Winnipeg Tribune - quoting an un-named but very wise member of the Liberal back-bench who said that they were going to have to work like the dickens just to keep what they had because they could feel the hot breath of my honourable friend the Leader of the New Democratic Party on their neck. They couldn't see anything in front of them, they could just feel that breath on their neck. And I think that man - and if he wants to stand up and identify himself I think we'd all be prepared to give him some acknowledgement tonight - I think that man, whoever he is among the noble ranks across us, deserves some special commendation for his insight and for his wisdom, because until they cure within themselves this philosophical dilemma that they now face, that they now manifest so clearly, they are not going anywhere in Manitoba. They not only will not present a viable alternative to the people of Manitoba, they never will be a viable alternative to the present government, because they are torn and rent within themselves on this philosophic idea of what government should be doing in 1966.

Oh, occasionally you know, we say, "Well, here's what they're doing in New Brunswick or here's what they're doing in Saskatchewan, or here's what the federal government's doing, but does it have any impact? No, they don't care. "We don't care what's going on in New Brunswick or Saskatchewan or the federal government. We want to talk about policies in Manitoba." That's what they say, and there's - the Honourable Member for Gladstone confirms this -- (Interjection) -- that's right. My honourable friend says he doesn't care what's going on in Saskatchewan or Alberta or anywhere else. In fact, it might be said that my honourable friend doesn't care what's going on outside of Gladstone-Neepawa. --(Interjection)--yes, well, we can --let my honourable friend continue. I enjoy his speeches. I think he is beginning to earn that appellation that was once given to him as being the poor man's Will Rogers, and I'm wondering now as I hear him talking whether or not he is the honourable member who had the wisdom and erudition to point out to the newspaper columnist that the Liberal Party was really going to have to scrape to keep up with where they were in Manitoba. I doubt it, but I wonder if he was.

..... continued on next page

(MR. LYON cont'd.)

Well, Madam Speaker, what about this philosophical difference, because I can see this manifested, as I say, in my honourable friend, the Leader of the Opposition. He spends a third of his speech talking about debt - "the debt in Manitoba is a matter of grave concern." He has this five-member family, as the Honourable the Minister of Utilities said last night, worried sick to death lest they wake up tomorrow morning and find, my heavens, they have to pay back 3,000 bucks all of a sudden. Oh, it's a great thing. You quote these figures, you know, and you say, "Isn't that shocking? You know, every mother and father and three children in Manitoba you've got X number of dollars bending over your head because of the terrible Roblin government." It doesn't matter that when you reach for the light switch and pull on the switch the light's going to go on, or when you pick up the telephone you're going to be able to use it, or that the money is going into industrial development providing now thousands of jobs in Manitoba, or into Agricultural Credit, giving the farmers of this province something that they haven't had in the 40 bleak years before this government came to office. All of these things don't matter because it's debts that counts. This terrible word "debt" burned into the hearts and minds of this party during the years when they had responsibility for public affairs in this province. Debt-depressive is the word that we read more often nowadays about people of this ilk. They're a fast-disappearing lot, but it's amazing to find them in the numbers that we still do opposite us in this House. You would have to shake the sheets practically all over Manitoba to find as many as you find here in this House, Madam Speaker, but here they sit, these debt-depressive people. Worried about the debt. -- (Interjection) -- Well, I know my honourable friend from St. George doesn't want me to labour that point. I know it's troublesome to him, but I was leading up to the second branch of it because I want to point out the split personality that we find among these people. A split personality, because my honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition, while being a philosophical disciple of this debt-depressive group, is a political disciple of, whom shall we say? Jack Pickersgill; Roger Teillet; Joey Smallwood; some other notable Grits.

MR. DESJARDINS: Savigney?

MR. LYON: I am glad to hear that retort from the Honourable Member . . . -- (Interjection) --

MR. MOLGAT: I regret I must deny that allegation.

MR. LYON: I'm glad to hear that allegation from my honourable friend from St. Boniface. I am sure that he is much more preoccupied with such matters than are other member of the House, but in any case if he is a disciple of Cardinism, I am glad to hear him say so tonight in the House, but I don't even believe that of my honourable friend from St. Boniface. But who are the political philosophers? Who are they, the political disciples of Manitoba today? Because they know philosophically, at least the Leader of the Opposition I am sure does, that this debt idea is going to get them nowhere politically. It's about as out of date as the Model T Ford and he knows it, but he still gets up and talks about it. He thinks there is a lingering group of people in Manitoba who perhaps will pay some attention to him, but he's having real doubts about it now, so he's got this split personality. Though philosophically he's a Campbell Liberal, politically he wants to be a Jean Lesage of Manitoba. I guess that would be the best example. -- (Interjection) --

MR. DESJARDINS: What do you want to do, replace Duff?

MR. LYON: Madam Speaker, I don't want to replace the Premier. My honourable friends do. But I'm merely trying to point out to them why they never will.

MR. DESJARDINS: You couldn't replace him as leader, that's for sure.

MR. LYON: So my honourable friend, the Leader of the Opposition sits in this very funny position today of, on the one hand saying and I think believing, that debt is a terrible thing in Manitoba, and on the other hand knowing darn well that if you are going to support the standard of services that the broad majority of the people of Manitoba want today, that you have to have the kind of debt structure that this and every other province in Canada has, and furthermore, knowing full well that even though he opposes such things as heat tax - he's still talking about the heat tax, whipping that dead horse - and though he says he opposes such things, he knows in his heart of hearts that the kind of political philosophy that he is adhering to today has no place in 1966. So what's he going to do about it? Is he going to go to the people of Manitoba talking about debt out of one corner of his mouth and about building more hospital beds out of the other, because the two don't add up, you know. If you are going to build all these beds that he talks about, he and his great social reformers on occasion, on the other side. They want

1566

(MR. LYON cont'd.) more hospital beds, greater consolidation of schools. "Why didn't you build this road in my constituency? Why don't you pay the teachers more? What about an increase in teachers' grants? We're all for more for retarded children. We're all for motherhood and against sin" - that's what it amounts to. But no suggestion whatsoever, no reality about where this money is supposed to come from. "Ah," they say, "elect us and we'll have," what is the word? "We'll give more prudent, more prudent government, and we won't have to worry about increased taxation because we'll run things so much more cheaply. Well the people of Manitoba had this kind of prudent government for what was it, 12, 22, 40 years? Take your choice.

MR. DESJARDINS: have coalition.

MR. LYON: "Have coalition," he says. Well, Madam Speaker, we know the political philosophy of these people, and if we ever have any doubt about the political philosophy which still manifests itself today; the long shadow of that regime not only hangs over this party today, it sits with them. And any time we want to find out about what that long shadow is and what the political philosophy is that I'm talking about, we don't have to look to recent editorial writings or anything like that at all. We can go to a much better source. We can go to one of the foremost historians in Canada, Professor William Morton, who wrote Manitoba History, a book that I very often resort to when I become a little discouraged after listening to my honourable friends opposite about the future of this province. I look back at the history of this province as written by Professor Morton, and it's certainly enough to give one heart even after listening to the speeches from the Liberal Opposition opposite.

And here is what I'm talking about - my honourable friends know it as well as I do. We're talking about this government that persisted and persisted and persisted, up until 1957 until 1958, until it was finally defeated, a government that went through various phases of development from Progressive to Progressive-Liberal to Coalition, back to Progressive-Liberal then to Liberal-Progressive, a doubting Liberal-Progressive but still Liberal-Progressive in 1958.

Going back to some of its earlier years when the philosophical forebears of the present Leader of the Opposition and his party were in control, the ones at whose feet they still do penance, here is what Professor Morton says on Page 462 of his Manitoba History: "The long ordeal of the twenties and the thirties had imposed a saving prudence on both the provincial administration and the provincial electorate. All the pragmatic character of the government assured its abstention from extremes of doctrine. Nothing revealed this attitude more clearly than the adoption of a plan of retirement of dead-weight debt at a rate and on a scale which severely reduced the funds available for public services. There was indeed a touch of extravagance," says Professor Morton, "in this haste to retire a debt dwindling in the steady inflation. The Garson and Campbell administrations were debt-depressives." Unquote.

Now my honourable friends wonder, when occasionally from this side of the House we advance this theory to them that they were, and are today, debt-depressives, what we are talking about. This is exactly what we are talking about; the same philosophy that permeates their thinking today. They're beginning to have doubts about it, but not to the point, not to the point, Madam Speaker, where they're willing to give it up. Debt-depressives. They're concerned about surpluses being brought forward in our Budget. They've said every year, "What's going to happen next year when you don't have a surplus?" just as they've said every year how next year there is going to be a sales tax. We've heard that for eight years too. But, Madam Speaker, here is the underlying philosophy of these people.

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker, may I ask my honourable friend a question?

MR. LYON: After I am finished, Madam Speaker.

MR. CAMPBELL: probably, it would be more appropriate now.

MR. LYON: Well it may be less appropriate when I'm finished.

MR. CAMPBELL: No, No. Quite appropriate now. Would my honourable friend

MR. LYON: No, Madam Speaker, I would like to continue. Madam Speaker, carrying on, the more the long-continuing administration begun in 1922 changed, the more it was the same thing, an agrarian and rural government, non-partisan, non-political and independent of, if not unco-operative with the National Liberal Party. The more it changed the more it remained the same. How appropriate are those words today about the philosophy of my honourable friends opposite. And what about his final words concerning this administration, the philosophy of which is still so vividly apparent in my honourable friends opposite in all they say and all they do with respect to the public affairs of this province.

(MR. LYON cont'd.)

What does he say on Page 464? "The constriction of the representative system was one indication that the pragmatic mind which had governed Manitoba for a generation, and served it well in hard and trying times, was now revealing its inherent limitations." And here I add, Madam Speaker, it's still revealing its inherent limitations. "Parliamentary and responsible government had been seriously, if not fatally impaired by the persistent confusion of government with administration." Is any footnote needed to that comment today? "The task of democratic government to lead, inform and inspire had been deliberately neglected by Ministers who bound themselves to their desk doing the administrative work which should have been left to their departments. And the same Ministers, largely trained in municipal affairs, reduced provincial government to municipal administration. This led them to look to the electorate, not to the Legislature, as the source of power. The result was the creation of a plebiscitary democracy, and the degradation, both of the Legislature and the Crown by a Cabinet exercising an excessive and usurped influence. The long stifling of debate on political principles, the long insistence on administration rather than politics, had ended in a groove of routine, an incapacity to comprehend opposing points of view," - any footnote needed? - "or to envisage new opportunities and new lines of advance. Renewal by recruitment of new men to the government offered only a slight hope that men of genuine independence and challenging capacity would be chosen. The impatient surge of a new generation," - and here I digress, that generation which has now taken over in Manitoba - "the impatient surge of a new generation of public men to whom the past might be a springboard rather than a pedestal, and who might feel impelled to develop talent rather than demonstrate mediocrity, was much to be desired." Unquote.

Madam Speaker, if my honourable friends wished me to continue at any length on the philosophy about which I speak, there it is. There it is. And so I say to my honourable friends that while they may be concerned about debt today, and they have this debt-depressive attitude, and they're entitled to have it, but I merely point out to them that history moves on, and what was good enough in 1935 or 1945 or even 1958 is not good enough today, and that we require new challenges and new initiatives from the Opposition if they are to provide that kind of viable alternative to government that every proper democratic government needs if it is to give its best. I say again, without attempting to flatter my honourable friends from the NDP that they do fulfill that role on many more occasions than do the Official Opposition, because they do provide at least an alternative; if not one that we agree with, at least an alternative.

Well, Madam Speaker, enough about debt. I think we know where our honourable friends stand on debt and I think we know why they stand there, and I think we realize that they are probably going to stand there for a good many years to come.

Madam Speaker, there are many other figure-juggling exercises that one could go through in commenting on the speech of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition. It seems that if he bats a few figures around, why perhaps we should give him a few back just to reassure him again that things aren't as bad in Manitoba as he would like us to believe they are, but I suggest to him, Madam Speaker, that the substantial facts of growth in Manitoba are demonstrated not so much by statistics as they are by the attitudes of the people of this province. We have a young, dynamic people in this province, people by and large who want to make their futures here and who want to see this province grow and develop. We have people here today who are - - "inflamed" is perhaps too strong an adjective, or too strong a verb, but who are tremendously excited by the future prospects not only for themselves but for their families, by such projects as the Nelson River project; people who think it is a good thing for Manitoba to get new industry into our province, whether it's developing mines or developing forests, or whatever; people in Western Manitoba for example, Madam Speaker, who think that the new chemical fertilizer plant in Brandon is an excellent thing, not only for Brandon but for all of Manitoba.

These are the kinds of things that this generation of Manitobans, this generation of new Manitobans are looking for. This is the kind of development they want to see going on in their province. I think they're impressed by the fact that since 1958 - we know, we all know, and these are indisputable facts - that some 323 new firms have established operations in our province, that some 32,000 new jobs have been added to the total of employment opportunities in this province; that some \$276 million in new manufacturing investment has been put into place, and that a total of all the classes of new investments, public and private, of three billion, 391 million dollars have been committed in Manitoba over the past seven years. I think they're impressed as well, Madam Speaker, by the fact - we all know it to be the case that manufacturing

(MR. LYON cont'd.) . . . shipments have increased by over 48 percent since 1958 and the present, and if comparisons have to be made (and I'm sure my honourable friends want to make them occasionally) in Saskatchewan, a comparable province, the rate of growth was only 35 percent. I'm sure they're aware of the fact, these new Manitobans, this new generation that is going to make the future of this province, that retail trade in our province cost a billion dollars last year and that was up 253 million or 34 percent over the 1958 level. They're not going to argue about these facts at all. They know that our mineral output is up to \$182 million this year, and that that's 219 percent more than it was in 1958. They know that our electric power output was higher by 2 billion, 260 million kilowatt hours in 1965 over the 1958 figure, a rise of 69 percent. They know it well, Madam Speaker, that personal income in this province in 1965 was 45 percent higher in aggregate than in 1958, and on a per capita basis the rise was by 32 percent. These people know this, and all of the poor-mouth talk about debt and about taxes, I suggest to my honourable friend, with regret, it doesn't mean too much to these people because really they know better.

A lot of these people lived through that philosophical period that I was just talking about. They know. They can make the contrast. They know, when they drive in Manitoba today, the standard of roads that they drive on. They know when they send their children to school the quality of the education that their children are getting, whether in urban or in rural areas. You can't fool people in rural Manitoba about the quality of education or the quality of roads. You can't fool people in rural Manitoba, Madam Speaker, about anything. You can't fool them about anything, and I say no more. I say no more, but I hope my honourable friends have heard that. They know what's happening in this province just as well as everyone else does, and they know of the tremendous advancements and achievements that have been made in the last eight years. That's not to say by any means that we or anyone in this House can be complacent about those advances. Not one bit. We've got a long way to go in all of these fields. Who can say that we have reached the millenium in education. Of course we haven't. We've got a long way to go. My honourable friends say, "Read from the Economic Consultative Report." I did read from it, and are they prepared to accept the medicine that goes with the recommendation there that our educational estimates and accordingly the taxation of the people of Manitoba over the next four years is going to have to be increased by 50 percent? They're prepared to accept the benefits but they're not prepared to take the medicine that is required for the benefits. You can't have both, Madam Speaker. You can't have it one way and not the other. So I say to them, read the report; read it well; because it points out to them some of the eternal verities of finance with which they are apparently unfamiliar, and remember again that the people of Manitoba know just as well that if you have these services, and they want and demand these services, that you have to pay for them.

Madam Speaker, we could go over figures all night. I don't think it's necessary to go over figures because I know that nothing that I will say to my honourable friends will convince them any more than what they say to me convinces me, but I think the substantial proportion of the people of Manitoba are satisfied that this province has progressed as perhaps many of them thought it never could progress in the past eight years. And I think further, Madam Speaker, that they're satisfied that a continuation of the present stewardship will ensure that kind of progress in years to come. I don't know if they're willing to take a chance. I do know that I'm being modest when I say I don't know. I'm sure that they're not willing to take a chance on turning back the reins of government to my honourable friends opposite. I'm not concerned about that.

There's a great preoccupation, Madam Speaker - there has been throughout this whole session by my honourable friends in the Liberal Party - with the forthcoming election. It's almost becoming now a fixation with them. I don't know if they look upon it as an evil day or what; a day of judgment; a doomsday; but they have this fixation with the day of the election. There is a little concern, not too much concern, in the NDP. There is very little concern on this side about the election. But there is this almost neurotic concern among my friends in the Liberal Party with an election. Well, Madam Speaker, elections come and elections go and this one's going to come some time, and I hope that -- (Interjection) -- well, I like their faces; I hope that not too many of them go, but I'm afraid for them, and I do hope, Madam Speaker, that between now and the time whenever that election comes that they may have a chance to sit quietly and consider this political philosophy that I have been talking about tonight, to judge whether or not they should not begin to turn over a new philosophical leaf and try to make some new initiatives in the development of public policies in the Province of Manitoba.

(MR. LYON cont'd.)

Madam Speaker, I hadn't intended to speak this long, but I find the subject matter of such consuming interest that I have gone on a bit longer than I expected.

Madam Speaker, I took copious notes from my honourable friends, and I'm sure that . . .

MR. JOHNSTON: While the honourable member is gathering his wits, would he permit a question?

MR. LYON: In a few moments, Madam Speaker. There are just a few delightful little tidbits that were left coming out of my honourable friend's speech, because there was one statement that he made that really caught my attention, because he was preaching back to me what I had been saying to him for some time. He made the statement, he said that if you repeat something often enough, no matter how wrong it may be, sometimes a portion of the public will begin to believe it, and he indicated that that was the desire of the Government of Manitoba. Madam Speaker, he's been talking about Debt, oh that Capital D Debt, for the last six years in Manitoba, hoping that people would buy this idea of a consuming debt that faces our family, our fictional family of five. He says that we have the second highest - and here's the kind of glib statement that he makes - second highest rate of personal income tax in Canada. That's true, but I think there's a job you know on the part of both government and opposition to not only state facts out of context but to give the full picture. Of course we have the second highest rate of personal income tax in Manitoba, but of course we don't have any five percent sales tax in Manitoba, none at all. Now there's my honourable friend from St. George, my delightful friend from St. George, talking about heat. He's the greatest whipper of dead horses in this House and he's going to whip that old nag right down to the election line, Madam Speaker, because he's got very little else to talk about, and I wish him well. I haven't had the opportunity now for about two elections campaigning in his constituency. Fortune may be good to me this time.

MR. GUTTORMSON: I'll take you around and show you.

MR. LYON: But, Madam Speaker, I hope he carries on in that one for a long time because he's got a preoccupation with the past that's almost as good as some of the front benchers that sit in front of him, and if he wants to go around talking about history in Manitoba, why that's fine -- talking about history of taxation fine and dandy, but I think, Madam Speaker, the people in his constituency and the rest of Manitoba are going to be a little bit more interested about the taxation policies of the Liberal Party if they believe in the Economic Consultative Report, the taxation policies that they will adopt to support all of the extra hospital beds that they want built, the retarded children's quarters and so on and so forth.

So, Madam Speaker, I say to my honourable friends, tell the whole story when you're talking about taxation. Don't be afraid to tell the people of Manitoba, don't be afraid one little bit to tell them that of all the major provinces of Canada in terms of provincial and municipal taxation, we have the second lowest taxation of any province save only the Province of Alberta, and you can mention that second highest personal income tax, Madam Speaker, all you wish, but don't be afraid to tell them the rest of the facts of the situation too. Tell them the facts of the Civil Service that were mentioned last night by my honourable friend the Minister of Public Utilities. Tell them about the tremendous increase in provincial grants to municipal corporations in Manitoba, where now approximately on the average something like two-thirds of their funds come from provincial sources of revenue. Tell them about the proportion of their school tax that is paid by the tax rebate system which they apparently don't like, the tax rebate system that is bearing a high proportion of the cost of local and municipal taxation on property, on home owner property in Manitoba. Tell them some of these facts, because this is all part of the total background, Madam Speaker. You can't just be selective and talk about heat tax which is no longer with us; tell them about the whole story. Let my honourable friends also tell the people of Manitoba more particularly, let them tell the people of Manitoba - and they owe this explanation to them - that if all of the policies that they have advocated, whether by way of speech or by resolution in this House, were totalled up, and the capital and the current bills were added to the present large budget of the Province of Manitoba, let them be frank enough to tell the people of Manitoba where all of these blessings would come from in terms of taxation. Let them tell us that, Madam Speaker, because these are the kind of facts that the people of Manitoba want today. I don't think that the kind of comment, the kind of poor-mouth comment that we hear from the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, is quite good enough. It doesn't quite measure up. It's true he's of this generation, but he's not with this generation.

(MR. LYON cont'd.)

So, Madam Speaker, going back to my honourable friend, the unnamed Liberal MLA who made that wise statement, as they carry on for the rest of this session and on into the months ahead, I hope they feel the hot breath of my honourable friend the Leader of the NDP on their necks, and I hope

MADAM SPEAKER:9:30. I must interrupt the proceedings and forthwith put every question on the motion before us.

MR. CAMPBELL: time for the honourable member to answer the question that he promised to answer?

MADAM SPEAKER: Order please, I must put every question at this time. Are you ready for the question?

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

MR. PAULLEY: In support of the government, Madam Speaker, may I have ayes and nays on the motion.

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the members. The question before the House, the proposed motion in further amendment thereto by the Honourable the Member for St. John's. Those in favour of the motion please rise.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I wonder if you would mind reading the motion please.

MADAM SPEAKER: "That the amendment be amended by deleting all the words after the word "regrets" in the first line and substituting the following: 1. That the government has failed to utilize the financial resources of the province to promote the economic growth of the province by (a) establishing industries, by public funds where necessary, to provide employment for our citizens in developing the products of our primary resources and to ensure a fair return to the citizens of Manitoba for their investments. (b) increasing minimum wages, and establishing a monetary return climate which would tend to curtail the exodus of skilled and professional personnel from Manitoba. 2. That the government has agreed to permit outside financial interests to exploit the natural resources of our province for private gain rather than for the well-being of the citizens of Manitoba. 3. That the government has failed to produce a blueprint for the future which would ensure every Manitoban with a reasonable standard of living, a reasonable standard of health and has failed to provide the necessary educational opportunities to enable our citizens young and old to develop their talents based on ability to absorb knowledge."

A standing vote was taken the result being as follows:

YEAS: Messrs. Cherniack, Paulley, Peters, Wright.

NAYS: Messrs. Alexander, Baizley, Barkman, Beard, Bilton, Bjornson, Campbell, Cowan, Desjardins, Evans, Groves, Guttormson, Hamilton, Harrison, Hillhouse, Hryhorczuk, Hutton, Jeannotte, Johnson, Johnston, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McGregor, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Mills, Moeller, Molgat, Patrick, Shoemaker, Smellie, Stanes, Steinkopf, Strickland, Vielfaure, Watt, Weir, Witney, and Mrs. Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 4; Nays, 41.

MADAM SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost. The proposed motion of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition in amendment thereto "THAT the motion be amended by striking out all the words after the word "that" in line one and substituting the following: This House regrets 1. the failure of this Government to give the true facts to the people of Manitoba, regarding the financial affairs of their Province. 2. the failure of this Government during eight years in office to promote adequate economic growth in Manitoba. 3. the failure of this government to take full advantage of the federal assistance programs, particularly in the field of vocational education."

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

YEAS: Messrs. Barkman, Campbell, Cherniack, Desjardins, Froese, Guttormson, Hillhouse, Hryhorczuk, Johnston, Molgat, Patrick, Paulley, Peters, Shoemaker, Vielfaure, Wright.

NAYS: Messrs. Alexander, Baizley, Beard, Bilton, Bjornson, Cowan, Evans, Groves, Hamilton, Harrison, Hutton, Jeannotte, Johnson, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McGregor, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Mills, Moeller, Smellie, Stanes, Steinkopf, Strickland, Watt, Weir, Witney, and Mrs. Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 16; Nays, 30.

MADAM SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost. The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable - order please. The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of

(MADAM SPEAKER cont'd.) the Honourable the First Minister THAT the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Ways and Means for raising of Supply to be granted to Her Majesty. Those in favour of the motion please rise. -- (Interjection) -- Agreed on the same division? Agreed. Would the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre please take the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF WAYS AND MEANS

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution before the Committee, Resolved that towards making good the sums of money granted to Her Majesty for the public service of the province for the fiscal year ending the 31st day of March, 1967, the sum of \$284,271,677 be granted out of the Consolidated Fund. Resolution passed.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, is there no resolution to be presented to the House? There's been no motion as far as I know from the Minister that this motion be entertained and we pass \$298 million or whatever it is that we're asked to be passed?

MR. EVANS: debate that we've had for eight sitting days as concerned going into committee to consider this resolution.

MR. PAULLEY:..if I may, the House Leader is perfectly correct I believe; it was the motion that was passed. I confess that as one of the members of the Committee, I'm in the unfortunate position at the present time of not having before me the details of the revenue. I believe we did receive them - I believe they were tabled, possibly the Clerk can correct me through you, Mr. Chairman. I believe they were presented but I'm in the unfortunate position, and I'm sure that this is so with most of the members of the Committee, that we haven't the documents with us at the present time and I wonder whether or not it might suit the convenience of the Committee and the House if either we take a five minute recess so that we can go and get them, or in the alternative that we call it 10:00 o'clock so that we can go into the motion again tomorrow.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I think we should raise another point in addition to that and that is that we have not completed the estimates and after all while technically I'm sure that we're quite okay because we're in Committee of Ways and Means, but I for one, would protest vigorously if we were going to pass the item for the raising of the "whole" of the Supply that's being granted to Her Majesty at this time, and as I listened to the resolution that Mr. Chairman read, it seems to me that that was the whole of the vote. Is that correct?

MR. CHAIRMAN: amounts to be paid to members of the Legislature. statutory.

MR. CAMPBELL: Yes, that's it. Those are statutory. This is really the whole amount that we have to raise by the Ways and Means motion, and inasmuch as we have not yet completed the Supply with one or two whole departments to go yet, I think it would be incorrect procedure, and certainly it would not be a practice that I would like to adopt, if we passed this motion now. So what I suggest to the Leader of the House, Mr. Chairman, is that we're properly in Committee of Ways and Means, but I would think that the proper procedure is to report progress, ask leave to sit again and the motion remains on the Order Paper and we go back there when we have completed the Supply. I would think this was the right system because we certainly wouldn't want to pass the Ways and Means for all of the Supply that's to be granted to Her Majesty before we finish the Committee of Supply.

MR. EVANS: like to raise, Mr. Chairman, is this, that I take it there would be no further debate upon the motion to go into Committee of Ways and Means. I am sure that all the parties would wish to register their understanding on that point, that is, limited to eight sitting days, and that has expired.

I acknowledge the weight of the argument that it would be proper to complete the consideration of the Estimates before the money is voted to meet those Estimates. Who knows, my honourable friends might prevail on somebody to reduce my salary to \$1.00 and then we would be able to reduce the Ways and Means accordingly. That would be -- (Interjection) -- There you are, it wouldn't balance any more. So I am quite sure that this is the right -- I was going to say theoretical approach; I don't mean anything unfortunate in that way, I mean technically and theoretically that is the correct approach to the matter. If my honourable friends, as has been done, accept the proposition that the motion to go into Committee of Ways and Means is subject to no further debate during the present Session, I think we should agree then to . . . Does the Committee wish to receive the resolution as it stands? To hear it, present it, perhaps to engage in some debate if they wish, and then we will undertake to have the Committee rise and meet again.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, I think the suggestion that has been made is perfectly sensible and acceptable to us. We certainly don't want to start the debate over again on the motion to go into Committee. We have accepted the rules as they were agreed to by the Committee and by the House and we are prepared to abide by them.

What I would suggest though is that the next time we meet in Committee of Ways and Means, if we could have the Papers that are normally presented to us. I think what we usually get is one four page sheet giving us all the items. At the moment we have them, I think in the brown copy of the final estimates that have been presented to us. We normally get, as I recall it, a separate four page sheet giving us the same information. Now if we know when it's going to come up we can bring our copies of the brown book. If not, if extra copies could be supplied I think it would be helpful to the Committee. As far as we're concerned, we're agreeable to the proposition put to the House not to debate the matter further when it comes up again. That is, not to debate the motion further, not necessarily the items in Committee.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I understand that the figures are in the brown book that you require. There won't be any further figures distributed because they've already been distributed.

MR. PAULLEY: As far as I'm concerned, Mr. Chairman, I think we have the figures. The only request that I'm making is that we don't go into those figures this evening because due to our negligence we haven't them before us - at least I confess this and I am sure this is so with most of the members, and suggest that the Committee rise, make its report, and maybe we can steal ten minutes of government time and go home.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise. Call in the Speaker. Madam Speaker, I wish to report progress and ask leave for the Committee to sit again.

IN SESSION

MR. COWAN: Madam Speaker, I 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. EVANS: Would you be good enough to call the second reading of Bill No. 79 followed by the second reading of Bill No. 81 which I think we can dispose of now?

MADAM SPEAKER: Bill No. 79 and 81? The second reading of Bill No. 79. The Honourable the Minister of Labour.

MR. BAIZLEY presented Bill No. 79, an Act respecting Annual Vacations with Pay for Employees for second reading.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

HON. OBIE BAIZLEY (Minister of Labour) (Osborne): Madam Speaker, I believe the content of the Bill had good explanation at the resolution stage. In the first place the Bill will provide for vacation pay on a pro rata basis of four percent of earnings for employees with less than one year continuous service with an employer, and the second important factor in the Bill will be the elimination of the rather complicated procedure in the present legislation providing four percent for transitory workers.

MR. PATRICK: Madam Speaker, I beg to move seconded by the Honourable Member from Portage la Prairie that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. BAIZLEY presented Bill No. 81, an Act to amend the Workmen's Compensation Act, for second reading.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. BAIZLEY: Madam Speaker, the first major change in this Bill is to increase the widows' pension from \$75.00 to \$100.00 a month. I might say that maximums payable to widows and invalid widowers with children will also be raised \$25.00 a month.

The second provision that is of important in this Act is the compensation factor for recurring injuries. It will be noted after considerable discussion this evening that economics of the province has advanced so much that it's not felt to be fair to have a person paid compensation on earnings at the time of a previous injury if he's off work for the same injury in today's economy. I might say in fairness too, I suggest that the Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party last year went to great length to explain to me and members of this House why he felt that this would be fair. He did mention too, and I give him credit for it, that things had improved so much in Manitoba that the worker should have that benefit.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, just a brief word on the Bill and I want to say to the Honourable the Minister of Labour that I appreciate very much the improvements that are going to be made in the Workmen's Compensation Act. I just have one maybe minor conflict with my honourable friend as to why the change is before us. I think it's because after three or four years of endeavour to convince the Minister of Labour that this change should be made insofar as the basis for the payment of compensation, that he saw the light. I think it was more that he saw the light as to the justness of our cause rather than due to the economic situation in the Province of Manitoba, which we of course during the debate on the Budget so clearly pointed out was not as seen through the rosy glasses of the government.

However, notwithstanding that, Madam Speaker, I want to say I appreciate the fact that at least another battle instituted by the New Democratic Party of Manitoba has been won in an area of compensation. As you know, Madam Speaker, I have had a resolution on the Order Paper since the commencement of the House dealing with this very matter, and now that the Bill has been introduced for second reading, I will subsequently Madam Speaker, remove that clause from the Order Paper.

So I suggest, Madam Speaker, that there are still many improvements that are required insofar as the Workmen's Compensation Act are concerned, and these will be coming, but I do say that this is a step along the right direction. I am sure that I can speak on behalf of many workers, particularly fellow workers, Madam Speaker, in the Canadian National Railway, who have been prejudiced insofar as earnings are concerned, because of the fact that they had an accident some 15 or 20 years ago and their compensation was based on their wages at that time. The wages today have been increased two or three times over and it's only fair the compensation should be based on present costs of living or present wage rates rather than before. So I am sure, Madam Speaker, that this will be appreciated by many workers that I know have suffered as a result of the present legislation.

MR. PATRICK: Madam Speaker, may I also make a few comments on this legislation. I believe it's a step in the right direction but I am somewhat concerned - the raise from \$75.00 to \$100.00 if this is going far enough, because if I look at the other provinces, to Saskatchewan and Ontario, it is quite a bit higher than what the Minister proposed in here. The other section, or the other principle in the Bill is allowances or increases for children. I see that the Minister has seen it necessary to increase the compensation for widows from \$75.00 to \$100.00, but for some unknown reason in the Bill he has not seen it necessary to increase the allowance for the children. I can't seem to understand why because he seemed to have followed the same principle in one place, surely he probably should have followed in the other case. The reason for this, as we all know there is certainly a higher cost of living today, and I can't see no reason at all why he hasn't increased compensation for the children as well since he did seem it reasonable and necessary to increase it for the widows in this instance. That's the only point that I wanted to raise on this matter, Madam Speaker.

MR. JOHNSTON: I beg to move seconded by the Honourable Member for Assiniboia that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. EVANS: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources that the House do now adjourn.

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