

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Monday, February 14, 1966

Opening Prayer by Madam Speaker.

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

The Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q. C. (Minister of Mines and Natural Resources) (Fort Garry): Introduced Bill No. 48, an Act respecting the Boundaries between the Province of Manitoba and Saskatchewan; and Bill No. 49, an Act respecting the Boundary between the Province of Manitoba and the Northwest Territories.

MR. D. M. STANES (St. James): Introduced Bill No. 17, an Act to amend the St. James Charter.

MR. WILLIAM H. HAMILTON (Dufferin) introduced Bill No. 32, an Act respecting the Town of Winkler.

MR. JAMES H. BILTON (Swan River) introduced Bill No. 45, an Act to amend the Flin Flon Charter.

MR. JAMES COWAN (Winnipeg Centre) introduced Bill No. 36, an Act to validate By-Law No. 1081 of the Town of Tuxedo and Bill No. 40, an Act respecting the Registration of Psychologists.

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George) introduced Bill No. 21, an Act to amend an Act to incorporate the J.W. Dafoe Foundation.

HON. GEORGE HUTTON (Minister of Agriculture and Conservation) (Rockwood-Iberville): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, that Madam Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the following proposed resolutions 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. HUTTON: Mr. Chairman, His Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor having been informed of the subject matter of the proposed resolution recommends it to the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The resolution before the Committee is that it is resolved that it is expedient to bring in a measure to amend the Plant Pests and Diseases Act by providing, among other matters, that the government may give financial assistance to the municipalities pursuant to agreements, to assist in the implementation of programs and measure through controlling Dutch Elm Disease.

MR. HUTTON: Mr. Chairman, I would like, first of all, to make it clear that we do not, to our knowledge at this time, have Dutch Elm Disease in Manitoba; but we do know that it is about four or five hundred miles away from us. We know that it travels many thousands of miles from the time of its inception and introduction into Canada and we must always be ready to combat this disease. The best remedy that is known today with which to counteract Dutch Elm Disease are prompt sanitary measures, so therefore it behooves us at all times to keep a very close surveillance on the trees in our different communities in the province and it is with this thought in mind at preparing ourselves, to protect ourselves, that we are introducing measures at this Session of the Legislature. Funds will be required if at any time we should diagnose Dutch Elm Disease in any of our trees.

MR. DOUGLAS L. CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Mr. Chairman, I understood the Honourable the Minister to say that the best measures known at present are what he refers to as "sanitary" measures. Does this mean a spraying program? I'd also like to ask the Minister, Mr. Chairman, if this disease is approaching from the west or east or south. I assume it's not from the north. Is it coming from more than one direction or one in particular? I quite agree with the Minister that it is a proper measure to take to prepare for it because I've seen something of the ravages of this disease in other areas. I agree with the introduction of the measure.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party) (Radisson): Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I might ask the Minister if he could describe this disease. Is it a disease that attacks the leaves of the trees causing them to shrivel up and die; or what is the description?

MR. HUTTON: Well, I'm not a tree doctor but if you saw the leaves in the uppermost branches of your elm tree begin to turn yellow you might think about Dutch Elm Disease. This is one of the symptoms. I'm not going to pretend to try and set out the symptoms and the method of diagnosing that are followed by experienced and trained horticulturists, but this would be one of the things that you would look for.

The disease is mostly likely to attack us from the south following the Red River Valley which has been for a long time the home of a good many of our natural elm growth. When I speak of sanitary measures, I'm speaking principally of pruning and destruction of any diseased material. Apparently the disease is spread by the elm bark beetle. The dead wood on a tree is the host for the beetle and it works from there; so the best method to date of controlling the disease is to destroy the host wherever it exists. So keeping our trees in healthy state, keeping all the dead branches trimmed off, etcetera, is about the most effective method we have today of preventative measures; and it's also once a tree has been diagnosed as being infected, the immediate destruction of that tree is essential.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, I'd just like to ask provided those sanitary measures are taken, is there some spray that is useful as well?

MR. HUTTON: Mr. Chairman, there is a great deal of experimental work being done in the field of chemical control of this disease. I think the most promising area here is the injection of a chemical into the tree to control the disease.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Resolution passed? (Passed) Committee rise and report. Call in the Speaker.

MR. COWAN: Madam Speaker, the Committee has adopted a certain resolution and instructed me to report the same and ask leave to sit again.

IN SESSION

MR. COWAN: Madam Speaker, I move seconded by the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain that the report of the Committee be received.

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

MR. HUTTON introduced Bill No. 50, an Act to amend the Plant Pests Diseases Act.

MADAM SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Education) (Gimli): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to lay on the Table of the House, the Annual Report of the Department of Education for the year ending June 30, 1965.

HON. WALTER WEIR (Minister of Public Works) (Minnedosa): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to lay on the Table the Annual Report of the Department of Public Works for the year ending March 31, 1965.

HON. MAITLAND B. STEINKOPF Q.C. (Provincial Secretary and Minister of Public Utilities) (River Heights): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to table the Annual Report of the Manitoba Centennial Corporation for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1965.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, on Friday last there was considerable discussion in the House, relative to the Nelson River Project. There seemed to be a little competition between one or two gentlemen as to whether or not they may proceed or the likelihood of proceeding. I note one of the honourable gentlemen is not here; I notice one is. I wonder if we might have from the First Minister, any progress report -- I understand he did take a journey to the East of us, I wonder if he has anything to report on this important project.

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier and Provincial Treasurer) (Wolseley): Madam Speaker, it's true, as members know that I was away on Thursday and Friday, and perhaps I might just say that the occasion of my being away was a "goodwill" trip, I suppose that might be a way of describing it, in the Province of Quebec. I had the pleasure of the company of the Minister of Municipal Affairs and a large number of leading municipal men from the Province of Manitoba. We went down for that same event. I must say that we were received, all of us, in a most friendly and hospitable manner, and that -- l'hospitalité qui dévoile un monde formidable. (Translation: hospitality which shows off a formidable people). If anyone has

(MR. ROBLIN cont'd.) ever experienced it before, they will know what I mean. Apropos of the question, it is true that during my visit there I was in touch with the Leader of the Federal negotiating team on the Nelson River and I'm very pleased with the results of negotiations so far. I believe that we have reached an agreement on all the main heads of our understanding. I'm expecting to have written confirmation on it soon and if all goes according to the plan that we discussed over the weekend, a statement should be made both in this House and in the Federal House on Tuesday.

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker, I was just wanting to ask the Honourable the First Minister, rising out of his statement, if he is aware that it was reported on the radio in this Province that the Prime Minister of Quebec, as he prefers to be called, made it very plain that not only had the Premier of Manitoba made a great impression down there at the social event that he attended, but in addition to that that the sentiments that he voiced with regard to Federal-Provincial relations were very much along the same line as Mr. Lesages.

MR. ROBLIN: Was it a statement; a question or what?

MR. CAMPBELL: I can understand my honourable friend's embarrassment, Madam Speaker. It's a question.

MR. ROBLIN: Well, I think my honourable friend has misquoted Mr. Lesage.

MADAM SPEAKER: Address for Papers standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Seven Oaks.

MR. ARTHUR E. WRIGHT (Seven Oaks): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Elmwood, that a Humble Address be voted to his Honour the Lieutenant-Governor for a Return of all correspondence between the Government of the Province of Manitoba and the Government of Canada relating to co-operation between the Manitoba Tourist Bureau and the Canadian Government Travel Bureau for the years 1964 and 1965.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the question.

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce) (Fort Rouge): . . . Madam Speaker, I am very glad to accept this Order subject to the usual reservation of getting the consent of the Federal Government.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried. Order for return standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Assiniboia that An Order of the House do issue for a return showing, (1) All Traffic Counts conducted by, or on behalf of, the Manitoba Government, on PTH No. 1 West from Winnipeg to Portage la Prairie, for the years 1962, 1963, 1964 and 1965. (2) All traffic counts conducted by, or on behalf of, the Manitoba Government on PTH No. 1 West from Portage la Prairie to Brandon, for the years 1962, 1963, 1964 and 1965.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. WEIR: The information requested in this Order of Return is information that is taken by the department, for departmental use, are primarily estimates only, and are considered as a confidential information within the government service; therefore I cannot support the motion.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Madam Speaker, I can hardly accept the Minister's explanation for refusing this order. Surely information that's been made available to private enterprise and to the oil companies, should be made available to the members of this House. What has the government got to hide by showing -- letting the members of the House know what the traffic counts are. We are led to believe that the roads in this province are built on a priority system based on traffic counts. Surely there should be no objection to the members of the House being allowed to know what these traffic counts are. I suggest that the Minister reconsider his refusal and allow this order to pass.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. JOHNSTON: Madam Speaker, I was asking for traffic counts, not estimates; perhaps the Minister doesn't understand.

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

MR. GUTTORMSON: Madam Speaker, Yeas and Nays.

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the members.

The question before the House, the Order for Return by the Honourable the Member for

(MADAM SPEAKER cont'd.) . . . Portage la Prairie.

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

YEAS: Messrs. Campbell, Cherniack, Desjardins, Froese, Guttormson, Harris, Hillhouse, Hryhorczuk, Johnston, Patrick, Paulley, Peters, Shoemaker, Tanchak, Vielfaure and Wright.

NAYS: Messrs. Alexander, Baizley, Beard, Bilton, Bjornson, Carroll, Cowan, Evans, Groves, Hamilton, Harrison, Hutton, Johnson, Klym, Lyon, McDonald, McGregor, McKellar, Martin, Mills, Roblin, Seaborn, Shewman, 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 second reading of Bill No. 7. The Honourable the Member for Elmwood.

MR. S. PETERS (Elmwood): Madam Speaker, I adjourned this debate for my colleague, the Member from St. John's.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable the Member for St. John's.

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q. C. (St. John's): Madam Speaker, in reviewing the bill which proposes to amend Chapter 77 passed in 1965, I looked at the debates that took place at that time in order to refresh my memory, and I found that when the bill was introduced by the Honourable the Attorney-General, he mentioned the fact that this bill was intended then to deal with parking fines and similar minor offences. This appears on Page 258. Again on Page 262 he stated, "These deal with very minor matters - parking meters and the like." You may recall that when this bill was first proposed, it was indicated that there was no existing statute which would have been affected -- or offences which would have been affected by this bill, but it was expected that it would be used to enforce payment of fines for parking on government property such as the Legislative Building. I recall then that when I spoke on this matter, I pointed out that there were no summons to be issued and therefore it was not a conviction that was contemplated but rather payment of an amount which would be agreed to by the person receiving the ticket.

Now we find that there's a very important change in the philosophy behind this bill. Whereas last year it was made to appear that it was just a convenience for payment of a minor fine for a minor penalty, we now find that this Section would read, or rather the bill would read -- and I would like to just quote from Section 4A of last year's Chapter 77. It states that a person who is alleged to have contravened or failed to comply with or committed a violation, may voluntarily consent to appear before a justice, and there, without an information being laid or any complaint or charge being made or other formality to admit the correctness, etc. Now, the bill as it is proposed now does not eliminate these words which I have just read. It would still be a voluntary appearance; there would not have been an information laid, nor a complaint, nor any charge, and yet the proposed amendment will now make it a conviction. A conviction when there hasn't been an information laid; a conviction when there hasn't been a complaint or charge made; and yet it is a conviction that will stand on the records against this person.

Now this, Madam Speaker, is a very serious change in the philosophy which was proposed by the Honourable the Attorney-General last year in bringing forward this bill. If the amendment dealt only with the disposition of the monies, as to whether they go to the province or they go to a municipality, that's just an administrated distribution of revenue. But to change a bill which was proposed to take care of minor matter so as to make it easy for a person to pay his debt, if we could call it that, without involving himself in anything more than paying what he knew he was paying, that was last year's proposal; this year's proposal is clearly to convert this type of allegation into a conviction carrying with it whatever consequences there are as set out in the Act. And some of these consequences are established by regulations. The entire point system of drivers' licenses I believe is not in the statute; I may be wrong, I'm under the impression that it is an administrative decision as to how many points shall take away a man's license. And now we find that the man who thinks he has a \$2.00 or \$5.00 fine to pay for parking in the wrong place, suddenly is involved, without having been charged, without an information being laid, without a complaint being made, he is involved in the fact that his future use of his driver's license is affected by the fact that he took advantage of a simplified procedure which the Attorney-General last year stated, dealt with very minor matters: parking meters and the like. It is no longer a minor matter when

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd.) there are consequences other than just the payment of the minimum fine. It is not a minor matter if it involves a driver's license. And don't forget, Madam Speaker, that in the original bill, it's made general: "Where an Act of the Legislature provides that this section applies to an offence, etcetera." Now any subsequent Act of the Legislature may just inferentially refer to Section 4A of The Summary Convictions Act and we're right into the fact that a person is involved in being found guilty, convicted, on a matter on which no charge has been made.

This is a terribly serious thing, Madam Speaker. I don't -- although I do object in principle -- I don't really take strong issue with a thought that a man who knows that he parked improperly somewhere and should pay a \$2.00 fine, should have the opportunity to do it in his time off, should not have to leave his work in order to go and attend in court in order to plead guilty and pay the fine. He should have the opportunity to go to the Justice of Peace in any police station and pay that fine. But he must know the consequences of his actions, Madam Speaker. I don't think it's enough, it has been proposed, and I think it's a sensible proposal, that if the government is intent on going through with this, that the least it ought to do is to make sure that there are large words printed on that -- I can't call it information, but that allegation or ticket that there are serious consequences that may result upon the payment of the fine proposed. That I think is not enough, because the fact is there's still is not a proper charge being made; so that certainly if the government is intent on going through with it, it must provide ample warning and sufficient time with sufficient prominence so that there's no doubt in the mind of the person involved that there are serious consequences. There may be serious consequences to what he does, but the main thing is that they shouldn't reach the stage where there are consequences other than what he knows; payment of a minimum fine. If it's left at that, then as far as the bill is concerned and it deals with distribution of the revenue, that's perfectly all right; but to breach what I think was a statement of policy or principle made last year, to say this is a minor matter -- it is no longer a minor matter when there is a record kept, not as if it were but this proposal in this present bill, is to make it a conviction, I say that's very serious and I certainly feel that the government should take another look at the consequences of this change that is proposed.

Now there's another section of the bill dealing with suspended sentence, and the explanation of the Minister in introducing this was to bring it in line with the code. I would suggest that this be looked at from several standpoints. There's nothing in this proposed Bill 7 to limit the maximum times for a suspended sentence. I don't think that an offence under The Summary Convictions Act should carry with it the possibility that a sentence could be suspended for, let us say five years. It seems to me there ought to be a limitation placed on the maximum amount of suspension and then the matter should drop. I wonder also at the suggestions that the court in imposing conditions for a reconnaissance on a suspended sentence can order that it be conditional on reparation to any person aggrieved or injured for the actual loss or damage caused. Now if it is a theft of money or something that can be translated into money, I can understand that as being restitution; but if it involves damages for personal injury then this is a civil matter and I doubt very much if it is proper for the Police Magistrate's Court to set a condition involving damages which should normally be dealt with in a Civil Court, with all the procedures involved for -- examinations for discovery, etcetera. It is quite conceivable that a person may commit an offence, but that the damages resulting from the occasion might be one where contributory negligence or some other matter is involved, and where the actual damages should not be his responsibility. I would suggest that this be looked at.

I also question very much the power involved in making a condition that the person shall provide for the support of his wife and other dependents whom he is liable to support. That is the law. But there may be certain circumstances where a person involuntarily becomes unable to support his wife and other dependents. We will be dealing during this session with garnishment orders. Now, as of today, a garnishment order or a series of them against a man's salary, could make it impossible for him to support his wife and other dependents. This would not be his own default or neglect. This would be the due carrying out of the process of law. He might be suspended; he might be discharged from employment. I think that this is a serious matter which should be looked at carefully.

Now there's also the proposal that the Court may from time to time impose further conditions; may from time to time change conditions; and increase or decrease the period of the reconnaissance. This might almost result in a summary conviction's offence being dealt

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd.) with for the lifetime of the individual involved. The Court could constantly extend - increase the period of the reconnaissance and this person could become a ward of the court without having been convicted of an offence other than one under The Summary Convictions Act. I think there's a great deal of power involved; I think there are insufficient limitations provided and I would suggest that it be looked at very carefully from that standpoint as well.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. B. P. STRICKLAND (Hamiota): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Roblin, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The second reading of Bill No. 25. The Honourable the Minister of Agriculture and Conservation.

MR. HUTTON presented Bill No. 25, an Act to amend the Livestock and Livestock Products Act for second reading.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. HUTTON: Madam Speaker, this amendment is being recommended to the Legislature, because the Standing Committee on Regulations and Orders in reviewing The Livestock and Livestock Products Act, and the regulation under it, discovered that there was not in their opinion, adequate basis for the regulation in law and recommended to us that such basis should be made by amendment to the Act. The regulation provides that where poultry products are on business premises, that they are deemed to be for sale; and without this amendment of course, it is impossible to enforce the quality standards that we require under this Act.

MR. CAMPBELL: I understood my honourable friend -- this is a question. I understood my honourable friend to refer to "poultry" products. Is it not a fact that this amendment applies to all livestock products?

MR. HUTTON: It would, Madam -- I'm closing the debate I'm afraid.

MR. CAMPBELL: I think we've always followed the practice that a question can be answered. I'm asking a question. I want it plain that I'm not speaking in the debate either.

MR. HUTTON: To answer the question of the Honourable Member from Lakeside, in this case the regulation that was questioned by the Standing Committee was one respecting poultry products. It is true, as the honourable member points out, that the amendment sought here to the statute would provide for such a regulation in respect to all livestock and livestock products.

MR. J. M. FROESE (Rhineland): Madam Speaker, is it because of certain infractions that have already occurred that these amendments are brought in; or what is the reason for bringing them in at this time? -- although the Minister already explained in part. However, on checking this particular amendment and checking the Act, I noted in the second part under Definitions, it says livestock products, meats, rawhides, dressed poultry, eggs, wool and honey, in whatsoever form, and hay and cordwood. I just wonder, where does the cordwood come in under livestock products? I think there should be some further amendments to that Act.

MR. ALBERT VIELFAURE (La Verendrye): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Emerson, that the debate be adjourned.

MADAM SPEAKER: Your seconder?

MR. VIELFAURE: The Honourable Member from Emerson.

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

MR. JOHNSON presented Bill No. 29, An Act to amend The School Attendance Act, for second reading.

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

MR. STEINKOPF presented Bill No. 31, An Act to amend The Prearranged Funeral Services Act, for second reading.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. STEINKOPF: Madam Speaker, this Act has to do with Trust Accounts that are provided for people who purchase prearranged funerals. Under the Act 88 percent of the amount that is put in belongs in the first instance to people who sell the funerals; the other

(MR. STEINKOPF cont'd.) ... 12 percent -- no, it's the other way around -- 12 percent belongs to the people who sell the funerals, the other 88 percent to the people who make the deposits. There has been a clause in the present Act that requires the interest to be held during the term the payments are being made until such time as there are sufficient funds in the account to be equal to the amount paid by the purchaser under the plan. This has been very difficult to work out and it is not clearly understood whether it is the amount the purchaser has paid to date or the total amount that he has obligated himself for for the plan. So now it is intended to amend the regulations under the Act to provide that the interest, the last two years' interest which actually would work out to 2½ years' interest, would be retained in the fund before any of the interest could be paid out, which would make up the amount of the 12 percent that belongs to the vendor or the people who sell the deals. In this way if there's any doubt about it there would always be enough money in the Trust Account to cover the full amount paid by the purchaser of a prearranged funeral.

MR. FROESE: Madam Speaker, I think this particular Act in question makes provision for trustees to be set up under the Fund. I would like to know who are the trustees; what is the amount of the Fund to date; the interest accrued; and is there provision for releases in case certain funeral homes want to sell out or so on, or discontinue business? What is the setup? Can they be released? These questions pertaining to the Fund, are they in the Public Accounts, or do we get a separate report on this matter?

MR. STEINKOPF: Each plan, Madam Speaker, is registered separately and would be between the purchaser, the vendor and the trustee. Usually it is a Trust Company that handles this and the reports are tabled. Each one is a private transaction with the department, and it's in connection with these regulations that we are interested and which we intend to change. We do not have, unless we request it, each individual account in our department. The purchaser now under the agreement is entitled under certain circumstances to get his money back, but the first 12 percent would belong to the vendor, he can't get that back, and it is our intention now to keep the interest in the account so that if he wants his money back at a later date there will be a good chance of him getting all of his money back not even just 88 percent.

MR. CHERNIACK: Madam Speaker, I'm afraid that the proposal here is again a conversion from statute to regulation. Apparently the statute set out a prescribed formula and the proposal now is to change it from what the statute required and make it into a matter dealing with regulation, which goes outside of the decision of this House. Now, I deplore that, because I think that a principle should be enunciated and should be clearly made to apply to all. As I read the proposal here, it would be possible to make regulations which vary as between different prearranged funeral plans, and whether or not that is the intention of the government, I think the possibility is there, and I can see the possibility of a form of discriminatory practice. I'm not using that term in any bad sense, but in the correct sense of saying that there might be a different approach, a separate approach for each of the different prearranged funeral plans. It seems to me that this is fraught with certain dangers which it would be best to avoid, and I would like that when the Minister closes the debate, he clarify for us just what it is that he has in mind.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. ROBLIN presented Bill No. 10, An Act to amend The Revenue Act 1964, and certain other Acts of the Legislature, for second reading.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I think the substance of this bill was pretty well gone into at the committee stage. It's divided into three parts as the members will see; the first is designed to remove the tax on heating fuels, that is electricity and gas; the third part does the same thing for motive fuel used for heating purposes. In addition in the third part it has been thought convenient to change certain exemptions from taxation -- to put certain uses of fuel on an exemption basis rather than a refund basis. No change in principle, merely the method by which the refund is to be provided for, and it extends the time limit for the prosecution of offences under the Act. Section Two has to do with the School Tax Rebate and makes it possible to give the rebate to certain classes of applicants that were not covered by the previous legislation. In the course of working the Act it has been found that it wasn't particularly

(MR. ROBLIN cont'd.) . . . flexible to enable us to deal with certain categories that are entitled to the refund in our view and this statute corrects that situation and makes it possible to extend a refund.

One I particularly draw your attention to is in respect of certain housing co-operatives which are now entitled to the refund. We also ask to be relieved of the necessity of making refunds if they're very small, less than \$1.00. I recommend the statute to the House. I hope it will be dealt with as speedily as possible because we are very anxious to get our instructions out to people concerned with this matter so that it may become effective on the date previously announced.

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Madam Speaker, I would just like to ask a question of the Honourable the First Minister. Is it the intention to have the schools and the school boards go on paying the tax on heat, This is just a question that I

MR. ROBLIN: I'll deal with it in my reply.

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

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

MR. ROBLIN presented Bill No. 19, An Act to amend The Agricultural Credit Act, for second reading.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, again the main point of this bill was put before the House at the committee stage. It provides that a corporation may now obtain funds on the sole credit of the province, on the sole credit of the corporation or the sole credit of the corporation with a provincial guarantee. The effect of this is to bring them in line with other Crown instrumentalities of the same sort.

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Selkirk, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. HUTTON presented Bill No. 33, An Act to amend The Water Power Act, for second reading.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. HUTTON: Madam Speaker, this amendment to The Water Power Act provides authority for the leasing of certain lands within a water power reserve for temporary purposes. For instance, it covers the type of thing where we lease the rights to Ducks Unlimited in the Mawdesley Lake area which is within the power reserve, Grand Rapids power reserve. The retroactive aspect of the bill covers a regulation which was passed giving the Lands Branch authority to lease lands for haying purposes in the power line reserves and in the power reserves.

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

HON. CHARLES H. WITNEY (Minister of Health) (Flin Flon) presented Bill No. 11, An Act to amend the Health Services Act, for second reading.

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

MR. EVANS: Madam Speaker, in the absence of the Minister, I wonder if the House would allow the item to stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed motion by the Honourable the Member for Souris-Lansdowne, and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition. The Honourable the Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: Madam Speaker, it is customary to take advantage of the Speech from the Throne to either do a little bit of bragging about one's constituency, to bring up a pet project, or sometimes just to make a plain political speech. Well, the rebel in me, the non-conformist you might say, would like to take over for a few minutes and bring in some suggestions, not only to the government, but also to all would-be politicians.

I might say that during the last campaign of the last federal election, I was extremely disappointed and disgusted. I do realize that there are a lot of difficulty to be elected; the candidates in all the different parties have to pull off all the tricks. I do realize that it is quite a temptation for a politician to place political expediency ahead of everything else, especially at that time. But Madam Speaker, I think that this last session -- last campaign I should say

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd.) really went a little too far. The only thing I -- I have here a quotation from the Free Press, that is from October the 7th and October the 22nd -- I should not say a quotation, but a list of promises -- promises, promises, promises from the Progressive Conservative Party and the Liberal Party. One list is the Liberals 11 and 14 for the Conservatives, and then 17 for the Conservatives and 14 for the Liberals. And there were many more but I decided that this was enough, I couldn't keep track of all these promises.

Well you must agree, Madam Speaker, that this has gone a little too far. I think that the people of our country and our province are fed up; they've lost confidence in politicians; they're completely mixed up, and therefore they're disinterested completely in politics. Now we know that politics, the words politics and politicians have become ugly words. Oh, yes, we might take ourselves quite seriously at times, practically all the time, -- I think that the people consider us now more like opportunists or jokers. I think that this is quite unfortunate, because in a democratic form of government, although it's not the perfect, democracy is not perfect, that it seems to be, still be the best available, and politics is nothing more, nothing more than the management the business of the people - the management of your affairs, Madam Speaker, and the management of my affairs, and every citizen not only has a right, but a duty to take an active part in political life. Now I think that if there is such a -- I don't know, if the people are so fed up with the would-be politicians, it is probably because this partisan politics seem to take over and now seems that the country is serving the parties instead of the parties serving the country.

Now partisan politics or party politics is nothing to be ashamed of. It is a necessity in the democratic form of government, because in a free world like we have here, where every single one of us is born free, and we're different, it would be impossible for all of us, for all of us to go make up the rules, make up the laws, and so on; so we have some people that agree at least in certain large principles, and they get together, they form a party, they form a political party. Now, to be successful, we know that a political party has to be broadly based. This party has to have the welfare of all the citizens of our country at heart. This is what I would say, this is what I think that the NDP Party will not be successful because it seems to cater, it seems to favour a certain group in our country; and too often I think that their policies that they have would damage these groups that they are supposed to help. I believe, Madam Speaker, that if the Socialists had anything on the ball at all, they would be forming the government at Ottawa now because God knows they had enough help from the two older parties with all the mistakes and the errors that they've made lately. I think that it is high time that these two major parties, these two older parties, sit down and do a little bit of soul-searching; reassess their principles, and decide if they are going to stand up for these principles once and for all. I think that it is time, in our country and in our province, especially we are talking about an election year, provincially, that the people are offered a clear choice.

Now a few days ago the leader of the NDP Party stated that Liberalism was dead; that there was only room for a party of the right and a party of the left. No more party in the centre. Well that might be; and if it is, I say let it be. It's not the end of the world. If there's no demand for a Liberal Party, all right we'll go along with two parties, but let's have a clear choice. Now others feel that it's the Conservative Party that will go. They feel that Diefenbaker is really killing it, doing a good job of killing it. But, Madam Speaker, I think that it is safe to say that most of the people believe in the two older parties. One in power and the other in opposition. I think that this, in this country, this is no criticism of the Socialists, this is only my own personal opinion, but I think that in this rich country, a large country like we have, we haven't even scratched the surface yet. I think that there is no room for Socialism or Communism. I think that it is the party of free enterprise that we need. And we are looking for people with courage, with foresight, with a little more ambition, and I don't think that these qualities are stressed too much, if we are going to believe the Socialists. This is why I do believe, this is my own opinion of course, that we should go back to two parties; but, as I said before, these two parties will have to show a little more intestinal fortitude and they will have to be more than mere pulse takers.

No, Madam Speaker, I don't believe that our party is perfect, far from it, and I admit it; but I believe I do believe in true liberalism, I don't think that it's dead at all. And I believe in this slogan of Liberty, Equality and Fraternity; do believe in free enterprise. But I do believe also in some social reforms, because if we're going to talk about liberty, it will have to be a liberty that we can practice as well as a liberty of theory.

I don't think, Madam Speaker, that you will find any Liberal that would believe that a

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd.) person should be saddled with an excessive medical bill, that should cause him to lose everything he has and be in debt for the rest of his life. In a rich country such as ours we certainly have a responsibility, we owe -- we have to take care of a certain percentage of our population, people that can't take care of themselves, such as retarded children, abandoned mothers, orphans, handicapped people and so on, and I think that we should do more for those people, but I am against, and I say to heck with these free-loaders. But if the Liberal Party keeps going to the left, Madam Speaker, then I agree with the NDP that it will no longer be needed. That it will not serve any purpose. For instance, I'm all in favour of the Medicare Program, but I'm not, certainly not, favouring a compulsory Medicare plan. I don't think that this is liberalism at all. Now unless this is the only way that we can have a Medicare program I'm definitely against the compulsory part of it. I think that we are having too much trouble, we can't hardly afford our hospital plan here in this province.

Madam Speaker, you might find it odd that I criticize my party. But I assure you that I still believe that it is the best; and I believe that true liberalism will do more for this country, and more for national unity than any of the other parties. I think if the Conservatives had a leader something like Mr. Robarts, I think that they could also bring quite a contribution here in this country; but first of all I think they have to get rid of this man Diefenbaker who will stop at nothing to further his own personal ambition and who's motto seems to be divide and conquer, but I think that he has done more to divide our country than any other politician in this country.

Now mind you, many of the members here today might think that this is a -- might ridicule this speech, well this is their prerogative, but I think that we must stop and take stock before it is too late. I said that political parties were a must in a democratic form of government because we simply cannot agree in all the principles. But there are some points that most of the people, the people of goodwill, these people agree; and then I say that there's no need for partisan politics.

I would like to give you an example, something that's getting under my skin, something that I'm fed up with. The question of the retention of the Air Canada Overhaul Base here in Winnipeg. Well I don't know of a single Socialist, Liberal or Conservative that want us to lose this base. No one. Regardless of who's in power. We didn't want to lose it; the Liberals didn't want to lose it when Diefenbaker was in power; and I don't think that the Conservatives would like to lose it now that Pearson is in power. But, in the same House, just a few days ago, the First Minister made quite a speech, and the key word, the key sentence, was when he told us about our friends at Ottawa. This must have been the most important part of this very important speech because that's when the troops applauded him. Well, Madam Speaker, I don't think that this is right. I think that we should be Canadians first, Manitobans second, and then blue or red. Don't you think that we'd achieve an awful lot more if we'd unite? This is not a question of Liberals against Conservatives, this is East against West; and I think that if we presented a united front and if we had all the leaders of the different parties we'd go on Ottawa once and for all, and say we're not getting our fair share, I think we'd stand an awful better chance, an awful better chance than what we're doing now. It would be certainly less costly, less childish, also. Why then should the Minister of Industry and Commerce, prevent the leaders of, or try to prevent leaders of other parties to go, to unite? I think that -- (Interjection) -- Yes but -- isn't it a fact that the Minister tried?

MR. EVANS: That is not correct, Madam Speaker.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, Madam Speaker, we have reason to believe otherwise and I think that this has been substantiated in the speeches that were made last year, and another further date, we'll have another debate. But this again is not the point. The point is that we should be together whenever something like this comes in -- this has nothing to do with Liberalism or with Conservatism or with Socialism. I think that we should get together. This is not the time to play politics. Politics should serve the country and not the country serve the different parties, and we'd be a lot more successful here in the west if we'd unite. I'm fed up with the Minister of Utilities, I think, last Friday blaming our great-grandfathers -- in those days the Liberals had done this -- I don't care what they did in those days. I've been here since 1959 and this is what I'm responsible for, and if I'm not satisfied with my party I can leave any day. But I think it would be less childish and I think that we would achieve an awful lot more, and one of these days this will be accepted. It would be fair for everyone -- nobody would take advantage. This would be something that would be outside of the party field and I think that the people of our province, people of our country, would give it an awful lot more.

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd.) They would be the real winners in this.

I'm not gullible enough, Madam Speaker, to think that all of a sudden nobody will play politics. No, but I think that at least in certain important points like this where we're all together, where they're laughing at us down east because we're divided here, I think that we need every single one of us. I think that then we should forget a little bit about our politics and parties.

There is another point that is much more important than this. The people of Canada will have to very soon unite to fight crime. If we don't do it pretty soon it will be too late. Oh I know, in a year or so this is not true - not in Canada, or at least not in Winnipeg - but it is, and it is frightening. It's coming, Madam Speaker, and it might be too late, and the day that crime really takes over we can say "goodbye democracy." I've heard these same words and I've made a mental note, "oh yes, we'll have to be careful," and then you forget about it.

Well I had occasion to travel to Chicago a few months ago and I had my eyes opened. Watching a game at the Chicago Arena, after the game a friend of mine and I, walking out of the Arena, we were surprised to see the number of police constables. Then when we tried to walk a block to get a cab we were told that we had to stay right there, that it wasn't safe. I think it is obvious -- we know that in places like Chicago, and this is not exaggerated, there's a lot of clubs, lots of businesses and so on that are controlled by the mobsters. A lot of very good, very honest businessmen in the States accept this payment now. This is part of it. They're used to that.

Well, Madam Speaker, when in this country, which is supposed to be the leader in the free world, when they have American boys fighting and dying all over the globe for freedom, and their mothers and wives cannot even go for a walk in the park in their own country, in their own city, I think that we should stop for awhile and start to think. We don't want this kind of thing to happen here in Canada; and it's not by the exchange of insults by the Attorney-General of Quebec or B. C. that we're going to remedy this. We're talking about priorities, and I think, Madam Speaker, that this should be at the very top of the priorities.

Now, Madam Speaker, this is a debate that deals with a non-confidence motion, and I think that a few points should be aired here this afternoon. It seems that whenever we have anything controversial here in Manitoba, anything controversial happens, that we have no leadership at all. I think that probably the reason for this is that our Premier is quite ambitious. He has personal ambition. He wants to become the Prime Minister, or he's not too sure if he wants to become the Prime Minister of our country. He will not attack anything that's controversial because it might prove to be unpopular.

Now the Throne Speech made all kinds of promises, half of them promised as early as 1958 and the other half depending on Ottawa. Now maybe he feels that politically this is sharp, to get ready to put the blame in Ottawa, and then he can forget about his responsibility here. We want -- and I said awhile ago we should be united -- and there are certain things that we want. We want our rights in Ottawa, but I've never heard of a Throne Speech that was all -- practically all -- waiting to see what Ottawa would do.

Of course this is a gentleman that aspires to go in the federal politics. I say to the Premier of this province that if he intends to go in federal politics, I say, well get on with it. If his advisers, if he, himself feel that this might not be the right time, well that's fine if he has to wait, but in the meantime he should resign as the Premier of this province. Why should the train stop just to be ready for him to jump out? Now this is not a question of being drafted. I think that if he's going to a federal election he should be ready to stay here and finish his term. It's not a question of they're looking for somebody to replace Diefenbaker, and I think he should make up his mind. What's the matter? Isn't there anybody that can take the job in the front bench? We're talking about Manitoba but everybody has their eyes on Ottawa.

Now, Madam Speaker, you might feel, or some of the members might feel that I might be exaggerating here a bit, talking about the Premier like this, his lack of leadership and saying that he's using his high office for political reasons. I'll give you an example. On the national scene, what is the First Minister's favorite subject? Yes, it's the national unity; and his stamping ground, favorite place to be is the Province of Quebec.

Now I think that it's quite clear that the French people in Manitoba haven't interested the Premier too much. Oh, but those French people of La Belle Quebec are very close to his heart. Now is this a coincidence or could it be that the Premier knows that to form a national government one must have quite a strong representation of Quebec; and while here in Manitoba the people of French origin are spread out, are not numerous enough to even control one seat.

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd.)

Well, I don't want to discuss national unity; I just want to show the two faces of Roblin, and I would like to look back in this field of national unity since I came back here in this House since I was elected in 1959. Now if you will go back about ten days before the election on May 5, 1959, the Premier, being interviewed by Mr. LaPorte, had this to say. I'm going to talk now to show what is done here and what is not done here, and what is done down east. This is what the Premier said at the time: "We know that Manitoba is a bilingual province since its creation. We believe that this character must be developed more and more. My wish is that all citizens of Manitoba will one day be able to speak English and French." Then he added that teaching French from Grade 1 would be allowed after the next election. That was the election of May 14th, Madam Speaker. This was the first thing that was said -- not in this House. Then, of course, this government was returned, and I believe it was May 14th, ten days after.

Now in 1959, 1960, 1961 and 1962, what was done? Some of the French people - French-speaking people of this province repeatedly asked the government to implement this promised program. Not a single member of the House tried to embarrass the government. We believed that if this was to be a success it should come from the government. After all, the government had promised this and we believed in the sincerity of the Premier.

Now on July 1st of 1962 the Premier was a guest in Quebec City. He spoke French very well. He said then that this unity - in his speech in Quebec City - "This unity I speak of today is not a unity of conformity as much in opinion as in action. Quite to the contrary, it is a unity resulting from a harmonious combination obtained in an atmosphere of confidence and mutual consent. This unity is the very foundation of our agreement." This is what he said in 1962, and he also said that bilingualism is necessarily the base of Canada's double culture and that attempts should be made to hasten the goal of full bilingualism and it is incumbent upon the provinces of our country to organize, from this point of view, schools and institutions of learning. "It is incumbent upon the provinces of our country" -- just remember these words because we will go back to this, Madam Speaker.

Now in 1963, after not one but two elections, I brought in a resolution asking that French be taught from Grade 1. There were no reproaches when I introduced my resolution, Madam Speaker, but what happened? The Premier did not say one word on this important subject. The then Minister of Education did not say one word. The members of this party spoke; the NDP made their position clear. Finally, the Minister of Education used the only French-speaking member of the Conservative caucus to bring in a wishy washy amendment, and I believe that he was used. This flatters the government and it placed the responsibility on an advisory board. He refused to stand up here and make a start.

Now it's true the advisory board in the summer recommended that French be taught from Grade 1 -- well from Grade 3 and Grade 2 and Grade 1. It would take three years, but this only for those whose mother tongue was French. Yes, you'll see, this was the former Minister of Education and this is what it was. Now there was no talk of trying to have a branch of the teaching college to develop French teachers, and I expressed my disappointment to the Premier in an open letter at this time.

Now the Leader of the NDP has asked the government what was going on in Windsor Park. I can tell him what's going on in Windsor Park. We don't need to have an investigation. The school board is following the law; that's all. Members of the citizens committee are not very happy and I can't say that I blame them completely. There is no other way. These people were told that they can have French for those whose mother tongue is French. This is the government that decided that, not the school board, and as usual they're finding out that nothing is happening. The Minister of Education or the Premier did not stand up and try to clarify this. I'm shocked to know that we've had so much adverse publicity in St. Boniface, the city where people used to live side by side without name-calling and so on. It will take years to rectify this because things are bad in Windsor Park, and it is no fault of the commission - the school board - and it is no fault of one group or the other. It is because the government will not stand up behind their programs or correct them if they're wrong.

Now in the same field, on November 15, 1963, the Provincial Secretary had this to say in a speech: "There can be no split personality or birthday cake for Canada's Centenary Celebration in 1967. The question of French-Canadian culture and language must be settled first." He added that he was certain that the Fathers of Confederation intended to guarantee the right to instruction in the French language to all French-Canadians in all provinces, not just Quebec.

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd.) . . .

Well we get this kind of lip-service and what happens here? Last year, Madam Speaker, I brought in, after advising the Premier, that if nothing was being done, I would bring in a resolution. I got a resolution - a bill - and in this bill I asked that French become a teaching language. This would not be compulsory and this would be - now that they had started this business of those whose mother tongue was French - at least start with them. Now this had been demanded for many years. I thought I would bring in a bill - not a resolution - it was so easy to amend. Well, to be honest with you, I thought that the principle would get second reading and I thought maybe in committee, I thought maybe it would be felt that we can't go this far, that maybe we'll start with social studies or something like this. The government would have a chance to make a move. No. I informed the government of my intention of bringing this bill in the second week of the session, in February if I remember right. The first reading was March 31st. No comments -- I'm just making a statement. It was printed on April the 20th. The second reading was April the 27th. This was the first chance this come up. Immediately after I introduced my bill it was adjourned by a Conservative backbencher and it was on May 6th that he brought in his amendment. If you remember right, you took this thing under consideration, nobody could speak, you gave your decision on May 11th, the afternoon that we finished the Session. This amendment brought in was one of the dirtiest speeches in the House, of the Session, and the Premier and his party applauded. Again not one word from the Premier, not one word from the Minister of Education, only from one backbencher; and this is something that is so important that the people will go across the wide beautiful country of ours talking about national unity.

Now during the last campaign the Premier made a speech in Three Rivers. Again he spoke in French. Oh he was convinced -- and through boy scout fashion he served us again this wax fruit -- He was convinced that the people that had the solution to the problem of national unity were the Conservatives, the Liberals were all hypocrites, corrupted and liars. Well I'll throw back to him, and I didn't expect him to be in this House, I'm not disappointed, but maybe the Leader of this House can tell him that I'm throwing back to him the words that he said at this time. The quotations from Adlai Stevenson, "Let them stop lying about us and we will not say the truth about them." I think that this should suffice. But in case it doesn't, if the First Minister wants to talk about scandal, we're ready to talk about the Conservative scandal, and we might accommodate them by going back two generations back. We can play, anybody can play this game. I'm not gonna pay for the sins -- I'm not saying that one Liberal or one Conservative is being wrong, the whole party should be painted the same colour.

This is what he said at this time Madam Speaker. This is a report from the Tribune, October 21st. This is a speech in Three Rivers. "Mr. Roblin said Canada must have a new constitution, not just a patch-up, which would recognize not only individual rights but also national rights." By national rights he explained outside the meeting, he meant French and English language rights such as bilingualism in government services and use of the mother tongue official language, English or French, as the principle language of instruction in schools. Well, that's French Canada. The Premier said, Canada probably is inviolable because it would then be difficult, if not impossible, to maintain a Canadian culture distinct from that of the United States. I'm not debating if this vying culture is important right now. We'll have time to do this. I'm just showing the lack of leadership -- with no mention, no word about these important things; and then in Quebec its a different thing. And I'm fed up with this kind of business. I could go on -- in this year, Mr. Roblin said a question of French speaking public schools would be dealt with on a national level only.

Remember a little while ago, Madam Speaker, I quoted him that this was the responsibility of the provinces. Now we have to go on a national field. Well the Conservatives lost out. They didn't win the election. What's going to happen now? Are we going to have another stall? Well we'll find out, because, Madam Speaker, I'd like the page boy to come here and bring this to the Legislative Counsel, and this is the same Bill that I proposed last year that I'm bringing in again. We'll find out if once and for all we'll be able to discuss this. And if we can't and if this is too hot, well he should stay here and not go and talk about this in Quebec. This is the part that I don't like, this is the part of partisan politics that I don't like. Oh, he said many other nice things mind you.

Madam Speaker this is -- I think this point is proven. There's a lot of other things that we'll talk about and I won't have time today. I certainly intend to bring in this tax business. I tried, I have made up my mind in this session, well I won't only be criticized, I'll try to go

(MR; DESJARDINS cont'd) along. When it was announced that this tax on heat would come out, I was pleased, and I even held myself under control, I didn't even smile when the Premier got up and said, "This has nothing to do with the election." But then he turns around and he tells us that my leader is looking for votes. All right, if he doesn't want to say too much. I said it takes courage and it takes courage to say I'm wrong. But all of a sudden I was all wrong, I was wet, because he wasn't admitting he was wrong. He started bringing in the reasons for that and we've got a bill here and we'll talk about this. I haven't got time today but we'll talk about the tax structure here in Manitoba if this is what he wants. We'll see the kind of leadership we've had since that special session when he brought in the tax that was ability to pay and then he threw it out; and then he went on T. V. last year and he said to the people of Manitoba, "You're paying less for your Medical for your Hospitals because we did this -- and it wasn't for that at all, it was because they had a new income tax. Now that income tax is going by the board, we're told we're gonna have larger premiums. They change their mind so often.

Now there's another thing. We talk about the Nelson. Well we already had an election in 1962 for that. Out of the clear blue sky this was the main thing. It's getting to be quite a joke. It was just a survey that started I think in 1950 something, tho we don't get the blame -- there's no credit for that, just the blame. Well this is a joke. This is another thing that everybody here in Manitoba -- were all interested in that. We don't need, I don't think that the Premier is morally right if he calls an election. I'm not afraid of an election not more than he is, but I don't think that he's right if he hasn't got anything better than that. Just things that they've promised in the past, or haven't done, something that he can blame on the Federal Government or the Nelson Project that we've all agreed with.

MADAM SPEAKER: I'd like to remind the Honourable Member that he has five minutes of his time left.

MR. DESJARDINS: Thanks very much, Madam Speaker. The question of the ability to pay I think is an important thing -- maybe I can use some of these few minutes that I have to discuss this tax business. Now last year, first of all the premiums went up, then we had a special session it was a bad session. I recognize this, politically it was bad because he got nothing from Mr. Diefenbaker and we had to agree, we had to agree to this Bill. So they combine everything together and they brought in a reduction in premiums and brought in an income tax. It was something that -- the income tax was raised by Ottawa at no cost to us. But this was something new. And at the time we tried on this side to have this earmarked as a tax for hospitals. Well it's clear in the Throne Speech, we can quote, what we did last year, and we will again this year, it's very clear that this is what was supposed to be a hospital tax. Then the Premier explained -- and I agreed with him then and I agree with him again -- this was bringing in an ability to pay, this was the chance that he had been waiting for. No taxes are fun. Income tax - nobody wants to pay income tax - but if there's anything that is a fair tax, and this is what he brought in. Now last year he answered that no we had nothing to lose; it wouldn't change anything, the income tax had gone down one per cent but he had had more money from the income tax, this other percentage of income tax that's why he could do it. Well Madam Speaker, he replaced this income tax from the consolidated fund. Isn't that right? The Minister of Health is looking at me and we'll talk about this in Health again. And then he brought in a tax on heat he reduced the income tax, took the money from consolidated fund to pay this, because he needed the same amount and more, and we're told by the Minister and by the Premier that the premiums might go up -- and we know they will go up -- and then he brings in a heat tax. And talking about this heat tax, it's the same thing. I paid -- I've checked this, I took the trouble of checking this, you see this year the heat tax is going out -- I think he made so much in January, in this awful month, that I've paid practically as much this year, so far, than I did last year. So this again is politics and this is something that is not right. If it's wrong, if this tax was wrong, was a mistake last year, we won't embarrass them on this, but let's go back and let's make this retroactive and the people should not be penalized on this awful month. Madam Speaker, I thank you for warning me on my time. I believe this is it. Thanks very much.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. HUTTON: Madam Speaker, at the outset I would like to first of all extend my greetings to you and let you know that I have every confidence that your graciousness and your wisdom will keep the engine of democracy on the rails here in Manitoba through this present session. I certainly hope that we can look forward to your leadership for a long time in the future. I would like also to extend my congratulations to the mover and seconder of the speech in reply to the Speech from the Throne. Both of them to my way of thinking expressed an understanding, not only of their constituencies, but of the Province of Manitoba and the aspirations of the people who are our primary concern.

I thought, Madam Speaker, that when the Honourable Member for St. Boniface rose to speak today, well I wouldn't say that I was interested, I was curious, because I thought that I was sitting in on one of the great dramatic moments in history. I thought that I was seeing the ushering in of the political millennium where the lion and the lamb would lie down together. The thing that bothered me a little bit though about his approach was the fact that he would want to be the lamb, because I knew for certain who was the lion in the House, and I was somewhat perplexed for some time while I listened, along with the other members, to his philosophical discourse. Well it turned out that he wasn't a lion at all; he was the wolf in sheep's clothing, and all he wanted to do was to see if he could get close enough to pull the fangs of the lion. I'm awful glad that he let us know that he wasn't a man but that he was really a wolf, because it's much easier to deal with him on that basis.

I was rising to speak today primarily on the subject of agriculture and the position of agriculture for Manitoba in the year 1966, and certainly to comment upon some of the remarks that have been made, those most especially made by the Honourable Member for Laverendrye. He sort of mystified me a little bit too with some of the things that he had to say. I was interested in his statement when he said, "I think many efficient farmers are more modern than the advice that is coming from the government at this time."

Well, rather than be discouraged by such a situation, I think we should be encouraged by the fact that we have this kind of progressive farmer in the industry in Manitoba. He criticizes the programming in the department because - to the extent that these people have been early adaptors or innovators - our help is directed to those who are a little bit further down the scale. I am much more satisfied with a program in the department that concerns itself with helping people who need help and who can use help, than that we should be associated or able to meet all the requirements of our very best and largest operations in Manitoba.

I doubt very much, Madam Speaker, if we can do a great deal to help the kind of an operation that the Honourable Member for Laverendrye is associated with. I understand he runs about 1,200 hogs in an enterprise in his constituency. At today's prices, when he sticks his foot up on the edge of the pen and surveys that operation, he's looking at about \$72,000 worth of hogs walking around. I'm not really too concerned, I'm not too worried about the fellow who's got \$72,000 worth of hogs on the hoof walking around, because I know

MR. VIELFAURE: Madam Speaker, on a point of order, I would like to point out to the Minister that in my speech I never asked for his help from the department to run my operations. I was talking about the small farmers in the province, not my own operation.

MR. HUTTON: Madam Speaker, I don't have to repeat the words that the honourable member said; they're in Hansard to be read. All I'm saying is that the fellow who has got 1,200 hogs walking around, when you've got that much pork you can live pretty high on the hog. The fellow that I'm worried about is the guy that's got only a small percentage of this, and even though we may not be absolutely the last thing in knowledge in any specific operation that you want to name, I think that we have been able to assist a lot of farmers in Manitoba, and I would like to produce some proof of what I'm saying.

In 1959, we started what has been referred to as the Farm Business Groups in Manitoba. These were organizations of farmers who agreed to enter into a course of study with the Department of Agriculture Extension Service, this course of study to run over a four-year period. They agreed to adopt modern accounting systems in their farm practice. They agreed to attend lectures at regular intervals during the four-year period. At the end of this period we issue them a diploma or a certificate certifying that they had completed this course.

Now, as I said to the last group that I met with about a week ago, this certificate would mean very little if all it represented was four years' association with the Department of Agriculture, but the wonderful part about this program over the last six or seven years - seven years - is that everyone of these groups who have graduated have shown very encouraging progress in

(MR. HUTTON cont'd) the operation of their businesses, both to their own benefit and to the benefit of the general economy of the Province of Manitoba. In other words, they were able to help themselves because of the information and technical know-how that they imparted over the four-year period, and because they increased their production on their own place, they added to that extent to the total productivity of the Province of Manitoba.

From 1961 to 1965 -- these figures are taken from the Farm Business Groups in Starbuck, Carman, Ste. Rose, Altona, St. Pierre, Neepawa and Steinbach, and I just want to give you some notes. Here's Steinbach -- number graduating, 14. There was very little change in land base in this area. Only one member in this group rents land and the others own all of their land. The dairy is quite specialized as three members account for most of the dairy animals; hogs relatively important; the average size of enterprise has increased from '74 to 117; and one operator accounts for most of the poultry. But it was fellows like this who kept Manitoba's production up during this cycle that we're going through so that our production cycle dropped less, relatively speaking, than any other province in Canada, and for this reason more profits are accruing to the Province of Manitoba because we are able to cash in on the recognized prices in this industry.

Neepawa -- numbers graduating, 16; considerable increase in number of acres operated, 799 to 937; summerfallow about the same, 98 percent of what it was in 1961; almost all members of group that have beef cattle, average herd size increased from 47 head to 79 head; average investment in the farm business in this group was about 65,000 with net farm income in 1964 of \$6,867.00. These farmers have done relatively well.

Well, we've been graduating these people from different communities across Manitoba over the last three years. These men, through their association with the department over a four-year period, have learned the real value that can be theirs from such an association, and they said to us, starting three years ago when the first graduating groups left our fold, they said, "What do we do now? What can you offer us now?" Well, we knew right then that farming industry in Manitoba was coming of age and that services comparable to any other industry had to be made available to agriculture. These men are operating now farm businesses. They need the service of specialists and they need them applied to their own particular farm business. You can't talk in generalities; you have to talk in specifics.

Now how do you provide the farmer with the kind of specialized agricultural consultative services that he needs. Nobody was ready or available in the private sector to do it and it came down on the government to see to it that these services were available. This year we are starting to offer a personalized extension service, if you like, to the farmer, and these services will involve visits to the farm; analysis of his accounts; consultation on any problem areas; a very personal kind of service and one which I think will meet the needs of the kind of fellow that the Honourable Member for LaVerendrye was talking about. These farmers will pay for this service. They will pay the costs and they are willing to do so, and already we have 35 farmers who have agreed to avail themselves of these services being made available by the government.

Well, he says that we're a failure because not more than 20 percent of the farmers today are using most of the programs that are put out by the department. Well, he's talking about a phenomena that's been with us since the Extension Service was established fifty years ago. You see, we can't compel people to come to us; we have to use friendly persuasion, and it is on the record that we only reach a portion of those who need it. One of the bad things about extension work is that often those who need us most are the last who will ever come to us, and even when we go out and call a meeting they won't come. It was to meet this situation that we went into television back in 1960, and the Province of Manitoba was the first province in Canada for two years to offer our one-week extension course over television. We have now been joined by Alberta and Saskatchewan and have presented our third annual television short course. It's entitled "This Business of Farming", and you know it was successful and is successful to the extent that, according to our surveys -- and these are taken by the CBC -- we have reached about 50 percent of the farmers in Manitoba. We also know that they have been successful in the extent to which it has stimulated interest in our other programs. For instance -- I can't tell you what the distribution of this material is today, the written material, but I know that in the first and second years we distributed something like 10,000 copies of the written material that was dealt with on television.

To say that Manitoba has been slow and backward -- we've been first -- first! And if you're not proud of it, there's something wrong with you. We were the first province in

(MR. HUTTON cont'd) Canada to offer these agricultural consultative services. In other countries, they've had some, yes. New Zealand has had some for six years. Over there they've got some eighty groups who are organized. These men retain their own agricultural specialists, but at their own cost. We are first in Canada, and remember all the time we're not the richest in Canada.

Another area that he decides that we were vulnerable on was water. "It says in one paragraph that we will be asked to establish a Manitoba Water Commission and in another paragraph we will be asked to increase the staff," and then he goes on to say, "but I must say with regret that as far as I'm concerned the more departments we've added the less efficient it has been."

Madam Speaker, for the honourable member's information when I became Minister of the Department of Agriculture and Conservation, there were 35 engineers on staff. The amount of money authorized for projects in that year was \$3 million. In the year 1965-66, we had 35 engineers on staff and the amount of money authorized for projects - Canada money, Manitoba money, municipal money - \$30 million. I think that an apology is in order to the department for anyone making such a statement, that we add staff and we do little more work for all the staff. We have one more man and we have ten times the physical program to be responsible for. There's a very good reason why we haven't got more men. There's a tremendous shortage of engineers in Canada today, of all kinds. With the centennial program and with the tremendous construction programs going on across Canada we have a terrible time to get and maintain engineers. We have been very fortunate in the fact that in our responsible positions, the men there have not only carried their work out in a responsible manner but they have stuck with Manitoba in spite of the fact that I know that many of them could name their own salary in other jurisdictions. I thank Providence every time I come to work and these men are still of the same opinion that they were the day before, that in spite of the fact that they might be able to do better financially in other areas, they have enough sense of loyalty and devotion to this province that they stay and work with us.

Well, another complaint that the honourable member hit was about market information. The honourable member seems not to have heard of the annual Market Outlook Conference that we have established in Manitoba. This was the third year that it's been held. He's never heard about the farm outlook material that is distributed widely; he's never heard of this thing having been dealt with through the news media, television media -- never heard of it. Well, he should have been at Brandon this year. I'll be very candid with you. On the way up to this meeting, talking with senior staff of the department, we thought that maybe you know after this year, the third year, we might have to revamp the format to sustain interest. Well, it may be exaggerating a little bit to say that I had trouble getting into the building, but not very much. It was a complete sell-out - standing room only. This, in the third year of this program being offered to the farmers of Manitoba. It was 47 below, so they must have thought it was worthwhile coming to. There were people there from Swan River Valley and there were people there from the Red River Valley who thought it worthwhile enough to travel all the way to Brandon in that kind of weather -- (Interjection) -- Yes, Madam Speaker, we gave them a very encouraging outlook.

It seems to me, Madam Speaker, that when the government of this province two or three years ago stuck its neck out and said the farmers of this province should get into the livestock business in a big way, that the beef industry in particular looks to have a promising future -- oh, watch it - watch it - watch it. Even last year the Honourable Member for Emerson said he didn't like that. He didn't like that. He didn't think the Minister should be encouraging people to get into livestock.

Well, Madam Speaker, I heard the Honourable Member for Emerson sometimes object a little bit to the reference to turkeys. I will never associate the turkey bird with him again. The ostrich - that's the bird who sticks his head in the sand. Well, things have turned out in the beef industry. And how have they turned out? We have been told that the people of Canada consumed, on the average, 100 pounds of beef last year - 100 lbs. of beef per capita. That was the consumption of beef in Canada. They won't eat that much in the next five years because they won't be able to buy it.

Now, is this government not taking some leadership when back in 1962 we told the farmers about this? If my honourable members want to talk about non-partisanship and everybody working together for the good of Manitoba, when we make a forecast like that and tell the farmers of this province that they should exploit this situation that's going to develop, let's

(MR. HUTTON cont'd) see them in behind us pushing, instead of pulling the other way because they thought there might be just a chance the market might drop and then we'd be embarrassed.

Well the market did drop and it was kind of rough a year ago this past fall. It was kind of rough to be the Minister of Agriculture and had told the farmers of this province to increase their herds. The market was extremely erratic and a lot of fellows in the beef business lost their shirts - maybe some of them their trousers - but we said it was a short term thing, the market would correct. Well, it did. But I think there would have been a few more people in the beef business yet in Manitoba to take advantage of the upward trend if my honourable friends across the way would quit playing politics and trying to take a good trick on the basis of a short run fluctuation on the market, and get behind and say, "come on you fellows, let's go."

Well, I don't think there's been any lack of leadership in market outlook material; I don't think that there's lack of leadership in the fact that Manitoba is the first province in Canada to approach having province-wide coverage of crop insurance. We're going to celebrate the centennial of Manitoba with the whole province under crop insurance, and we'll be the only province in Canada. We've got enough "firsts" and we don't have to listen to this jargon about lack of leadership. And there's another place you can help -- there's another place you can help. You can support the government when it's looking for the means to do all these things.

Here's one little item I must comment on, and that's this business about the farmer getting \$50 tax rebate. Now the average farmer in Manitoba did not get \$50 tax rebate. The average farm in Manitoba is almost three-quarters, and he collected on every quarter. His rebate in a good many cases was \$150. On the average it will be something approaching that; not \$50 at all. Maybe there's some danger in saying this, but I think it's about time that somebody said it. A great deal, in larger proportion than half, of the monies raised by these taxes are not raised on the farms of Manitoba. The farmer is getting a good deal, a real good deal out of this tax rebate - a very good deal. And let me emphasize that, I'm not saying that he's not entitled to it, but I am saying, don't let the party politicians run around and tell the farmers that all he got was \$50 rebate, because first of all they know different; and the second fact of the matter is the taxes that were required to make that kind of a payment possible to him did not all come out of his pocket, because that argument just won't hold water in a province where two-thirds of the real estate value of the province is located in metropolitan Winnipeg.

Well, we have announced in the Throne Speech that in addition to the new extension service that's going to be made available to farmers of this province that we intend to establish in conjunction and in co-operation with the agro-business of this province an Agricultural Productivity Council, and the reason that we're going to do that is because we want to share the responsibility because it's a great one, and we need the help of agro-business in all its different sides in charting the course for the agriculture industry in Manitoba.

You know, when you look ahead in the world, taking into account the population explosion that's taking place, taking into account the limited area of land in the world for agriculture production, there seems to be a boundless opportunity to produce to meet the needs of the human family - the food needs. There's another side to that, however, in that at the same time that this opportunity to produce is shaping up, that there are other problems that we must face and resolve if we're going to really capitalize on this opportunity to produce, which is really the birth-right of the farmer. The problems of increasing cost -- these can not be met entirely by the farmer. He has to guess well ahead and he has to change and adapt in order to keep his costs down as low as possible.

But there is another responsibility, and that of the nation; because the farmer's input costs is the sum and total of the cost of all the in-puts that he must make into his business. And to the extent that many of these costs are determined not by the farmer himself but by society at large, then the nation at large and society at large has a responsibility to our farmers to help him to be competitive in world markets.

But the big opportunity today, Madam Speaker, is the world market. It isn't the home market, it's the world market. With countries like Russia and China coming to us for almost record sales or purchases of grains, let's remember, Madam Speaker, that in the middle 1950's, Walter Gordon wrote a book about the future of Canada, and when he dealt with this business of wheat, in looking ahead - and I am sure he had the best estimates available at that date - he said it would be 1980 before the farmers of Western Canada could count on export sales of more than 250 million. It would be 1980 before they reached 300 million. Madam Speaker, we have reached the plateau - the sales plateau of 300 million - three or four years

(MR. HUTTON cont'd) ago. Right today, we're at about the 400 million figure, and the 500 million figure, I think, is one that we can realistically look forward to if we are able to keep ourselves competitive in world markets.

Well, a province like Manitoba, where our most important primary industry is agriculture, it behooves us to take our best brains in the industry, not just government, not just politicians, but the best brains in the industry, in the various fields of processing and marketing and so forth, and bring them together with the farmers, and let's all work together as a team in charting a course for the future of agriculture in Manitoba.

This is not an insignificant proposal. That's all I'm trying to say to the honourable member. It has important implications for Manitoba, and they won't just be felt on the farm. They'll be felt in every village, in every town, in every hamlet, and in this great metropolitan city of ours. I don't have to re-emphasize the experience of the last four or five years, which have proved once again that as agriculture in this great nation of ours goes, so goes the nation. We are enjoying an unparalleled period of prosperity in Canada. It's not a mere coincidence that during this period agriculture has thrived and Providence has blessed us in the production of food products. I'm not going to apologize today for the record of my department, or the government, in the field of agriculture and agricultural policy. I'm not going to apologize at all. I'm very proud of the record that we have.

I have a few more figures here that I would like to give you before I sit down, because under the aegis, if you want to call it that of this government, under the programming of this government, the farmers of Manitoba have responded with a new confidence, with a new belief in agriculture, and when we talk about the relative position of Manitoba as compared to the progress made in other provinces of Canada, we can be sorry that prior to this government taking office Manitoba did lose some ground, I think primarily because we continued to rely upon our traditional production of grains rather than diversification.

But the fact is that in the last few years, in the last six or seven years, any gains that we have made in the last 20, we made them in the last six or seven years. I don't want to go back and rehash what happened prior to 1958 - I don't want to talk about that at all - but if the Premier of this province and the Minister of Agriculture of this province can't get up in front of farm audiences and say, "Look Boys, we got to do better if we're going to keep up, or if we're going to get out in front", -- we can't say that without this non-partisan approach that we heard about earlier, the lamb or the wolf in the lamb's fleece, attacking us for admitting that we are failures. Why? What does the coach say to the football team at half time? None of us know, do we?

Well if the government, which is an intrinsic part of the team here in Manitoba, can't pep-talk, straight-forward, candidly, with the farmers in this province without having the politicians, the non-partisan politicians twist everything that we say, well then, some of us have to stand up and say, "Yes, we're doing all right the last few years." We don't go out and say to the farmers of Manitoba, "You know, it was under the Grits that you slipped away below." When we get up at a Conference like that at Brandon, we can't afford to go after the Grits, because there's some Grits sitting out there and they're pretty good farmers. We're not there to offend them; we're there to encourage everybody, even ourselves, to get together to work and to bring the benefits to the people of the Province of Manitoba.

And I'll just say this before I sit down. The record of production, in terms of constant physical volume, shows that prior to this government taking over in 1958, Manitoba had lost ground from the 1940-45 years, and that since 1958 we have gained ground. It's just as simple as that. But we haven't done enough and we can't rest on our laurels. My leader has a saying that he uses to remind us all the time, and a good one, that achievement to a politician is a wasting asset. Achievement to anybody is a wasting asset if they sit down and look ahead. So all I'm saying is that without taking anything away from our farmers at all in this Province, because they can be the best, most progressive farmers in the world; without taking anything away from them in the past of what they have done, I say all of us together have a responsibility to do better in the future.

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker, might I ask a question of the honourable gentleman who just took his seat? I'd like to ask the honourable gentleman if he is able to break down the figure that he gave us of \$30 million spent under the water section of his department - water resources section - as to how much of that was spent on the Winnipeg Floodway.

MR. HUTTON: Yes, I can do that. Madam Speaker, just to qualify, it wasn't the money that was spent, it was the authorization that we were faced with to get done. We had

(MR. HUTTON cont'd) \$30 million authorized. This was the kind of work program that we faced at the beginning of the year. I can give you the breakdown.

MR. WRIGHT: Madam Speaker, I first wish to extend to you my best wishes on you again assuming the more onerous duties of your high office, and I also am very pleased to be able to read from time to time in the newspapers, with pride, about the gracious and friendly way in which you represent this Assembly between sessions. Madam Speaker, I believe in equal rights for women, and your performance here more than justifies that belief. There is a saying that the hand that rocks the cradle rules the world. Well, I think that this is a little old-fashioned and out of date, and I would predict that if civilization is to survive, that this hand is going to control the cradle and rock the world, Madam Speaker.

I wish to congratulate the honourable members for Souris - Lansdowne and Churchill for the able manner in which they moved the Address in Reply. While they were doing this I was making mental pictures of their constituencies, making pictures of the contrast, Madam Speaker. I visualized the peaceful and pastoral scenes along the Souris River of the Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne in his constituency, then I remembered the mighty Nelson River with its muskeg and rock and barrenness, even when you get to Churchill where even the trees seem able only to produce branches on one side. This to me was a study in contrast, and this to me represented variety, and if variety is the spice of life, then we here in Manitoba have no reason for apathy, Madam Speaker.

Yet apathy is what the Honourable Member for Churchill so boldly and yet so rightly accused this and other governments of when he said, and I quote, Madam Speaker, "The previous governments have offered only lip-service to the north and to northern problems in the past and have turned their backs on large and expensive projects needed to improve that part of the country. He said Northern Manitoba became the home of the hardy and the prophet -- P R O P H E T. He believes now though that the government has seen the light, and just as he warned the government, I remind him not to expect too much, unless the other word profit appears in the horizon -- P R O F I T.

The Nelson project, Madam Speaker, is one of stupendous immensity, and I wonder just what this will do for Manitoba. I can see where this could be the most wonderful thing that ever happened in our province, and yet I have to make certain reservations in my thinking when I look at what is happening outside of our own Province of Manitoba. But the honourable member went on further to say, Madam Speaker, he urged that programs be developed to turn the raw materials of the North into finished products within the Province, and he said, "Gone are the days when we can be satisfied to ship our raw products out of the province, and their full value can only be realized through their manufacture, through a finished product. I commend him, Madam Speaker, for those words, and I think they are very apt.

I said a moment ago that I had reservations about the huge development on the Nelson because of the very thing that the honourable member said. I haven't forgot the Columbia River deal, Madam Speaker, the size of that. I am also reminded that the Conservative government under John Diefenbaker drafted this agreement, visualized it, and the Liberals of the day criticized it thoroughly. I can remember that fine Canadian, Major General McNaughton, and his thoughts about the matter, but it didn't take the Liberals very long to push it through Parliament when they became the government.

When we come to think that eight percent of our water that's going into the United States, or will go into the United States, eight percent of that water could have doubled the flow of the Saskatchewan River. We are going to hear more in North America about the shortage of water because this is probably one of the most vital subjects on this continent today. The day will come when we will wonder why we turned this water into American hands, because it wasn't only power the Americans were after. Here we have turned the entire control of the fifth largest river in North America into United States hands -- 90,000 cubic feet a second pouring into the United States, and this water is destined to go as far as Oklahoma and southern California. Not only in B. C. do we see what I consider irresponsible giving up of our resources, it will be interesting for those who will read what posterity has to say about how Alberta's rich resources have been turned over to outside control.

I have an interesting paper with me written by our Leader Tommy Douglas, "How Canadians Can Get Their Country Back." He points out that 62 percent of the economic resources of this country is now under American control. Sometimes I wonder -- I heard the Honourable Member for St. Boniface speak today, and he speaks with conviction at times and I try to be tolerant towards his attitude, and I am wondering whether the situation in Quebec is

(MR. WRIGHT cont'd) really as bad as they tell us. Sure there are a few hooligans who make the headlines, but I'm wondering if the people of Quebec are not also concerned about this loss of Canadian economy to the United States, and perhaps it would be worth studying to find out whether they have taken a more positive approach to the problem of getting their country back.

Madam Speaker, I am reminded that in Sweden, when the Democratic Socialist Government took over in 1932, that 68 percent of the economy in Sweden was controlled outside that wonderful country, and it took the Democratic Socialists thirty years, until today they now have complete control of the economy of their country.

I'm not suggesting that we do not need outside money, Madam Speaker, because we do. We need it badly, but surely there is a difference between rolling capital and equity capital. We need to be able to borrow money at a fair rate of interest to develop the many things we have here in Manitoba - the many resources we have - but I was reminded of the difference at one of our seminars between rolling capital and equity capital, because I didn't fully appreciate it. I was told about the farmer who owes a lot of money, and to be able to borrow it he allows the people he borrows from to have an equity in his farm. This sort of financing is pretty good because you can live pretty high. The only trouble is that sooner or later you run out of farm. I think that this applies to much of the things that have been done here.

Now I'll speak of the COMEF Report of 1963, on page D-III-8. It talks about the lumber industry in Manitoba. I'm reminded again as I read it - the words of the Honourable Member for Churchill when he again so rightly said this. He called for twenty-two steps to help the north catch up with the south, including a redoubling of our efforts to establish an integrated pulp, paper and lumbering industry in northern Manitoba.

Now the COMEF Report on this page said, and I quote, that "The lumbering industry in Manitoba is a sick industry." They realized this fact when they made the study, and again later on on the same page they said that there was not one modern sawmill in Manitoba. It went on to talk about the proper methods of harvesting our natural resources, particularly timber. It talked about integrated harvesting, and never was this drawn to my attention more vividly than when I paid a visit to Birch River to see the plywood factory there. I could see the need for integrated harvesting, where you picked the trees and put them to the best use. We have a plywood plant now in Birch River that is being starved because of a lack of large timber, and we have allowed timber to be cut up for two by fours and what have you because of a lack of proper policy. This was pointed out back in the COMEF Report, Madam Speaker. This makes sense. Manitoba doesn't have the huge timber resources or the size of trees that they do in British Columbia, but this is all the more reason that we have to use intelligence in our harvesting.

Now, I read where the present policy -- and you must remember this is the COMEF Report written back in '63, so that if there have been any changes since then I can be corrected, Madam Speaker -- but it said that the present policy at that time was based on the 1930 estimates, and it went on to say that the annual drain from logging and from insects and from fire and this sort of thing exceeded the natural growth. This was the vision that we had when we entered upon this business of forestry. It said that the requirement would outgrow the ----- produced. Now, the present inventory which was taken just a few years ago shows this to be seriously wrong and that the Crown lands alone can sustain an annual cut of 100 million cubic feet, and this is soft wood alone. I noticed from the report that the average five years, the cut was 35 million cubic feet and that was all species on Crown land.

The COMEF Report also pointed out the need and the feasibility of having a kraft paper mill in northern Manitoba which the honourable member also mentioned. We have known this for a long time and we know we have one at Pine Falls, but I know of one gentleman who was interested in the buildings at Cranberry Portage for this three or four years ago, or two years ago when the Federal Government relinquished the buildings there. I congratulate the government for having seen fit to use these buildings in the interests of education, but this need was seen by this gentleman some few years ago, that these buildings could have been turned into a kraft paper mill.

The report said the best time to do this was between the years 1965 and 1970 when the market would be just -- or demand would be right, and they even suggested the location of The Pas which isn't very far from Cranberry Portage. It was suggested that a plant of 500 tons a day capacity of air-dried bleached kraft at a fixed investment of \$45 million. I mention these things to point out that this has already been looked at and suggested. It points out the economic

(MR. WRIGHT cont'd) benefits and it says unless it would be done soon that we might lose permanently the opportunity to do this. I mentioned the federal buildings at Cranberry Portage and very few Manitobans realize the size of these buildings that they had there for our hangars.

It mentioned the Port of Churchill, and we all know the great struggle that took place to even get the railway to Churchill. And on Page E-III-13, it said that by 1975, as a result of doing the very things that the Honourable Member for Churchill suggested, that we could have 18, 000 full-time and part-time jobs for the people of Northern Manitoba.

But many times, Madam Speaker, in that COMEF Report, I am interested in the use of the word "catalyst". It says that the role of the government should be that of a catalyst. Now in industry a catalyst is a material that doesn't undergo a change in itself but it does produce marked changes in other materials. Now this doesn't simply mean then that the government is to become a catalyst, that they should simply introduce the other parties. The government, like the catalyst, must be thoroughly mixed, involved, in order to produce and enhance the new product, just the same as a catalyst has to be thoroughly mixed. So I think it's very apt that the COMEF people use that expression from time to time.

And where we have failed, Madam Speaker, I don't think that there's any lack of dedication or diligence on the part of the department. In fact, I am rather impressed by the sincerity of the Minister and of his co-workers, and I think it must be discouraging for him to see Manitoba lagging so far behind in industrial development. As I said before, the fact that Manitoba doesn't have the huge resources of the other provinces, the timber of B. C., the gas and oil of Alberta, the Potash of Saskatchewan, or the iron or asbestos of Quebec makes this all the more necessary that we should take a good look at putting public money into this thing.

Now private enterprise is interested mainly in readily available profits, and yet in Manitoba we don't have exactly the readily available resources of the other provinces. It therefore seems anachronistic to me to think that we should wait for private capital to come in and merely encourage them. We have to be - as they suggest - the catalyst that gets right in there and gets involved, even if we have to use public funds to get some of these things started.

The times call for bold actions, Madam Speaker, and the Nelson development is to be commended. I'm afraid we're going to - I have doubts about this - I think we're going to use public monies to produce electricity which will be sold and go south, and be delivered along with our timber and our other resources, to be made into manufactured articles which we will be able to buy back in Manitoba. This is the fear that I have, that is if we have the buying power to do it at the time. Now if we can get money for the stupendous development on the Nelson, I suggest that we can get money for the development of factories in Northern Manitoba, and I want to point out that there's a difference between development and exploitation; there's a difference between a fair return on an investment and robbery.

Now what can happen to Manitoba, Madam Speaker? Well let's look south. The U.S. economy, because it's a free enterprise system, is unplanned, and by being unplanned it creates industrial whirlpools which suck resources and manpower into the large centres like Chicago and New York and Los Angeles. We're all well aware of the affluence of these big cities, but when we take a look at the Dakotas and the Carolinas and we realize that Montana's population is not half of what it used to be, we can see that this is really the way it's working. The periphery areas are becoming depleted of their population, not of their resources, but becoming depopulated of their manpower.

Now the Nelson River could hasten this for us too. I am being pessimistic probably here, but this is what could happen if we don't watch. The Nelson could, as I said, be a means of sending huge quantities of power to develop our natural products in the United States or it could bring about the greatest development in our province, and I have a notion the odds are against us when I look around and see what is happening outside of Manitoba.

Now when we press for reform, Madam Speaker, we are told from time to time by the First Minister that he agrees that we need more money for this, for education, for health, for psychiatric treatment, but he says you can't have everything at once. We realize this and we realize too that we must have priorities. This is common sense. But I also suspect at this time that the opponents of comprehensive medical care have seized upon the Second Annual Report of the Economic Council, which stresses the fact that huge amounts of money must be poured into education, they are going to seize on this fact to play down the need for

(MR. WRIGHT cont'd) Medicare. Now I want to submit to this House that in my opinion you can't divorce education from health. If the health of a nation isn't good, then all the education in the world will be of no use.

Now I said a minute ago that I thought the odds were against us. I think so because when I read in the paper of the influence that Premier Manning of Alberta and Mr. Kilgour of the Great West Life are having upon our First Minister, this is one of the reasons. I think this is one of the reasons why Manitoba has not committed itself yet to a national scheme, and when we say we can't afford both, we can't afford medicare and its costs along with that of the high cost of education, the Howe Commission itself answered this, Madam Speaker. It said that the only thing that was more expensive than comprehensive medical care was inadequate or no medical care.

I believed the First Minister when he said that the next election won't be as soon as you think it will, the other day as he was looking across at the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. I believe that because he is an astute politician and he knows the big issues, and I think he knows that health care is going to be a big issue too in the next election. I suggest that he wear himself of the desire to sympathize with Mr. Manning and Mr. Kilgour who are very active just now postponing this great social legislation. I said before in a speech that it reminded me of when I was going to school of King Canute sitting by the edge of the sea trying to get the tide to stop. It's just about as much use trying to stop this great social reform of proper medical care as it was to try and stop it.

I have a clipping in my hand, Madam Speaker, from the Winnipeg Tribune of May 3, 1963, where I predicted in a speech here that the next big issue in the provincial election would be medicare. Well I was wrong because we've had an election since then, but what I said still holds true. I charged that the Conservatives may adopt it as a plank at a politically expedient time. I can't believe that they'll call a provincial election unless the issue of comprehensive medical care is one of the big ones. That's why I agree with the First Minister that he will not call a quick election. I'm looking into my crystal ball and I think that he would probably take a look at this to the point where we may even get a special session, and that will be the issue then, when it becomes politically expedient for them to call it on this big issue. This is how sincere, and really how much I believe that the people want it, despite the Gallup polls. Gallup polls, to me, would never impress me, and I hope that the government doesn't make the mistake of the voluntary plan of Alberta, because when you compare them, it's certainly a patched-up affair compared to the plan they have in Saskatchewan.

I had a little stay in the hospital the first time in my life last October, and it was the most — it was really a happy occasion, and while I was there I enjoyed the finest treatment I believe that a person could possibly get. I stayed there for a week and I wasn't really too sick although I went for major surgery, but what I did think about was what I was enjoying for myself I wished for the rest of the people of the world, because the care that I got was simply wonderful and I think this is a tribute to our hospitals and to our medical people.

This is what we're asking for. We know we have good care for people who can afford it. We're asking this for many many more people who are not getting it. Too many people today are needing dentistry, Madam. I know of many young couples who postpone the care of their teeth because of the fantastic costs today. I've talked to young people who are waiting to get their teeth out rather than go through the expensive procedures. Well this to me is proof that we do not have comprehensive medical care. I keep perennially reminding the House of the elderly lady who is 83 -- if she gets a year older every year like the rest of us, she's now 83, who pays out of her \$75. a month, being one of the pioneer types she still pays her MMS, and yet the only thing she really needs are drugs, and yet she can't get drugs under the MMS contract and anyone knows the high price of drugs. In fact, the cost of drugs in North America now exceeds the cost of medical services for the first time in history. And what is Manitoba doing about the high price of drugs? I remember withdrawing a resolution here some two or three years ago because the Federal Government were going to hold an investigation. I asked the Minister of Health to tell us what happened. I think he owes it to this House to tell us what happened with the federal investigation about the high price of drugs.

I don't believe we can separate health and education with the argument of priorities, Madam Speaker, and at our recent New Democratic Convention I was fortunate enough to be on a committee for education, and when I saw the government White Paper the other day I wondered if they had been at the convention of last year. We had a paper there "Education for the Next Decade", and when I saw the paper yesterday -- and I want to give credit, I think

(MR. WRIGHT cont'd) perhaps you did see it and maybe you took some notice of it, because it's remarkable when I looked at the two -- I have them both here -- and I'm pointing out, Madam Speaker, that we see the needs for more money into education and with this we find no fault, but I want to warn that we're not going to allow this business of priority to be used as a smokescreen for the lack of good medical care.

Now today we had a visit from a delegation from the Teachers' Society and the Trustees' Society, and I want to say that I'm very pleased about the co-operation that's existing now between the Trustees and the Teachers' Societies, that they do see the need for much reform. Sometimes I did wonder if school boards were not in the position of the doctors today, where many of our doctors simply can't keep up with the science of drugs, that they are besieged and bombarded by the various high pressure methods of the drug companies to the point where they don't really know, and sometimes I wonder if school boards too are not besieged and bombarded by Teachers' Societies. It's so complex today, Madam Speaker. I get bewildered by the whole set-up, just as the doctors are bewildered by whether they should use this drug. I recall one Winnipeg doctor who had thalidomide and looked at it, bounced it, and thought he didn't know enough about it and he didn't prescribe it for his people, and he is a very happy man about it. This is what I mean by the complexity of education.

I was very happy at our convention too to see the support for the autonomy of Brandon College. I think that this is a great step forward, that it will provide Western Manitoba with a new look as far as university care is concerned. Education today in an age of technology is a very very complex thing. It calls for a lot of daring, and as I said before, I commend the government for this, although they do not stipulate just how much money they are going to spend. It's sort of a blanket arrangement.

Sometimes when we, looked at the ARDA programs which keep on mentioning the Interlake Country, I wonder just how much ARDA has done for the Interlake Country, and I wonder -- I know they have community pastures, but it seems to me that some of this ARDA money, some of this federal money could have been thrown into education in this poverty-stricken area of the Interlake. --(Interjection) -- I heard "hear, hear" from the Minister of Education and I did have a clipping that referred to him, and I commend him too, that he was saying that ARDA considered Gimli as part of the plan there and I think we go along with his reason that they certainly made a mess of the deal there.

Well, Madam Speaker, much time is taken in this House on recriminations at times, and I suppose that this is a necessary step in the eyes of a lot of people who feel aggrieved, but to me - it upsets me. Stuart Chase said 30 years ago -- or he concluded 30 years ago that 50 percent of the labour force was used in unessential industries, and he went on to talk about salesmen and all these things, the people that really produce nothing. When I look at some of the auto showrooms and see these young fellows there, carnations in their lapels, all dressed up and trying to high pressure people into buying things that they really can't afford, I wonder whether we are heading in the right direction. Is this what we want to train people to do? I don't know. Then I see the farmers struggling against the rise in the productive costs that they have today. We certainly have to be sympathetic to the cause when we see the cost of production rising, with the fixed prices that they have to contend with.

The times call for daring, Madam Speaker, and I'm reminded that C. P. Snow, the great Briton, says that it's getting so complex today, he believes that we have about ten years in which to put our house in order if we are to survive annihilation by our knowledge. He says that knowledge is becoming so specialized today that a chemist doesn't understand a physicist. This is what I worry about. I believe in education. I think that education will be the salvation of the world, but I found out the fact that the complexity of it is what frightens me.

Robert Bend, the former Minister, the other day spoke about the tensions of the student. This too makes me realize the complexity of education. We must not only improve communication and understanding, sometimes we have to get beyond our own horizons, Madam Speaker, and we have to be receptive to new ideas. We had problems in communication that we could not solve until we got our thinking out beyond this world. When we were able to put a satellite out into space and we were able to bombard the beams from the satellite, then we were able to solve some of the communication problems. In fact the railways are thinking of getting together in a co-operative effort to place a satellite into space to solve some of their communications problems.

When I was on supervisory training for the railway, Madam Speaker, we used a nine-dot puzzle to show our supervisors how they had to get their thinking out beyond the sphere in

(MR. WRIGHT cont'd) which they worked in order to solve a problem. They were told to try and hook up these nine dots with four straight lines. The problem could only be solved when you carried the lines out beyond the area of the nine dots. The moral is this is what we did with communications by placing a satellite into space. I think we have to do the same thing in our thinking. That's why my speech today is based out on the periphery of this gathering, Madam Speaker. I think we have to be receptive to ideas and to not just wash them away as so much malarkey.

I think that we have come to the point, Madam Speaker, when we realize and we believe that we are our brother's keeper, because time is short and I really believe this. I think the sooner we accept this, the easier it will be to accept new ideas. Stuart Chase - I keep mentioning him because he is the economist, the veteran that writes for people like myself. I can understand very few economists, but I give the credit to Stuart Chase that he is able to get something into my head. He had a definition of planning which I mentioned before here. He said that planning was intelligent co-operation with the inevitable. I think, Madam Speaker, it's inevitable that many of the proposals that we make in this House are to become a reality soon. Let's co-operate intelligently.

MR. EVANS: Madam Speaker, I wonder if you -- my honourable friend may want to adjourn -- (Interjection) -- I think the debate cannot be adjourned and undoubtedly the members would wish to continue the debate this evening. For that reason I wonder, Madam Speaker, if you would call it 5.30.

MADAM SPEAKER: I call it 5.30 and leave the chair until 8 o'clock.