

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Tuesday, March 19, 1968

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to present a petition that's addressed to the Honourable George Johnson, Minister of Education, Legislative Buildings, Winnipeg, Manitoba:

"We, the undersigned ratepayers and electors of Assiniboine School Division No. 2, do deplore and protest unnecessary delay in approving the plans of the school board for construction of Hedges Junior High School. The brief containing the proposal and statistics was submitted to your department on September 18, 1967. Modifications and revisions demanded by your department extending over many months were, in many cases, negligible and in any case should have been considered and proposed to the school board in one revision. The net result was delay of final approval to March 8, 1968.

"This undue delay of seven months nullified school board plans to have this school under construction in the early part of 1967 and ready for partial occupancy at least by the beginning of 1968-69 school term. As a result of this delay, the school board has found it necessary to introduce staggered and split classes for some 800 pupils involved in classes 7, 8 and 9 and subsequent overcrowding and double use of Ness Junior High School in the school year 1968-69.

"We feel this will result in lower educational levels, and the disruption in pupils' and parents' lives cannot be measured. We strongly urge your department to expedite the construction of this school so no further delays will develop with a possibility of staggered classes extending into a second school year. We also strongly urge you to overhaul your department to expedite planning for future schools, and thus avoid future disruptions of this nature."

It is respectfully submitted on behalf of some 650 members of this school division and constituents of Assiniboia.

I wish to table this petition, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees

Notices of Motion

Introduction of Bills

Before the Orders of the Day, I would like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the Gallery where we have 125 Grade 8 students from the Hugh John MacDonald School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Fedak, Mr. Enns, Mr. Turman and Mrs. Fleming. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Logan. On behalf of all the honourable members of the Legislative Assembly I welcome you all here today.

The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question. I presume I'll have to address it to the First Minister. It applies to both Municipal Affairs, I would think, and Education. I received a telephone call this morning advising me that one of the municipalities I represent had received a letter from the government advising them that the mill rate for the Foundation school program was going to be increased. The mill rate as introduced last year and the understanding that the people of Manitoba had from the White Paper was that the mill rate for the Foundation Program on residential was to be 9 mills, and the letter apparently advises them that it will be 13.1 mills, which is an increase of some 30 percent. The commercial rate which was established last year as 33 mills, according to this letter will be 37.1 mills, and this municipality is deeply disturbed. This is, in their opinion, a change from government policy. Could the Minister indicate exactly what is going on in this regard?

HON. WALTER WEIR (Premier) (Minnedosa): Mr. Speaker, I can answer it in general. If it were detailed questioning I think the Minister of Education is more capable than I to reply to it, but I think that the legislation called for the general municipal levy to pay for 35 percent of the Foundation Program. To pay for the 35 percent of the Foundation Program, as I understand it called this year for 13, and I presume whatever the mill rates the honourable gentleman used are the accurate mill rates, to pay for the 35 percent of the Foundation Program which is the responsibility of the local taxpayer, maintaining the 24 mill differential that existed within the legislation as between shelter, for an easy definition, and other properties - again for another easy definition - and I presume this - the Minister of Education may be able to

(MR. WEIR cont'd.) comment on it - but this, I presume, is what is required with the assessment of the total area to cover the 35 percent of the cost of the Foundation Program.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, a subsequent question. Was it not established last year, though? Was not the public of the province led to understand that their share of the program would be 9 mills on shelter or residential and 33 on commercial, and that the balance would be from provincial funds and that was the purpose for putting on the 5 percent sales tax? Wasn't this the whole basis of the discussion at the last session?

MR. WEIR: Well, Mr. Speaker, as I recall the legislation, the permanent feature was the 35 percent and 65 percent and the province's share of the 65 per of the Foundation Program has increased proportionately with the 35 percent of the real property cost of the Foundation Program. The 9 and 33, as I recall it, was the level that was required to the equivalent mill rate on the equalized assessment to pay the 35 percent share, but as I recall the statute, the thing that was firm was the 65 percent of the cost of the Foundation Program paid for by the treasury and 35 percent being paid for by the real property taxpayers through their municipal taxation.

MR. SAUL MILLER (Seven Oaks): Mr. Speaker, I wonder whether the First Minister might answer or perhaps the Minister of Education. Along the same lines, in view of the fact that the Foundation Program has not been enriched nor has not been broadened, would he not have to concede that a colossal miscalculation was made in the Foundation Program costs in order for the increase of 45 percent to have to happen within 12 months?

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Education) (Gimli): Mr. Speaker, to clarify the situation: under the Act the Finance Board, as the First Minister has said, is required under the Act to strike the mill rates for the 35 percent of the Foundation Program. The Finance Board recommended certain increases in certain categories in the Foundation Program which, because of the necessity of getting these rates out and determined by that board, had to be -- I announced in the House as soon as I was able to, and once the Finance Board knows the Foundation grant for the year, they know from their own calculations what the total cost of the Foundation Program is for all divisions, unitary divisions, and they are required by statute to strike the mill rate to raise 35 percent of that amount.

MR. MILLER: A supplemental question, Mr. Speaker. This may be so, but can the Minister not realize that if the Foundation Program had been properly laid before this House and estimated, that the costs could not have increased 45 percent in view of the fact that the Foundation Program is basically the same as what it was last year. There has been no enrichment nor enhancement of it to any extent.

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, the estimates will soon be before us and the honourable member will see from those figures just what the situation is.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Mr. Speaker, I have the White Paper before me that was presented to us last year explaining the whole program and the basis for the assessment. You will find it on Page 12 if you have it there, for my honourable friends' information, but on top of what has already been said today, the alarming thing in most cases is that the balanced assessment is up. Now, I only checked with one municipality today, and whereas their balanced assessment and actual assessment last year was just about identical, within \$400.00 I do believe, this year the balanced assessment is up over a third of a million dollars over the actual, so that the 13.1 mill rate on farm and residential, when applied to the actual, amounts to 16.8 on the actual, and when applied to the business is 47, and the point that we've been making here is that we were led to believe, certainly the public were led to believe that the mill rate would be 9 and 33 when in fact -- (Interjections) -- Well the question is, were they not led to believe that that was so?

SOME MEMBERS: No.

MR. SHOEMAKER: They were not led to believe. I've got the answer to that. Well then . . .

MR. WEIR: Equalized assessment.

MR. SHOEMAKER: On the equalized assessment. But, then will someone kindly tell me - this is the second question now - how does a municipality get to know what their equalized assessment is, and what factor is applied to the actual that results in an equalized? Somebody give me a complete answer to that. What factor is used so that we will know where we're at?

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, I don't believe this is the kind of question that we can deal with under Orders of the Day.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party) (Radisson): ... Mr. Speaker, if I may, direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Education on a related line. Notwithstanding the original proposition of the sharing of the cost of education of 35 per cent - 65 percent, which results in the increase in the mill rate basis that has been referred to in previous questions, is it not a fact, however, that the burden of taxation for educational purposes will increase at the local level contrary to the announced policy of the government notwithstanding?

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, it was made abundantly clear when that Act was passed last year and abundantly clear at those meetings which I attended throughout the province, in saying categorically to the people, as the White Paper says, that the 9 - 33 was the estimate of the local mill rate in the first year of operation as deduced as best they could by our Finance Branch in the Department of Education, and that taking this into account - as you remember, we said that for the previous year they had estimated the total educational costs in '66 in the province were \$95 million or whatever it was, going to 105 with the special levy - that these should reduce special levies markedly, that this should be and large pick up with the 9 - 33 and the 65 - 33 split, but it was made abundantly clear that the 35 split, that it was estimated that 9 - 33 in the first year of operation would raise approximately \$33 million, as I understand it, for the support -- or \$30 million for the support of the Foundation Program in its first year, and then the Finance Board in that bill were given the authority in each year, taking the balanced assessment of the province, and they collect. If the whole assessment of the province doesn't go up as much as some of the programs go up, obviously the rate changes and they must strike according to the statute. We are by statute to pay 65 percent of that Foundation Program as determined, plus the people paying 35 percent. To raise their 35 percent - they come to I guess X millions of dollars in any one year - taking the balanced assessment of the board of unitary divisions they strike a rate and they are required by statute to set that rate and so notify the local municipalities. This had to be done this month in order to help them get the notices out.

MR. PAULLEY: May I ask a supplementary question on this same point, Mr. Chairman? Is the government, or will the government give consideration to changing the ratio of 35 - 65 in order that the burden of education on the local taxpayer will not be increased, as it is evident it will be unless the statutory conditions are changed relative to the 35 - 65 percent.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, if there is any announcement in that regard it will be made in due course.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Honourable Minister of Education: is there any intention of increasing the amount of this special levy, the maximum that can be levied under any unitary division?

MR. JOHNSON: Are you suggesting a ceiling on the special levy?

MR. FROESE: Is there not a ceiling of 15 mills at the present time and will this be increased?

MR. JOHNSON: No, there is not.

MR. SPEAKER: I realize the importance of the matter that is being brought before the House but I wonder if this question period is not developing into something of a debate which will probably pretty well be ironed out, in due course, under the matter of Education.

MR. SAMUEL USKIW (Brokenhead): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct this question to the Minister of Agriculture. Yesterday he tabled the Order for Return on the question of the Baron Commission and its report to this House, and in going through it I didn't notice one communication either from the Minister to the Commissioner or from the Commissioner to the Minister. I wonder how he received the report from the Baron Commission. In what form?

HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Minister of Agriculture and Conservation) (Rockwood-Iberville): Mr. Speaker, it was personally delivered to the office of my Deputy Minister.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q.C. (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, in order to keep the records straight, I would like to go back to the question of the equalized assessment and ask the Honourable Minister of Education whether or no the statement which I am about to read was not an enunciation of government policy at the time the White Paper was read, and I am reading from Page 10 of the White Paper which says ...

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder -- I'd be prepared to take a little advice from the House on this matter. I wonder if we should continue this particular discussion at this time. Is this not allocated to question period and could we not keep it as such?

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, if I may, if you are seeking the advice of myself as leader of my group, may I respectfully suggest to you that the matter is of such supreme importance to the whole of the Province of Manitoba, and in particular to the municipal councils and school boards that are faced - and also of course the local taxpayer - that are being faced with increased taxation that they thought they had been relieved of to some degree last year due to government policy, that it is most important and I would suggest that pertinent questions should be allowed by your Honour at this particular time.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, the reason I brought the matter up in the first place is that when the news came to me this morning I couldn't believe that these were the facts. My impression was that possibly we should adjourn the House on a matter of urgent public importance, which I consider this to be, because it appears to me, and certainly to the taxpayers of the province, to be a reversal of government position, and while I don't want to pursue a debate at this point, I think that a questioning on a matter as vital to our public is in order.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I certainly do not object to discussing the matter. However, I'm amazed at the questions that are being put because we had a full discussion last year and I think every one realized - at least I did - of the implications in this matter.

MR. SPEAKER: I thank the honourable gentlemen for their opinions and I wonder if the Honourable Member for Selkirk would excuse the interruption and proceed.

MR. HILLHOUSE: The question that I wish to put, Mr. Speaker, is this - I'm reading from Page 10 of the White Paper which was read by the Minister of Education last year. Was this not the policy of the government which you then enunciated? And I quote: "Under the revised system, a real property taxpayer in a single district division will pay a uniform standard levy calculated on the basis of the equalized assessment of nine mills for farm lands and homes and 33 mills on other real property in the municipality in which his property is located. In addition, he will probably pay a special levy, the size of which will depend upon the extent to which the program of the school division in which his property is located, exceeds the Foundation Program. He will no longer receive the school tax rebate."

My question is: Was that not the policy of the government as enunciated when you read the White Paper on Education?

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, I think if you follow on -- I haven't got the White Paper in front of me but I think it's made abundantly clear that in the first year of operation to raise that 35 percent it was determined, under the cost to the Foundation Program last year and in the first year of operation, it would be 9 - 33. Certainly, in all the statements I made at public meetings, I made that point abundantly clear, that on the first year of operation it was calculated that 9 and 33 mills would raise the local share of the Foundation Program but for extras outside, which would be covered by of course a special levy. We further postulated that those special levies should be very low in the first year of operation. And then in the bill it clearly states that in each year the Finance Board is given the statutory power of striking the mill rate required in any one year to raise that amount of money - the 35 percent?

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I then wonder if I may get an absolute clarification here. Is it correct, then, that the government has now stated that the mill rate which last year was nine mills on residential will now be 13.1? Is this the correct statement?

MR. JOHNSON: Thirteen point one on residential.

MR. MOLGAT: That is correct?

MR. JOHNSON: The Finance Board has struck this rate as the Act provides.

MR. MOLGAT: And that the commercial will increase from 33 mills to 37.1; is that correct?

MR. JOHNSON: I believe those are the right figures, yes.

MR. MOLGAT: So the increase in the residential, then, will be over -- from nine mills last year the mill rate increase is 45 percent increase. Is that a fact?

MR. JOHNSON: From nine to 13.1.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister of Education can advise the House whether he has ascertained whether last year's calculations, that is the nine mills and the 33, was correct and did it finance the program?

MR. JOHNSON: I would have to get the exact figures before me; I'd be prepared to make a statement on that and deal with that in due course.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, would the Minister of Education also agree that the increase ...

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Order, please. I want the Member for Inkster satisfied.

MR. GREEN: I have another question but . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I'm sorry. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MOLGAT: Is it correct as well that, in addition to this increase, the fact that the assessments have been going up throughout the province will impose a greater share on the local taxpayer?

MR. RODNEY S. CLEMENT (Birtle-Russell): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Highways. Has the date been set for the meeting that was requested by the Mayor of Virden and the Reeve of the Municipality of Ellice and the Reeve of the Municipality of Archie, and several other towns and villages, where they were requesting a meeting with you after the 26th of March about a highway to be built from No. 41 to the present new potash mine at Rocanville or the Saskatchewan boundary? Are you familiar with this and has the date been set?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, to the best of my knowledge, a firm date has been set. I believe the Member from Virden has been in contact with the gentlemen described by the Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell. It's my understanding that we're meeting in the middle of next week but I left the matter in hand with the Member from Virden to firm up the meeting suitable to the members from out of town.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, in order to get final clarification on this matter, I wonder if the Minister of Education could answer these questions. If the Foundation Program last year, which was based on \$95 million, if that was valid and 9 and 33 were the mill rates struck to raise that amount of money, and in view of the fact that in the referendum held last winter only a small number of the divisions voted to become unitary divisions, then would he not recognise that if all 48 divisions had come into being, as he had hoped, that the \$95 million figure which was brought to this House as the cost of the Foundation Program, was indeed a complete miscalculation of the actual costs, because the present mill rates being levied on the Foundation Program have nothing to do with the special levies which had to be raised last year and which this year will probably have to be doubled.

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q.C. (Attorney-General) (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I think the last question by the honourable member which was obviously well thought out by him, points up, Sir, what you were trying to tell us, that this is the kind of a question that is really not appropriate for Orders of the Day because this is the kind of question that would have to be debated and answered in some detail, I would think, having regard to the nature of it and the seriousness of the question as put by the honourable member, so I really suggest it points out what has been previously suggested to the House on other occasions that we are here on Orders of the Day to answer urgent matters that can be answered simply, quickly and expeditiously. If debate is required on the question of the 9 - 33 mill rate, there is going to be ample opportunity as soon as we get into the Throne Speech, and there will be ample opportunity when the estimates are tabled, as I understand they will be tonight or tomorrow, and the matter can be gone into quite thoroughly, but I do suggest consideration from honourable members opposite that the Orders of the Day is really not the appropriate period to do it in - not to have a debate.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood): . . . a question to the Minister of Education on another topic. There's been a great deal of concern expressed by people in the Interlake region and throughout the province about the maximum distances of time on school buses. Does the Minister, or does the government have a sort of maximum distance or maximum time limit that students are expected to ride the bus? Is it for instance 70 miles or an hour or what?

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, the provisional plan as presented by the Boundaries Commission was presented as a result of a bill passed in this House forming such a commission and directing them to bring up a plan and presenting it to the people. It's a provisional plan which, after they hold hearings, will come back to us. I don't know about the distances of 70 miles or whatever you're mentioning there. I do say this, that this is a pretty difficult question to answer because very often it depends on the road, it depends on children coming from a distance to a central point and so on. Ideally, I guess, under ideal conditions, the thought in the department is that roughly 45 minutes morning and night for an elementary, and one hour each way for a secondary student, is a rule of thumb that we think is, as far as you'd like to do it, to transport children or in time, but there's no firm foundation in this. Some other provinces, I find, transport children 40 miles or better, with no problems, depending on roads and the

(MR. JOHNSON cont'd.) accessibility of children to a central point and so on, but these are generally, in my experience in the department, the times which have been discussed as reasonable times, in my time in the portfolio.

I would like to say, while I'm on my feet, Mr. Chairman, and I intended to say before the Orders of the Day, that the Collective Agreement Board notified me first thing this morning that they had met with the principals in the dispute in Winnipeg over the negotiations. As you know, the Winnipeg School Division requested a conciliation officer. The teachers' bargaining agent for the city presented a written complaint feeling that negotiations could continue. As directed under Section 430 of The Public Schools Act I referred this to the Collective Agreement Board who, the Act states, their decision is binding. They have notified me this morning that they have felt that the Winnipeg School Division has complied with Section 377, which more or less says that they did take the proper time and measures to bring about a settlement, and I have therefore appointed a conciliation officer and notified the parties by letter as of this morning.

MR. DOERN: A supplementary question to the first part of the Minister's comments. Has the government considered the possibility of any financial assistance or allowances to parents who will find it necessary to board their students in another town because of the great distances they would have to go to another school?

MR. JOHNSON: No.

MR. JAMES COWAN, Q.C. (Winnipeg Centre): I would like to draw the attention of the members of the House to the fact that our guests this afternoon from Sir Hugh John MacDonal School are from Winnipeg Centre and not from Logan.

MR. SPEAKER: I regret that error but I mentioned it as I was informed.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture. Could he ascertain whether, when the Baron Commission Report was handed to his Deputy - and addressed to his Deputy, I take it - whether there was a covering letter with the submission of the report to him? Or is he able to answer now that there wasn't.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, the relationship between the Department of Agriculture and the commissioner appointed, Mr. Baron, is one of long standing, and we were able to conduct our business in that way. For this reason, the absence of -- perhaps the usual or the normal official letters and receipts were not exchanged. To the best of my knowledge no such letters were transmitted or forwarded from my office. I would be very happy to check on it. I do believe there must have been some recognition of his services in terms of his -- and payment for his services made, which I assume probably came through the Deputy Minister's office. I'm prepared to check into that, of course.

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Health. Is he receiving delegations to discuss the question of vocational school facilities? Education, excuse me.

MR. JOHNSON: When he addressed it, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Health, I tuned out for a moment. Could he repeat the question, please.

MR. DESJARDINS: Is the Minister receiving delegations to discuss the question of vocational school facilities?

MR. JOHNSON: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, as a matter of fact this should be directed to the Boundaries Commission only. They are to make the decision.

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Speaker, I would like to just inform the committee briefly, if it's possible, that we, as a result of the White Paper last fall on vocational programming, set up a task force in the department and made them available to divisions and school boards to discuss these matters. I've met with the - and my Deputy Minister was in touch not so long ago - with the Metro people, discussing vocational high schools and sites, and he is still in contact with them re sites. I haven't had a final report from him.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, could we clarify, then, who will make the decision where these schools will be? The Department of Education, the Cabinet or the Boundaries Commission?

MR. JOHNSON: Well, I believe -- we've referred to the Boundaries Commission who have been in touch again with the Metropolitan Planning Authority to get whatever information and recommendations we can from them.

MR. DESJARDINS: . . . please answer my question. Who's going to make the decision?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, on another note altogether. I think it would be proper for the House to welcome back one of its unofficial members on this occasion. I'm referring to one of the news reporters up in the gallery who is back with us after an unfortunate car accident. Barry Came is back today for the first time. I'm sure it's with regret that we learn that his wife is still in the hospital but I'm sure all members will wish her the very best.

MR. FROESE: I'd like to address a question to the House Leader; I think it concerns him. Is there a list available of the Orders-in-Council passed, and also the nature of them?

MR. LYON: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Could the same be made available though?

MR. LYON: No. The Orders-in-Council are filed in the Executive Council office, which is a public office.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable the First Minister, and I must apologize possibly of not giving him due notice, but yesterday afternoon, while accused of being away on a junket by the Minister of Industry and Commerce, I attended a meeting of the Advisory Board of St. Boniface Hospital which I think is a duty some of us have to perform, and at that particular meeting the question of the present situation in respect of the matter of hospitalization of Indians was raised. I'm wondering if my honourable friend the First Minister has any more information that he might be able to relay to the House in regard to that very important subject.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, I have nothing new besides what I indicated to the House last night.

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. Is it correct that his department paid \$27,000 toward the cost of the supplement which appeared in the Financial Post?

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q.C. (Minister of Industry and Commerce) (River Heights): Would you mind repeating that question, please?

MR. GUTTORMSON: Is it true that your department paid \$27,000 toward the cost of the supplement which appeared in the Financial Post?

MR. SPIVAK: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. GUTTORMSON: What was the cost to the government towards that supplement?

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, that's a proper Order for Return.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Speaker, I have a question I'd like to direct to the Provincial Treasurer. Is the 5 percent sales tax applied to coin sets? I'm referring to the 1967 Centennial coin sets which the Federal Government sold for \$40.00?

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Provincial Treasurer) (Fort Rouge): I believe so. I would have to perhaps check my answer but I believe so, that the revenue tax applies to coins or currency that are sold above the face value of the coin or currency concerned.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the First Minister. It's my understanding that the Federal Government has a program which contributes a certain amount of taxation collected throughout the country towards the building of vocational schools. I wonder if the First Minister intends to challenge the legality of that program in the courts.

MR. WEIR: No, Mr. Speaker, because I think it's evident from the standpoint of Manitoba taking advantage of it that they agree with it and that they have consented to it.

MR. GREEN: ... a supplementary question. I would like to know whether Manitoba agreed to this program at some sort of Federal-Provincial Conference in advance of it being enacted by the Federal Government.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, speaking last night in the House the First Minister indicated that he might be prepared to test the position of the Federal Government on this taxation over the Medicare matter. The headlines today indicate that "Weir May Take Ottawa to Court Over Medicare." What would be the position of a Manitoba taxpayer who has no children in school and who is forced to pay the school tax? Would the First Minister agree that such an individual would have a right to take the province to court for collecting school taxes?

MR. WEIR: No, Mr. Speaker, and the honourable member should know better than to even ask the question because this is something that is within the constitutional authority of the Province of Manitoba, to levy taxation for school purposes, and it's been a principle that has been established over many many years. The honourable member was here, as I was, and if

(MR. WEIR cont'd.) he was listening he heard me say that I hoped that it wouldn't be necessary to dig into the details because I hoped that changes would take place. But certainly, if they don't, I will be having checked Manitoba's position as far as the constitutionality is concerned.

MR. MOLGAT: A subsequent question on the same point, Mr. Speaker. Does the province feel that its prosecution of, for example, people like Mr. Hart, who refused to pay certain taxes because they get no benefit, is justified in the light of the province's position now?

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, the reply to the first question applies. It's within the jurisdiction of the Province of Manitoba and he knows what I think of compulsory plans under normal circumstances, and if it wasn't that the law was there and needed to be enforced on Mr. Hart as well as everybody else, I'd be inclined under some circumstances to be on Mr. Hart's side.

MR. PAULLEY: . . . if I may, Mr. Speaker. Does the Honourable the First Minister apply his same philosophy and theories in respect to compulsory plans to education as he does to Medicare?

MR. WEIR: It all depends on what you call compulsory, Mr. Speaker, because beyond a certain point it's not compulsory to take education - it's compulsory to help pay for it. And if we get into a voluntary plan and somebody went into it to the area that it might be subsidized in Manitoba or other areas, it would still be compulsory from the standpoint of paying for it, but it wouldn't be compulsory to receive it.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, may I ask a supplementary question of my honourable friend. Is his philosophy and theories based on the degree of compulsion?

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, I don't think my honourable friend would understand any philosophy.

MR. PAULLEY: I'm sure the First Minister does not understand either.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend from Rhineland asked me a question yesterday at Page 244 of Hansard: is it correct that an individual cannot sell an automobile unit unless it is licensed? The answer: no, it is not correct.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Provincial Treasurer for purposes of clarification. The coin set that I referred to was sold by the Federal Government for \$40.00 but it had a value -- the actual value was something like \$22.00. A \$20.00 gold piece, a dollar and some change. Now does that \$40.00 constitute face value or what . . .

MR. EVANS: No. If my honourable friend's data are correct, there's a face value of \$22.00. The article sells for \$40.00, the coins sell above the face value and are therefore regarded as souvenirs, collector's items, or whatever you will. They are not currency in the ordinary sense. The object of the exclusion under the Act is to make it unnecessary to tax currency. As a matter of fact, it's probably beyond the powers of the province to tax currency as such, but when currency becomes souvenirs, then they are taxable.

MR. GUTTORMSON: A supplementary question. The purpose of my question, Mr. Speaker, is that a woman bought a coin set in a department store this morning and was ordered to pay a 5 percent sales tax, but the same set was purchased from Ottawa for \$40.00 and there was no sales tax.

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q.C. (St. John's): Mr. Speaker, I have two unrelated questions to direct to the Honourable the First Minister. Firstly, do I understand from what he said just now about education that his non-acceptance of the Medicare program is based on the apparent misinformation that it is compulsory under the Medicare Plan for the patient to take health services under Medicare?

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, I don't believe this is any time or place for a philosophical debate or answers to hypothetical questions.

MR. CHERNIACK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. He did answer on education, but I'll go on to my next question. Is there actually a Minister of Highways?

MR. WEIR: There is an acting Minister of Highways who performs the official functions of being Minister of Highways.

MR. CHERNIACK: Is it the intention of the Honourable the First Minister to appoint a Minister of Highways in the near future?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I believe that question is somewhat out of order at this particular stage. I wonder if the honourable member has some lead-up remark to the reason

(MR. SPEAKER cont'd.) for the particular question.

MR. CHERNIACK: . . . Mr. Speaker, I'm interested in knowing about the welfare of the highway program in the Province of Manitoba, and if you think that question was not in order I would ask another question, which may be in order, and that is, since the Honourable the First Minister occupied the position of full-time Minister of Highways for the last two years, does he feel now that it did not require a full-time minister or indeed that now it does not?

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, there will be another opportunity for me to enter into this debate. There's a resolution before the House which I expect to take part in before it's resolved.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Tourism and Recreation. I wonder if he has extended an invitation to CAREB to hold a CAREB convention in Winnipeg in 1970. My information is that a convention has not been decided upon, where it's going to be held, and it is quite a large convention with some probably 2,500 to 3,000 people that would be in attendance. The Canadian Association of Real Estate Boards has a membership of over 20,000 people and if this invitation has not been extended I wish it may be proper for the Minister to make all effort to have this convention held in Winnipeg because it does bring a great amount of revenue. I understand any person spends somewhere, \$140.00 within three days at a convention, and if this is true and you have somewhere in the neighbourhood of 2,500 to 3,000 people, this means revenue somewhere between \$350,000 to \$400,000, so I think it would be worthwhile going after it.

A MEMBER: How much for the go-go girls?

MR. LYON: I thank the honourable member, Mr. Speaker, for his worthwhile question and suggestions. I believe it's possible that such an invitation has already been extended. If that is not the case we will certainly make sure that it is extended.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Attorney-General. Could he indicate when my answer regarding telephone tapping equipment will be available?

MR. LYON: When the answers are received within the department.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. George, did you have a supplementary?

MR. GUTTORMSON: I have a question I'd like to direct to the acting Minister of Highways. Could he indicate to the House when the dates of the restrictions will be put on the highways?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I do not have the exact dates. I know these are being worked on by the department. I expect to be able to announce that to the House perhaps tomorrow.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the First Minister. In view of your attitude towards matters compulsory, is it the intention of the government to remit the penalty that was imposed on Mr. Hart?

MR. WEIR: The answer is no, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I would like to direct a question to my honourable friend the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Some two or three or four years ago, I believe, Professor Tyler at Brandon was appointed to make a population shift study. I believe that he has finished with his research, he has tabled the report. When can members of the House expect to receive a copy of his findings?

HON. THELMA FORBES (Minister of Urban Development and Municipal Affairs) (Cypress): Mr. Speaker, Mr. Tyler did work for the Boundaries Commission and he did provide them with material. This material is still with the Boundaries Commission and we have not been provided with a report of that to date. When it is provided we'll let the honourable member know.

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN, Q.C. (Provincial Secretary) (Dauphin): I would like to place on the table of the House the Annual Report of the Public Utilities Board for the year ending December 31st, 1967; and the Third Annual Report of the Manitoba Centennial Corporation for the fiscal year ending March 31st, 1967; and I table, Mr. Speaker, a Return to an Address for Papers No. 1 dated March 14th, 1968, on the motion of the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I have one question for the Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Have any changes been made in the formula that is being used in making assessments on properties?

MRS. FORBES: No, Mr. Speaker, none.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. As I understand it, it is intended to ... Did you have an announcement ...

MR. LYON: I was simply going to suggest, Mr. Speaker, probably what you were going to say, that there was unanimous consent that the House would move now, rather than to private members' business, to government business and in particular to the Throne Speech debate which appears on Page 7, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Virden for an Address to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor in answer to his speech at the opening of the Session. The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, last night we were discussing the remarks of the Minister of Industry and Commerce. Now, finding that his position was quite weak, yesterday he decided to attack. That was his strategy. He was going to carry the attack, cloud up the issue, and also make counter accusations, but I see that he ran out of the House just a minute or so ago. I can't wait for him; I only have 13 minutes, I believe, Mr. Speaker. Ten? Boy that's short. The vote was at 9:30 ...

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member used the three last night, do you remember?

MR. DESJARDINS: Wasn't the vote at 9:30, Sir? And how long did it take to ... We even had the Honourable Minister conducting a trial, with himself being the accused, the accuser, the defense lawyer, the prosecutor, the jury and the judge. And within a few minutes he came out of there smelling like roses. He was the benefactor of the people of Manitoba; he was defending these people that were borrowing, that wanted to borrow money from the people of Manitoba. And the people that had dared to criticize him turned out to be -- were just a bunch of hoodlums just trying to scuttle Manitoba, to harm Manitoba. How dare anyone from this side of the House criticize the Honourable Minister.

Well if he was here we'd say to him: hold down there, boy, for a minute. Reel in your red herring and roll your sleeves because nobody, not even the Honourable Minister, will intimidate the members of the House. And when it's time to criticize we certainly will. This is what we were elected for and we intend to do so.

We might say a few words about his propaganda machine. He said that we were criticizing him for using the press, radio and T.V. to sell Manitoba. That is not true, Sir. You know it and he knows it; we never criticized him for this at all. Granted we're not all as clever as he is, but we know the value of press. T.V. and radio. We did not even criticize him for using the same media to sell himself, to sell his party and to sell the government, but we're criticizing him using public funds to do it. This is the issue. This is what we're criticizing, the people of Manitoba having to pay to sell him and the government. And we also criticize some of the ridiculous things that come out such as the wild boar and the bear and the fish stories that we've heard. This should be taught in schools - in kindergarten, I should say.

Now, the only defense that I hear on this is, that was done in other areas, in other provinces. That will not make it more palatable to the people of Manitoba and this is not an excuse even if it is true, and I for one am tired of every time there's something that's not popular, "Well, this is what they say their members in Nova Scotia ..." or Lower Slobodia or those places. I'm not interested in that. We're talking about the people of Manitoba.

I think that we should also have a few words on the Manitoba Development Fund. For years we were told that not even the Minister knew what was going on. Of course, we saw the then Premier and all the Ministers running around the province cutting ribbons and taking credit for making it possible to open this plan. But they knew nothing about it. Now we have been elected, Sir, to represent the public and the public has a right to know how the money, public money is spent. Yesterday the Minister told us that the members of the Cabinet had reviewed some cases. They were satisfied and therefore this matter was closed, he said. Let me inform the Minister that the matter is not closed. It's not over. It's not good enough. This government has too often shown how partisan it can be, and we have had all kinds of examples and we'll give you more before the session is over. Remember that this is the same Cabinet that created commissions that were supposed to be independent commissions to deal with these things, and then some of the members of this cabinet will tell the people: "Forget about the commission; me and the boys will decide. We'll decide; the members of the Cabinet will decide." They have no respect for democracy at all when they do things like this, and it

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd.) is quite clear to a lot of people to what extent they will go to stay in power. They are trying to make it clear that the people who vote for them will get much more and stand to do much better if they are on the government side.

Now is the Honourable Minister going to tell me that because he reviewed the case, because the Provincial Secretary reviewed the case, everything is all right and we'll close the books? No Sir, not by a long shot. The Minister is worried about the borrowers. Well, what about the people who are lending this money? Shouldn't they have something to say about this? Their clothes are taxed so there could be money to loan to other people. They have no say where their money goes; at least they should say who borrows this money.

Now, he made a statement yesterday that the loan companies do not discuss private business. This might be true, but this is public business because this is public money that we are using. This is the difference. And, by the way, this government yesterday has shown that they have changed their mind on this secrecy. Nobody was supposed to know, and yesterday the Minister told us that 12 or 14, whatever number of ministers they have, know about it because the Cabinet must review these cases. Where is the secrecy? The Cabinet must review these cases, 12 or maybe 14 of them. This is what we have been asking for a number of years, that we have a committee of this House to study this, but a representative committee. Let us remember that less than 50 percent of the people of Manitoba voted for my friends at the last election, and you know there will be an awful lot less than that next election.

Now, does he mean to tell me that the people of Manitoba have more confidence in himself than the Leader of the NDP party? Or that the Premier of this province should be trusted more than the Leader of the Official Opposition? Or that the people - and not only the people of Dauphin but the people of Manitoba - have more confidence in the Minister, in the Provincial Secretary than the member from Flee Island? I never remember the other name . . . Now all right, we can have a member of this House . . . what was that -- (Interjection) -- You know that reminds me, I'd like to read something else about him, about the partisan way he's laughing where he should get up, stand up and resign. This is what the member should do. This is what he said in Dauphin. Let us look, this member that thinks this is a joke. He's saying "Servicing offices for provincial departments now include the Assessment Branch office, the Planning Section, the EMO district headquarters for the whole of Northern Manitoba, expanded agriculture service, the drivers' testing unit and office, the Cache Lake Correctional Institute, extended Welfare Department services, the office for the Probation Supervisor for northern Manitoba, the office for the Crop Insurance supervisor for this region, and the headquarters for the Frontier School Division. In listing these services, Mr. McLean noted that all of them employed staff personnel now living in Dauphin, and that other centres had hoped for or expected to have these offices situated in their locality, but no such luck, because they didn't elect a Conservative."

This is what he said later on. This is the kind of man we are supposed to have confidence in. They're the ones that are going to review, they're going to talk for all the people of Manitoba. He says, "In the matter of representation, and provincial boards and commissions, Dauphin has been recognized more than any other constituency in Manitoba," and he listed the twelve local citizens who have been named as representatives of the Boundaries Commission, the Liquor Licensing Board and Commission, Physical Fitness Advisory Council, the University of Manitoba Board of Governors, the Cancer Research Foundation, the Manitoba Racing Commission, the Agricultural Credit Corporation, the Alcohol Foundation, the Manitoba Economic Council and the Manitoba Sanitorium Board.

What about the rest of Manitoba, Mr. Speaker? What about the rest of Manitoba? Is this democracy? Are we inspiring the trust of our government when we do things like this? And they're talking about developing funds and the Minister has the gall and the arrogance to say that only them should decide. Members, people like my friend across from me, this kind of thing and all of a sudden he's going to stop? The same man who has been practising this kind of stuff is going to stop when it comes to the public money? The people of Manitoba have no confidence in this kind of thing and this is not good enough. If this is public money we demand and we will keep on demanding during the next campaign also. We must protect the funds of the people of Manitoba. And if we are going to name ten people or twelve people, there is no secrecy any more. Why should ten clowns know the private affairs? Why everybody from one side of the House? If we are being sincere, if we want to look after everybody, the lender and the borrower, we could very easily have twelve members including the leader of the Official

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd.) Opposition and the leader of the NDP party, and my honourable friend the former premier. I think that these people have the confidence, enjoy the confidence of the people of Manitoba. No, Sir, my honourable friend will not scare us on this side. He can pull in his red herring as much as he wants; we will fight to see that the people of Manitoba have a voice in the management of their affairs. This is the name of the game. This is government. So this is not good enough, Sir, not by a long shot.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. John's.

MR. CHERNIACK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to express my pleasure at having you back in the Chair and I would like to express my amazement, really, rather than just straight congratulations to the mover and the seconder of the Address. It seems to me that we in the Opposition have to adjust to a number of changes that seem to be taking place in the government ranks, and the first indication that I had was when the Honourable Member for Virden attacked the government, as I believe he did, for its position on education. He did not forecast, as I think he should have, that either the government was going to change its attitude on education and support to education or else a straight, outright criticism. Of course we were stunned, as we were yesterday, when the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks reported to our caucus on the unexpected increase in the requirements for the Foundation Program and that was aired to some extent today. Maybe that indicates a government attitude that was forecast by the Honourable Member for Virden. The Honourable Member for St. Matthews, of course, didn't surprise me but may have surprised other members of the House by indicating an attitude towards the responsibility of government which I think this government has yet to accept. He spoke on the housing needs in the area of Greater Winnipeg; he spoke of the need of the people on fixed incomes. What he didn't say, but what I assumed he meant, was that the Speech from the Throne had nothing to say about these important needs and to me it was a criticism that he voiced.

There are other things that have happened lately, Mr. Speaker, that have given me cause for surprise, and now that the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce has returned - and I would not for a moment suggest that he was away on a junket - but lest he leave again I shall rearrange my planned words to make sure that I am able to address myself to things that he said yesterday, while he is here and before he leaves again, as of course he has a right to do should he feel it necessary so to do.

He dealt with, I think, three different matters yesterday. One was the question of advertising, and I think the Honourable Member for St. Boniface made it clear that the objection that has appeared from this side was the question as to cost, as to involvement in costs, as to the extent to which the advertising program of the government may be going out of line. This is a perfectly legitimate question that may be raised by opposition and indeed will be raised in spite of the fact that the Honourable Minister says that he went out to sell Manitoba and for that he is being castigated, and I forget what other terms he used. He was so flowery yesterday in talking about the flower people that he carried himself away to such an extent that I would hate to follow him in that direction.

On the question of the information services, I think it should be clear to him -- and I should say this about him, Mr. Speaker. I have known him long enough to have tremendous respect for his mental capacity and I don't believe that he just doesn't understand. I don't believe that he lacks the ability to grasp what he is told, but I do suggest that he has the ability to distort or confuse what he is told if it seems to him that it is well so to do, so I had better straighten out, not him because I think he knows, but for the record, straighten out the fact that I'm not aware that anyone in my party has attacked the need for informational services by government. I don't think any person speaking on behalf of my party - and that doesn't mean that by not mentioning the Liberal Party I'm excluding them; I'm just not speaking for them - has said that informational services are not a function of government, but certainly we have all taken the position that the promotion of government programming of a political nature is not justified and should not be countenanced and should be condemned, and indeed I suspect we'll continue to condemn the government for using its information service for promotion of its political image in the province.

Now, with the Manitoba Development Fund, the Honourable Minister, who has been in this government and in this House now, I think this is his second session, is now the person who fights on behalf of the Manitoba Development Fund principle and policy. I wonder if he knows that the policy espoused by the Manitoba Development Fund Act is one which was promoted by

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd.) our party for many, many years and not accepted by government for many years, and that we have in our party a great deal of interest in the justification and in supporting the Manitoba Development Fund and what it stands for. It is our party that believes in government participation in the development in industry. It is our party that was most interested in approving the Part 2 of the Act. I had occasion, I think it was two years ago, to point out that probably it was only the member for Lakeside who was still not prepared to go along with Part 2, and of course the whole party of the Social Credit group, and the Honourable Member for Lakeside agreed that he had left his party policy on the issue of Part 2 of the Manitoba Development Fund. But the government brought it in only after a great deal of prodding on our part, and although it brought it in, did nothing about it as is indicated by the latest report. They asked for the authority, they received authority; they did nothing about it. And to me that may be an indication again of a change in this government's attitude, so that I need not have to assure the Honourable Minister of our intentions of supporting the Manitoba Development Fund authority. I need not have to point out to the Honourable Minister that he misquoted my leader on the statement -- where he quoted the Minister as saying he will harass the Manitoba Development Fund. What he may be reading out of news reports is not necessarily, as he should know, the statement that was made, and I believe the statement that was made was that the Honourable Leader intended to harass the government in relation to the Fund and that's a big difference, Mr. Speaker.

There is not criticism of the Fund, of the Manitoba Development Fund, as there is criticism of the government in the way the government has refused to accept responsibility for what the Fund is doing, has refused to indicate that it will direct the work of the Fund, will assess the value of the work of the Fund, will prod the Fund into doing work, and that the Fund needs prodding and that the Fund needs assessment requires no longer an acknowledgment generally, because the government has itself in the last day or two answered that and said yes, the Fund needs assessing, the Fund needs reviewing, the Fund needs prodding, and I intend to point out just how I justify that statement. So that the attitude of the government until now has been quite different to what we have now learned it has become in the last month, and now I understood, once the Minister in the evening yesterday started to tell us what changes have been made in government attitude to funds, I realized why he found it necessary to be sarcastic, to be superior, to fill his words and thoughts with innuendoes and suggestions which were improper and which aroused the reaction as it did from this side of the House, because he was ready to announce the capitulation and because he thought it was better to attack, to say shocking words, to use shock tactics, in order to minimize the capitulation on the part of the government.

Now, in the year in which the Honourable the Minister was in this House, indeed on December 12, 1966, I raised the question as to the interest rate being charged by the Development Fund at the time, and I asked the question of the Honourable the then First Minister, who said in answer that the government has no information about individual transactions and as a result of discussion that went on, he said - and I'm reading from Page 108 and onwards of the 1966-67 Hansard: "Mr. Speaker, the government does not deal with the details of a loan that is made by the Manitoba Development Fund. It was by a very deliberate self-denial that we decided some time ago that we would not undertake to operate that Fund as a branch of the government," and he said that "it would be better to leave it at arm's length from the government so as not to involve the government in the work of the Fund."

But, Mr. Speaker, what we didn't know then, and what the members of the Committee on Statutory Regulations learned only during the meetings that we had during this last fall, was that at the time the Honourable the then First Minister was saying that we are not going to interfere with the Fund, the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council had already passed regulations limiting the extent and scope of the work of the Fund and regulations which, members of this House will see from the report of the committee on regulations, went beyond the authority of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council to the extent that it interfered with the authority of the Manitoba Development Fund in carrying on its work. And Regulation No. 87/66 which was filed in August of 1966, some months prior to the statements made by the Honourable the First Minister, have had to be repealed because of the work of the Committee on Statutory Regulations, which found that the government had gone away beyond its powers in interfering, in spelling out to the Fund, what it should do and how it should be limited. And when we dealt with that and found these things to be wrong, the government took what is the obvious and correct position - it repealed those regulations and passed new ones, and we were presented with regulations passed on January 12, 1968,

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd.) which in the opinion of the Legislative Counsel were within the scope and power of the legislative body to do. So that we find that in spite of what the Honourable the First Minister said back at the beginning of the last session, they had already interfered, but he still said in answer to a question asked by my honourable leader: "Has not the government the authority to investigate into the use of public funds in the Province of Manitoba?" and on Page 110, Mr. Roblin said: "Not unless we change that statute, we haven't."

The statute hasn't been changed, Mr. Speaker. As a matter of fact, on Page 192 of Hansard I had occasion to address the Honourable the First Minister and point out to him that from my reading of subsection (2) of Section 30, the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council had the power, and as often as he deemed it necessary to use the power, to require the Board to furnish information, and the answer by the then Minister was: "As I read the statute, it is the policy of the government, although we may inquire as we are going to inquire with respect to this interest rate question, I have no intention of inquiring into details of a particular loan." And conversations developed; they had to get legal opinions. It was the opinion of the government then that they neither had the authority nor should they exercise the authority - to do what, Mr. Speaker? What they just did. That's what they had no authority to do - what they just did. That's what they ought not to do, in principle or policy. What they just did is what they said they should not do.

Just to complete the record, on Page 345 of last year's Hansard, the Honourable the Member for Inkster addressed the First Minister and stated that he would stake his legal opinion, on which he put some value because he earns a living from it, on the statement that he made and which I had made, that Section 30, subsection (2) gave that power to the government. I must assure the Honourable the Member for Inkster, in case he's been worried about his ability to continue to practise law, that the government - and indeed the Minister of Industry and Commerce - have justified the position he took last year, where indeed he stuck out his neck. Now he says he's worried because if the government has done something which it said it could not do, possibly he has cause to worry.

Well, we find that with all this debate and all this statement made by the Honourable First Minister, who is no longer the First Minister - and I think we have to recognize that point - on March 4th of this year, Orders-in-Council were passed - of course they weren't published because I think they don't have to be - but suddenly we became aware -- that is yesterday, last night, we became aware that changes have been made, and that is why I say the Minister took the attitude and the posturing that he did in the first portion of his address yesterday, of minimizing what was to come; and what was to come, as I say, was a complete capitulation of the government to the demands made by this side that the government get busy and find out what's cooking, and I haven't found the reference but I am quite certain that some years ago, and of course before the Honourable Minister was in this House, I had occasion to say, "Give us examples of what happened." I recall saying, "Don't name the company that's the borrower; call it Company A, and tell us the nature of the loan that's being made so that we will understand." But of course the government took the position that they had no right to and indeed would not ask.

Well, now I obtain copies of the Orders-in-Council that were just passed this month, and they were passed only a few days prior to some letters which were given to us by the solicitors and accountants for the Fund. One of them is that the Development Fund shall instruct the solicitors of the Fund to make a report along certain lines. This was passed on March 4th, it was signed on March 5th, and the letter from the solicitors of the board of the Fund is dated March 8th. So we had some pretty fast action. The Cabinet said, "Let's find out; let's get a certificate; let's instruct the Fund to get a certificate," and indeed a few days later this certificate was produced, not to the Fund but to the Honourable Walter Weir, and then it was spelled out that this information was to be given and the nature of it. There was also passed these regulations requiring the Fund to give quarterly reports to the government dealing with financial statements, dealing with that certificate that I referred to, dealing with the production of a list of the names of persons to whom the Fund has made loans or for whom the Fund has guaranteed loans, and the amounts thereof during that six-month period. So, the government has now, this month, decided to learn and acquire the information which we insisted all along it ought to have in order to play a proper role in the industrial development of this province and in order to make sure that things are being done properly.

The other matter that I think is of interest to the House filed with the Development Fund

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd.) report, and I am preparing a list of questions for Orders of the Day in connection with the Fund report, but the letter produced by some authority from outside the province - no, not only the province, outside the country - who has come in and who's made investigation (I suppose this way the government is sure that information was not imparted to persons in Manitoba or indeed in Canada who should not have it) and this authority makes some interesting comments. He points out that, as he understands it, this Fund was organized as a profit-making venture and it has functioned as such. That was not the purpose of the Fund but it's a profit-making venture; and he says on Page 3 in paragraph 9: "The Development Agency has a difficult time in reconciling the position of sponsoring development capital, and at the same time approaching it with a feeling of eight-nine percent." So he says it's having trouble trying to work within a small area of interest return. And he says, "The Fund has managed to encourage venture capital but has used security and equity requirements which would seem quite stiff to me." He says, "It should meet this problem" - I'm not quoting entirely; I'm picking out the salient features - "It should meet this problem through equity participation, enabling it to average a higher return through the success of the enterprise invested . . . Mr. Speaker, what have we been talking about at this corner of this room if it has not been participation in the growth and development of this province? Equity participation is the word that's used by this expert from Minneapolis. And that's exactly what we've been talking about. It's in their report. It's published as part and parcel of their report. He says that the Fund has succeeded in establishing as a sound enterprise, and I give them no credit for that, Mr. Speaker. I don't think we've ever insisted that the Fund has to make money or indeed has to be successful in all its loans. "And," he says, "in so doing it is necessary to follow somewhat more conservative practices than would ideally be suited to promotion of venture capital projects." We've been saying that all along, Mr. Speaker, and now they hired an expert from Minneapolis maybe they'll believe him if they wouldn't believe us. But these are the words we've been using.

He concludes his letter by saying, "I think the time has now come to take a second step towards greater flexibility." That step was taken two years ago when they passed the Act, but they didn't do anything about it; they just got the power and did nothing about it, which I think is typical of the party and indeed the direction in which it is now going under this new leadership, which I believe has brought in an aura of retrenchment in spite of the fact that that's the very word rejected by the Honourable the First Minister, who spoke yesterday in terms of his proposal for the future, and this was his first major speech, which the Winnipeg Tribune summarizes, I think, by stating "Weir May Take Ottawa to Court Over Medicare." That's his statement of policy as brought out, in terms of the press, as being the most important part of what he said. Well, I wouldn't agree with that really. I think he said many other important things and he's warned the people of this province that there is going to be retrenchment and that there is going to be a calculated look at everything in relation to certain priorities, one of which, of course, he says is education. That's vital. Though we heard today the change that is taking place in the cost of financing education from last year to this year, a few extra mills added on to the real property taxpayer.

But the changes that are taking place are not only in that line. I would like, Mr. Speaker, if I may, to read something to two of the gentlemen present in the House today: The Minister of Health and the Minister -- the First Minister. I almost said the Minister of Highways and that would have been a serious error on my part, I know.

I'd like to read from Page 1002 of 1966 Hansard, the following statement, Mr. Speaker: May I ask how much time I have left? -- (Interjection) -- I'm wasting it right now. All right then, I expect I'll get the answer soon. The quotation I wish to read is as follows: "The full development of the human resources of Manitoba is a main aim of policy being followed in the province. Education is one of the first priorities in this connection, but the preservation of the health of the population is also of prime concern to society, for the seeds of education only attain full fruition in a healthy people." And we heard about seeds last night from the Honourable the First Minister. The seeds he was talking about, I think, bear little relation to what is important as was quoted two years ago.

MR. SPEAKER: . . . the honourable gentleman he has 20 minutes.

MR. CHERNIACK: I didn't hear it.

MR. SPEAKER: Twenty minutes.

MR. CHERNIACK: And the quotation goes on: "This concern is reflected in the activities

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd.) of government and the Government of Manitoba is providing extensive and expanding programs in the field of public health services in order to assist any individual in exercising his responsibility to maintain his own health and that of his family. Medical services insurance is a further program which, by relieving the fear of excessive costs incurred as a result of ill health, aid the individual in fulfilling this responsibility. The Government of Manitoba maintains that medical services insurance should be available to all residents of Manitoba at a cost within their means. Studies have shown that approximately 25 percent of the population of Manitoba presently remain uncovered by any form of medical services insurance. It has also become apparent that of the 75 percent who have some form of medical services insurance coverage, a goodly number do not have adequate coverage. It is also estimated that an appreciable number find it difficult to meet the cost of adequate coverage. From these studies we are convinced that better arrangements than we have at present are matters of public concern, and that we need such better arrangements at the earliest possible moment." To date, Mr. Speaker, March 16, 1966. Let me go on.

"It is clear, however, that the plan eventually adopted will not work without the co-operation of the medical profession." So it goes on that discussions have been initiated to devise means for establishing medical services insurance with the greatest benefit to the health of the people, at the same time respecting the rights and positions of the medical profession. And he says, "The government is confident that the current negotiations with the federal administration and with the medical profession will enable all the citizens of Manitoba to enjoy the benefits of medical services insurance as soon as possible."

And on a further page, 1004, just in case the Honourable the First Minister hasn't read it - it's last year's Hansard, dated March 16, 1966; I don't know the number - "It is a matter of concern and regret that the Federal Government has failed to implement the proposals." Now these are the proposals that were proposed by this government to the Federal. "Despite disagreements with the Federal Government on the phasing and methods of implementation of certain elements in the provision of health services, the Government of Manitoba proposes to introduce a medical services insurance plan designed to provide comprehensive benefits in the field of physicians' services, offer universal coverage, be available at a cost within the reach of all, maintain the maximum possible freedom of the individual and of the physician, and to take full advantage of federal participation. The Federal Government has stated that it will be ready to participate in any plan which qualified on July 1, 1967, and Manitoba intends to meet that date."

Those are historic words, Mr. Speaker, but there are more. I might refer to Page 1377 of the same Hansard, whose number incidentally is Volume 12. I'd like to read just a short statement that resulted at a time when the Honourable the former Member for Seven Oaks brought a resolution to this House back in 1966, proposing that there be one of three forms, "alternate forms of provision of comprehensive government-sponsored health plan as proposed by or suggested by the Royal Commission on Health Services." The Honourable the Minister of Health amended the proposed resolution and in such a way as to state - and I'll read it - I'll paraphrase it in order to save some time - "that whereas the Royal Commission on Health Services recommends that the Federal Government enter into agreement with the provinces to provide grants on a fiscal need formula, to assist provinces to introduce and operate comprehensive, universal, provincial programs of personal health services, and whereas the government has announced it is going to do this on July 1st, and whereas the Government of Manitoba has announced its intention to implement such a program, Therefore Be It Resolved that this House urge" - that this House urge - "that such a program be implemented by July 1, 1967."

And you know who voted against that, Mr. Speaker? I must make that confession. The people who voted against that are the Leader of the Social Credit Party and the four members of the New Democratic Party that were present at the time, and they voted against that amendment because they said, "Do it now. Go it alone. Be prepared to assume your responsibility." But the Honourable Minister, speaking for the government, said, "No. We say let's do it in the way I design it, which is part of the federal plan." So it carried, and I wonder if members would care to know whether some of the important people - and of course all the people who were important were present and voted, voted in favour; the last name on the list is Weir. I don't know why I can't find the name. No, I'm looking at the wrong page. The last name is Weir and -- I don't know why I can't find the name of the Honourable the Minister of Health, but can it be that he could foresee two years ago the embarrassment that he would be

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd.) suffering had his name been on the list now? But I confess I can't find it. He moved the amendment, and it was his speech that I found wherein he indicated that he wished to go into this plan in July of 1967.

Now last year we had occasion to discuss this program, and I find that in last year's Hansard on March 13, 1967 - we are always dealing in about the middle of March of these years with the question of Medicare and the way this government is going we'll continue to be dealing with it for years to come. As was just pointed out by the Honourable Member for Inkster, it's the ides of March which seems to be influencing -- (Interjection) -- And on that day again it was that the Minister announced that we are going ahead with Medicare on July 1, 1968.

So what happened, Mr. Speaker? What happened was, I believe, that we got a new Premier and that Premier who had been silent throughout all the years - or all those two years of discussion - who to my recollection never participated in any debate on this subject at all, voiced his opinion and apparently persuaded his Cabinet or his caucus or the people who elected him that we've got to go slow on this because of various reasons to which we were not privy on this side of the House or indeed to which I think the people of Manitoba were not privy. And the Honourable Minister, I believe, never indicated to us what his reasoning was until he spoke yesterday. Unfortunately, we don't have as yet the Hansard of last night but we do have a newspaper report on what he said and of course we have some recollection. And he said with great indignation that they were led to believe that the cost of Medicare would be \$35 million for Manitoba; then the government changed it to \$42 million; and then the Finance Minister indicated \$50 million; and then he said our research leads us to believe Mr. Sharp is closest and indeed that the cost would exceed \$50.00 per capita.

I challenge the government to give us those figures, because as I recall it, Sharp, the Minister of the Federal Government, did not give the figures on which he based that estimate. And if the government, which of course should be in possession of the information much sooner than the Federal Government, if the government has figures to support this statement I challenge them to produce it so that we'll know what we're talking about. And if the government has those figures, then is it not based on what it is costing the people of Manitoba today? Is it not based on what we are all as citizens and residents of this province paying out for medical care, for health services? And if it is, then what is he talking about in terms of cost to the province?

The Honourable Member for Inkster pointed out the other day that in the scheme devised by this government there would not be a dollar of tax money that would be required to be raised by the Province of Manitoba to finance the health services scheme. He's right or he's wrong, but which ever it is, the Honourable the First Minister, who I believe is the first member of the government that spoke on the question of Medicare, certainly did not deal with that point raised.

But if it costs as much as the Honourable the First Minister says it costs, then isn't it costing our people that kind of money? Or to the extent that it's not costing our people that kind of money, isn't that an indication of the lack of adequate service that they are missing, that they are now suffering because they are not paying for it - because they don't have it? But instead the Honourable the First Minister said: well, I'm disturbed about that, he says, and he said something I didn't quite understand so I'll have to wait to read it to follow how he figured out that it's not going to cost much anyway if he loses the gamble which he is now making on behalf of the people of Manitoba that the Liberals will elect a Premier who, like the Conservative Party of Manitoba by being a new Premier, has reversed policy and reversed attitude of government, and he's hoping, he's gambling that the Liberals will elect somebody who will postpone, reject, revise the Medicare program. Well that's a gamble he's doing for all of us and he intimated - and this I didn't quite understand - that somehow or other it will work out all right even if he loses the gamble. And, as I say, I confess it's now that I couldn't follow his reasoning. But what he did do was wave some sort of a stick and say we will declare it unconstitutional, or we will try - or we think we will try.

MR. SPEAKER: May I remind the honourable member that he has five minutes.

MR. CHERNIACK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

He says something about we think we will try or we will investigate the possibility of it. What utter nonsense, Mr. Speaker. He says that the reason that they don't question the Federal Government's right to tax and to pass those taxes over for educational purposes is that they consented to it. Well, he didn't answer the question as to how they consented to it. Was it by agreement? Was it in writing? Was there a letter? Was there a telephone call? I don't

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd.) believe any of those things happened. I think what happened was the Federal Government said that there is inadequate provision for technical vocational training in the country of Canada. The provinces are not doing the job. Maybe they haven't the money to individually do it - especially the poor provinces - therefore we will raise tax money and we will make it available, and the Province of Manitoba was delinquent in taking advantage of the opportunity offered to it in the establishment of tec-voc schools. We had the figures a few years ago showing that we were far behind other provinces in taking advantage. You call that consent, Mr. Speaker?

The Honourable the First Minister called it consent, otherwise, as may have been suggested, they didn't want to break the law so they didn't take it. But what was his rationale, Mr. Speaker? That's what interests me. He said education is all right because you don't have to take the education, you just have to pay for it. Well can it be that the policy of the Conservative Party on Medicare is based on his ignorance of the Medicare Policy? Is it conceivable that the Honourable the Minister of Health or other members of his Party have not straightened him out on that issue? Because as far as I read the Medicare Act, there is no compulsion on any one to take the services under Medicare; there is no compulsion on a doctor to be a member of the Medicare scheme. There is compulsion to contribute to federal taxes; there is compulsion, if this government would decide to have premiums, to pay the premiums. How does that differ from education? I don't have any children at school in Manitoba; I haven't had for some years. I contribute to the cost of education, not only because I believe in it - that's a minor thing - I do it because it's the law, because this government taxes me for that purpose. It has the right to, and how the Honourable the First Minister can sympathize with a man who has stood up in the face of organized society and flaunted it and said I will not pay taxes that are democratically assessed against me, how he can sympathize even in a general sort of way is beyond my understanding. For the leading citizen in terms of government in this province to sympathize with a man who rejects authority -- well, Mr. Hart is what - an anarchist? Is that a fair word? A man who rejects the decision of the majority over what is happening, and he sympathizes with it and that is the state we're at. A man who I believe has indicated that he does not understand the principle of Medicare when he uses the term compulsion and compares it with lack of compulsion in education, is an indication to me that he's directed and is directing a policy which is based on ignorance.

Now, I'm sorry to be using such harsh words and I certainly don't direct them at the Honourable the First Minister himself because he has plenty of things to do in life and none of us can learn all we have to know about what goes on in the House, so we all of us learn to lean on the people that we respect and who advise us and acquire information from them. All of us do. Well what sort of support is the Honourable the First Minister getting from the people on his side if they couldn't at least make him understand that, just like in education, there is no compulsion to accept the service; there's no compulsion to take the service. The only compulsion is that we all share and that is to contributing to the cost on a tax basis or premium.

Now the only thing that I can expect in line with what the Honourable Minister just said is that he will now turn about and do to the Hospital Services Association what he wants to do in terms of medicare, that is rejection, because if there is compulsion in his concept of Medicare then there is a great deal more compulsion in the question of hospital services, because there you can't take advantage of a hospital service in this province except one which is already supported under the hospital services scheme. So that there you can't say to a hospital, I need hospital services but I don't want to take advantage of your services. I don't know, maybe there are private hospitals in this province where you can go and not participate in this scheme, but to be consistent that's what this government should do.

And I would expect that again it would no longer surprise me because of the changes that have taken place: the rejection of statements made by the Honourable the First Minister of a year ago, and two years ago; the rejection by the Minister of Industry and Commerce of the things that were stated by the Honourable Member for Wolseley when he was Prime Minister; the rejection by the present Premier of the policy that was laid down by his government of which he was a part last year and two years ago; and the fact that the Honourable Minister of Health is able to sit in the same chair with the same smile and not deal with the question of Medicare on the Throne Speech, is, to me, a matter of amazement. I would think that since the Honourable the First Minister has now broken the ice and said we are talking about Medicare, that the person charged with the responsibility for the last couple of years, and who

March 19, 1968.

305

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd.) presumably knows what Medicare is, would get up and say something about it to justify the present position. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that we will yet hear from the Honourable the Minister of Health on this issue.

. . . . continued on next page.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MRS. CAROLYNE MORRISON: (Pembina): I welcome this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to extend to you my very best wishes as you carry out so very efficiently the duties of your high office. May you have good health to continue in this position for many years to come.

I would extend also at this time my congratulations and good wishes to my new Leader the First Minister, and express the hope that he too will be blessed with good health to carry out the heavy responsibilities that the position of the premiership of a province demands. I feel fully confident that Manitoba is in very capable hands, that the programs so ably begun under the outstanding leadership of his predecessor, the Honourable Member for Wolseley, will continue, and that such programs as are required for the benefit of our province will be brought forward under the able guidance of the Honourable the Member from Minnedosa.

I wish also to extend congratulations and good wishes to the Honourable Member for St. Vital. I am sure his ability will enable him to carry out well the duties of his new office as Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

I appreciate this opportunity to congratulate the mover and seconder of the Speech from the Throne, and before completing these preliminaries, my congratulations also to the member for Turtle Mountain on his recent re-election.

And now, Mr. Speaker, I will take a few moments to consider our way of life in the rural areas of our province. Last week, when I had hoped to make my few remarks on the Throne Speech debate, was suddenly recognized as health week, and what could be of greater significance than Health Week, because surely good health is the greatest asset we can have. In thinking of Health Week, Mr. Speaker, my thoughts immediately turned to the hospitals that serve the rural areas of our province. I could not find words to describe just what these hospitals mean, regardless of their size, to the people in the rural areas, the tremendous needs that these hospitals fill in the life of the people in the country.

I am sure it is only those of us who live in rural areas that can fully appreciate their value. There are always many patients who do not require the intensive care, the use of the highly complicated and the extensive equipment required in the larger hospitals. We have our senior citizens who so often require just a few days in the hospital to get them on their way again. We have people of all ages who require minor surgery, if surgery of any description can be called minor. We have accident cases on the farm; on the highways; in the home; yes, and there are heart seizures; severe attacks of pneumonia; to name just a few of the cases where the most important factor is getting medical attention with all possible speed. Many times it's a matter of minutes determines the difference between life and death. And so, Mr. Speaker, let us never underestimate the tremendous security provided to our people by our country hospitals, and what is more important than people.

In recognition of Health Week, again I say our health is our most important asset and so let us pay special tribute to our hospitals everywhere, be they large or small; let us pay special tribute to our doctors and to our nurses; yes, and to our nursing homes; to all people who strive to promote good health.

With these thoughts in mind I'm delighted to relate that a sod-turning ceremony took place in Morden in January to mark the beginning of a \$1.3 million renovation and enlargement of the Morden District Hospital. When this project is completed in 1969 the hospital will have 75 beds and a laboratory, an X-ray unit and a separate health unit. The expanded hospital will also have a 27 bed extended treatment unit for chronically-ill patients. I am hopeful too that before many weeks go by there will be a sod-turning ceremony at the Pembina-Manitou Hospital and a long awaited and much needed extension and renovating program will get under way. I am pleased to say too that in the Village of Somerset, Somerset Manor is almost nearing completion, and here many of our senior citizens will receive much care and good health in the years to come.

In looking over the Throne Speech, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to note that we will be asked to approve legislation permitting RCMP to provide municipal policing services in towns and villages with a population of from 500 to 1500. This will be welcome legislation in many areas.

Also, I note that there will be continued improvements and expansion on our provincial roads and highways. I am looking forward to an early start being made on Highway 31 for reconstruction, and in this area we will have an up-to-date connecting link with our good friends south of the border. I am pleased to note that a fine bridge over the Pembina River

(MRS. MORRISON cont'd.): on this highway has been completed two weeks ahead of schedule in readiness for the road construction.

Turning to another field, I am pleased to report that during the centennial year the Manitou-LaRiviere area was provided with the dial telephone system and this has proven to be a very acceptable step forward in our way of life. The Honourable Member for Virden in his remarks made brief reference to the redistribution bill. I hope I may be forgiven if I also make a few remarks on this subject because there is a very great difference in representing a rural constituency than an urban.

In the rural areas there are times when we are required to drive many miles in one day if there are matters to be considered or functions to be attended at opposite ends of the constituency. The greatest percentage of our phone calls in the rural areas have to be long distance, while in the urban areas a member will find all his constituents on his own exchange in many cases, and as the Honourable Member for Virden stated, the man or woman in the city can take problems to their aldermen or their councillor, or for the price of a ticket on the transit bus can come right here to the Legislative Building. I am sure we in the rural areas very much enjoy the personal contacts we have with our constituents, but I present to you just a few of the differences there are in representing a rural constituency as compared with an urban. So let us not overlook the difference; let us be sure we maintain the same representation in the rural areas that we have now.

The Honourable Member for Rhineland made mention, Mr. Speaker, of the resolution that he had received from the Red River Valley Water Commission regarding the Pembina River Basin Project and expressed the urgent need to have immediate action on this project. I, too, studied this resolution with much interest and was gratified to hear the Honourable Minister of Agriculture announce that he was arranging a meeting with Ottawa for the end of this month in an effort to make progress in this tremendous plan.

I was somewhat surprised to read a report in Wednesday's Tribune - that is Wednesday of last week - regarding a study that had been prepared on this Pembina River project. The report expressed skepticism of the value this project would be to southern Manitoba because of the overall cost in supplying water to this area. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that in a project of this magnitude we have to take a very long-range view spreading the cost over many years. The report states that there are two vegetable processing plants in the area but that two others have decided against locating in this area because of a shortage of water for their plant. Is it not a fact that this in itself expresses the need there is for a good supply of water, not only for agricultural and industrial growth, but also for household use, for human and animal consumption, as well as many other uses. I could go on at much greater length regarding the Pembina River project but will leave it here and will wish the Minister of Agriculture well in his efforts with the Federal Government at Ottawa to get action on this project and get it moving ahead.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, I will take time to mention just one more subject that I find of great concern and that is the Vaughan St. detention home. I was gratified one evening recently when I heard the Attorney-General on television stating that some plans were being considered for changes in this area. I am sure there is no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that this building is a hangover from the dark ages. There is no doubt that this building didn't just become so out-dated in the last ten years. I believe something should have been done many years ago. Perhaps the children who are lodged in this place are problem children, but they do deserve a chance to be treated like human beings. They deserve a proper place where a teacher can give them instruction. They deserve a place where they can enjoy games and outdoor activities. How else can we ever expect them to be better boys and girls? How can we expect them to improve their attitude towards life and to have a brighter future to look forward to? I urge my government to do something soon in order to improve the way of life for these young people.

In my closing remarks, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that centennial year was a delightful year in my constituency as I am sure it was in all our constituencies. I am sure we look forward with great anticipation to celebrating the centennial of our own beautiful Manitoba. I would remind members of this Assembly, as I have done on previous occasions, that the constituency of Pembina is one of the finest in Manitoba. Last year the rich farming areas produced some of the finest crops that were ever harvested. Stock raised in the area make an excellent showing at the Toronto Royal. Some of the most beautiful scenery to be found in

(MRS. MORRISON cont'd.): Manitoba is found in the constituency of Pembina. I suggest to the members, Mr. Speaker, that they see Manitoba first and take a trip through the constituency of Pembina. Thank you.

MR. JOHN P. TANCHAK (Emerson): Mr. Speaker, I stood up several times but I understand that you have to give the turns, so no hard feelings. I am pleased to see you, Mr. Speaker, back in your Throne Chair and wish you good health and a lot of endurance. I am sure that is necessary.

My congratulations to the new Premier, and as the saying goes, there is no change necessary unless some change brought in will improve, therefore, I hope that the new Minister will make a better First Minister than the former Premier did.

Congratulations to the new Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. All I have to say is just repeat what has been said before, that he really made a good guess on who was going to be the next Premier of Manitoba.

I also enjoyed the speech of the mover in reply to His Honour. I liked his frankness. He was quite frank in criticizing this government. Similarly, the seconder's speech - he did not appear to be too happy with the Conservative administration. The speech was well delivered.

I would like to congratulate the member elect, Mr. Dow, who I understand will soon be occupying his chair. Congratulations on his victory and I'm sure that the House will agree with me that he has a contribution to make in this Legislature. We are looking forward towards his entry into this room.

I'll just mention a few words about my own constituency, the constituency of Emerson, as is the usual practice - just a few highlights because I do not want to take too much time up. I know there are quite a few members who wish to get up and speak on the Throne Speech. In Emerson constituency in the past year, 1967, the people of this constituency have undertaken nine centennial projects. Every one of them was completed in time and I wish to congratulate them on that. We also built three senior citizens homes in the constituency. There has been some improvement in roads - not so very much - I would have liked to see quite a bit more. As far as the unitary school plan, the whole of my constituency has accepted the unitary school plan with the exception of a small portion at the eastern end which has been declared a remote area. I am happy about that. We know that this land still has its deficiency but I hope that in time these may be ironed out.

Now some of the things that we lack in our constituency is industrial development. We seriously lack this industrial development. There were some surveys made but nothing has come out of that and I hope that the future will be brighter. A problem that really hurts the people in this constituency is drainage, and they surely lack drainage.

Now coming to the Throne Speech, I am not going to try to tear the Throne Speech apart because I do not think there was too much in it, but it indicates that the government has completely run out of new ideas - no grand programs - run out of new ideas and I presume run out of money, and now, of necessity, the new Premier is preaching austerity. A new Premier but the same old government. The saying goes well, Old Mother Hubbard found the cupboard bare, so now austerity of necessity. And who is the black villain in this? It's the government, and it is the present government, regardless of the change of the Premier. I would say that if the government had been careful with the people's money it could have accomplished much much more with much less money.

I think the confusion stems from the fact that this government has never learned to do long range planning. There was actually no leadership, and that's what I would like to talk about for a short time, long range planning. And by that I mean planning carefully for the future and not blindly forging ahead and spending people's money just to create an image of great activity in the Province of Manitoba, and that's what has been done in the past. This is a government of expediency rushing into many projects, crash programs and so on, without any long range planning, and that's what they are guilty of.

In education, for instance, was there real long range planning? No. Remember 1958 and 1959 the government entered into a crash program, into a tremendous building program, very very costly but not realistic. Now we have troubles. The new Minister now is trying to fit the pieces together in this great crossword puzzle and he is having a very very difficult time. That's why, one of the reasons, why the cost of education has skyrocketed and we cannot even keep up with it because of the lack of long range planning in education.

(MR. TANCHAK cont'd.):

Now the government has failed to plan, it has failed to come to grips with many problems of the rural area, especially areas that are a little behind times - and I'll refer for a few moments to the southeastern part of Manitoba. The people of this area have been promised better drainage and they have come to the government consistently for ten years. For ten years they have been promised better drainage and practically nothing has been done about it. Most of these people are still waiting, waiting for better drainage, hoping, existing, hanging on to some of their farms, but for how long will they have to hang on to those farms. It seems to me that if the government feels that this area is not worthwhile saving, why not be frank with them? Why not relocate them? But no, they just permit -- the government wishes to starve them out of their farms. What will happen, it will force them off their land and away from their homes, and those who have been forced out are destitute people. And where do they go? They move into the city and here they create urban problems. No planning again here - no long range planning.

I would say that this government has failed to come to grips with the urban problems, many problems in the urban area. It has failed to relieve the burden of taxation on the real property owner. We have talked about it continually. This was the main promise, and still the taxes keep going up and up on real property. We had an indication of what's coming in 1968. It has failed to come to grips with many problems in the urban areas: housing, slum areas, and even proper accommodation for our high school students as has been mentioned today. There isn't proper facilities for them. What about building of the detention home? This government has been building this detention home almost for ten years and yet the start of it has to be announced. -- (Interjection) -- That is long range planning - ten years or better. What about the metro fiasco? Another good example - another good example of no long range planning. Something done in a hurry and created by this government and then the government abandoned it - afraid of it I presume - I do not know. Now the people of our metropolitan area are groping in the dark and they are trying to solve the problem on their own. Where is the government leadership in this? Where is the government planning? It's not evident at all.

Coming back to taxation and the Foundation Program, even as late as last year I do not think that the government was frank with the people of Manitoba when they promised or said that if the people accept new plans the burden of taxation will be relieved. We see today it isn't; the taxes are going up and up and up. I would say that this government is a very costly government to the people of Manitoba.

Agriculture - some things have been said about agriculture, but as far as I can see the present government is trying to put the blame on Ottawa for the shortcomings in agriculture. It seems to be washing its hands of this problem of cost-price squeeze.

Yesterday we had a lecture on industry. What about this industrial expansion in the Province of Manitoba? Sure, there has been some industrial expansion but hasn't there been industrial expansion in Canada and Manitoba since the pioneer days? You've got to compare it with other provinces and we all know that industry in Manitoba is lagging behind. The government front benches like to boast about Simplot, a good industry, a worthwhile industry, but they have been boasting about it now for the third year in a row. It's nothing new. What about Seagram's Rye? I imagine they'll be boasting about it this year. We've been facing it for the second year already. --(Interjection) -- Well, it's actually not, but I mean facing the sounds, the music in the year. What about --(Interjection) -- It's aging. I hope it turns out well.

What about Thompson Nickel Mines? It's over 10 years old. Sure, there is expansion, but I would give the credit to the company because they know that their expansion is necessary at this time and they have expansion, so actually there isn't very very much to boast about it.

What about the Sprague forest products plant at Sprague? Sure we are happy it is there. It has been there for about eight years. But what? It happens to be an on and off affair. It's on for a few months and then it's off for the next few months, and I hear that pretty soon it'll be on again. And here I say again, it was kind of a crash program without any planning, no long range planning. Why did the government have to build, with people's money, because there was a lot of Manitoba money put into that, why after building a wonderful building, a brand new building, why did the government permit to have this building filled with used

(MR. TANCHAK cont'd.) obsolete machinery somewhere from Seattle? That is what has been troubling this plant ever since it started operations. They can't do anything with this obsolete machinery, and I would say that if there were proper planning in the first place it wouldn't have been an on and off proposition, that plant would still have been booming as it should be.

Now, the Minister of Industry is boasting about employment. We heard yesterday how many hundreds of people or thousands of people have been employed due to expansion of industry, but it so happens that in every other province in Canada employment is increasing because our population is increasing. But why, if the department was so good, why is it that Manitoba is behind - or leads the way, you would say - Manitoba tops prairie jobless. And here is an article just last week in the Manitoba Co-operator. I'll read part of it: "Manitoba had the highest unemployment rate in the prairie region." The highest unemployment in the prairie region. "Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta according to the Prairie Manpower Review." Why is it that if our government or our department is doing such a wonderful job, why is it that our unemployment is rising even in Manitoba? And it says: "While the percentage of unemployed in Manitoba at 4.8 percent was below the national average of 6.1, it was still higher than Saskatchewan at 4 percent and Alberta at 3.9 percent." So I don't see that there is so very much to boast about.

And what about all the people who are leaving Manitoba because there is no opportunity here? They're dissatisfied with the leadership of this government and they're leaving Manitoba, and if they keep on leaving Manitoba as they have been, we're bound to have full employment some time when there's no people left. I would say that the people are dissatisfied with the present government and they're not even waiting for an election. They're voting with their feet; they're going out.

And oh how well we remember the year 1958, 1959. It's a good year to go back and the members from across sometimes like to go back. Do you remember the team the former Premier projected? All these handsome front benchers, most of them still sitting there, what a wonderful job they were going to do for the Province of Manitoba; how they would pull together and do great wonders. And what happened to them, to those front benchers? Most of them are still here and everyone pulling in his own direction. I would say about one-third of them wishing to fly up to Ottawa; one-third of them do not know where they're going; and the balance wish that they knew where they were going. And how could these gentlemen do any long-range planning? They did not sit long enough in any one of their chairs, not long enough even to warm it up. I would say that this government indulged in a game of musical chairs, bouncing those Ministers up, back and forth. Take a look at the front bench with all the shiny faces sitting here yet, pretending they're happy. How many of them still head the same department that they have started off as this original team? I would say none. Maybe some are occupying the same again, but they have been bounced back and forth. Some have had as many as three changes. Now why is it that it was necessary to bounce them around? Is it because they made a mess in their former department that they had to be changed? I believe that in most cases it was right, because how can you get after a Minister who occupies a different chair? He's not responsible. It could have been demotion or promotion.

And now let us start with the former Premier. What happened to him? He used to occupy a chair there. He tried for a chair in Ottawa but came with a kind of thump in the backbench, but he isn't holding his front bench here anymore.

What about the Minister of Health, former Minister of Mines? I think he would have done better in the former.

Now the former Minister of Health, he went right into Education. Maybe that's the right place for him, I don't know. I think he's still kicking himself for accepting that job. He tells us education is good for you. I believe he is right. He is being educated himself at the present time.

What about the Provincial Secretary sitting next to the Minister of Education. He was promoted, demoted -- (Interjection) -- I can almost hear the Minister of Education whispering to his right, May God forgive you for your past sins. He's got the job of straightening the mess out now.

Now the present Premier, the former likeable Minister of Highways, slipped down that golden highway into the Chief's chair. All I will say is I wish him well, and I mean it.

The former Treasurer, the former Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, I'm sure

(MR. TANCHAK cont'd.) his conscience is bothering him now, taking all that money from the poor people and not giving them value in return for that money that he's taking.

And the Attorney-General, he was in and out and in again. He's back where he was in the Attorney-General. He has learned his lesson I think in the last few years and I'm sure I hear him say let them fight their own battles now.

Minister of Welfare, Minister of Labour, they played the same game. I'm not going to take up more time with that. The rest of the Ministers are relatively newer Ministers and probably they haven't learned of the game of musical chairs yet. They may in the future. It depends on the new Premier. He might not toss them around so much as the former Minister did. Several of the former members of the team are not present with us any more. Some have gone away and some have been - what shall I say - thrown out.

So if you look at this, I wonder how a government or a team like this that's been tossed around, 11 or so different Ministers, how could they do any long-range planning. I would say that there are 11 of them and they're pulling in 11 different directions all at the same time.

Now, I think that I should say a few words, just touch on Medicare, and I'm not going to talk about the virtues or the ills of Medicare. As you all by this time know, I'm not a socialist by nature. Those people who wish to be could be, but I'm not a socialist by nature but at the same time I also believe it's our duty to help the worthy needy - the worthy needy - and probably I would rather have a health service on the ability-to-pay basis. But we all know that the M. P. 's in Ottawa have made this law and it wasn't only one party who did it. All the parties joined together and the party -- their own party on the opposite side voted in favour of it; the NDP voted in favour of it; all of them voted. It has become the law of Canada, and I would say that if Prime Minister Stanfield does not believe in it and if he is sincere, why doesn't -- (Interjection) -- the Prime Minister - not the Prime Minister, the Leader. I don't think he'll ever get that. I meant Mr. Stanfield, the Leader of the Opposition. If he's really sincere in what he's saying, why doesn't he introduce a resolution in the House and see how he stands. Maybe, maybe he has a chance even of postponing, but no, he'll just play political football with Medicare and don't come out with any clear-cut ideas.

In Manitoba we also know that it's a Canadian law; we also know that it's the law of Manitoba at the present time because the First Minister himself voted in favour of it last year. He did not say, "No, I reject it." It has become the law of Manitoba at the present time. The Health Minister told us last year that if Ottawa is in by 1967 as has just been read to you, then we'll be in it; we'll participate in it. But why make a political football out of it now? On account of austerity? I think that's all it is. Some people think that they could make mileage by that.

But why is the present First Minister willing to sacrifice \$17 million of Manitoba's money in doing so - throwing it away? It is the law whether it's good or not, and now it's us. Last year we all voted for it and passed it. I think he's playing political football with this, but at the same time what I don't like about it is playing good father to the people of Manitoba. I'm going to save you; I'm going to get this \$17 million and save it to you from Ottawa. But I'll say to him, think back a few years when part of my constituency was not in the secondary division and well remember how many times I had asked for the grants for this area, and what was I told by the people opposite, the same people who say now we can ask for that grant to be refunded or the tax that has been collected in Manitoba to be refunded, the same people told me this is the law of Manitoba now and if those people choose to stay out of it they have no right even to ask for this money. I was told to whistle - exact words - because some of those people did not accept.

So I'll end my contribution now by telling the Premier, Mr. Premier you may just whistle - just whistle.

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON (Rock Lake): Mr. Speaker, I would first of all like to congratulate you on the high office which you hold and to wish you well and may you enjoy good health in order that you may fulfil this very important obligation. I for one, as a relative newcomer to politics, have watched last year and up to the time we have spent in this year, the performance that you have performed in this House, and I would like to say to you, Sir, that I think the task which you are performing is one in which you have showed a very unbiased attitude and I think in all cases fairness to the Members of this Legislature.

Next I would like to congratulate the Leader of my Party, the First Minister, who has attained the high office as Premier of Manitoba, and this, Sir, I would like to say, the

(MR. EINARSON cont'd.) challenges and the responsibilities on your shoulders are one of very great importance to the people of Manitoba and I share this with you.

I would also like to congratulate the mover and seconder of the Throne Speech in the way in which they expressed their views.

I also, Mr. Speaker, would like to make mention of one member in this House, namely, one whom I have been closely concerned with since I entered this House over a year ago, my colleague and deskmate to my right, the Honourable Member for Springfield. I think the Members in this House would join with me, and I know I think I took a part in probably advising him along the way, by which he took that all important step of the blissful token of marriage. And I think you will all join me in extending a word of congratulations.

Last but not least, Mr. Speaker, while I am in the thought of this nature, as a newcomer and one who is a farmer by profession, I became interested in politics and the fact that I was hoping that I could make some small contribution to the farming community in my constituency and to other segments in my constituency and as well to the Province of Manitoba. I would hope that I could measure up to those who have performed services of this kind representing the constituency of Rock Lake, and I would like to make mention of my predecessor, the Honourable Abe Harrison who gave of his services for so many years in this House to the people of Rock Lake Constituency, first as a member; secondly as his time when he was Speaker of this House; and thirdly as Minister without Portfolio.

I would like to dwell briefly in describing to you the constituency of Rock Lake, one which is predominantly an agricultural community. I think probably I could describe it also in this way that it rather involves three different departments; namely, when we speak of the Department of Mines and Natural Resources I think of the Tiger Hills area whereby we have active game and fish associations, farm people who are interested in maintaining our wildlife, and for that reason I'm pleased to say that I have some people in that area that are very active in preserving wildlife.

Secondly, I would like to mention the tourist areas, the lake series that we have in Rock Lake, namely Pelican, Rock Lake itself and Swan Lake. I would like to mention here and express my thanks to my colleagues insofar as the Rock Lake is concerned, and that is going back about two years we had a real problem with algae on the water. Here, as you may know, and for those of you who may not, there has been a good deal of activity in the Rock Lake area and I might say that the United Church, from the Red River to the Saskatchewan boundary, people have taken a very great interest in providing swimming lessons and other activities in that area. They have sponsored, through the assistance of the Red Cross, swimming lessons to young boys and girls of my constituency and other areas.

In speaking on Rock Lake, a committee was set up to establish the improvements that might be considered in this area, and while nothing has been done so far, that is to say while I'm not able to make any official announcement, I'm hoping my colleagues in this regard will see fit to do something about this problem in the not too distant future.

I would also like to mention, insofar as Pelican Lake is concerned, we've had a problem there as well with the fish in the lake, particularly in the winter time, where they have seemed to have died off for some reason or other. And here again the council in that area of Strathcona are requesting that a dam be built in the Pembina River in order that the water - fresh water that is - may be diverted through the Pelican Lake, and they feel that this might be the answer to some of the problems there.

Thirdly, Mr. Speaker, I would like to dwell for a short time on the industry of agriculture, and while we have heard a number of remarks, comments and debates on this very matter, I do thank the members opposite for the consideration that they have taken in this vital industry, one that I think is one of the important industries in Manitoba. And while I have not altogether agreed with the comments of some of the members and while I am fully aware that we have come a long ways in solving some of the problems of agriculture, we still have areas in which improvements can be made.

I would like to make a comment here where the Leader of the Liberal Party, the Honourable Leader from Ste. Rose, mentioned in his speech in connection with the five percent sales tax, and I quote here Mr. Speaker, "The 5 percent sales tax imposed last year did not, as was expected, exempt all of the items included in production costs on farms, rather it added to the burden." Well, Mr. Speaker, in this regard I recall that the Minister of the Treasury Department listed quite a number of items that farmers would be exempt from the

(MR. EINARSON cont'd.) five percent sales tax. I fully understand that there are some items that were difficult to put in this category because of the nature of human beings, as we are, could possibly take advantage of the situation.

On the other hand, I would like to mention one of the things that I took a personal interest in and was concerned about - probably it was a concern of no great magnitude but still I think was of help to what we have been hearing about the cost-price squeeze of agriculture - and that was the coloured gas that farmers could use for their farm operations. And I do recall in our own caucus where it was difficult because of our financial situations as to just how much of the year we were going to allow farmers to use coloured gas, and I think that we did the best possible there.

I would like to divert on one other subject, Mr. Speaker, that concerns my constituency and that is in the field of education. I might take this opportunity to say here that in the division of Tiger Hills, that portion which I represent; that portion of Mountain division; Pembina Valley; and that portion of Turtle Mountain Division, we've had problems there that haven't been solved and probably, as you know, the areas that I have just mentioned are still not under the unitary system. I feel that I have dealt with these matters as people have come to me in I think the best way possible, but I do want to say that the Chairman of the Boundaries Commission has given me relative assurance that they will be out in that area in the very near future. I realize while we discussed these matters that it's all well and good to stand up and offer criticism; this is health providing that it can become constructive. I don't think it makes any difference what you do and what walk of life you take, if you're going to progress one is bound to make some errors, and I've always been of the belief, Mr. Speaker, that if one is going to progress, I think that possibly it's only humanly natural that we do make mistakes. The important thing that I want to state here is that we will progress and improve our situation by the errors that we make.

Mr. Speaker, there's one other thing that I would like to mention in regards to agriculture and as it affects the farmers not only of my constituency but of the farmers of Manitoba. I think that it was of real interest to the farming communities when it was made known that a distillery at Minnedosa -- pardon me, the distillery at Gimli will utilize some 1,500 bushels of grain per day and this would develop to a maximum of 2,250 bushels per day. I would like to say in this regard that when we were meeting with the stock growers of Manitoba, they were concerned about developing and improving varieties of feed grain. But I want to stress here, Mr. Speaker, that we have come a long ways in improving our malting varieties of barley. And I think it has a significance here that we don't want to lose sight of the fact that the gains that we have made in this regard are very important. And the outlet that we have now, or are now developing for barley rye into this factory, I think that when the time comes and we see the results, this is going to be a real benefit to agriculture.

Also, I would like to mention the distillery at Minnedosa which is also going to be an outlet for our grains in the production of the commodity that it's going to produce.

Now while having mentioned these few comments in regards to malting variety of barley, I would like to say to the producers of cattle that I am in full agreement, Mr. Speaker, and I suggest to my colleague the Minister of Agriculture that we do progress in improving better varieties of feed grains for our cattle.

I've also heard a number of remarks from the other side of the House where they have stated that we are all too critical of the Federal Government not performing their duties insofar as agriculture is concerned, and it seems to me that I've gathered the impression that we should not be so critical, rather take more of the responsibility ourselves.

If I may - and I have heard some members of the official opposition go back approximately 10 years - I would like to digress if I may back to the year around 1956, and I think I must do this to explain my point, that the Federal Government of that day had a Minister of Trade and Commerce who stated that Western Canada in particular produces the finest grain in the world - that is wheat particularly - and any country who is interested in purchasing it may do so at their wish.

One of the things, Mr. Speaker, that I have been critical about, and I think justifiably so, and that is the differences in the government of that day and the government that followed in the year 1957 was this, that our Wheat Board is an institution that I think is very important and vital to the farmers of Canada, and particularly Western Canada, as an agency. I feel it in this way, that the Canadian Wheat Board was under the Department of Trade and

(MR. EINARSON cont'd.) Commerce and I feel that this is the reason why at that time the Minister made those comments, because it seemed to me that agriculture came second insofar as the priorities of his department was concerned. It was only at the time that the Honourable John Diefenbaker became Prime Minister of Canada when the Wheat Board was switched into the Department of Agriculture where I felt that it rightfully belonged, and where I felt that the people who were concerned about agriculture would deal with the matters of agriculture.

And I ask you, Mr. Speaker, is it not a fact that when we made our first sale of wheat to Communist China, the then Minister who is now Prime Minister of Canada made the statement in the House that he was opposed to it; and the Leader of the Social Credit Party stated that this sale was a hoax and you'd never get your money. I ask you, Sir, is this not a fact?

And then you all know the progress that was made in the sales of our wheat under the leadership of the Honourable John Diefenbaker. I recall the member for Brokenhead last year making comments in this regard and he mentioned Honourable Diefenbaker's name and as to how he felt our successes were insofar as our wheat sales were concerned. Following that, and at the present time, our Wheat Board is back in the hands of Trade and Commerce and this is the reason, Mr. Speaker, that I feel critical of our wheat situation. As far as the relative marketing of it is concerned, if you don't have people who are directly interested in it, I don't think they're going to do their best job in promoting and selling that commodity.

There are other fields in agriculture in Manitoba which I think the Party, of which I am a part, have done a lot to assist agriculture in Manitoba. I think of one of them, the Crop Insurance Plan. While it isn't a guarantee, that is you know insofar as guaranteed income is concerned, but it protects the farmer against losses from all the elements of human nature.

I can think also, Mr. Speaker, of the Hog Marketing Commission that was brought into being. I think we all remember the changes that took place as soon as that Commission went into operation, and here again, Mr. Speaker, one who is an individual, who regards his independence as one of real value, and this commission was made and drawn up on a voluntary basis. I think that here is one field where agriculture has been assisted in the Province of Manitoba.

My mind goes back to last fall when I toured a considerable area in the Province of Manitoba, travelled approximately 1500 miles of highway, and of those 1500 miles there was only about 40 miles that were not paved. I think, Mr. Speaker, if we were to take this House back 10 years the reverse would be correct. I recall, Mr. Speaker, in my own constituency back in the mid-50's I heard the philosophical saying that was used, with all due respects to the honourable member for Lakeside, that it seemed the thinking in those days was to use the slogan "Pay-as-you-go basis", but I often wonder, where did we go? I think, Mr. Speaker, of the highway that was referred to as the Sunshine Highway. I recall, and have heard that at the time just prior to an election they would muster all their engineers, get them out to do the survey work, and get the crews out to start building the roads. When the election was over, that all seemed to disappear overnight.

MR. CAMPBELL: May I ask the honourable gentleman a question? Would the honourable member tell us who was Minister of Highways at that time?

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Speaker, I am speaking of the Party in general.

MR. CAMPBELL: I asked the honourable member who was Minister -- (Interjection) -- It was Willis.

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Speaker, I thank the honourable gentleman from Lakeside for the answer. Mr. Speaker, I would like to also mention the highway that I am now concerned with in my own constituency and the highway that was referred to in those days as what was called the Sunshine Highway. That Sunshine Highway is not in the exact location as it was supposed to be had it been built in those days, but I am very pleased to report that the final stages of that highway, namely 258, will be completed this summer.

With these few comments, Mr. Speaker, I am one who believes in progress; I am one who is proud of the fact that I am a member of the Party which is the government today. I am one who does not believe in pessimistic attitudes; and in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, am proud and pleased that I am a member of this Party.

MR. PAULLEY: I wonder, Mr. Speaker, in view of the five minutes to go, maybe my honourable friend would be satisfied if it were called 5:30 so that we could start fresh at

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.) 8 o'clock.

MR. HARRY P. SHEWMAN (Morris): If we would come back at 5 minutes to 8 I'd go for that.

MR. PAULLEY: I'd be ready to come back at 7:30 if I were assured of hearing my honourable friend the member for Morris.

MR. SPEAKER: I believe we will stand by the rules, and if the honourable member for Elmwood would bear with us, and probably go his six minutes and carry on when we come back at 8.

MR. DOERN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thank you my Leader. Mr. Speaker, I would first like to extend personal good wishes to the Premier, the new Premier. He is now gone from the mere ranks of a Cabinet Minister to a historical figure and he is, I believe, the second youngest Premier in the history of our province. He is well known as being a person of good nature and amiability and I hope that he is able to maintain that level throughout the storms and stresses of the future.

I would also like to extend my congratulations to yourself on remaining in the position of Speaker. It is sometimes very difficult.

I would like to congratulate the new Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. I think when I first heard of his appointment I thought perhaps he was getting a good promotion, but I realize now that although it is a good promotion, it is a real hot potato and I wish him well on some of the difficult times ahead.

I also congratulate the Minister of Agriculture on accepting a second portfolio. I wonder whether he is going to make an arithmetic or a geometric progression, whether it will be three next year or four, but at any rate he is making progress.

I would also as well like to congratulate the member for Springfield on his recent move. He and I once shared the sole honour as batchelors in this House, but he now has abdicated and he has given the sole title to myself.

I would like to make a few comments on my constituency before I get into the general political part of my speech. We were very pleased in Elmwood to finally have the Nairn overpass built and I think that this is an issue that was talked about since 1930. It finally opened on October 31, 1967. I would like to thank the Minister of Highways - the former Minister of Highways, now the Premier - for whatever part he played in seeing that the Nairn Avenue construction began.

We are still waiting for the final approval on the new Concordia Hospital. The Minister of Health has indicated that they are finally getting around on one of the commissions to approving initial construction plans and we are watching that with some concern. There has been some delay now and there certainly is a need for a hospital in the north end of Winnipeg. We once had three and now we are down to a very small one waiting for a more modern facility.

I think the people of Elmwood also have a particular interest in the Minister of Health's proposed legislation on pollution, because there are several businesses in the area which cause considerable air pollution and we are going to watch this legislation carefully.

I hope somewhere in the near future that some better facilities will be built like a swimming pool or an indoor arena. I would like to extend congratulations to some of the outstanding athletes of the area who were successful in the past year. For instance, we have a reputation for having some of the finest curlers in the province, if not in Canada, at Elmwood Curling Club. A woman, Glenda Burr, of the Curling Club won the 30th annual city ladies' curling championship. There are a number of city championships, for example the East Elmwood Community Club, which is a real soccer hotbed, took the Bantam Soccer Championship, the Playground C, the Playground A, and so on. And our football team, the Elmwood Eskimos, finally got off the ground and almost got into the finals.

I would also like to mention a young student from the local high school, T. . . Bodie who produced a very fine sculpture for Winnipeg's Administration Building; and I would also like to pay tribute to the continued musical ascendancy of our Elmwood High Band and the David Thompson Jr. High Band.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if it would be time to call 5:30 so I could go into the second portion of my speech this evening.

MR. SPEAKER: I take it the honourable member wishes to relinquish a minute, and if it's in order I'll now call it 5:30, to return to the Chair at 8:00 this evening.