

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
10:00 o'clock, Friday, March 15, 1968

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions

Reading and Receiving Petitions

Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees

MR. HARRY P. SHEWMAN (Morris): Mr. Speaker I would like to lay on the table the Interim Report of the Legislative Committee on Farm Machinery.

(MR. CLERK receives report)

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the honourable member - I beg your pardon.

MR. SHEWMAN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to submit the report of the Special Committee of the Legislature on Farm Machinery - an Interim Report.

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q.C. (Attorney-General) (Fort Garry): The report will be printed in Hansard in the usual way, thereby obviating the necessity of reading of it.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed.

MR. SHEWMAN: I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Dufferin that the report be received.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

Interim Report

MANITOBA LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE ON FARM MACHINERY

MEMBERS: Honourable Harry Enns, Mr. Oscar Bjornson, Mr. Earl Dawson, Mr. Henry Einarson, Mr. J.M. Froese, Mr. Horner Hamilton, Mr. Mike Kawchuk, Mr. Fred Klym, Mr. Morris McGregor, Mr. Sam Uskiw, Mr. Albert Vielfaure, Mr. Doug. Watt, Mr. Harry Shewman, Mr. E.I. Dow.

The Committee has conducted its investigation into different phases of farm machinery.

The scope of this investigation is indicated by the number of hearings to-date-26-and the number of briefs submitted to-date-21.

The Committee has contacted 625 people as to when our hearings would be held covering different phases of: manufacturing, distribution, dealers, transportation and users of farm machinery. The Committee has also contacted other provinces and some states and universities.

Summary of Activities:

Public Hearings: July 25, 1967, October 12, 1967 and January 22, 1968.

Informal Meetings: February 15, 16 and 26, 1968.

Total: Number of Meetings	26
Number of Briefs Submitted	9 (21)
Number of Letters Sent Out Advising of Hearings	625
Mailing List	260

Lists of Briefs submitted:

July 25, 1967 - 1. Mr. George Franklin, 1st Vice-President, Manitoba Farm Bureau.
2. Mr. Robert Hopley, Vice-President, The Western Manitoba Farm Business Association.
3. Mr. Lloyd Kitching, Farmer, Carman, Manitoba.

October 12, 1967 - 4. Mr. K. Singleton, President, Manitoba Farmers Union. 5. Mr. W. Newman (lawyer) on behalf of certain members of the Wholesale Implement Dealers Association of Manitoba as follows: Agristeel Ltd., J.I. Case Company, Allied Farm Equipment of Canada Ltd., Cockshutt Farm Equipment of Canada Ltd., John Deere Limited, Farmhand of Canada Limited, International Harvester Company of Canada Limited, Killbery Industries Ltd., Minneapolis-Moline of Canada Ltd., New Holland Division of Sperry Rand Canada Ltd., Simon-Day Ltd., Robinson-Alamo Distributors Ltd.

December 1, 1967 (by mail) - 6. The Manitoba & Lakehead Farm Equipment Retail Dealers' Association.

January 22, 1968 - 7. Mr. L. Wakefield, General Manager, Manitoba Trucking Association. 8. Mr. L.E. Jordan, Farmer, (Letter of Complaint) Portage la Prairie. 9. Mr. M. Meronek, P. Eng., (Verbal) Markwill Industries Limited. Massey-Ferguson Industries Ltd. (Brief Forthcoming).

May 4, 1966 - First Committee Meeting - Membership as follows: Messrs. Bjornson, Campbell, Harris, Klym, Moeller, Shewman, Strickland, Vielfaure, Watt. All members present. Mr. Shewman, Chairman. Discussed setting-up of public hearings; gathering of relevant material; opening of office and need for technical adviser.

May 10, 1966 - Office opened and secretary engaged. Began compiling mailing list. Letters (23) sent to farm groups (see appendix) advising them of Committee. Letters (5) requesting relevant material.

May 19, 1966 - Provincial election called thereby dissolving Committee.

April 21, 1967 - Committee Re-established by Resolution with change in membership as follows: Honourable Harry Enns, Messrs. Bjornson, Dawson, Dow, Einarson, Froese, Hamilton, Kawchuk, Klym, McGregor, Shewman, Uskiw, Vielfaure and Watt. Now fourteen members, originally nine.

May 3, 1967 - Second Committee Meeting - Thirteen members present. Mr. Shewman, Chairman and Mr. Hamilton, Vice Chairman. Tentative format set for first public hearing. Briefs from "users" of farm machinery. Publicity arranged with Manitoba Government Information Section.

May 15, 1967 - Secretary engaged on part-time basis. Mailing list compiled. Letters of enquiry (11) went out to various provinces and states requesting information on farm machinery legislation and testing. Copies of Farm Implement Act mailed to members along with Manitoba Government Brief to Barber Commission, for study by Committee.

June 14, 1967 - Letters mailed (23) to farm groups (see appendix) inviting briefs at public hearing scheduled for 10: A.M., July 25, 1967 in Room 254 Legislative Building.

June 16, 1967 - Letters mailed (151) to manufacturers, dealers (see appendix) and other interested parties advising of public hearing on July 25th.

June 18, 1967 - Copy of Barber Commission Terms of Reference and outline of studies mailed to members.

July 25, 1967 - First Public Hearing - in Room 254 Legislative Building. All members present. Briefs presented by Manitoba Farm Bureau; Western Manitoba Farm Business Association; Mr. Lloyd Kitching, Farmer.

July 25, 1967 - Third Committee Meeting - Meeting followed hearing. All members present. Discussion of briefs submitted and date of next hearing. "Manufacturers and dealers" to be invited to present briefs at hearing slated for October 12, 1967 at 10: A.M., in Room 254 Legislative Building.

August 11, 1967, Mailed to members: Copy of transcript of hearing of July 25th and Minutes of meeting of same date; copies of letters from three machinery companies re testing; copy of Farmers Union brief to the Barber Commission.

September 14, 1967, Letters mailed (145) to dealers and manufacturers of farm machinery (see appendix) inviting presentation of briefs at October 12th Hearing in Room 254 Legislative Building. Letters mailed (29) to farm groups (see appendix) and other interested parties advising of October 12th hearing.

September 20, 1967, Mailed to members: Copy of Excise Tax Act; Customs Tariff Items; letter from CPR with attached freight rate schedule; material re leasing of machinery, from Ontario Department of Agriculture.

October 12, 1967 - Second Public Hearing at 10: A.M. in Room 254 of the Legislative Building. Ten members present. Briefs were presented by the Farmers Union and Mr. W. Newman representing certain members of The Wholesale Implement Dealers Association of Manitoba as follows: Agristee Ltd., J.I. Case Company, Allied Farm Equipment Ltd., Cockshutt Farm Equipment of Canada Limited, John Deere Limited, Farmhand of Canada, Limited, International Harvester Company of Canada Ltd., Killbery Industries Ltd., Minneapolis-Moline of Canada Ltd., New Holland Division Sperry Rand Canada Limited, Simon-Day Ltd., Robinson-Alamo Distributors Ltd.

October 12, 1967 - Fourth Committee Meeting held following hearing. Nine members present. Discussion of briefs presented at hearing. "Labour and transportation" to be invited to present briefs at next hearing, date of which was left open to the discretion of the Chairman.

October 25, 1967, Mailed to members: Copy of Report of Ontario Farm Machinery Investigation Committee; copy of Manitoba Farm Bureau submission to The Royal Commission;

Minutes of meeting October 12, 1967.

December 20, 1967 - Mailed to members: Copies of brief submitted to the Royal Commission by Cockshutt Farm Equipment of Canada Limited; copies of brief submitted (by mail) to the Manitoba Farm Machinery Committee by the Manitoba and Lakehead Farm Equipment Retail Dealers Association; copies of report of Western Manitoba Farm Business Association for 1966; copy of letter received from Mr. W. Newman re Red Book on Machinery Testing; notice of Hearing scheduled for January 22, 1968.

December 20, 1967 - Letters mailed (89) to transportation and labour (see appendix) involved with farm machinery inviting briefs for hearing January 22, 1968.

December 28, 1967 - Letters of information (171) mailed to dealers, manufacturers (see appendix) and other interested parties advising of hearing January 22, 1968 in Room 254 Legislative Building.

January 22, 1968 - Third Public Hearing held at 10: A. M. in Room 254 of the Legislative Building. Eleven members present. Briefs presented by the Manitoba Trucking Association and Markwill Industries. A letter of complaint was read by Mr. L.E. Jordan of Portage la Prairie.

January 22, 1968 - Fifth Committee Meeting held following hearing. Eleven members present. Discussion of briefs presented at hearing that day. Informal meetings planned and dates left open to discretion of Chairman.

January 22, 1968 - Informal Meeting held with Farmers Union for presentation of supplementary brief.

January 30, 1968 - Mailed to members; Notice and agenda of Informal Meetings to be held February 15th and 16th with various companies and organizations; Minutes of meeting of January 22nd; transcript of hearing of October 12, 1968.

January 30, 1968 - Mr. Shewman and Mr. Hudek (Engineer with the Department of Agriculture) met with Mr. E. C. Wilcox and Mr. Bob Hill of the C. N. R., to discuss farm machinery transportation problems.

February 15, 1968 - Informal Meetings were held with the following: John Deere Limited, J. I. Case Company, International Harvester Co., Minneapolis-Moline of Canada, Allied Farm Equipment Ltd., Cockshutt Farm Equipment of Canada Ltd., Farmhand Co. There were twelve Committee members present. Copies of Volumes I and II of brief presented by Massey-Ferguson Industries Limited to the Royal Commission were handed to representatives of each party on Committee.

February 16, 1968 - Informal Meetings were held with the following: Killbery Industries, New Holland Division Sperry Rand Ltd., Agristeel Ltd., Simon-Day Ltd., Robinson Alamo Distributors Ltd., Manitoba Farm Bureau. Eleven members present.

February 26, 1968 - Informal Meetings were held with the following: Manitoba Truckers Assoc. Manitoba & Lakehead Farm Equipment Retail Dealers' Assoc., Western Manitoba Farm Business Assoc., Carman Farm Business Assoc., Manitoba Federation of Labour (were notified but did not appear), Markwill Industries. Twelve members present.

March 5, 1968 - Mr. Hamilton and Mr. Hudek (Engineer with the Department of Agriculture) met with representatives of Customs for further information for the Farm Machinery Committee as to how parts etc., are handled through customs.

March 6, 1968 - Sixth Committee Meeting - Eleven members present. Interim Report was read by Chairman and unanimously accepted by Committee.

Further study of customs, transportation and the Farm Implement Act.

Many of the problems involving different phases of farm machinery and their proposed solution have inter-provincial and international implications. A further study is needed before these become clear.

Full co-ordination, analysis and evaluation of material on hand remains to be accomplished. The Committee's final report will be more complete and its value clearly enhanced by further investigation in certain areas.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, I take it that there will be no motion of concurrence on this brought in later on so that this will be it and therefore I would just like to make one comment or two.

Being a member of the committee I attended meetings and the hearings that were held and I do not oppose the report as such in any way. I feel, however, that there is quite a bit of work to be done and especially in connection with pricing of farm machinery. I feel that this aspect of the committee's work should be delved into much further and that this is an area

(Mr. Froese cont'd.) where I think feel a lot of importance should be attached to and more work should be done in order to get a better statement.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I adjourned debate on this motion yesterday in order to read the report of the committee. I was not a member of the Insurance Committee. However I did attend some of the meetings on my own and have received material that was made available to other members of the committee and I feel as some other members have already expressed themselves, that certainly something could have been done already at this particular session and probably legislation brought in to that effect.

However, I will certainly not press the matter because as already stated we have similar commissions going on in other provinces where I feel that we should be able to benefit to a large extent and which would certainly help the committee in arriving at some further conclusions.

I note that the committee will be re-appointed. I don't know whether I'll be a member of the committee - it doesn't look like it - but certainly I will do my part in attending meetings if and when possible and also to be informed. On the other hand I also hope that the government will submit the information and briefs and so on, provide copies for me as well so I can peruse these and arrive at conclusions of my own. Thank you.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motion
Introduction of Bills

Before I call Orders of the Day I would like the honourable members to know that we have a special guest with us today who I would like to take a moment to introduce. I'd like to draw the attention of the honourable members to the Speaker's Gallery where we have as our honoured guest Manitoba's youthful representative for the Easter Seal Campaign. Generally we have an Easter Seal Timmy with us; this year we are privileged to have an Easter Seal Tammy; she is 12-year old Janet Chambers of Brandon and so is from the constituency of the Honourable Member for Brandon. With Janet is her mother, Mrs. Mary Chalmers and Mr. Sid Scott, Manitoba Chairman of the 1968 Easter Seal Campaign. As members know, the month-long campaign began yesterday and continues until April 14th, Easter Sunday.

Janet is a bright young girl, with a happy out-going personality. She is in Grade 6, Machray School in Brandon, a recently enrolled member of C. G. I. T., and an active girl who likes swimming and other sports. She suffers from a form of cerebral palsy that affects her right arm. Janet first came under the ministrations of the Easter Seal officials when she was three and has had help with speech therapy and other services. A plastic hand splint was provided for her in 1966. The same year she was at the Crippled Children Society's Lakeside Fresh Air Camp north of Gimli. She has been attending the Brandon Rural Clinics each year since 1960. Janet, as a representative for the 1,200 other handicapped boys and girls, will appear at the Easter Seal parade of stars at the CBC television in Toronto. We are pleased to have you here with us today, Janet. Your help will give well-deserved public recognition to the Society for Crippled Children and Adults of Manitoba for its effective work for the handicapped throughout our province. Janet, on behalf of the Honourable Members of the Legislative Assembly I welcome you here today, and may God bless you.

Orders of the Day.

MR. BEN HANUSCHAK (Burrows): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I wish to direct a question to the Honourable the Attorney-General. Apparently the constabulary of the City of Winnipeg is spending a considerable amount of time and hence the taxpayers' money in abortive attempts to uncover evidence of indecent exposure by our entertainers in the beverage rooms. Would the Minister be good enough to define "indecent exposure" to enable our law enforcement officers to operate more efficiently and get onto whatever more exciting and interesting assignments they may have on their beat.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member will appreciate that I'm really not an expert in indecent exposure. -- (interjection) -- But having regard for the context of the subject I'll make the best breast of it and see what I can do. This matter, seriously, is - we have asked for reports because of complaints that have been received and the honourable member correctly identifies the subject matter as being an indecent act or indecent type of

(MR. LYON cont'd.)..... display. It's extremely difficult, as members will appreciate, to get evidence, and then to get evidence which will stand up in court. The department have had inquiries out now with the City of Winnipeg Police Department and another Police Department in order to assemble information as to what is the practice in some of these places of entertainment and if the law officers of the Crown find that there is any breach of the relevant section of the Code you can rest assured that appropriate charges will be laid.

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q.C. (St. John's): Mr. Speaker, if I may, a supplementary question. I'm not clear just who is complaining. Is it the people who frequent these places that are unhappy with the disturbance that's caused in their normal pursuit of what they're doing or is it somebody from outside that is trying to decide what is proper and what isn't? The Attorney-General said he is trying to have an investigation made to see just what is the problem. Well, could he clarify just who says that there is a problem. --(Interjection)-- On what basis.

MR. LYON: The nature of the complaints that have come to the department have been from some of the people in the hotel business and in the restaurant business. In addition to that there have been citizen complaints. I couldn't say whether they were citizens who had been present at the shows or whether they were citizens who had heard via the radio or other places that shows were going on. But my honourable friend points up the neat question that's involved; you get into a question of censorship. But the problem of the matter is looked after by the Criminal Code and if there is anything taking place that is in breach of the Criminal Code, that can be proved, then we will proceed with any charges; but we haven't done that as yet.

MR. CHERNIACK: If I may ask you, Mr. Speaker, shouldn't the Chief of Police know what it is. Why should he be complaining to the Liquor Commission. If there is an offence surely it's the Police that should be looking after it rather than complaining to some agency of the Crown. Am I not wrong in putting that question?

MR. LYON: The Criminal Code offence, it is not involved as a statutory offence under The Liquor Control Act because indecent acts or shows or exhibitions are within the purview of the government or of the parliament of Canada because they have legislated on this field in the Criminal Code of Canada. You're quite correct in saying this is a Criminal Code matter and that police department and one or two others have been asked to institute investigations pursuant to the relevant sections of the Code.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition)(Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Attorney-General. Is there any truth to the rumor about that my honourable friend intends to appoint a special select committee of the House to study this matter directly?

MR. LYON: I first heard of that rumour one day when I dropped into my honourable friend's caucus room; but we didn't take the suggestion up immediately, no.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party) (Radisson): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Attorney-General on the point of the jurisdiction of the Chairman of the Liquor Commission. Is it not a fact, however, that under the regulations or himself as the head of the Liquor Commission undertake to decide on the types of entertainment in the various outlets? For instance, if I may, Mr. Speaker, I know that some suggestions have been made or approaches have been made to the Chairman of the Liquor Commission for allowing women entertainers in men's beer parlours and it has been rejected by the Commissioner and there's no provision in the Act for it - him being able to do that, that I'm able to ascertain, so is it not a fact that he has some control over what goes on inside beer parlours and beverage rooms?

MR. LYON: Certainly not by statute and the questions of obscenity are certainly not within the range of jurisdiction of the Liquor Control Commission.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, my point is apart from any obscenity, is he not the man that's charged with responsibility of the conduct and operation of our liquor outlets in the Province of Manitoba.

MR. CHERNIACK: It's only in relation to the

MR. PAULLEY: Oh, no, it's more than that.

MR. DOUGLAS CAMPBELL (Lakeside): I would like to address a question to the Honourable the Attorney-General. Is it not a fact that the Honourable the Attorney-General owes it to the House to investigate this matter personally and report to the House on his findings

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd.) particularly because he is the Minister in charge of athletics and physical fitness.

MR. SPEAKER: I wondered as the final note on this if I might suggest that I feel confident that none of the members of the House have witnessed one of these exhibitions. Orders of the Day.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate of the proposed motion of the Leader of the New Democratic Party. The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. SAMUEL USKIW (Brokenhead): I wonder, Mr. Speaker, may we have this stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders for Return. The Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I wish to move, seconded by the Member for Seven Oaks, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return giving copies of all written communications of every nature and kind between the Minister of Agriculture or anyone in the Department of Agriculture and the Manitoba Vegetable Marketing Inquiry Commission.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

HON. HARRY ENNS (Minister of Agriculture and Conservation (Rockwood-Iberville):

Mr. Speaker, I only wanted to draw to the attention of the Honourable Member from Brokenhead that I'm prepared to accept this Order. I believe the Order is in fact ready to be brought to the House under the same conditions that I accepted it in the previous session.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

MR. USKIW: I wonder if the Minister would elaborate on those conditions.

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm going from memory but it would seem to me that there may well be some items of a privileged nature that I'm not empowered to release in terms of some of the correspondence, but he was, I believe, specifically referring to official correspondence emanating out of my office or offices of the Department of Agriculture in this province to the Commission, lists of names and so forth, and certainly we are prepared to release this.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, on this matter I'm just wondering what matter of "privilege" there would be between a department and a commission established which is set up to enquire into various aspects of the operation of work. Now surely if the Minister says there's a privilege of some kind involved, then he ought to clarify just on what basis there is a privilege which exists which would prevent it being filed. It's not certainly a government matter, it's not a matter within the Cabinet where the commission has been appointed presumably, it's an independent commission and as an independent commission surely there's no privilege that exists as to instructions or otherwise. If indeed there are then surely that should come out. So may I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that there ought not to be conditions unless the Minister is in a position to clarify just how these conditions arise which create "privilege" and that may well be the answer to the question that is being asked.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, again I don't choose to argue with my learned colleague the Member for St. John's. I believe the area of privilege that I referred to is in that area that surrounds the Commissioner's report and the involvement of third and other parties in the carrying out of his responsibilities of the investigation that took place - I refer to the Baron Commission. While the commissioner was investigating all phases of the vegetable industry, I am not fully aware of the precise nature under which some of the information the commissioner on his own solicited from individuals and private peoples involved that contributed to this hearing. Now it's in that area alone that there was some question if I recollect last year, last session, that my legal advisors in the department were concerned with divulging any privileged information. Certainly none exists insofar as the Department of Agriculture is concerned and with that I certainly concur with your description of that.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, may I then ask the Minister whether there was any privileged communication dealing with the report made by the Baron Commission to the department. -- (Interjection) -- Well then I don't understand his question and I would assume that if anything is being held back for any reason it will be indicated as to what is being held back, course not a copy of it if he's holding it back, but an indication of the nature of what is being held back and the reason for it, so it could be debated.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. CAMPBELL: As I read the motion, Mr. Speaker, it appears to me that the

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd.) Minister has in fact undertaken to give all the information that is required in the motion, because the motion asks for copies of all written communications of every nature and kind between the Minister of Agriculture or anyone in the Department of Agriculture and the Commission. Now the Honourable Minister, if I heard him correctly, said just a minute ago that he is willing to give everything so far as the people connected with the department are concerned in their correspondence with the Marketing Enquiry Commission and I would think that if that's done, then he is answering the request completely.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Orders for Return. The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Wellington that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing the total expenditure by the Province of Manitoba for:

- (1) a. Magazines
- b. Periodicals
- c. Books

for

1. 1966
2. 1967

for inmates in each of the following:

1. Headingly Provincial Jail
 2. Portage Home for Boys
 3. Manitoba Home for Girls
 4. Vaughan Street Detention Home
 5. Portage Jail for Women
 6. The Pas Jail for Women
 7. The Pas Jail
 8. Dauphin Jail
- (2) Are there library facilities in each of the eight provincial institutions? Describe each.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say a word on this Order for Return. Apparently the government has announced that it is going to make renovations to the present Vaughan Street Detention Centre and that at least for the time being no new facility will be built. I'm quite concerned about this particular place because having visited it and looked at the so-called library facilities which consisted of no more than a small apple box type of shelf with some very old and very uninteresting books on it, I was told this was the library. Apparently one of the reasons is that these boys are supposed to be rather unruly and that therefore no magazines or books can be made available. I don't believe this, because I think that these are young boys, they're the same boys who went to school the day before and will go to school a few days later and I think that this can be controlled.

By contrast Headingly has a first class library with some pretty good facilities in it. I think that people who are put in some sort of jail or some sort of detention centre have time; I think they have to have something to occupy themselves with. In some of our provincial institutions there is very poor recreation facilities; there is nothing to do except to vegetate. So I would like to know just what these facilities are and just how much moneys are being spent on the inmates, not on the members of the staff, but on the people who are in prison, I think this Order will set out what the facilities and conditions are so that we might be able to bring to light some of the more inadequate and unpleasant conditions and possibly make some improvements.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

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

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Virden and the proposed motion of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition in amendment thereto. The Honourable Minister of Agriculture .

MR. ENNS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If you recall I was, the latter part of the sitting last night, simply recalling some of the programs of our department, not for the purpose of going through them in any detail -- the members of the House will have that opportunity when we go into the estimates of the Department of Agriculture -- but simply for the purpose

(MR. ENNS cont'd.) . . . of focusing again our attention - and I say again, because it has to be done from time to time it appears - in to those areas that the province has jurisdiction and is in fact empowered to act, if we are talking about our agricultural problems. And it seemed to me I arrived at that particular point where I was charging the Federal Government with what I considered to be irresponsible action in arriving at a 30% rise in wages during the Seamen's Strike some two summers ago.

I don't know whether the Honourable Member from Inkster would agree with me in describing that particular action as inflationary but I do know what it means to me as a farmer, in terms of the goods and services that I need on my farm, the tractor the other pieces of equipment that may well be transported on these lakes and that I need to grow my crop and it's been underlined for me and for all the farmers in Manitoba this year, when we are faced not with only "fixed" world prices, but the declining prices as has been the case in many of our major commodities, and that, Mr. Speaker, of course, is precisely what the cost price squeeze is all about.

Now we share a certain responsibility here in the Province of Manitoba, and there is no two ways about it, and we can do a certain amount about it and there is no question about it, and we think we are doing a great deal about it, but there cannot be any dispute from member opposite that the root causes, the solutions, the first steps to solving these problems lie in Ottawa. Now you know, I don't particularly wish to carry on some of the comments that have been made in the current debate on the Throne Speech, particularly directed at myself or indeed the actions of my First Minister in perhaps not devoting sufficient attention to the idea of a full-time Minister of Agriculture. I am a full-time Minister of Agriculture and my First Minister is only too capable to present his own particular point of view on this. But I want to draw the attention of the House to the situation that we face in Ottawa today where we have some four or five Ministers of Agriculture running around and no national policy coming.

I have to write to the Honourable Mr. Pepin for water; I have to write to the Honourable Mr. Chretien in terms of Federal Credit for agriculture. If it has to do with general agriculture problems I write to Mr. Greene. If it has to do with ARDA or the rural development programs I write to Mr. Sauve. If it has to do with the Wheat Board I talk to Mr. Winters. --(Interjection)-- I'll tell you what the proof is; it tells me that there are about five stools there and the agricultural policy that this country needs is falling in between every one of them and we are not getting very much done. . . .

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface) : What's Manitoba doing? That's a terrific solution.

MR. ENNS: This isn't just idle talk, what is happening to some our very unique needed programs that we have here in this province - in this western part of the country? I didn't hear the Honourable Leader of the Opposition's voice too strong as of late in the concern that many of us here in the west express about the organization - and I refer to the PFRA. You know, one of the leading contenders of the leadership race has suggested that perhaps this very unique and worthwhile organization, as far as we western farmers are concerned, has outlived its usefulness and should be scrapped. And I don't even mind referring to the Minister who said that: this was the Honourable Mr. Sharp. I wonder is that the position of the Liberal Party here in Manitoba? -- (Interjection) --

I have no doubt you will have an opportunity to answer it on many occasions, but while I may anticipate the answer, my concern is that I would have to surmise that the influence of the western Liberal group is no greater on the federal policies on this subject as they were in influencing them in adopting a voluntary health scheme.

What about some of our national transportation policies as they affect agriculture. I refer specifically to the policy, the outdated policy, the anachronism of the war years, the eastern feed . . . assistance policy, long outlived its usefulness and yet we're unable to resolve that problem. And what's happening in this whole situation is that we have no national goal. Now my previous First Minister on several occasions repeated the call for a national agricultural policy. I put that position forward with the Federal Ministers, in my meetings with them. We go along certainly with the efforts of the current Minister, in his Task Force. I'm happy to advise the House and I'm sure the House will take it as a measure of satisfaction and merit for the Province of Manitoba that one of the capable members of our agricultural community are on that task force. I refer to Professor Dr. Clay Gilson whom I know has the sincere interests of agriculture at heart and my department presently is engaged in discussions and in meetings. We've met with other western groups in Regina just recently in

(MR. ENNS cont'd.) attempting to put forward our position to this task force, the policies that we feel, the directions that we feel we should be going in.

Now you know when we talk about national agricultural policies it has a nice ringing sound and it's fine if we don't get into specifics, but I suggest, Mr. Speaker, there are many specific points that we can talk about. Just what is our policy on wheat? We got some fuzzy thinking at that Western Liberal Thinkers Conference here in Winnipeg on that subject a little while ago. They kind of adopted a two-price policy and then again they kind of didn't. --(Interjection) -- I don't know what the right position should be. I know that the two-price system isn't adequate because it only involves 20 percent of our production and 20 percent isn't good enough. If there is supposed to be a redistribution, a better sharing of our goods then we want it on 100 percent of our wheat, not just on 20% of it, and this of course is essentially why up to now, even though the Liberal policy, the present Liberal Government, went into office on the promise of delivering a two-price system of wheat to the farmers of this country, have to date not implemented it. I can't really blame them for not doing so because it isn't the final answer.

MR. MOLGAT: Tell us your policy?

MR. ENNS: What about our policy on that? -- (Interjection)-- What about my policy? All right as a good beginner I suggest we listen all of us very carefully to one of the best speeches on this particular subject that was made in Regina by the leader of one of our grain companies. I don't mind referring to him by name either, Mr. Runciman of the United Grain Growers. He laid down a solid 8, 9 point program that called for a complete overhaul and review of some of our sacred cows in our grain industry. I don't know, I don't have the answers, I don't pretend to have the answers, but I am worried about many things - just how far distant has the Wheat Board grown from the farmers? Particularly in these last few years in this shuffling around, once with the Minister of Finance, once with the Minister of Industry and Commerce. Where does the farmer begin to identify, with his organization the Wheat Board? When do we start to take a broader look? If we can't find the markets for the premium wheat that we have, is it not time that we looked seriously and consider very strenuously the suggestions that have been made in some quarters about the introduction of new varieties, higher yielding varieties, to help out our feeding industry. I'm not suggesting for one minute that we give up what we have in our hand for something, for two in a bush concept, but I'm suggesting that these are matters that should be opened up and looked at and pursued with on a crash program basis at this time.

I can refer to another particular item. Let's talk, not as significantly, but what about our national sugar policy in this country. The production of sugar isn't a major part of the agricultural industry in the western provinces or in Canada but it is a significant one and recently it's been drawn to our attention by the closing of a sugar plant in Chatham, Ontario. Canada is one of the few countries numbering some 50 or some 60 that has not got a minimum domestic production requirement such as is the case with so many others. I believe in the United States the minimum domestic production requirement runs around 30%. Now that may well be a national goal, a national policy in terms of the sugar beet growers in this country. Surely there comes a point when it becomes a matter of vital interest, a matter of vital concern to the nation to have an industry in a state of healthy existence within the boundaries of our country.

What about our national dairy policy? I noted with some interest -- and I'm sure the Honourable Member from Gladstone will take it as a compliment if I follow in his style of tailoring my speeches around news clippings - it's intended in that way -- but I noted with interest recently, just last week, a very distinguished senator the NDP Liberal Senator Argue launches attack on new dairy policy - new dairy policy - this is old news. This government and this minister was aware of what was going on when the dairy policy first made its proposals known a year ago this time, and we brought into our offices the interests of dairy producers, the interests of creameries, the interests of the industry people in this regard and hammered out a program and approach that we felt was suitable for Manitoba, and at our insistence the Dairy Commission came to Winnipeg and I had the pleasure of chairing the meeting that took place between the producers and the dairy interests and we managed very significantly to modify some of the harsh implications of the original position that the Dairy Commission had on this matter. I might say they were of vital importance to us at that particular time, we had some new plants in construction -- I refer particularly to the one in

(MR. ENNS cont'd). . . the St. Claude area -- and its very existence was being threatened by the policy that was in a very ham-handed way emanating out of Ottawa with respect to the dairy situation in Canada.

Now I'm not arguing in principle with the things the dairy commission, with the policy the dairy commission, the national dairy commission is after; I think basically they're on the right track; but I do believe they require a great deal of assistance and advice in seeing that the rationalization that they're looking for in industry, particularly in the small producer area, is one that is reasonable, is one that gives the producers reasonable time to adjust, reasonable time to rationalize before this is -- so the harshness of any of the implications aren't borne too hardly in too short of time for any particular individuals.

Mr. Speaker, these are some of the areas, some of the national programs that have to be adopted and we have to get on with the job of getting at those national programs. Now it's my hope that maybe with the Task Force in operation, maybe we can succeed in calling together some kind of a national conference. I do believe it's necessary and I'm glad to see that the Manitoba Farm Bureau's organization supports this call for a national farm agricultural policy, because while I think we're going to find some very interesting in-depth studies by this task force, because I happen to have a lot of respect for those people that are involved in this study, we still need a broad agricultural conference to decide just what is the place and just where in the structure of the whole make-up of our nation are we the taxpayers, the consumers, all the citizens of Canada prepared to place the agricultural industry in. Now, I'm an optimistic man, Mr. Speaker, I have a lot of optimism about agriculture, but I must admit I really cannot find myself extending that optimism that some of these things that I've called for will happen with the current federal administration.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, would the Honourable Minister permit a question?

MR. ENNS: Certainly.

MR. DESJARDINS: Are you the agricultural critic for the Conservative caucus in Ottawa or are you the Minister of Agriculture for Manitoba, and if so why do you refuse to give any of your policies. You admit that you have no answers and you keep on criticizing Ottawa. We're not elected to represent Ottawa. Give us leadership in this province.

MR. ENNS: We're prepared to give that leadership in the province and we'll continue to give that leadership in the province. --(Interjection)-- The essence of the debate here, Mr. Speaker, and this is only my reason for interjecting at this time, was the suggestions that the cost-price squeeze can and should and only can be solved here in this province, and my pointing out the lack of federal policies is the nature of the theme, the discussion that I'm pointing out at this time.

MR. DESJARDINS: Now give us your policies, your answers.

MR. ENNS: My answers will be forthcoming in the estimates, in the programs I've outlined tonight to a good part. These are sound programs, they are programs that have proven their success beyond any question, Mr. Speaker, and I know that we'll go forward with them. But I was expressing my lack of confidence in the present Liberal administration in Ottawa to come forward with the kind of agricultural policy that we require in the west. And really, Mr. Speaker, should we wonder, should we wonder. After all the one lone western voice on the government side of the House happens to be the Honourable Member from urban St. Boniface whose hands I can appreciate are fully occupied with the Department of Veterans's Affairs. And so we have to wait as we confidently can wait for that time when the western voice is once again heard loud and clear on the government side of the bench and I am certain that that will be within a very short time. Mr. Speaker. . . .

MR. DESJARDINS: We'll have lots more, that's right.

MR. ENNS: In concluding, I would like to make it very clear, the concern, our concern, our awareness and our willingness to respond to the problems of agriculture, within their scope, have been questioned by members opposite. I ask the Leader of the New Democratic Party where was his concern and where was his awareness and how was he going to respond to the farmers in Turtle Mountain? And I would suggest to the honourable members opposite --(Interjection)-- I'm not concerned about Turtle Mountain. Our man was there, our man was voicing his concern, our man was telling them what he was going to do in the event that he would be successfully elected. And I can assure you he will be successfully elected within a very short time.

Mr. Speaker, for my honourable friends opposite, I really have to say that there is

(MR. ENNS cont'd). . . little less opportunity for shouldering the responsibilities and the concerns of agriculture, simply by virtue of the example we have from their federal brothers. On the other hand, on this side, Mr. Speaker, on this side, I'm not alone in this job, I have the practical experience and the sound judgment of members -- I can name them: member from Arthur, member from Lansdowne, member from Rupertsland, member from Virden -- these men are not always called upon to make the big speeches or stand in the limelight, but they are there for the sound and practical advice and to them the word 'cost-price squeeze' is not just a catchy phrase, they live with it, day in day out. And in this same regard I have come to appreciate very much the services, the wisdom and the mature judgment of a man who has over the many years been one of the staunchest supporters and allies to the Department of Agriculture and always of great assistance to the Minister of Agriculture - and I refer to the Member for Morris who has in many ways contributed above and beyond the duties of what you would normally put on a private member.

Mr. Speaker, I have no concern and I have no problems about facing the coming problems in this year, the years that lie ahead, in doing the best for the farmers of Manitoba because we have the understanding and we have the willingness, we have the willingness to make those our problems. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MOLGAT: Would the Honourable Minister permit a question? I think he referred to a national policy on water and the need for co-operation and the questions of ARDA. Could he tell the House which province it was that held back on signing the agreement between the three prairie provinces and Ottawa regarding overall inventory and approach to the water problems to the west.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to inform that that agreement of course has been signed and we've got a better sharing deal as a result of delaying it a little while.

MR. MOLGAT: Could the Minister indicate which province it was held up the agreement for a full two years, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SAUL MILLER (Seven Oaks): Mr. Speaker, last year I didn't have an opportunity to participate in the Throne Speech debate, it ended far too soon for me. This year the order of business seems to be much wider and some of us who wouldn't normally get an opportunity are therefore in a position where they can participate.

In the traditional way, Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate you on resuming your seat as our guide and as our mentor in this House. Your experience of last year will stand you in good stead, and although a recent ruling of yours took me, and I think some other members somewhat by surprise, nonetheless I hope that the session will go along smoothly and we will not be called upon to question your rulings and your authority.

My congratulations to the mover and the seconder to the Throne Speech for their presentation of their case on behalf of the government - and in trying to defend the government you have to make good speeches, because certainly this government is very open to criticism and is becoming more and more open to criticism as time goes on.

But I think the most interesting feature of this Throne Speech, and although I've only sat in this Chamber and heard one read - I have read others although not in this Chamber - but the most interesting feature of this Throne Speech is that if a stranger came into Manitoba, he wouldn't know that such a place as Greater Winnipeg existed. This is the province with a non-existent metropolitan area. He'd know about the north, he'd know about agriculture, he'd know about dams, he'd know about Bird's Hill, he'd know about everything, but he wouldn't know of a little area where over half the population reside, which is the base of most of Manitoba's commerce, with all due respect to the agricultural people here, which is the source of most of the provincial revenue, but he'd never know this. On Greater Winnipeg, this government and the Throne Speech was silent. And it's not by accident, Mr. Speaker; it points out very clearly this government's attitude towards Greater Winnipeg and its residents. But perhaps I shouldn't have been too surprised-- I'm thinking back to the last fall when the Conservatives of this province had a convention and they chose as their leader and consequently as Premier a man who I read, according to newspapers, was quoted as saying that to be a Premier of Manitoba you must be able to kick the manure from tractor tires. Now that's true, that's the kind of thing I like to hear. That's a requirement beyond which you need no other and it's so very very obvious that with that approach Winnipeg and Greater Winnipeg and all the residents in it certainly would not be mentioned in the Throne Speech debate - on the Throne Speech read by His Honour.

(MR. MILLER cont'd)

Where have these people been. All over the world people are congregating into big cities. The big cities are both the cause and the effect of our highly industrialized society. Just yesterday evening I read DBS statistics, nothing new, that the trend toward the increase in the size of our cities is continuing and the drop in the rural areas and in the small towns is continuing as well, on the average of one percent per year, until today in Canada 73.6 percent of the population resides in the urban areas. But this government is rooted in the past, this government has blindfolded itself and refuses to recognize the problems of the large cities. Problems of housing, of transit, of welfare, of education, of recreation, the complexities of providing municipal service in a modern urban community. On this they are silent.

I remember during the 1966 - yes, it was 1966 election, that the former Premier dug out of the moth balls an old slogan that the Conservatives had in their 1959 campaign, and it said: "The responsibilities of municipalities must be related to their abilities to pay." This is an old slogan, I first heard it in 1959; I even believed it in 1959. But the fact is that in areas like my own, Seven Oaks, and throughout the Greater Winnipeg, property taxes in 1968 are going to rise, they're going to continue to be oppressive and regressive and that's a prediction. And this level of property taxes makes it almost impossible for the municipalities or for Metro to do the job for which they are designed and for which they are supposedly to undertake, and this has nothing to do with boundaries within Metro or anything else. There just simply isn't enough recognition, practical, actual recognition on the part of this government of the problems of the metropolitan area whether it be one government or fifty governments. If there is no money given to these municipal levels, they cannot fulfill their function.

Here's a typical example: in a metropolitan area such as Greater Winnipeg, the traffic flow and the movement of masses of people is recognized as essential to survival as is the circulation of blood in the body, but unless this province recognizes that it must play a share, an active role in that problem, Greater Winnipeg is going to develop hardening of the arteries. Sure they've made the odd placating gesture. About three years ago, I think it was three or maybe four, this government finally broke down -- it was probably just before the '63 election, as is typical, that's when they usually make their increases in grants -- so this government finally broke down and agreed to a grant for urban transportation. It was 3 percent of revenue or \$250,000 was the usual kicker in there, "whichever was the lesser" - just to make sure it doesn't go too big. This is all 'heart', really, big-hearted daddy. They collect over \$600,000 from the transit system just for sales tax and fuel tax, then they give them back \$250,000.00. This is their contribution towards resolving one of the most vital and serious problems in a metropolitan area, the problem of transit, of keeping a city from stagnating, from just simply being choked. This is their answer.

What about education. Now there the government is forever beating the drum. The Minister is forever proclaiming the great strides made in education, and I'll admit that compared to the former Liberal administration, this government and Manitoba has achieved some gains, but I also submit that compared to the former Liberal administration, anything this government would have done would have been an improvement. But here they say there's a real new deal, we're going to have a real new deal, we're going to shift the burden of the cost of education from the municipalities to the province. We're going to listen to what every enquiry commission, royal commission, municipal commission, what they've said to us since year one, we're going to finally listen to them and we're going to shift the burden to our shoulders, because we have the tax base -- they admit this -- and at the first session of the 21st Legislature last year we were treated to a White Paper and in it the new deal was unveiled - a Foundation Program. It's purpose was to cover the costs of public school education in a sound and rational basis. I admit that the Minister did acknowledge -- I remember this -- that the City of Winnipeg and perhaps some of the divisions in the metropolitan area because of the nature of their systems, because they wanted a few more frills that they might have to impose special levies, but basically this Foundation Program was going to cover the known needs of a good system, a system which the province approved of, which the province could support and which the problem was designed. . .

Well, what happened? Does the Foundation Program cover all the costs? Last year I suggested during the debate on the White Paper that perhaps the figure of \$95 million on which the Foundation Program is based, I inquired indeed whether this figure wasn't just

(MR. MILLER cont'd)...pulled out of a hat. On what basis was \$95 million construed as being the cost of a Foundation Program? The answer was that the department knew what it was doing. Because it was a realistic program and they had gone into it. Well, Mr. Speaker, the Minister was as wrong as were his estimates and was unrealistic as were his estimates. I don't know of one unitary division which was able to function without a special levy over and above the Foundation Program. This is in its very first year of operation, in its inception, at its very inception, when one would assume that the Foundation Program would be attuned with the needs and the time.

And what's the projection for 1968? We're back where we started from, we're going through that revolving door again. The province is easing the burden of costs right back onto the shoulders of the local ratepayers. The other day, quite by accident, or because he had no choice really, the Minister was obliged to announce adjustments in the 1968 Foundation grants. Now why did he have to make this announcement? -- It's interesting. Last year when the various bills were going through the House, it was suggested that the target dates set in the bills were unrealistic and that a March 15th deadline whereby the school boards were required to notify the municipalities the amount of money that was to be raised for the Foundation Program, that the March 15th deadline was unrealistic because this House would be in session and that the Finance Board couldn't possibly know what the estimates were unless they were privy to information to which this House was not privy, and the answer was, well, it won't happen. Well, we didn't have to wait long - it happened. It happened this year, because very quietly the Minister got up, I believe it was last Tuesday, and announced that because of the March 15th deadline, he was advising the House that this year the Foundation Program was going to be enhanced - in his usual grand manner - it was going to be enhanced by \$50.00 per authorized teacher for supplies and by \$50.00 per authorized teacher for maintenance. (Wow!) Wow is right! And that's it! The next day I asked him was the Minister considering recognizing the failure last year of the Foundation Program to come up with a realistic grant for the Class IV teachers because by and large throughout Manitoba the discrepancy between what is paid to the teacher by every school division and what the grant provides is somewhere between the nature of \$800 to \$1,000 per teacher - the most glaring error in the entire Foundation Program. And I asked him is there going to be any recognition of this? And the answer was no. The sum total of \$50.00 for supplies and \$50.00 for maintenance.

There's no recognition at all that the grant for authorized teachers - and I say authorized teacher because that doesn't mean all the teachers on any one staff, - it's just the authorized teachers, because a teacher isn't a teacher, he's a numerical figure representing a certain number of children in a classroom - you can have 10 teachers but you may only get 8 grants. And so the government has failed completely to recognize that the grant structure last year was completely unrealistic, and that was even in 1967. They refuse to recognize it. There's no recognition at all that in the last 10 years the average increase in the cost of education has been eight percent. This is due to increased costs, this is due to increased enrollment, any number of reasons, but by and large it's never dropped below eight percent over the last 10 years, on an average. Yet this year's pittance, and this is what it is, a pittance announced by the Minister, may be one percent - maybe an increase - when it is known by him and by anyone who is all aware of what's going on, that the increases saved by the school divisions throughout Manitoba are large -- and it's not because as the Member for Souris-Lansdowne would tell us, it's because the teachers are greedy, and because they're asking too much and because they're trying to - I forget the exact term he used - that they're trying to scuttle the program - Nonsense! The costs are going up because what is happening is what the government knows what should happen and which the government admits and recognizes in all its pronouncements, that education is essential if we are to survive in a modern society, but again, although the government recognizes its essential, they are trying to avoid their obligations by passing on that responsibility to somewhere else. So we're back on that old roller coaster, we're always there. The government introduces a new deal, a brand new formula, everybody says this is it - a new deal. They pick up a larger share of education costs and then we come to the dip in the roller coaster - and we didn't have to wait long, one year later - and already its share of costs is sliding downward while the municipal share starts going up again. And I suppose we have to wait for another election in order that legislation will be brought in again with the beating of the drum to again say that we're going to take the costs of

(MR. MILLER cont'd), .. education off the shoulders of the local ratepayers.

I once prepared a graph, and this goes back to the former government, really prepared a graph for submission to the 1957 Royal Commission on Education and I was surprised at the results of the graph because the graph kept going up and down and it wasn't until I tied these dips and valleys to election years that I realized what had happened, and we're back where we started from. There's dips and there's valleys, there's rises and there's valleys, and when we get to the peak that's the election year, and in between elections we start going down again.

Now is that the only area where the government is turning a blind eye to the problems of city living and metropolitan life? What about housing? You know the crisis on housing that everybody talks about. Every time a Minister speaks they all admit there's a crisis in housing. Our Minister in Manitoba blames the Federal Minister, the Federal Minister blames the provincial minister, everybody blames everyone else but no houses are built. And it's again typical of this government. They seem to believe in this old adage that an admitted fault is half a virtue. But you know, Mr. Speaker, to recognize a fault and not to take the adequate corrective measures that are so obvious is no virtue, it's a disgrace.

In 1967 the Minister of Municipal and Urban Affairs (and I underline the urban) introduced a new Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation Act. This was an Act that was going to solve all our housing problems. She admitted that housing was in bad straits and that public housing was desperately needed. As a matter of fact I remember by her own admission in this House she stated that approximately 40 percent of the people of Manitoba could not afford to rent or to buy decent accommodation) and no one argued with her, because those figures are valid. However, when we pleaded for amendments to the Act so that the bill might be effective because frankly some of us could see that it could not be effective, effective with the various restrictions that were placed on it, those amendments were rejected and the answer was well, we'll see how it works. Well how many units have been added to the stock of public housing in the last 12 months? And by the way, let's not be misled by any figures introduced for the housing that's going up in the Lord Selkirk Park area, because that scheme was initiated many years ago. It has nothing to do with the new housing Act, it goes back eight and 10 years. I repeat therefore, Mr. Speaker, how many units have been added to the stock of public housing? A thousand? Would you believe 500? - or 100? Would you believe 10? I don't know of any. And if the situation in housing was bleak in 1967, Mr. Speaker, and those are the terms that were used, the adjectives to describe the housing in '67, last year, it's disastrous today, because today it isn't just the people on low incomes, the so-called poor who can't get housing; today it's people with incomes of \$8,000 and under who are caught in the squeeze and it's a tragic day indeed when an income of \$8,000 is considered inadequate and it's considered low insofar as housing is concerned.

Now, if the Minister doesn't believe a crisis exists, then perhaps the Minister should talk to the Member for St. Matthews who in seconding the Throne Speech -- very kindly mind you, not like I, I suppose he's in a different position than I -- very kindly pointed out that in his area of St. Matthews there was a problem and that the same problem prevailed throughout Greater Winnipeg. Mr. Speaker, this government is completely out of touch with the realities of life in urban areas. They want to kick the manure off the tractor tires. Maybe what we need, Mr. Speaker, what Manitoba needs and perhaps it's long overdue, maybe that's a failure, maybe it's time that we should have a Minister of Urban Affairs - let the present Minister look after Municipal Affairs, let there be a Minister of Urban Affairs. We have been waiting I think for 10 years for changes in The Municipal Act. They were going to provide a change; they were going to be city charters because of the recognition that there are other problems relating to cities that are different than municipalities. We're still waiting. They're still talking about it. To find anything in The Municipal Act, you take a day off to trace things through The Municipal Act. There's overlapping, there's contradiction, there's amendments to amendments to amendments, and throughout all this, the present Minister of Municipal Affairs and Urban Affairs is of course busy - she has what I feel is a double portfolio - talking about the old double portfolio. The problem of urban living in Manitoba is severe and if the only answer is to get a Minister who will concentrate on that and who'll have time to find out what city life is all about, then maybe that's what we need, because certainly this government doesn't

(MR. MILLER cont'd)... know what city life is all about.

Mr. Speaker, in the time allotted to me, I want to cover only one more thing, something that I can't keep silent on; the question of Medicare. Yesterday the Member for Souris-Lansdowns said he expects he'll hear more about it and I can assure him he'll hear more about it, not just from me but from the citizens of this province, I was particularly pleased to welcome to our side and our banner last night, the honourable members, in force, from the Liberal Party of Manitoba who got up as one man to support the proposition that this government has failed to accept the principle of the Hall Commission and that the responsibility for provision of health care to all Manitobans should be borne by society generally through a comprehensive and universal health plan rather than by individuals. I want to congratulate them and I want to remind them of the admonition which the member for Souris-Lansdowne said last night that when they go to Ottawa in April and when they have to pick a leader, that they keep this resolution in mind when they choose a man to be the leader and future Prime Minister, because I think all eleven MLA's -- and I was thinking of doing it for them this morning, I thought perhaps I should send a telegram to the Honourable Alan MacEachen and advise him that the 14 MLA's of Manitoba have, as one man, decided to support him in his candidature for the Prime Ministership of this country - or 13 - my apologies to the Member for Turtle Mountain --(Interjection)-- well he's consistent.

Now I assume that since the Liberals have supported our proposition they of course, as we are, are concerned about the financing of it because they're always worried about finance, and so I am particularly pleased that they coupled their support of our proposition by adopting our proposition that says that we criticize the government for failing to adopt and to recommend to the Federal Government that the Federal Government should adopt the principle of equity in taxation as suggested in the recommendations of the Carter Royal Commission on Taxation. And again I say to the gentlemen to my right, that when they go to Ottawa to pick a leader, make sure that the leader they vote for reflects their thinking - these 14 members - their thinking on how services like medicare or all services are going to be paid for in Canada and how there should be equity in taxation, and the man they pick must certainly reflect their thinking on it and should be somebody who espouses the Carter Commission on Taxation. If I were them I would wire Walter Gordon immediately and suggest that he come out of retirement and lead them, the Manitoba Liberals, in their fight at this convention to pick the kind of Prime Minister that reflects their thinking and their new-found philosophy.

But to get back to the issue at hand, which is really what's happening in Manitoba. Back to the farm that is. You know, the refusal of this government to recognize the extent of the feeling on this issue of medicare is, to me, completely incomprehensible. I just don't understand. --(Interjection)-- I don't know farmers - you're right - I don't know farmers just as you don't know cities. The day that the First Minister announced that it was his intention not to proceed with Medicare in 1968, I remember reading it in the press and I felt that this was a sad day for Manitoba. It was a sad day because it was an open betrayal of the pledged word of the government of this province, and in particular this front bench. It was a sad day, Mr. Speaker, because the government's action was an arrogant dismissal of the needs of all the people of Manitoba. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the high cost of living and that the problem of making ends meet -- and again, I'm not going to talk about the poverty level, because people on welfare will be covered; I'm talking about people on what we accept as medium income. These are the people caught in the squeeze, and that's the one thing that should be at the top of any list of priorities of any government who is honestly and sincerely concerned about the residents of their province, the top of the list of any priorities should be the institution of Medicare. And I'm not talking about some half-baked voluntary Medicare scheme where those who can afford to voluntarily choose to subscribe or to avail themselves of coverage, and those who are faced with inadequate incomes, who are stretching the dollar in so many ways that they can't stretch it any more, that they are placed in the category of people who voluntarily choose to opt out of the scheme. This is a voluntary scheme - the kind of thing we are hearing about all the time; and this government and the Liberals who, despite the vote yesterday, have been wriggling and squirming and twisting the meaning of words to avoid giving the people of this province a decent comprehensive universal Medicare plan.

(MR. MILLER cont'd)...

Mr. Speaker, this is 1968, not 1868; 1968, the era when the genius of man has brought us to probably the highest level of affluence and achievement of man's development. Now, surely the time is long overdue when every man, woman and child in this province must have medical care without fear of impoverishment, without fear of incurring an unbearable debt, without fear of becoming a charity case. I remember hearing last night the Member for Roblin - and I want to congratulate him on the speech he made - when he spoke about the Indians and the problems of integrating Indians into our society, and he rejected the idea of separate but equal facilities, separate but equal services. He says this is an inequality that he can't accept, but apparently he is prepared to accept the separate but equal standard of service for Medicare. He says those that can will voluntarily subscribe, those who cannot if they haven't got the money, when their incomes are brought down to a level of impoverishment, when they meet the kind of standards that our Minister of Welfare imposes, where if you make over \$105.00 a month you don't qualify, when you bring yourself down and strip yourself literally of any assets you have acquired, of any dignity you have acquired, then you can come to us for Medicare. This is a separate but equal sort of theory, and I have absolutely no confidence that this government will come up with anything that will make any rational sense or in any way enhance the people of this province.

Mr. Speaker, I see my time is running out very shortly. The decision of this government to renege on their pledge, reminds me of a line in Alice in Wonderland by Lewis Carroll. It went: "Always jam tomorrow but never jam today," and this is the situation in Manitoba. It's always jam tomorrow. Before an election, jam; after the election, they don't even give you the bread. Thank you very much.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, and before I get into the material that I have on my desk I want to congratulate you, Sir, upon your election, or resumption to the highest office within the gift of our Assembly and wish you well in health and your responsibilities here, and I would like to thank the mover and the seconder, neither of which are present with us here today. I thank the Honourable Member for Virden for the cheese. I am letting it age a little before I eat it. I thank him for the oil. I can use that in my car if I get short on the road some day.--(Interjection)-- And the electric shaver. It's good for that too, eh? Good, I have found a new use for Virden oil. Before or after you shave, or both.

And I want to congratulate the new Minister, the member for St. Vital, and certainly I want to congratulate our own member elect from Turtle Mountain, who I believe will be able to take his seat next Wednesday or Thursday.

I want to take a few minutes to congratulate my honourable friend the new First Minister and my neighbour from Minnedosa. I must confess that when the campaign was on last November for the leadership I lost a \$10.00 bet - I didn't think he would make it; and incidentally, Mr. Speaker, I don't suppose that you or anyone else will pay any attention to this request, but I would like to have the Honourable Provincial Secretary change seats with the Attorney-General so that the four contenders for that leadership would be in a row, because the Provincial Treasurer sitting between the First Minister and the Attorney-General just kind of throws me off sometimes and if they just had the four contenders there, the four hopefuls - that's what the paper calls them, the four hopefuls - it would be to some advantage I think.

Now someone has asked me, who did I bet on and why did I lose the \$10.00. You probably would be anxious to know, Mr. Speaker, too. I was confident the Attorney-General would win. Now I think that they should take up a collection and pay me back the \$10.00 over there.

MR. LYON: Now I know why I lost.

MR. SHOEMAKER: You know why you lost. Does my honourable friend say that because I bet on him he lost? Well I want to apologize. I didn't even think that it got around that I had bet \$10.00. I was trying to keep it fairly quiet. But I'll tell you the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks has hit the nail on the head as to why the First Minister occupies his position today in my estimation, in my estimation; because he did say, by inference and otherwise, that those other three hopefuls were really, if you vote for any one of those it's a vote for Duff and we are sick and tired in this province of the

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd). . . old Duff regime, but he said, "I'm different, I'm different. Those fellows don't know which end of a cow you get milk from. I'm your boy. I at least have kicked manure off the wheels of a tractor and those other three fellows, they don't know anything about agriculture, and I'm your boy." Now, I think this is good for agriculture despite the comments of the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks --(Interjection)-- Hard on tractor wheels. Well I think it is kind of important that the First Minister has said that one of the first qualifications is that you should be at least able to recognize manure and be able to kick it off the wheels of a tractor because within this Assembly we've got lots of material to kick around here, I can tell you that.

Now, Mr. Speaker, before I get into the Throne Speech and it won't take me long to deal with this Throne Speech because there isn't really anything in it, but I do want to register a couple of complaints that I have and one is this: Did we not open this Legislature on Thursday, March 7th, and the Throne Speech was read by His Honour on Thursday, March 7th? I happen to subscribe to a lot of papers, as you know, one of which is the Western Producer which is published in Saskatoon on Thursday, March 7th, so I guess that it goes to press on the day before likely, printed likely the day before. Reports from the western Legislature is one of their features and then they report from the whole four of them, but it gives us the content of the Throne Speech the day before. I wish I had been in Saskatoon; I could have read the Throne Speech myself before His Honour. Not only does it do that but it tells you, it goes into some detail as to the new electoral divisions, Boundaries Commission's recommendations. We haven't heard them here yet, have we? Well they go on - it tells you all about it here. Now how does this information leak out? There's the report - it tells you all about it. I can't figure it out and I protest this. --(Interjection)--The Civil Service? Well, we should have some control over the Civil Service.

Another thing that I do deplore is the Tory tactics and I think that's the best way to describe this - that goes on immediately prior to every election and every by-election and was so evident in the Turtle Mountain by-election, that if you don't vote for a man on the side of the government you get nothing. Now the Tories seem to think that this is one of the fringe benefits of being in office. They have practised these tactics for years and years and years, and I think the first fellow to enunciate it as government policy was the fellow that sits immediately to the left of the First Minister who isn't present in his seat today, and I think that he enunciated this as government policy about ten years ago speaking to a nominating convention out east of Winnipeg somewhere, that well, you vote for a man on the government side and you get this, if you don't vote for him you don't get anything.

You'll recall in 1966 what went on in Portage la Prairie. Surely you know that. Read between the lines, that big ad that said that if you don't vote for John Araan Christianson you will not get a blade of grass, you won't get a brick for a school, you will get nothing; and I don't like these tactics because what the Tory Party are saying is this: that our whole policy, our entire program is determined by party representation in the House. That's what you are saying; and that immediately prior to your privy council meetings or whatever you call them down there, your Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council meetings, I suppose their prayers are this: Let us now first consider representation before we decide who is going to get anything. You have said this for ten years. You are continuing to say it. You said it, I don't know - well I suppose every time you shook hands with somebody down in Turtle Mountain you said it all over again. Vote for Rose here's what you get; vote for Dow you get nothing. Well, I'm glad to say it didn't work in Portage la Prairie and it didn't work in Turtle Mountain, and it serves you right. If these are the kind of tactics that you are going to continue to politic on, I'm agin it.

Now both of the daily papers, both of the daily papers were the first to twig that this was your program in Turtle Mountain. Both of them were "Turtle Mountain campaign trail starts for Weir." He says - he's speaking at Hartney, and Mr. Speaker, I got a nice little note from Hartney today and I don't intend to pass it around but you can all have a look at it if you like; I can't even make out the signature but I spoke at Hartney on behalf of Dow three days before the First Minister, I believe, I was there on Thursday night, I do believe, and I think my honourable friend was there Monday, the following Monday. I'm happy to report, and I take no credit for this, that we had about 40 more

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd)... at our meeting than he had at his, and I'm happy to report that, as I remember, the results of that poll were about 200 for Dow and 160 for my friends, and do you know what it was two years ago? The opposite. And I take no credit for that. --(Interjection)-- Why don't I take credit? Because we won by default. These fellows over here with the tactics that they were using, it serves them right if they didn't get a vote at all.

Now, I want to read what the First Minister said. "The premier repeated a pledge," - which suggests that he had been making it all over the country - "that he had made when seeking the Leadership of the Conservatives, that it was his intent to bring people closer to government." Well he's got 57 of us that are pretty close to him here. "It is easy to get word from government to the people, Mr. Weir said, but it is much more difficult for people to reach the government. That's a real problem."

He said that Mr. Rose as a candidate and hopefully an elected government member and the Minister of Agriculture -- no, that wasn't in it, but I understand that's what they were saying -- will be --I'll start again. I'm getting some interruptions here. He said that Mr. Rose as a candidate and hopefully an elected government member, will be in the position to present his ideas on policy and legislative change to the government." The inference is that if Mr. Dow is elected he can't get through to him. Why can't he get through to him? If Mr. Dow or Mr. Enns or Mr. Desjardins have the majority of the votes of a constituency, why can they not get through to the government, regardless of their political affiliations? Is it that they cannot comprehend what we are saying? Is that it? I think Will Rogers said that everybody was ignorant but on different subjects, and I think that was kind of demonstrated this morning, that Mr. Enns should be in another portfolio, but I'm going to get down to that later on. But these are some of the things I don't like about these Tory tactics of leading people to believe all over the province that you just have to vote for a man on the government side or you get absolutely nothing. I don't like it.

Now, I have a letter and I will table it if you like. It's unsigned; you can do what you like; but I got it from a school teacher - I made four copies - to point up exactly what I have said. It's addressed to me, dated February 29, 1968. "It is with some alarm that I read recent newspaper reports on the election campaign in Turtle Mountain. It appears to me that our Premier is suggesting that the people of Turtle Mountain may only get influence on government if they elect his party men. I believe Mr. Dow was the member last year. Once elected, does he not speak for and serve all of the people of his constituency, regardless of party? I strongly feel the government should be questioned on this matter. As one who has worked with young people and their various organizations trying to get the idea of our democracy across to them, it appears to me that this kind of campaigning is much against our basic ideals. Tell me if I'm wrong. If you agree with me then the issue should be investigated. No constituency should receive less or more attention than another just because it happens to be either in the government's side or the opposition. A strong opposition is our key to good government and fairness to all. Once an election is over, let the government serve the people, equality to all and favors to none. Respectfully submitted, your constituent." Name withheld.

Now doesn't that say exactly what I've been saying? Here's a school teacher who has been teaching history, as he says, and democracy to the children. Even he recognizes the tactics are wrong. It's against the whole principle of democracy. Now if you want it tabled, Mr. Speaker, there it is, because I think it would do well if they paid some heed to that.

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd.)

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think it is time that I made another observation. It's one that I made last year, and I'm glad to see the Honourable Minister of Public Utilities here because it does concern him. The House will remember the resolution that I had on the Order Paper last year that simply asked that the Boundaries Commission be stripped of their responsibilities in respect to the location of vocational schools. You remember that one, surely, because it remained on the Order Paper for about two months, and it said that the government had promised on numerous occasions and in printed material that the people of this province would receive ten vocational schools. I said that nearly anybody that had a map of Manitoba could hang it up on the wall and say, well here are where the ten vocational schools should be. It was that simple. And I said, why leave it to the Boundaries Commission to decide, because there was some urgency of the matter. The Minister of Education had said to all of the rural school divisions, "We will not allow you to proceed with your building plans or your expansion programs because we are going to put in ten of these vocational schools and it is quite possible, we believe, that as a result of putting in these vocational schools for up to 40 percent of the high school population would be syphoned off." That's the exact words they used.

Now that makes sense and anybody can understand that, but to say that on the one hand and then not tell the people of the province where the ten vocational schools were going to be built, just didn't make sense. And so the government, and in particular the Minister of Education, and all of the government members that spoke on this, they said the reason, the whole reason that we're leaving the location of these proposed vocational schools with the Boundaries Commission is because we want to take it out of politics. That's what they said. Let's leave it with the Boundaries Commission -- even though all of the commission members are defeated candidates. Let's leave it with them and keep it out of politics because you don't want to have this kind of a thing become political. That's what you said last year and voted against my resolution. Okay, we've got them nodding their heads in the affirmative on that one. Now, what did they do, Mr. Speaker? You know, because Dauphin's pretty close to your home base, and the Dauphin Town Council really took after my honourable friend the Minister of Public Utilities. They really took after him and charged him with oh, nearly everything -- if he wasn't a lawyer they'd likely have him behind the bars, you know. "Dauphin MLA answers by-passing charges emanating from council," in both of the Dauphin Herald -- it went on for about a month. There was a conflict back and forth and the issue became so hot that my honourable friend went out and attended the council meeting there, because the Town Council had said, "We want a vocational school in Dauphin and we want that thoroughly understood right now." And he didn't say, "Oh well, this is going to be left up to the Boundaries Commission." He told me it was. He said he didn't tell the Town Council that. He said when questioned ...

A MEMBER: Wait a minute, wait a minute now.

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN (Minister of Public Utilities) (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Gladstone is a neat transposer. -- (Interjection) -- Well, if I get a chance to say what I'm going to say. Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Gladstone knows full well ...

SOME MEMBERS: Order. Order.

MR. SPEAKER: I believe the Honourable Member for Gladstone has the floor. Does the Honourable the Minister have a question?

MR. SHOEMAKER: Well, to accommodate my honourable friend I will read what was reported in the Dauphin Herald and if it is not correct, well then let him charge the Dauphin Herald with false reporting and everything else.

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, the Honourable Member for Gladstone said a few moments ago that I took part, he implied that I took part in the debate that took place here in the Legislature last session. I did not take part in that debate. He can read all he likes about what went on in Dauphin.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Perhaps what my honourable friend is saying now is that he was one of the few that should have voted with me on my resolution. Is my honourable friend saying that; that the Minister of Education was wrong in his statements that the Boundaries Commission should not or should decide the location of the vocational schools? This was the purpose of setting up the Boundaries Commission, according to my honourable friends last year. And are you not a member of the Cabinet? But is it not a fact -- let me get back to my Dauphin story. Is it not a fact that the people of Dauphin, and in particular the Dauphin Town Council,

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd.) were more than concerned over my honourable friend's attitude, because the paper was full of this story for a month, I guess. "Dauphin MLA answers by-passing charges emanating from council" -- front page story. And then, so my honourable friend goes out to the Town Council. He was there, I hope. He's not going to deny that he wasn't there. "In direct answer to the mayor's statement that 'we can no longer sit and wait for a decision by civil servants located at Winnipeg,' Mr. McLean emphatically stated: 'Let's be quite clear that decisions on vocational schools will be made by the Cabinet of Manitoba as they have been in the past and will be made in the future.'" Now, he either said it or he didn't, and if he did say it he has said what I said last year. You said exactly what I said last year, that the decisions for the location of the vocational schools would be made by the Cabinet. That's what I said. You said oh no. You didn't probably, you didn't. But the government said, "Let's keep it out of politics and the decision for the location of the vocational schools will be left under the jurisdiction of the Boundaries Commission." My honourable friend says nothing . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please. I would like to remind the honourable member -- would he kindly take his seat for a moment.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Sure.

MR. SPEAKER: I would like to remind the honourable member that it's rather difficult for me to comprehend his present trend of thought and bring it into line with the matter under discussion, and that is, of course, the motion of the Honourable Member for Virden and the amendment of the Leader of the Opposition. I wonder with those thoughts if he would possibly continue his remarks.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, if I may on the point of order in your statement, I think that it's rather important that we understand what the rules are here. My impression has been that in the Throne Speech debate we have allowed complete latitude to members to speak on whatever it is that they want to speak about. We heard the Minister of Agriculture this morning discussing federal policies for three-quarters of his speech. Now, surely if my colleague is speaking about a matter that's absolutely germane to the Province of Manitoba, the Boundaries Commission, in the context of the Throne Speech I submit that he should be so allowed.

MR. SPEAKER: I thank the Honourable Leader of the Opposition for his considered words, and I want to assure him and to assure the House that it is not my purpose to curtail the opinions of the several members but rather to convey my thoughts that we keep it within the orbit of the matter on the Order Paper. It is not my purpose whatsoever to restrain anyone in that direction.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank you kindly for your comments and remarks and hope that I will be allowed an extra five minutes for the debate that has taken place here.

Now I don't want to belabour this point any longer, but if there is anyone opposite that believes I have not made the point on this Dauphin issue, will you please raise your hands and I will go over it again. Mr. Speaker, do they mean to tell me that they are so dense that they cannot understand the Dauphin Herald reporting? Well, in consideration of the fact that we are going to adjourn, I believe at 12:30, I'd better get on with some more items that are of equal importance, but surely I have made my point on that one. To summarize it, it was simply this: the Boundaries Commission were appointed, as I understand it, to decide the location of the vocational schools, according to my friends, a year ago; today they are saying, "No it isn't; it's going to be left up to Cabinet as it . . ." I'll read the quote again because the quote is the important thing: "In direct answer to the mayor's statement that 'We can no longer sit and wait for a decision by civil servants located at Winnipeg'," because that was the charge that the Dauphin council had made, "Mr. McLean emphatically stated: 'Let's be quite clear that decisions on vocational schools will be made by the Cabinet of Manitoba as they have been in the past and will be made in the future.'" Now, surely they can comprehend the point there. -- (Interjection) -- Sure, and I said when I first started out that this is one of the privileges the Tories believed, one of the fringe benefits of being in office. You've got to have a pork barrel going on every peg. You remember the cartoon that . . .

Well, now I want to get back to -- and this is really what prompted me to get up and take part in the debate, was comments based on my honourable friend the Minister of Agriculture, because last night he took about ten minutes to tell us to "Let's get back into perspective," I think that was the quote, yes. "Now let's quit horsing around and get right down to brass tacks here." Well, that sounded pretty good and he said, "Let's get it straight. I am the first one

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd.) to recognize there is a cost-price squeeze, but it's not my fault, not my fault, I'll tell you that, boys. You can start looking at Ottawa, you can look anywhere you like but don't look at me because I am not guilty, not guilty at all. " Did my honourable friend have a visit, was it yesterday, from the Manitoba Stock Growers, or the day before, that hosted us so royally down in the Royal Oak Room, and does my honourable friend not agree with me that the group that met with us and the group that hosted us down at the St. Regis were this, more or less the elite group of farmers of this province. My honourable friend talked yesterday about the elite group of farmers who were now graduating into another category or something; he had graduated. I remember Mr. Hutton, he used to graduate quite a few farmers every year from this elite group. I don't know who makes the selection and what type of ribbons they put on them when they graduate or where they graduate to, but I see my honourable friend is doing the same thing; he's graduating a bunch.

Well, this elite group that met with us yesterday -- was it not yesterday? Yesterday. I am certain everyone in this Assembly recognizes them as being the top ranking farmers of the province. There's no question about it. They're head and shoulders above the rank and file perhaps. Did my honourable friend not read the brief that was presented to him? Some of the members said it didn't sink in very far. But I'm glad to hear that you read it. But boy, oh boy, this brief, and it's not a long one, it's only 2-1/2 pages, but it points up that we do in fact have, that this cost-price squeeze is still with us, but my honourable friend over there says it's not his fault; he's not guilty. Well, Mr. Speaker, politicians make a lot of promises and I say - I'm the first one to admit it; they make a lot of promises that they should never have made, but having made a promise, then the electorate kind of looks to them to keep their promises. Isn't that fair game? If I take a promissory note from you and I come around to collect and say, "Well, listen; it's a 90-day note and you said you were going to pay me in 90 days," isn't it fair game that I should come around and say, "Well, time's up. I want my money." O.K. Fine. We've got them nodding in the affirmative on that one.

Now, I was elected in 1958 along with about 98 percent of the members here, and do you know what the election campaign was in 1958? I think the First Minister will know because he was operating the pork barrel at Clear Lake at that time. Well, he openly admitted that he was. Quite frank about it, and I want to congratulate him for his honesty, but back in 1958 I suppose a million copies of this was printed and I happen to have one of the last copies. It's a collector's item, I guess you could call it: "The Next Step Forward is a Roblin Government." You've just kicked out one in Ottawa and now it's the next step forward. Do you know what the Number 1 -- "A Nine-Point Program for a Greater Manitoba" - the Tories should pay me to read this because it was put out by them. "A Nine-Point Program for a Greater Manitoba." I want to ask my honourable friend the Minister of Agriculture did he ever see this one? Did you ever see this propaganda sheet that went out in 1958? You never saw it, eh? You authorized its printing but you never read it. Well, you made a lot of promises. You made nine of them and what do you think the first one was? Agriculture. And under the heading of Agriculture it says: "The Campbell Government has abandoned Manitoba farmers to the pressure of the cost-price squeeze." That's ten years ago, eh? Ten years ago. ". . . and the Liberal Leader has said there is very little the Provincial Government can do to help." He was honest. "Just as the Ottawa Liberals were dismissed from office for their failure to deal with the cost-price squeeze . . ." - and it goes on and on: "Elect us and we'll show you that the province can do something about it." -- (Interjection) -- Do what you can. I said - I was talking about -- (Interjection) -- Mr. Speaker, I said if I took a promissory note from a fellow and it was 10 years overdue . . .

A MEMBER: It would be outlawed.

MR. SHOEMAKER: It would be outlawed. It certainly would. But they gave the farmers a 10-year note 10 years ago and they haven't collected yet. The farmers have not collected yet.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I'd like to remind the honourable member that he has five minutes which includes a minute's bonus for my taking over his time.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank you very much. I have just really got into my Throne Speech here - I've got so many interruptions. But 10 years ago the Roblin Government promised that they were going to fix this cost-price squeeze. Right? Ten years ago. Now before the Orders of the Day on March 16, 1959, before the Orders of the Day, the then Premier of the Province who was here sitting there on March 16, 1959, and

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd.) Mr. Roblin got up before the Orders of the Day (Mr. Harrison was the Speaker then), Mr. Roblin said, "There's a statement that I should like to make at this time and in view of its nature I hope the House will allow me to read it," and he talks a lot, as he usually did - much more than our new Premier - he talks about priorities in Manitoba, and he says: "At the head of the list" - this was in 1959; we're coming around to collect . . . "at the head of the list, I place the situation in respect to our agricultural economy. Governments have been attempting both at the federal and provincial level to provide a measure of security for the farming community. In its efforts to adjust to an every-changing situation, agriculture has been called upon to bear a burden often in excess of the burdens borne by other sectors of the economy. Uncertainty of income, risk of great or even total loss are the perpetual partners of the prairie farmers. The Government of Manitoba feels the prime responsibility to speak strongly on behalf of Manitoba agriculture. And the factors bearing on the cost-price squeeze in our agricultural economy may well require protracted investigation and debate if they are to be clearly identified and properly eliminated."

Properly eliminated. You know what he's saying here? In 1959? You can't leave this cost-price squeeze to debate in this Legislature. You've got to have some policies and programs. Certainly you've got to have some policies and programs but it's 1958 and not 1959, and the farmers are coming around to collect the promissory note. Now in those years, in 1959 when we had both Dief and Duff, when we had both of them, and Duff said with Dief: "Anything Dief can do I can do better," why weren't you able to resolve this cost-price squeeze in those 10 years that you've been in office? Why haven't you? Because there's been a lack of policies and programs. You promised it and we're looking for it. And I would like, Mr. Speaker, but I guess I'm not going to have the time, to deal with this brief that was left with us by the Manitoba Stock Growers but I see my honourable friend - can I read just one - have I got one minute?

SOME MEMBERS: Yes. Go ahead.

MR. SHOEMAKER: In the two annual reports that my honourable friend left with us yesterday or the day before, the annual report of the Agricultural Credit Corporation - and incidentally you remember me asking that question yesterday - I think it was yesterday: has the province ceased to accept applications for loans under The Manitoba Agricultural Credit Act? I had a call from three or four farmers saying that they went to Brandon and were told by the officers over there, "We are not accepting any more applications under the Act." I had a call from the Farm Credit Corporation saying, "Well, if this is a fact, then we've got to change our whole program. I think it is a fact that the Farm Credit Corporation are now loaning about 400 percent more money than the Manitoba Agricultural Credit one, but on Page 4 of the Annual Report that we have here, it points up the weaknesses that my honourable friends

... MR. SPEAKER: May I remind the honourable gentleman that it's a matter of seconds if he wishes to make that quotation for the record.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I will have to come back. We are now on the amendment so I guess if I have the opportunity I will get on the main motion at a later date and I will continue then. Thank you very much.

MR. SPEAKER: I thank the honourable gentleman for his co-operation. The Honourable the Minister of Welfare.

HON. J.B. CARROLL (Minister of Welfare) (The Pas): First, Mr. Speaker, I would like to offer my congratulations to you as chief officer presiding over the progress that will be made in this House this year and I hope in many years to come. I'm very happy that you're enjoying good health. I bring greetings from your constituents in Swan River that I had the good fortune to meet with just a week or two ago when you were unable to attend. I would also like to offer my congratulations to the mover and seconder in reply to the Speech from the Throne. I am very happy that the Member for Gladstone has indicated some use for the product that was given to us on that occasion. I've already taken advantage of one of the gifts and was wondering what might be done with the bottle of oil. I was hopeful that he might try it internally so that we might speed the proceedings of the House somewhat.

I just wanted to take a moment to comment on the contribution that was made this morning by the Member for Seven Oaks. You know, I think sometimes people can't see the forest for the trees and that seems to be the situation with respect to some of our Metro members. I just want you to know that if you happen to take a trip to the country where you get a little

(MR. CARROLL cont'd.) better perspective on what's going on in this great metropolitan area, you'll probably get a different point of view with respect to the contributions of the provincial government in the various departments to services within this large and important community in our province, and I just mention the Floodway as one of the things that certainly the people in rural Manitoba are very conscious of, a great contribution ranking among one of the largest earth works on the North American continent. I just want to mention Metro itself, which is really one of the very interesting experiments in government of this kind taking place. -- (Interjection) -- Well, I'd just like to mention some of the things that we have done in our department, just those things which come easily and quickly to my memory without the benefit of consultation and advice. I'm thinking of the multi-service project, the first time in Canada when a government took the initiative to investigate the problems of people in a slum area - multi-problem families. The community development function was introduced to the urban area at that time and was part of that multi-service project. This is a first in North America, not only a first in Canada. The team approach to welfare problems is being started at the present time. They're actually in operation on a very small scale but will be expanding their operation very quickly using a team of indigenous workers, using community development, and using a social worker to head up a team to provide services to people again in an urban re-development area where there are substantially more problems than there are in the rest of the metropolitan area, but again here is a first for Canada as far as we're aware.

The Indian-Metis Friendship Centre, again a first for Canada, being supported substantially by the Province of Manitoba. Elderly Persons' Housing, one of the best programs, providing thousands of housing units throughout Manitoba, providing thousands of housing units within the metropolitan area. We think it's one of the best programs. The Lions Manor, an example of downtown urban, a combination of services for elderly people such as you will see no other place, to my knowledge, on this continent, one of the really great contributions made by the Lions Club supported by this government.

Day centres for the elderly, a first in Canada, supported very substantially by the Province of Manitoba.

Age and Opportunity Bureau. I don't know whether this was a first or not, but we understand it was one of the first if it wasn't, again support in that service by the Province of Manitoba.

Another first in Canada, foster homes program for the elderly. We have 500 people in foster homes getting service that is again a new contribution, a new venture in service to people in the metropolitan area, that the Member for Seven Oaks is not aware of.

The Social Service Audit. This is not a first but certainly one of the first, and I believe one of the first in which the Provincial Government was one of the sponsors, and is making a great contribution.

There are many other areas in which we haven't ventured at the moment, but certainly substantial progress has been made and certainly insofar as our department is concerned the citizens of the metropolitan area have been receiving the benefit of some new programs, some innovations that aren't available elsewhere in Canada and in some cases they aren't available elsewhere in Manitoba.

But I do now want to move on to the contribution of some of the members of the Official Opposition. I'm constantly amazed at the continuing interest of members of the Opposition in development in that part of Manitoba with which I am most familiar, northern Manitoba. Their interest in roads and services is a new found interest. In the length of time in which I have lived in the north I calculated the other day that before this government came to office the road construction program amounted to some five miles a year over a period of a considerable number of years in that area. I want you to consider that in comparison to the road program that was announced this year, the road programs that have taken place in the last 10 years. I want you to think of services in the north, practically non-existent or minimal, to say the least, in 1958, which today includes local government services in many communities, provided partly by the Province of Manitoba, The Northern Commissioner's office bringing services in to many of the under-developed communities, many of the communities along the Bay line. The welfare programs including community development and job placement - vocational opportunities we call it. The electrical distribution system - this has been substantially expanded to dozens of northern communities. With the development of power on the Nelson River and the Saskatchewan River both in northern Manitoba, multi-million dollar projects, the extension of

(MR. CARROLL cont'd.) communication services, land lines, the radio communication system; the scatter system; the services to the community of Thompson and the microwave network, part of which has been built and another phase of which is under construction at the present time. The tourist promotion and development; the geological surveys and mappings; all substantial new programs that weren't available 10 years ago. The Frontier School Division, the Frontier Collegiate, Northern Manitoba Vocational School, and many things of this kind. But the moment that we stand up to criticize the Official Opposition for their lack of having performed in this part of Manitoba in the past, or for the disinterest of their counterparts in Ottawa in such things as Roads to Resources programs and other services to people in northern Manitoba, they immediately back away and say, "Ah, yes, but we have no responsibility." The Leader of the Opposition says he has no influence in Ottawa and the party accepts no responsibility. The question that I want to ask, Mr. Speaker, is why are they all traipsing off down to Ottawa next month to serve their party if they really have no responsibility? I think, Mr. Speaker, they do have a responsibility and I'm asking that they use that responsibility, that they use their voice for those things that are important to the people of Manitoba, and I hope that someone will listen. Maybe the western voice doesn't count down there and maybe the Member for Gladstone gave us the reason today. When one looks at the small representation, maybe Manitoba doesn't count in the national perspective of the Liberal Party. I don't know. But certainly that is the suggestion that I get from the comments made by the Member for Gladstone. I believe that the Liberal Party have a special message to carry to their party in Ottawa, affecting many thousands of Manitoba citizens when they attend their conference next month.

For the first century of Confederation, the Government of Canada provided health services to the Indian people of our land. In the year 101 they sneak out like thieves in the night and cut the very lifeline to the people of Indian origin in our province. The Indians have an expression for the white man, particularly those who tend to deceive. They say that they speak with a forked tongue. I remember hearing a story not so long ago told by a Maori who was talking about the white man who came to their land, and he said, "They came and they pointed to the heavens, and as we were looking up they stole our land," and I'm just wondering if this doesn't have a familiar ring here in our country. Doesn't it sound familiar? The Federal Government says, "But we will look after you. We will write it into our constitution. We'll give you this protection in black and white so you can read it," but they went further than that and they said, "We'll write it into our treaties. We'll include a medicine chest; we will look after you when you are sick. You trust your white brother. As long as the sun shines and the rivers flow we will look after you." Does the sun still shine in Manitoba in 1968? I think it does. The sunshine province — my friend speaking on behalf of British Columbias, they don't have such good success with their weather out there, but we can say the sun truly shines in the Province of Manitoba. Do the rivers flow? We certainly hope so. We're betting a million dollars on the Nelson River that the water is going to continue to flow for some time to come to provide for the power needs of a growing and developing province — a province growing to beat seventy, if I can use that expression.

What's happened in centennial plus one? Well I think we can say that times have changed; the constitution has become out-dated in terms of today's services; but maybe, too, the memories have faded. Maybe we don't remember. And we have this new spirit; it's called "co-operative federalism." It's the use of the big stick in too many cases, I'm afraid. Surely our national preoccupation with deux nations does not preclude the consideration of the plight of our original founding nation, those people who owned this land before the white occupation. Gene Rheame was here a few weeks ago speaking to the Community Welfare Planning Council, and I didn't agree with very much that he said on that occasion although many things that he said were true, but there were some things that I didn't agree with, maybe I should say it that way. But the one thing he did say that the Indians three or four hundred years ago had a lousy immigration policy, with that I can agree. The Indians welcomed the white man. They guided him across this land, the early explorers. They didn't find the ways; the Indians took them. They taught the early white man how to live in this country. They shared their furs; they shared their buffalo; in fact, they sustained and kept the Lord Selkirk settlers here in the early settlement of the Red River Valley. Without the Indians settlement could not have taken place at that time and would have had to come at a much later date.

Somehow or other, in the intervening years, our white society has contributed to making

(MR. CARROLL cont'd.) the Indian what he is today. We have helped to destroy his leadership, his independence and his confidence, but we believe there is a great new re-birth in the Province of Manitoba and I would just invite anyone here who doesn't believe it to attend the Indian-Metis Conference next month and hear the Indian people of our province speaking. It's with a different voice than it was ten years ago, and I want to say that we should not destroy the gains that have been made by cutting off his lifeline to the essential health services that he needs. We don't make people independent by keeping them at a poverty level of existence, nor should we make them crawl for services. This is a degrading process and this is in effect what the Federal Government is saying today to the Indian people. They say, "You are today responsible for your own health services if you can pay for them, but if you can't you have got to go to your Band Council," and if the Band Council can't help them, then they go to the Provincial Health or Welfare agencies, and failing that - and remember, the Constitution says the Indians are the federal responsibility - then they must produce a letter to the doctor saying that they have been unable to get services from the province, from the Band, and they have no resources on their own; and if they survive this ordeal - if they haven't succumbed in the interval - then maybe the Federal Government will pay for their services. I say maybe, because they still have to prove that the service is necessary and that their condition was not avoidable. I wonder what they would do in the case of a pregnancy - you know, this would provide a real problem - or a person who is injured in making his own way.

Going through this process, then they become eligible for federal government assistance unless they are mentally ill, because if they are mentally ill they are still going to deny responsibility. These people have to make it on their own or "maybe" the province will take care of them. This is what the Federal Government is saying. This is an example of the kind of co-operative federalism that I referred to a moment ago. The Federal Government are saying in effect that we have no statutory responsibilities for health services, and they are saying the same thing with respect to welfare and other matters as well.

Is it a financial problem? This is what we are led to believe - it's a financial problem; and I sort of wonder how the Federal Government in this kind of a tight financial situation can say they can provide half the cost of health services to 20 million people in Canada where they have no responsibility for health services, and at the same time deny adequate service to the 200,000 Indians for whom they do have a responsibility for health care. Is this how we, as Canadians, carry out our commitments, our constitutional responsibility, our solemn treaties? Does this action destroy our credibility in the eyes of our Indian brothers, in the eyes of the world, in a year in which special attention is focused on human rights?

Our friends across are wont to bring forward resolutions on credibility. Surely the credibility and the reputation of all Canadians is on the line in this issue, and surely your voice should be raised with your party in Ottawa to have this matter resolved to the satisfaction of the Indian people of this country. Our Indian people are in trouble and they have problems, and in 1963 we pressed Mr. Favreau to call a conference to discuss the problems of Indian people, and he said we will look at them together. Unfortunately he didn't stay in that office, but we are still waiting for this national conference to discuss problems of Indian people. Mr. Laing seems to be quite satisfied with the progress that's being made.

How do we encourage the independence of people, of Indian people? Well we can do it by removing some of the road blocks and providing some incentives. I'm just going to mention some of the road blocks that impede the progress of Indian people. Their lack of educational achievement is one; their lack of job skills; their lack of acceptance in our society - you might call it discrimination; the language barrier; a different cultural background, different goals and ideals - it could be described as a different value system. You see we're oriented to material things, and I think they have much more worthy goals and ambitions, in many respects. They have inadequate housing and services; a poor self-image. We have segregation and we have social disorganization.

Well, how can we provide some of the incentives? I have just got a few of them listed here. I think, to begin with, we can accept the Indian as a human being, a man of dignity, a man whom we can respect. You know, I think we would be part of the United States today if it wasn't for the Indians, the war of 1812-14. We've never given them credit for the kinds of things they've done, for the kind of people they are, the kinds of qualities that they possess that are highly desirable in our society. We can help to improve their self-image by telling them more about their historical achievements in the past and the kind of people they were. We can

(MR. CARROLL cont'd.) provide decent housing, and that's not in areas of social decay or contamination as in some of our urban areas. We can help with job placement programs, help in this transition between the reserves and a place in our white society. Maybe they should be allowed to take some of their treaty rights with them. After all, these people have a sense of security back at home; why should they have to give it all up when they come out? After all, our veterans have a special status. Surely the people that shared with us this great land called Canada, who now do not share in it as many of us benefit, should surely have some special recognition for their contribution. Maybe they should take some of their special rights with them for a period of time until this transition is made, until the adjustment is made.

Surely this is a message that can be taken to Ottawa, because we haven't been able to sit down to meet with our counterparts there to discuss these many issues and problems with them in order to devise programs that might come a little closer to meeting the real needs of Indian people. And I am not wanting to gloss over the very valuable contribution that is being made by Indian Affairs and by the Government of Canada, because I think we are sharing jointly programs in this province that are again unique in Canada and that we think are producing results. Maybe we are not going as fast as we would like to go. Maybe we are not keeping up with all the problems, but we are making substantial progress.

I'm talking here about our community development program. I'm talking about community teachers, a program whereby we get better instruction. We get teachers that are oriented towards the cultural differences between Indians and others in our society, where they assume some adult educational responsibilities in addition to teaching. We have community education officers, the hiring of local indigenous people who work with their friends, who work with their neighbours to help them in seeking more of the opportunities available in society. We have our vocational opportunities service, which during the month of February had some 2,700 people enrolled, somewhere in the process of transition between the Indian reserves and employment and independence in the white society.

We have friendship centres and things of this kind, and there are many areas of common concern affecting Indian citizens and the Government of Canada and the Government of Manitoba. There are many government departments involved provincially, many government departments involved at the national level, all of whom have some responsibility for Indian people, and there are many urgent reasons why we believe there should be an early meeting between the Federal Government and the Provincial Government. The Prairie Economic Council asked that such a meeting should be held. The Ministers of Welfare or those responsible for Indians in Western Canada have been meeting regularly to ask for meetings with the Government of Canada to further these problems, and there should be meetings between governments and the Indian people themselves, because together and only together can we devise the kind of programs that will help to meet the situation, to help to improve a situation that I think is a blot on the history of development in our country. It is urgent, if we want to help our Indian people to improve their quality of life to the standard enjoyed by our fellow Canadians.

This is the message that I think you should take to your Ottawa meeting, because I think there is a problem of utmost urgency causing concern and distress among the Indian people of our province, and indeed the Indian people of Canada, which I think is really affecting the good name of Canada among those people in the world who are looking at the question of human rights throughout the world today.

These are some of the things that we can do and some of the things that I would suggest that the Official Opposition do in using their voice, if they still have one, and their influence with the Government of Canada in helping to improve the lot of our Indian people in this province and in the country.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, would the Honourable the Minister permit a question? I thank him very much for his statement on the Indian matters and I agree with what he says. Would he agree, as well, that for those non-treaty Indians in the Province of Manitoba for which he is responsible, his government, that the same situation exists exactly as for that that he is describing for the treaty Indians?

MR. CARROLL: Yes; yes it does. We don't deny our responsibility, and the thing that I was trying to say was we're doing something about it, but one of the real problems we face here is that we need the help of the Government of Canada. We need the help of Canada Manpower. I'll give you an example of the kind of thing that is happening here, that is causing us real concern, affecting the Indian and Metis people.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please. It is now 12:30. I am leaving the Chair to return again at 2:30 this afternoon.