



Legislative Assembly Of Manitoba

DEBATES and PROCEEDINGS

Speaker

The Honourable A. W. Harrison



Vol. VII No. 4 2:30 p.m. Tuesday, February 20, 1962. 5th Session, 26th Legislature

Printed by R. S. Evans, Queen's Printer for the Province of Manitoba, Winnipeg

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
2:30 o'clock, Tuesday, February 20th, 1962.

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions
Reading and Receiving Petitions
Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees
Notice of Motion
Introduction of Bills

The Honourable the Minister of Agriculture.

HON. GEORGE HUTTON (Minister of Agriculture and Conservation) (Rockwood-Iberville) introduced Bill No. 22, An Act to amend The Veterinary Services Act.

MR. SPEAKER: Before I call the Orders of the Day, I should like to draw the attention of the House to the gallery on my left. We have with us this afternoon the students and teachers of St. John's Ravenscourt School. The school is situated in the constituency of the Honourable the Attorney-General. We hope that their presence this afternoon will be a pleasure to themselves as well as an instructive visit.

Orders of the Day.

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier) (Wolseley): Mr. Speaker, I trust that members will not think it out of place if I make a brief reference to an event that has gripped our imagination and our attention over the past few hours, namely, the successful launching into space of the American astronaut, Col. Glenn. I think perhaps we are entitled to take a neighbourly interest in this very significant event and express our admiration to those who are responsible for it. I think, Sir, we admire the scientific achievement which lie behind this very notable event, and I think we also admire very greatly indeed, the fortitude and the stamina of the astronaut who had to put up with so many delays before he was finally launched into this successful flight into space, and I know that we all experienced a feeling of relief to know that he has safely been brought back to earth and I believe picked up at 2:01 this afternoon. I think, Sir, that we should also take note of the way in which these things are done in an open society where all the events leading up to this climax were so fully made known to the public and were entirely exposed to the public view of the people of the whole world. I certainly think that the administration showed courage and a good deal of public spirit in this matter in making it possible for these events to be made known to the people of the world in the way in which they did. I hope that this new achievement can be used for the cause of peace and of civilization and I know that all here will admire and congratulate the nation who accomplished this achievement.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, I am sure there are none in this House -- none in the Province of Manitoba who would do anything but agree with the statement made by the First Minister this afternoon. The achievements of our neighbours to the south in this scientific venture are truly marvellous. The point that he made as well about the way in which this was handled in our free world, I think, is something that should be emphasized -- one of the marvellous things in our system that we leave ourselves -- all of us -- open to scrutiny, to criticism, to an open attitude toward all the things that go on in our society -- this is really the basic elements in our democracy. The fact that our American neighbours have seen fit to go through what was certainly disappointments to them on many occasions when you consider that this was actually the 11th trial, the fact that they left themselves open to possibilities of failure, criticisms from the outside -- yet they did this perfectly and completely openly, and all of us, I am sure, would want to congratulate them on this occasion. Now while it is true that this is far outside our own responsibilities here, I think that due to the fact that our House is at this time in session, that we should ask that a message of congratulation be sent from the Manitoba Legislature to the American Government and the agencies responsible on this occasion of this great achievement.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party) (Radisson): Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate the group in this corner to the words already spoken by the Leader of the House and the Leader of the Official Opposition. I suppose, Mr. Speaker, like millions of others who watched the launching of Col. Glenn into the atmosphere this morning, just a few

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd.) moments ago we listened intently to make sure that the gentleman was picked up. I think it is marvellous that in this day and age such scientific achievements can be realized. I express this hope that all of the reasons behind the launching of the astronaut have a peaceful purpose. When one looks at the total cost in dollars and cents to make this achievement possible -- as I understood from a radio report this morning that the cost was somewhere in the neighborhood of 400 millions of dollars -- that, Sir, would have been sufficient to pay off the whole provincial debt which has been created rather rapidly lately, of some 353 millions of dollars, and would have left over sufficient monies to provide for the well-being of many peoples here in the Province of Manitoba. So, Mr. Speaker, I join in the tribute to the greatness, and indeed, to the open-minded approach to this great event, and trust that out of this can come further peace and further well-being for the people, not only of us in this northern hemisphere, but also for the peoples all over the world.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q. C. (Attorney-General) (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I should like to lay upon the table of the House a copy of each regulation filed under The Regulations Act since the House last sat.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. MORRIS A. GRAY (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, may I direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce. I hold in my hand -- and if you'd permit me to make one brief statement before I make the question -- I know it's not in order -- I hold in my hand

.

MR. D. L. CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Don't bother about that.

MR. GRAY: I hold in my hand an announcement from the Canadian Government Travel Bureau who opened bureau offices in all European countries, especially in London, and they have already nominated someone to be down there in order to increase tourism to Canada, which is the biggest industry in the world today. My question is, whether or not, and if not, whether the Minister could direct our agent in London to co-operate with their man -- I could give him the name -- with their man in order to concentrate, if possible, on tourism to Manitoba. The Federal Government may be interested to send him to Quebec -- every province is important -- but Manitoba is also important to us. In other words, whether he will direct our agent in London to co-operate with them and put in a little bit more weight on Manitoba.

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce) (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, I would be very glad to take this into consideration and see what can be done.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable the Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. E. I. DOW (Turtle Mountain): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Gladstone that an Order of the House do issue for Return showing: (a) All correspondence from the Ministers of Public Works of this government to the Rural Municipality of Morton and the Rural Municipality of Winchester re the building of the Dand Croll road from October, 1959 to January 30, 1962; (b) All correspondence from the above municipalities to the Ministers of Public Works re the Dand Croll road from October, 1959, to January 30, 1962; (c) All correspondence on the same road from the Department of Public Works to the Rural Municipalities of Morton and Winchester from October 1959 to January 1962.

Mr. Speaker put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GRAY: Mr. Speaker, in view of the resignation of one of our leaders in the party, I am anxious to give my leader all the time possible and all the publicity possible, so I restrain myself from particulars and I would ask the House to permit me one more request that the matter stand over.

MR. SPEAKER: Order stand. Proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, I also agree that the new party need all the time possible and I would beg leave of the House to have this matter stand.

MR. SPEAKER: That brings us to the Resolution standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Selkirk. I promise to take this matter under advisement and rule on the admissibility of the Motion before the House. I might say that I have had it under consideration, and I

(Mr. Speaker, cont'd.) might say that

MR. MOLGAT: if I may, on the point of order, before you proceed to give your ruling -- once your ruling is given there is no debate possible on it, as I understand the rules correctly. I wonder if possibly any members of the House have any statement to make prior to your making your ruling.

MR. SPEAKER: I was under the impression that the debate had been concluded yesterday afternoon and that I would bring in a ruling.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, it may be that -- I'm sure it is -- that not everyone who was interested in this matter was prepared to discuss it yesterday. If it would be Your Honour's intention, I would be glad to say a few words before your ruling is made because I realize that it's not debatable once it is made, and quite frankly, I would like to get my position with regard to this on record. I would rather do it before the ruling is made because the only opportunity after that would be to challenge the ruling if it is not in agreement with the way some of us see it on this side.

MR. SPEAKER: I don't wish to be autocratic in any way, I feel that I have a ruling prepared here, and while I am democratic I feel that I should give my ruling now.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I don't want to object to your ruling, but it seems to me that yesterday when this came up none of the members of the House had had time to consult the normal rules of this House -- our own red book or Beauchesne's or May's or any others -- and if some of them have taken some time in between to do this, that they should be free to express their mind at this time. Once you make your ruling they are in the impossible position of so doing and I can see no objection to those statements being made before your ruling this afternoon.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, that is the position that I am in. I had not given any consideration to this matter when it came up yesterday. Unlike some of my honourable friends I don't believe in speaking without some preparation, and so I gave the matter some consideration and endeavoured to consult the rules, both our own and Beauchesne, in the interval, and I would appreciate the opportunity of putting my views, briefly, on record if you would allow it.

MR. SPEAKER: If the Honourable Member for Lakeside would be brief I would permit it, but I do not think it is a good practice, I would think that it might even confuse the issue further. But if you wish to make a brief statement -- and we will terminate the debate with your statement.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, I don't wish to take advantage of any special privilege because I think that in the difficult position that you occupy, Mr. Speaker, it is always wise, and I think never wrong, to give consideration to the various points of view that are raised, and, to withhold your decision until you have had time to consider the various points of view that are advanced, because this is not an easy job. I sympathize with the position that you have, and I think that it's wise to take some time on some of these decisions, because when they're made they can be quoted as precedent and certainly it's not the wish of most of us to appeal against ruling.

Now I think the key point here is the declaration in the Speech from the Throne, because if the declaration in the Speech from the Throne is definite then, of course, there is no question that our resolution or bill or any other matter dealing with that particular subject is out of order; but if it's not definite then I think there is great doubt as to whether it can be declared out of order. Now here I think is the relative brief paragraph: "Through amendments to be proposed to the Hospital Services Insurance Act dependent young men and women under the age of 21 who are in attendance at certain educational institutions will be relieved from payment of hospital premiums." It is true that the next paragraph has some relation to matters of welfare and closely allied subject, but I think this would be the paragraph on which anyone would base the contention that the resolution proposed by the Honourable Member for Selkirk is out of order. Now our relative rule as I see it, with regard to anticipation, is 31 in the red book which deals with the reviving of a debate already concluded during the session, and anticipation, and here's what it says: "31. No member shall revive a debate already concluded during the session or anticipate a matter appointed for consideration or of which notice has been given."

Now I think it's perfectly clear that if my honourable friend's resolution transgressed

(Mr. Campbell, cont'd.) that section, that it is out of order, and while I do not intend to take the time of the House to read the whole of the proposed resolution, it seems to me that only a small part of it deals with the part that is spoken of in the Speech from the Throne. If the Speech from the Throne is correct in saying that their amendments will deal only with young men and women under the age of 21 who are in attendance at certain educational institutions, then this resolution goes much further afield than that. I would suggest too, Mr. Speaker, that it has been the practice in this House on many occasions to allow a resolution to be changed to the extent that it transgresses any rule or contains any information that in the meantime has become incorrect -- for instance the authority was given to the Honourable Member for Inkster to alter his resolution, of which notice had been given, to bring it into keeping with the events that had occurred in the meantime. So I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, to you, that only a portion of this resolution could conceivably be covered by the paragraph in the Speech from the Throne, and if the view that you have come to after studying the authorities, is that the small portion is out of order, then I would suggest that it is only reasonable and fair that the honourable member should be entitled to amend his motion, or to let it stand as he has suggested, to bring it in conformity with the statement that is made in the Speech from the Throne.

MR. SPEAKER: I am afraid that I am unable to agree with the Honourable the Member for Selkirk, and I would refer him to page 167, citation 199, clause 4, which reads as follows: "Any irregularity of any portion of a motion shall render the whole motion irregular." It's not possible to accept part of the motion and reject the other part. I am sure that the Honourable Member for Lakeside agrees that the motion does contravene Section 31 of our Acts, at least in part he admits that that is a fact, and I would rule that the motion is not in order on those grounds.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, if I may rise on a point of order, in view of the fact as my honourable friend from Lakeside indicated, there was permission given to the Member for Inkster to amend his resolution, would we not be allowed to amend this resolution?

MR. SPEAKER: I would think that that would be up to the Leader of the House, not the Speaker.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I don't think that there is any room for further debate on this matter. I think that you did the right thing in allowing the Member for Lakeside to express his position, but I do not think we should pursue the matter further. It is not as if there will not be plenty of opportunities for members to express their agreement or disagreement with government policy in this respect as matters proceed. We are dealing now with the particular motion that is before us. You have ruled that it is out of order and I think that ruling ought to stand.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, I would like first of all to express my view that the Leader of the House has no bearing whatever on the decision to be made on this matter. The decision is that of the Speaker, not of the Leader of the House. Secondly, if permission has been given to one member, I see no reason why the same permission should not be given to another member of this House.

MR. SPEAKER: I have given my decision on this matter. I consider it closed.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, in that case I must challenge your decision. I regret to do this, I am not trying to get involved in a procedural hassle, but if one member is allowed to do it why not another?

MR. CAMPBELL: Before the motion is put, might I ask the Honourable the First Minister if the amendment that he is introducing deals with the question of the spouse and the child or grandchild of the dependent, and does it deal with the other classes of people that are mentioned in this resolution?

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I don't propose to answer the question because the matter will be disclosed in due course, but seeing the point has been raised I do want to say this, that in my opinion in a sense goes right to the root of the matter, because what we are concerned about in this ruling here is whether or not the government will be allowed to introduce its policy if this subject which has just been ruled upon is placed before us. Now it is obvious that the resolution that is placed before us does include the subject matter contained in the Throne Speech, and if that amendment that has just been declined by yourself were to be approved or placed before the House, then we would be placed in the position of having disposed of the

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd.) subject, and that we on this side could not introduce our proposal of which notice has been given, as we should be allowed to do. Now it seems to me the ruling is clear and that when our amendments to the Act are brought down members will receive adequate notice and if they don't like it they can make any changes or additions or suggestions -- any manner of dealing with it that they wish.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, what about the resolution presented by the Honourable Member for Inkster? The same situation exactly exists. It asks for changes in exactly the same way.

MR. ROBLIN: as my honourable friend knows if he'll reflect upon it.

MR. PAULLEY: No, no, it is the case -- exactly the same case. You're bringing in legislation on the same subject.

MR. ROBLIN: Of course that's not so, Mr. Speaker, because read it. If it were the same subject, it would have been ruled out of order by yourself. I will expand on the point because the motion submitted by the Honourable Member for Inkster asks this government to ask the Federal Government to do something. That is not what was proposed in the Throne Speech at all. What is proposed in the Throne Speech is action that this government is going to take in respect of that particular matter. So the two cases are not on all fours at all, and clearly the question of order or lack of order does not arise in the case of the motion of the Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. CAMPBELL: would be the reason, Mr. Speaker, that the Honourable Leader of the House should agree to the reasonable suggestion that has been put forward that an opportunity should be given to amend this resolution to bring it into conformity with the rule, because certainly it is a fact that the part that deals with the 21 years of age student is in conflict with the rules. The rest of it is not in conflict with the rules and an ordinary courtesy of the House would allow that change to be made.

MR. ROBLIN: I trespass on your good nature, Sir. I know that I should not reply to this provocation, but I merely say to my honourable friend that I suggest that he observe the equally reasonable suggestions from this side of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Order.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question at this time?

MR. SPEAKER: Order. We're dealing with this matter of ruling by the Speaker at the present time. You did ask for a standing vote on this -- challenge my ruling. If you desire to go ahead we'll call in the members and proceed with taking the vote.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, if I may, I have no desire to challenge your ruling provided we will have the opportunity to bring in a resolution to put forth the ideas that we have over and above those of the government. But if this is now going to be considered as a matter dealt with by this House and that we are unable to bring in a resolution later on to go beyond what my honourable friends are suggesting, then I have no alternative at this time.

MR. ROBLIN: Well, if my honourable friend would just consult the rule book and make sure that he's in order, he may do anything in this House which is in order and I commend that course of action to him.

MR. MOLGAT: Provided that this is not considered today as disposing of this motion and is not enabling us to bring it back into the House at a later date.

MR. ROBLIN: My honourable friend knows perfectly well what the rules are. He doesn't need to make a protest.

MR. MOLGAT: What are the rules?

MR. ROBLIN: Do you want to challenge the Speaker or not?

MR. MOLGAT: In this case I must.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members. The question before the House is the ruling of Mr. Speaker on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Member for Selkirk that this resolution is out of order. The question before the House is: "Shall the Speaker's ruling be sustained?"

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

YEAS: Messrs. Alexander, Baizley, Bjornson, Carroll, Corbett, Cowan, Evans, Froese, Gray, Groves, Hamilton, Harris, Hawryluk, Hutton, Ingebrigtson, Jeannotte, Johnson (Assiniboia), Johnson (Gimli), Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Paulley, Peters, Reid, Roblin, Scarth, Schreyer, Seaborn, Shewman, Smellie, Stanes, Strickland, Thompson,

(Yeas, cont'd.) Wagner, Weir, Witney, Wright, Mrs. Forbes, Mrs. Morrison.

NAYS: Messrs. Campbell, Desjardins, Dow, Guttormson, Hillhouse, Hryhorczuk, Molgat, Prefontaine, Roberts, Shoemaker, Tanchak.

MR. CLERK: Yeas 42: Nays 11.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion carried. Adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Osborne and the amendment thereto proposed by the Honourable Leader of the CCF Party -- the Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party. The Honourable Leader for the CCF Party has the floor.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to admonish you for the title that you bestowed on me. However, I am going to extend to you, Sir, cordial greetings on this my first opportunity in the House. I express to you the support when we of this party are sure that you are correct, and reserve, of course, the right when we think that you are wrong in your decisions to oppose them. I'm happy, Sir, that in general since you occupied the position as the Speaker of this House I'm able to say to you in all sincerity that you have been most fair and have been most co-operative in the conduct of the business of this House.

I would like to offer my congratulations to the new ministers of the Crown, the Minister of Public Works, and of Welfare. I realize that they have a tremendous task ahead of them. There is much that remains undone in the Province of Manitoba, and I urge them in the short period of their duration in office to do all that they can while they can be doing something.

Sir, I would like to say to the Honourable Member for Osborne that I enjoyed his remarks when he proposed the motion to His Honour. I want to say to him, however, Mr. Speaker, that he let me down, for I have been in rather close contact with him in sort of a professional way lately, and I attempted on these occasions to indicate what should be the correct policy of government for the Province of Manitoba -- and lo and behold, Mr. Speaker, I find eventually after listening to my honourable friend that apparently the seed fell on barren ground.

To the Honourable Member for Churchill, may I too congratulate him. I must say in all honesty and correctness to my honourable friend, the Member for Churchill, that it isn't too often that we hear him in this House. If his remarks in seconding the Speech from the Throne are an indication of his real capabilities -- and I think that they are -- I sincerely trust that we will hear more from the Honourable Member for Churchill.

I join with the Leader of the Opposition in expressing my pleasure that the Minister of Municipal Affairs is back in his seat here in this Legislature. I say to him that while I may have been negligent in not getting around to see him, I followed his progress through his medical advisor, the Minister of Health, and I sincerely trust that he is well over the hump from now on out with just progress in his recovery.

I would like too, Sir, while I am offering my complimentary statements of the Throne Speech to say to the Leader of the Opposition, I enjoyed listening to what he had to say yesterday.

And now, Sir, my purpose in standing here today is to make comments in respect of the status of the economy of the Province of Manitoba, and to make comments regarding the speech that His Honour so graciously read to us the other day. I would like to compliment the author of this document for the manner in which he compiled it. I think, Sir, it is the most lengthy Throne Speech that we have had the privilege of listening to since the present government came into office.

It is very, very interesting as one reads the speech. It is non-revealing when one reads it, but it is provocative to debate, and because of that, Mr. Speaker, I intend to go over the Speech from the Throne in some little detail.

I would like, Sir, first of all, to make reference to the statement contained in the speech wherein it is stated that: "In the opinion of my Ministers 1962 promises to be a year of opportunity and of progress to the peoples of Manitoba." The paragraph goes on to say that: "There is strong evidence to show that our economy is buoyant and its prospects hopeful." I think, Mr. Speaker, the choice of words, the word "buoyant" in this instance is fitting and proper to the economy of the Province of Manitoba. I took the opportunity of consulting Webster as to a proper definition of the word "buoyant" and I find that it means "to float in a fluid". What fluid? When we're talking of floating, the economy of Manitoba floating in a fluid, are we talking in a fluid or as a result of the sale of fluids through the Commission or some other field of fluid? This section

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd.) goes on to say, Mr. Speaker, that we're in a period of economic upswing. It's very nice-sounding, but what do we mean? I suggest, Sir, that we do not want periods of upswing because there is an old saying that what goes up must come down. I think that what the author of this document should have said to us is that the economy of the Province of Manitoba has remained stable or is stable, and will increase as the days go by. Not that -- just that we're in a period of upswing which means literally that the Government of Manitoba are prophesying a downswing.

The Throne Speech goes on, Mr. Speaker, to say that employment opportunities are increasing. Is this true, Mr. Speaker? I don't think so, because while many areas in the Dominion of Canada have had some reduction in unemployment, we here in the Province of Manitoba, in January of this year, had 800 more unemployed in our area this year over last year. I ask the question: is this an indication of greater employment opportunities, when our unemployed figures are considerably higher than they were a year ago which was the highest figure that this province had known since the great depression of 1932? Sir, the economy of the Province of Manitoba is in such good hands and being looked after so well by the Roblin administration that I think for the first time in the history of Canada, that the Greater Winnipeg area is classified by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics as a labour surplus area. This does not indicate to me, Mr. Speaker, that the verbiage in the Throne Speech is a proper indication of our situation today.

I would like now, Sir, to just speak briefly on another item contained in the Throne Speech wherein reference is made for an increase in the gross amount of the unconditional grants to municipalities which should be of benefit to local taxpayers. There is, of course, in this paragraph no indication of any increase in the basic amount of the per capita grant to the municipalities, but only in the overall amount, and I suggest that what the government has in mind is the revision due to the increase in population in the Province of Manitoba. But I want to point out to the First Minister and Treasurer of the Province of Manitoba that there are many of the municipalities in the Province of Manitoba that are going to suffer as a result of the last census, because many areas in the Province of Manitoba, many of the municipalities have had a reduction in the total population count. Many of our rural municipalities have less people in them now, but they still have the same problem of municipal administration, and I fear that while it looks nice to see these remarks, when one analyzes them one can see that many of the municipalities as a result of this manner of the dishing out, may I say, of the finances of the province, are going to be less better off than they were before.

I note with interest -- and I would suggest that this part of the Throne Speech was written by the Minister of Commerce -- that: "The government notices with satisfaction that the total value of the output of secondary manufacturing industries in Manitoba achieved the record level in spite of drought conditions throughout the West." I would ask my honourable friend, the Minister of Industry, what is the relationship between the drought and the growth of secondary industries in the Province of Manitoba? Reference in this particular section is also made, Mr. Speaker, to the regional development program and to the Manitoba Development Fund which have provided material assistance in the expansion of our industrial base and has contributed to the strengthening of many rural communities as well as major centres. I have followed with interest, and I'm sure all members of this House have, the expansion of our secondary industries and the fact that many of them are going into the rural areas in order that the stability in these areas may be on a firmer basis. But I suggest this to you, Mr. Speaker, that the Manitoba Development Fund had an opportunity, a golden opportunity, to keep alive in the Province of Manitoba an industry with which we were all concerned; an industry which has been given great publicity, and I refer, Sir, to financial aid to the Brandon Packers plant in order that it might continue its operation in the City of Brandon. I think, Sir, that if this government was really concerned, as they have stated that they are, with the destiny of the livestock industry in the Brandon area, they could have well helped to keep this plant in actual operation.

I would next refer, Sir, to the mention in the Throne Speech of the Committee on Manitoba's economic future. I think this is good, and I would compliment the government in having set up this inquiry commission to look into the future years of the Province of Manitoba. Possibly this is something that my honourable friends on my right should have done years ago and the

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd.) picture as we face it today may have been different. But I would like to ask this question in connection with this survey, Mr. Speaker, of the Minister in charge. How many Manitobans are engaged in research in connection with this survey? How many outsiders are conducting the research for this Committee, and how many young men and women graduates of our University, who I believe are qualified for this work, are engaged to find employment in Manitoba.

The Throne Speech, Sir, mentions the question of public housing, that the government has a new policy. Very, very good. But, we are still awaiting the plan of the government in respect of housing. We have waited a long time for any statement of actual contribution from the government in this very necessary and important field. I hope that when the government announces its policy that it will announce to the municipalities of the Province of Manitoba we are four-square behind you and we will put up the 25% contribution ourselves in addition to the 75% that comes from federal authorities.

Mention is made, Sir, of legislation dealing with credit purchases. I trust that this legislation will be very specific. I trust that it is not a watered down type of legislation. I trust it will be a firm directive to all concerned in the Province of Manitoba that they must show not only the actual amount of money involved in credit purchases, but a firm percentage stated in simple annual interest rates. I think this is most important, Mr. Speaker, that there be absolute clarity in respect of the charges made in respect of credit purchasing. I also would like to know whether or not it is within the function of provincial authority to set a ceiling on interest rates that are chargeable on credit purchases. And if perchance the Attorney-General or his staff, or the Provincial Treasurer and his staff, can thoroughly investigate laws pertaining to interest rates and can find in there the rights of a province to establish maximum rates of interest charged, I beseech them to do it. I confess quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, that I have not got the full information. And if we have no jurisdiction, and that jurisdiction rests solely with the federal administration, may I suggest to my honourable friends opposite that they make representation to the federal authorities to have a ceiling placed on interest charges.

Another point which I raise for consideration of the government while we are dealing with the question of credit financing. I would like a survey made into the gimmicks that are on sale via a purchase of soapflakes, etcetera, in our province and in our Dominion. Legislation apparently is going to be introduced to show that interest rates must be made visible so that people who are contracting credit purchases will know the interest. I suggest that in the field of gimmicks where you get a towel in a case of soap or a dish, a fork or a spoon, I think that it should be an obligation on the industry concerned to show in clear figures on these products as well, in order that the public is fully aware of what they are buying; they should be compelled to show how much of the cost is taken up with the purchase of a towel. Because, Mr. Speaker, nothing is free. And when we're talking of a free towel in a box of soap, it's nonsense.

MR. CAMPBELL: Hear, Hear! Nothing is free.

MR. PAULLEY: I think, Sir -- yes, nothing is free, and I agree with you 100% and I've always agreed

MR. CAMPBELL: No, you're just catching on.

MR. PAULLEY: But I would suggest that this is a matter which also could be investigated. The government announces that there will be increases in the costs of education; that there will be an increase in the funds to support the school system of the province as well as the university. I hope my interpretation of this particular section is correct. That the Minister of Education is going to revise the formula of the basis of the grants in respect of education, and not like apparently is so in respect of the unconditional grants just merely going to pay additional amounts of money based on school population. And also in this particular field that despite the additional contributions from the provincial treasury, the tax burden on local taxpayers for school purposes is still a far cry from that promised in the election documents of my friends opposite when they appealed to the people of the Province of Manitoba.

MR. CAMPBELL: Hear, hear! Nothing is free.

MR. PAULLEY: No, nothing is free. Mention is made in the Throne Speech, Mr. Speaker, that the government has under active study the question of teachers' pensions. I don't know how long the Honourable Minister of Education is going to have this under active study, but I would like to see a little more action and a little less study if the time element

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd.) from the time that he was first approached in respect of this is any indication of the speed of my friends opposite. When one compares the teachers' pensions with other jurisdictions, Manitoba is practically at the bottom of the totem pole. The average pension to teachers who have rendered years and years of valuable service to the people of our province, an average pension of those on retirement is \$87.00. I think it is shameful, Mr. Speaker, and when the matter is under further review later in the session more will be said.

In the Attorney-General's department, we note that the department is talking of co-operating with the Law Society of Manitoba in a program to expand the availability of legal services to indigent accused persons. What was the situation, Sir, on January 15th of this year as reported in the Winnipeg Tribune? There are only six lawyers, this report states, that have given any aid to indigents in the Province of Manitoba. I think this is shameful and I don't criticize the Law Society, Mr. Speaker, when I say this because this is voluntary on their part -- and as far as it goes with many of them, I think it is okay. But I say, and as we have said in this corner of this House before, that it is time for the government of the Province of Manitoba in the field of provision of legal assistance to the indigents and others in the Province of Manitoba, to make provision for public defenders. This matter, Mr. Speaker, I know has been rejected by the Attorney-General of the province in the past. I think he is wrong. I think that the evidence that we have before us as to the lack of availability in respect of legal aid to many people is an indication that a young man like him should change his manner of thinking, his way of thinking, and follow the lead of some other progressive jurisdictions. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that despite the verbiages contained in the Speech from the Throne, the flattery and the patting of the back in respect of detention and rehabilitation, the Honourable the Attorney-General is not progressing very rapidly. There is a field of work to be done in rehabilitation as yet untouched. Yet I can recall when my honourable friend first stood up in this House as the Attorney-General of the Province of Manitoba he gave us such a rosy story of what the situation would be after he had had it for a short period of time. I think, Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend should go back to the Hansard of that day and read it again and be born again and show the vigour in this year 1962 that he indicated in his first year that he would show in the field of correction and rehabilitation. Yes, Mr. Speaker, my honourable friend says he'll read me a lesson. I don't want him to read me a lesson. I want him to read his own lesson, then go it further.

Mention is made in the Throne Speech, Sir, of the setting up of a board of commissioners to conduct the affairs of the Manitoba Telephone System. For a young government, this government here is sure catching on very rapidly to their example down at Ottawa of setting up boards of commissioners for everything. We had a board of commissioners on Hydro development, now we're having a board of commissioners on telephones; we're going to have a board of commissioners on Hospital Services Plan which I'll refer to in a moment or two. I want to say to the government, in all of these commissions make adequately sure that any appointment to any of these commissions is based solely on the ability of the persons appointed and not for political considerations, because I have seen as others have seen in government, in the setting up of commissions all too frequently it is not being the matter of ability first but a matter of political strength first. And I beseech my friends opposite that if they are going to set up these commissions they steer clear of any possible criticism of a political appointment to these commissions.

Mention is contained in the Throne Speech, Sir -- I will not belabour this -- of increases in the amounts of money under the financial responsibility section of our auto insurance in the Province of Manitoba, and for the limits applicable under the Unsatisfied Judgment Fund. We have debated the question in this House before of compulsory automobile insurance. Other jurisdictions are beginning to find that the type of system that we have in the Province of Manitoba is no longer a good system and are calling for compulsory automobile insurance, evidence of which to be shown before license plates are issued. We in this group, of course, Mr. Speaker, suggest that the automobile insurance should be publicly owned and publicly controlled and I suggest that if we have compulsory automobile insurance that that is the only basis on which it should operate in order to be fair to premium payers of insurance. I ask the government to take this matter under consideration once again. It is of grave importance to the automobile drivers and the general public of the Province of Manitoba.

I mentioned a moment ago when I was speaking of commissions that the Throne Speech

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd.) mentions that they are proposing the establishment of a Hospital Commission to administer the Manitoba Hospital Insurance Plan. I have tried to study the Willard Report which dealt with many aspects of hospitalization in the Province of Manitoba, but can find no recommendation from the Willard Commission that we should set up a Hospital Commission as I visualize that this will be. Indeed, the Honourable the Minister of Health almost jumped across his chair or his seat when we were considering hospital insurance at one session or two ago when I thought that there may be some criticism levelled at the Commissioner that we have. He told us that he was doing a really magnificent job. I wonder if he's changed his mind -- that the individual that is doing the job so magnificently now must have a commission to keep him in trim. While I am touching briefly I mentioned the Willard Report

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, I am sure my honourable friend really doesn't intend any reflection on the present Commissioner.

MR. PAULLEY: Oh no, no. I was supporting him.

MR. ROBLIN: Reflect on the Ministry if you will, but leave the Commissioner alone.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, may I assure my honourable friend, the House Leader, that there is no implication of any reflection on the present Commissioner of the Hospital Plan, Sir. All I was saying was in support of him, that my friend, the Honourable the Minister of Health, had said at the last session, or the session before the last, when I had offered some criticism at that time of the Commissioner, that this one man was doing a tremendous job and now that they are considering a commission, of a broader nature. Oh no, dear me, no!

May I suggest to the Honourable the Minister of Health and to the Provincial Treasurer that when the financial implications of the Willard Report are under consideration, that consideration be given to the financing of construction costs for hospitals on a similar basis to that presently used in the construction of roads. As we know, Mr. Speaker, in the construction of roads approximately -- and I stand liable for correction on this -- but approximately two-thirds of the total cost of roads in Manitoba is paid out of the general revenues or by borrowing on the assets of the Province of Manitoba, and as a result of license fees and gasoline taxes the other third is raised, and I suggest that rather than tagging the full costs of hospitalization on the premium payers of the hospitalization scheme that the government take into consideration some formula similar to that at present in effect insofar as road construction is concerned.

I am happy, Sir, to find in the Throne Speech that more consideration is going to be given to the matter of mental health services in the Province of Manitoba. I trust that the Minister of Health has been able to convince his colleagues of the great need in this field. He has admitted in times past of the need for it -- expansion in the field of mental health. In the past he was not able to do anything of any great amount because of the lack of finances. I sincerely trust that the Treasurer will co-operate with him this year in making more adequate provision for those suffering as a result of mental ailments. I note, Sir, that the Throne Speech says that we are going to have provision for more qualified staff to both community and institutional programs. I sincerely hope that by this the Minister means that we are going to have more psychiatrists and professional people available for these services.

I commend the government, Mr. Speaker, for making provision for the expansion of the St. Amant Ward in the old St. Boniface Sanatorium. On this particular problem, Mr. Speaker, there is a kinship, I believe, between the Honourable the First Minister and myself. My first speech in this House, Mr. Speaker, and members of this assembly, dealt with this very vital matter when my honourable friend, the present Premier of the Province of Manitoba, was sitting on this side of the House and made an appeal for aid to Mrs. St. Amant in Youville Hospital in the Town of Transcona. My first speech was in support of his contention at that time. It fell on the deafest ears -- the deafest ears of government that the province ever had. I'm happy to join in congratulating my honourable friend the Premier of Manitoba in achieving to a considerable degree those very noble objectives that he had when he was sitting, I believe, where the Honourable Member for Ethelbert Plains is now sitting, if I recall back to 1954. We were both up there at that time. So, Sir, so much for that.

I note in the Throne Speech mention is made of the fact that we are going to be able to consider the report of the government to the Royal Commission on Health. I want to reiterate once again, Mr. Speaker, the stand that this group took last year -- that if the Government of

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd.) Manitoba are considering any medical plan at all, do not include in that plan any deterrent charges for service. In this field I have the support, apparently, according to their brief, of the Manitoba Medical Society. The First Minister and his government apparently have the support of the Liberals and the Chambers of Commerce in deterrent charges. As a matter of fact -- oh, on this deterrent basis -- as a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I was rather amused when I was following press reports. At one stage during the hearings of the Royal Commission on Medical Care, after the government had made its report or presentation they had everybody against them except my honourable friends on the right. The Premier was in the unfortunate position of having the Medical Society against him, the Chamber of Commerce against him, but when one picked up the paper and read the report attributed to my honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition, he stated that Roblin just "copied us". Well, Mr. Speaker, may I warn both of them that when this matter is under review in this House the New Democratic Party apparently will stand alone in respect of a medical plan for the Province of Manitoba. I'm sure my honourable friends on the right will not be able to be critical at all.

We are pleased to note that the government is going to introduce companion legislation to provide for increases in the Old Age Assistance Pensions for those between 65 and 70 following the amounts as stated in the Throne Speech at Ottawa. The government rejected our plea last year for an increase to these people. I would ask the First Minister, Mr. Speaker, whether or not he was sort of scuttled by the authorities at Ottawa, or whether or not he had prior knowledge that in the Throne Speech at Ottawa he was going to be required, as the Provincial Treasurer in the Province of Manitoba, to put up an additional \$10.00 for Old Age Assistance. I wonder whether or not the Honourable John Diefenbaker consulted with the Honourable Dufferin Roblin of Manitoba before the federal authorities got their fingers in our pockets.

Reference is made, Mr. Speaker, in the Throne Speech to labour legislation, dealing with The Employment Practices Act and others. We await with great interest the Minister of Labour introducing these pieces of legislation. I warn him and I warn the Government of Manitoba that they're going to have a hot and heavy debate on their hands if they attempt any introduction of legislation which may be the result of the recommendations of Mr. Justice Trites. My honourable friend, the Leader of the Opposition, stated yesterday that he thought that this matter should be handled by a commission of the members of the House. I made that proposal last December to the First Minister. In reply to me he thought that that was a helpful approach to this problem. I again ask him and his Minister of Labour to reject any consideration at all for changes in our Labour Relations Act until this helpful approach has been realized; until the whole aspect of labour relations in the Province of Manitoba and not just one incident has been thoroughly reviewed. I think, Sir, that this is most important, not from a political standpoint of a government or members in opposition, but the far more important point of having good harmony between labour and management in the Province of Manitoba. So I make this appeal, Mr. Speaker, to the Honourable the Minister of Labour and to the members opposite, because I am fearful that if this approach is not carried through that, rather than industrial peace, it will not be peaceful.

Mention is made in the Throne Speech, Sir, of the great question of Metropolitan Government. I think, Sir, that what is required in respect of Metro Government is a better understanding between Metro and all of the area municipalities and the government. I suggest to the First Minister and to the Minister of Municipal Affairs that they should give consideration to calling a general conference of all public representatives in the Greater Winnipeg area to consider all aspects of inter-municipal relations in the Greater Winnipeg area; of area and municipal co-operation with Metro, and including school boards as well, that this whole matter may be thoroughly reviewed. I think, Sir, that some in public office regrettably are throwing bricks hither and yon and using Metro as a tool for personal political gain, and I regret it because it is evident when one reads many of the statements that are appearing in our press today that there is a section in our public life in the Greater Winnipeg area that is taking advantage to the detriment of harmony in Metro and the Greater Winnipeg area for their own personal gain. I may not be a shining example of what a municipal man should be, Mr. Speaker, but I don't believe that any municipal man, any school trustee, should use the present unsettled state of the minds of the people of Greater Winnipeg purely for political gain. But I think there is a more

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd.) important consideration that the government has got to give in respect of the municipalities of the Province of Manitoba, and that is that it must re-assess all of the responsibilities of our municipalities in every part of the province. It is time that we had a revision of the responsibilities and finances of all of the municipalities in Manitoba and their relationship to the Treasury of this province.

I would like to refer at this time, Mr. Speaker, to a report that was tabled in 1953. It is called the Manitoba Provincial Municipal Committee Report and Memorandum of Recommendations. The government of that day was, of course, the government headed by Liberals. I would compliment them for having set up this commission and this committee to investigate responsibility of a division. It is too bad though, Sir, that they didn't carry forward the recommendations in total of the committee. To be fair to them, I say that they did adopt many of the important recommendations but there are some of them that they did not fulfill that I think this government must take under consideration. In the report that was tabled it suggests this. The recommendations of the sub-committee have been framed in the light of present circumstances to deal with present problems and to further problems that appear likely to emerge in the near future. It must be recognized, however, that the solutions proposed herein may become outdated by events, or may in fact prove less successful than presently anticipated. The report also goes on to say, and I quote, -- this is page 122 of the report and I'll be happy to show anyone the portions that I'm using -- is this statement dealing with the reorganization of municipalities: "Our consideration of this matter in the light of present circumstances has led us to the conclusion that new and more vigorous steps should be now taken toward a reorganization of local government using areas and boundaries which are more consistent with modern transportation and communication facilities and with modern living habits." Further dealing with the question of reorganization of municipalities the committee reported on the question further on in the report, re-emphasizing the reorganization in co-operation with municipalities of course, our boundaries and our financial responsibilities. The committee recommended that the points contained in this report should be re-assessed in a few years and at the conclusion of the public representatives, or the municipal representatives, of their reports is this statement: "We are therefore fully aware that decisions in matters such as these can never be permanent. Actions now taken will require re-assessment in a very few years if the people of Manitoba are to have a sound structure of local government consistent with conditions as they now exist." I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that that is what we should be doing. I suggest there has been a considerable delay in attempting to do the things that these municipal men, all fully qualified in their respective fields, suggested back in 1953.

..... Continued on next page

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I might ask the honourable member a question? I'd like to ask the honourable member if he is not aware that some of the quotations he has been giving are quotations of sub-committees and others of the municipal representatives as distinct from the recommendations of the Commission or committee as a whole, and is it not a fact that the way he has read them into the record that it looks as though they were the recommendations of the Committee. Now my honourable friend, I think, did not give the emphasis to that, that he might.

MR. PAULLEY: Well, Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to my honourable friend, indeed welcome my honourable friend drawing this to my attention. I do not wish to imply at all that this was the statement of policy of the government of the day. I think at the outset of my remarks I mentioned that this was a committee set up by that government for which I gave them full credit. The report of the report that I have just read was the report of the municipal men to the government. I now want to refer, Mr. Speaker, very very briefly to the statement of policy of that then government.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, if I might rephrase the question. Is it not the fact that not all of those quotations that he has mentioned as coming from the sub-committees and the municipal representatives, not all of them were carried through into the recommendations of the committee. Completely apart from the statements....

MR. PAULLEY: It is my understanding, those that I have spoken of, Mr. Speaker, were carried through to the recommendations to the government. I think, Sir, that that may be established when I now read a sentence from the statement of government policy.

MR. CAMPBELL: recommendations of the committee itself.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to my honourable friend the member for Lakeside, in order to refresh his memory, he do the same as I--get the document and read it.

MR. CAMPBELL: Read all of it, not just parts of it.

MR. PAULLEY: I was just thinking, I've been reading too much now. The government in its statement of policy--(Interjection)--I wonder if my honourable friends would just let me finish a sentence or two and then I'll give them the book so that they'll remember, or be able to read what their statement of policy was. They're speaking, Sir, of the recommendations of the Metropolitan Sub-committee. Now this recommendation states that there might be established a single Metropolitan Board which would supersede all existing Metropolitan Boards or Commissions and be responsible for all the services now being administered by these bodies, together with any other services which might in future be organized on a Metropolitan basis. In order that my honourable friend the Member for Lakeside doesn't misconstrue, I point out again that that was one of the recommendations of the Metropolitan Sub-committee. And now here is the statement of policy of the government: "The government agrees that action along this line, if satisfactory to the municipalities concerned, could result in increased efficiency and economy. Therefore, in sending copies of the report to the Metropolitan Councils, we will call this particular recommendation to their attention with the suggestion that if it commends itself to them and they take joint action regarding it, the government is prepared, if the councils of the City of Winnipeg and adjoining municipalities so advise, to bring in legislation for that purpose at the present session." Sounds very good. And yet yesterday here was this government here prepared to bring in a recommendation in consultation with the municipalities in all haste, and yet we heard my honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition attacking the government, who it's not my duty to defend for its haste even in Metro. Then my friends in their statement of policy back in 1954 session agreed, with some reservations, to larger areas of administration but they did agree to a reorganization of our municipalities.

Now, Sir, one more point contained in the Throne Speech to draw to your attention. Reference is made in the Throne Speech to the question of the Red River Floodway. I have taken the attitude that the Red River Floodway is a baby of the government. They made up their mind that they were going to go ahead with this floodway, and having made up their mind, there was nothing that we in this House could do about it. It was suggested by some of the people out in my general area that they should at least come down armed with pitchforks, etcetera, to interview the Minister of Agriculture and the First Minister because of this floodway. However, I was able, I think, to persuade them not to because I think all that would have happened was--another Minister of Agriculture anyway. But, Mr. Speaker, there's one criticism, and I think

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd.) it's a very valid one, one criticism I have in which the government of the Province of Manitoba have broken their word to the people affected by the Red River Floodway. They expropriated the properties. The Minister of Agriculture has told us in this House that negotiations would be carried on with due despatch to arrive at a settlement of a price in respect of the properties expropriated. At a meeting in Oakbank some considerable months ago, attended by the First Minister and the Minister of Agriculture, citizens in that general area and concerned with the floodway had the assurance again of no undue haste in arriving at a fair settlement. Provision was made at that meeting for an independent group of appraisers to assist in arriving at a fair price. But as of today, Mr. Speaker, this 20th day of February, many people whose properties were expropriated a year and a half ago still haven't received any offer in settlement for the property that they no longer own, and I think the government has erred in this. I stated at the meeting at Oakbank that I thought that there was sort of a horse-trading going on by representatives of the government in dealing with the prices of these properties. I think, Sir, that despite the assurances that we received at that time that that was not so, that it is being done now; and I ask the Minister of Agriculture to investigate this whole matter. I think that it's unfair and undemocratic to move in and expropriate property of this nature and leave the people hanging in the air as long as the government has done, not knowing what price they are going to receive for their property.

I must apologize, Mr. Speaker, for being so long in respect of the Throne Speech, but I think in all fairness it was a long Throne Speech and contained, as I mentioned earlier, many points for debate.

Now I would like to deal just for a moment or two, Mr. Speaker, with my friends to my right. We have listened, Mr. Speaker, in this House to my honourable friends on my right condemning the government across the way, and its counterpart at Ottawa, for letting the provinces down. I agree with the fact that both this government and its counterpart at Ottawa have let us down, but I don't think that my honourable friend to the right should be too vigorous in his condemnations. At the special session of the Legislature, after knowing full well that the Government of Canada were going to withdraw from the tax rental field and go into the tax election field, he introduced a plan for hospitalization which called for no premiums to be paid because of the fact that we'll get the money from Ottawa. I wondered then whether or not that if we really did have a Liberal Government at Ottawa whether they would help us out here in the Province of Manitoba and the rest of the provinces of Canada in respect of welfare costs--welfare contributions.--Interjection--Yes, you'll soon know too. You'll soon know my dear friend because I'm going to refer to a speech that the Leader of this former great party stated in respect of provincial-federal shared programs. Mr. Pearson, speaking in Quebec City, suggests that we, the Dominion Government, should withdraw from all shared programs with the provinces. "Elect me and my government to Ottawa," says Mr. Pearson, "and we'll no longer make contributions to the hospitalization plan of Manitoba or any of the rest of the provinces as such. We'll no longer make contributions for many of the shared programs that we have at the present time; we'll no longer share these programs. . . ."

MR. STAN ROBERTS (La Verendrye): That's not true.

MR. PAULLEY: It is true and I'll send it to you. You better read it brother.

MR. ROBERTS: That's not true, he misinterpreted--reworded that speech.

MR. PAULLEY: That is what Mr. Pearson said in Quebec.

MR. ROBERTS: That is not true. He left an alternative.

MR. ROBLIN: Perhaps we could allow the honourable gentleman to make his speech and then those who feel he's wrong.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate very much the interjection of the First Minister. I don't think I require him to come to my defense. I am used to hearing rumblings and bellowings and blaring from my honourable friends to the right and it disturbs me not. It has been said, and said on many occasions, that if you have no criticisms to offer just blare out. That's what they're doing, so please, gentlemen, don't worry.

Mr. Pearson has stated of the withdrawal of the financial contributions to shared programs after they became the Government of Canada. He does say.

MR. ROBERTS: Quote from it.

MR. PAULLEY: He does say that provisions will be made. Provisions for what? He

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd.) does say, Mr. Speaker, that provisions will be made for the provinces by direct taxation to pick up the slack. We would have under this sort of a system, Mr. Speaker, ten balkanized states in the Dominion of Canada with ten different programs of welfare and hospitalization because all of the provinces and Manitoba haven't got the same ability to raise money by direct taxation as suggested by the great leader of the Liberal Party. Yes, social security. The Tribune of November 7th, 1961: "Social security back to the provinces". The Leader in Manitoba, however, in October suggested, Mr. Chairman, social security back to Ottawa. I suggest that this is just a true indication of the policies and the philosophies of the Liberal Party both at Ottawa and in the Province of Manitoba.

Let's take a look at the question of old age pensions which is a very very vital concern to the people of Canada and one which the Liberal Party does give some consideration--a great deal of consideration. Mr. Pearson announced a policy on behalf of the Liberal Party of Canada whereby there would be set up a contributory pension scheme, which is admirable. It would be portable, which is good. It would not cost the taxpayers of Canada a cent. It would come into effect one year after the Liberals became the government at Ottawa--Heaven forbid. And as the money would not be coming out of the taxpayers, where would it be coming from? This free enterprise party, who rejects compulsion and hates compulsion, would say that the revenues for the provision of old age pensions would come out of the compulsory contributions of waged and salaried workers. It wouldn't cost the taxpayers of Canada a penny. We would have to delay for one year after taking office--we would have to delay a year before we would be able to grant this \$20.00 increase that they were talking about until the compulsory contributions of wage earners and salaried earners had put enough into the fund to pay for everybody. But this was a logical scheme. It was a great scheme--taking the matter out of the field of politics. I'm not going to on behalf of the Liberal Party. Go ahead with it. On a political basis--my goodness, no. It's time we took politics out of old age pensions. We agree with that. We agree with that. That was the vision. We've heard a lot about visions before, but that was the vision of the Leader of the Liberal Party and he was so well supported by his organ here in the City of Winnipeg, the Winnipeg Free Press. The Free Press in its editorial on January 24th of this year had this to say, and I think, Sir, that I should take the tip from the Honourable Member for Lakeside and read this editorial in full. It is headed: "This Year, Next Year". "There is not likely to be any rejoicing in the streets over Mr. Diefenbaker's promise of pension increase, for the increase is indeed at this stage a promise only. The pensioners have as yet no knowledge of when they may expect the promised extra \$10.00. The Prime Minister in announcing the increase gave them no assurance that the necessary legislation would be introduced at this session. He gave them no assurance that he will not dissolve Parliament on some pretext and go to the country long before such legislation can be passed. Even vaguer is the hope that the government holds out to the recipients of old age assistance and to blind and disabled people. Their extra \$10.00 will have to wait, not only on the Prime Minister's discretion as to the best time to call an election, but as well to the consent of the provinces. While the pensioners and the people over 65 who are in need are waiting for all of these events to take place, they just might take to reflecting that \$75.00 (or more) as a Liberal plan would provide, would be more useful than \$65.00. They might also reflect that instead of costing the Canadian people an estimated \$120 million a year more, the Liberal plan would be self-supporting. What is more, it requires no constitutional amendment. Finally, they might gratefully conclude that with the Liberal plan the humiliating chess game with the pensioners' welfare, in which Mr. Diefenbaker on Tuesday made such an obvious move, would for once and all be over."

Then again, Mr. Speaker, editorially on January 30th this great supporter of the Liberal Party had this to say: "The first advantage"--and I'm not going to read the whole editorial. It was on January 30th--no, I'm not going to read it, Mr. Speaker, because my honourable friend wouldn't like to listen to the contents. On January 30th this was their editorial: "The first great advantage of the Pearson plan is that it will divorce pensions altogether from the ordinary budgets and put them permanently on their own separate solid foundation of finance. The second advantage is that it will remove pensions from the four year auction block of politics". That was the Free Press editorial, Mr. Speaker, of January 30th of this year, and on the front page of the same edition of the paper we find this headline: "Grits Boost Offer--Liberals Pledge

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd.) \$75.00 Pension At Once, so announced the Honourable Paul Martin". We're not going to wait now. We're not going to wait until we take office or wait a year after we've taken office before we look after the people that we're so concerned with. We're going to do it now--at the same time as this editorial was commending Lester B. Pearson, the leader of the Liberal Party, for taking this all out of the field of politics. Then the following day came this gem--and I say this is all typical of Liberal policy in every field--the illustrations that I have given you. Now what does this great paper say editorially the following day? On February 1st, headed: "Compromise". "When the Liberal Party a few weeks ago announced its intention of introducing a national contributory old age pension plan it proposed that the present basic pension of \$55.00 a month would be raised by \$20.00 within a year of the plan's start. The time interval was to allow for an accumulation of money in a new national contributory pension fund. The Liberal plan was widely acclaimed because it represented a constructive practical approach to financing old age security and because it offered the prospect of considerably larger actuarially sound pensions in the future. Above all, it seemed to be an honest, straight-forward way of ending, once and for all, the cynical process by which the public is quadrennially bribed with its own money". These merits have been considerably deluded, however, by the statement in Ottawa on Tuesday of the Honourable Paul Martin when speaking to the National Federation of Liberal Women. The final part of this editorial: "The general support and initial public approval of the Liberal proposal was largely based on the principle clearly stated in their printed pamphlet outlining the plan. The plan will be from the start financially self-supporting through contributions. It will not require any addition to taxes. This is not a hand-out". This was contained, Sir, in leaflets that were sent hither and yon across the Dominion. To deny in part, and so quickly, the assurance which the Liberals gave that their program would not be a hand-out from general tax revision comes as a sad delusionment. How true--my honourable friends to my right.

Now, Sir, a word or two about the remarks of my honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition in this House yesterday. He spoke well. I was particularly interested, Mr. Speaker, when he chided my group because of the deflection of Mr. Hazen Argue from our party, because of the fact that, in the words of Mr. Argue, we were not giving enough attention to the problems of agriculture. Yet, Sir.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, if I may just on a point of privilege, I don't recall saying anything of the sort. However, if my honourable friend wants to say it, that's fine. I felt sorry for him, but I didn't chide him or anything at all.

MR. PAULLEY: Oh, very polite, yes.

MR. MOLGAT: I'm not picking on anyone.

MR. PAULLEY: No, no. Well, Mr. Speaker, in an interjection from my honourable friend or somewhere close to him. If it was not him, it came from his quarter anyway with chiding about the political headlines of yesterday.

However, Sir, may I say despite the fact of the statement by Mr. Argue that the New Democratic Party was all for labour and giving no consideration or practically none to agriculture; and because we were not giving support to agriculture the New Democratic Party was letting our farmers and our workers in the agricultural industry down, we weren't concerned with their affairs--this is Mr. Argue, not my honourable friend--that was his statement. There has been newspaper suggestion that maybe Mr. Argue will deflect to the Liberal Party, but Mr. Speaker, when we listen to the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition in this agricultural Province of Manitoba speak for nearly an hour he did not use the word "agriculture" on one occasion in his whole address. I would like, Sir, to just say this to Mr. Argue, that if he is deflecting from the New Democratic Party in the interests of agriculture, and if the provincial Liberal leader in Saskatchewan follows the lead of the provincial Liberal leader in Manitoba, he's going where they don't show any concern for agriculture either. I say to my honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition, is not the state of agriculture in Manitoba one of the prime problems of Manitoba? I say to my honourable friend, can we take from his omission of the problems of agriculture in his speech yesterday, that the Liberal Party in Manitoba is not concerned with agriculture. Is he not concerned regarding agriculture when the latest reports show that the net farm income in Manitoba for 1961 was about half of that of 1960? Is he not concerned when our farmers were only able to show an increase of about \$10 million last year in cash

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd.) income, and this is a result of an increase in 21% of livestock marketed? I say, Mr. Speaker, that it is a duty of every member, and particularly the leaders of the parties in this provincial House, when speaking of the Throne Speech or compiling the Throne Speech or in replying to it, that they should have considered the problem of agriculture, which my honourable friend did not.

As I listened to the remarks of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition, I wondered whether or not he was acting as a supporter of the contents contained in the Throne Speech, for he agreed that the economy was buoyant. He agreed that the question of the European Common Market should be considered. He agreed that credit purchases should show amounts of interest. He agreed with increased funds for schools and universities. He agreed with the Law Reform Committee, and as I indicated earlier, he also agreed that the proposals as laid before the Royal Commission on Health by the Honourable the First Minister, has also gone on record as being in agreement with them. In fact he was in general agreement with most of the proposals of the government. All of this substantiates, Sir, what we in this group have often said, that basically there is no difference between the Liberals and the Conservatives, and we had to wait until this year to find out how true that is.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I had intended to lay before this House the problems, or offer solutions to the problems of Manitoba as considered at the founding convention of the New Democratic Party here in the Province of Manitoba last November. I hope I haven't bored the House with these remarks because I haven't got down to that, and will at a later date lay before this House and through this House the proposals of the New Democratic Party as agreed upon at our Founding Convention.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think that the party on my right have a grasp of the problems which we in Manitoba are being confronted with. I do not think, Sir, that the government of Manitoba is doing its job for the people of Manitoba, so therefore, Sir, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Inkster, that the amendment be amended by deleting all the words after the word "government", and substituting the following: "Has failed to provide the incentives and the economic planning necessary to stimulate the economy of the province whereby the industrial and agricultural sectors would have a high level of growth; has not shared the revenues of the province on an equitable basis with the municipalities; has failed to provide an adequate program for the social needs of our citizens, and has thereby lost the confidence of the people of Manitoba".

Mr. Speaker presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. A.J. REID (Kildonan): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Elmwood, that the debate be adjourned.

Mr. Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried.

MR. ROBLIN: Mr. Speaker, as we have come to the end of the Order Paper, I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce, that the House do now adjourn.

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

.....Continued next page.

Speech in French - February 19, 1962.

MR. MOLGAT: Monsieur l'orateur j'aimerais aussi en cette occasion exprimer mes félicitations a mon collègue, l'Honorable le Premier Ministre, pour cet effort personnel et son succès dans l'usage de la langue française, l'autre langue officielle de la Chambre. Quand nous constatons certains développements de notre pays aujourd'hui, certains mouvements que je considère très dangereux pour l'unité canadienne il est bon de voir des canadiens de langue anglaise, comme mon collègue, faire des efforts qui plaient. Je vous en félicite chaleureusement.

English translation of above:

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I would also like in this occasion to express my congratulations to my colleague the Honourable Prime Minister for this personal effort and its success in the use of the French language the other official language of the House. When we take into consideration certain developments in our country today, certain movements which I consider very dangerous for Canadian unity, it is good to see Canadians of English language like my colleague, make pleasing efforts. I congratulate you sincerely.