

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
2:30 o'clock, Tuesday, March 12, 1963

Opening Prayer by Madam Speaker.

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

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage La Prairie): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, may I address two questions to the Minister of Industry and Commerce? Is it true that the Minister's department filled the position of Civil Defence Co-Ordinator Area 2, with headquarters at Portage La Prairie, without first advertising for applicants for the position? The second question: is it true that a higher qualified man applied for the position and was passed over in favour of a person from Dauphin who did not seek or desire the move?

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce and Provincial Secretary) (Fort Rouge): Madam Speaker, I'll accept this as notice.

MR. S. PETERS (Elmwood): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I'd like to direct a question to the Attorney-General. Last year in May the government set up an Industrial Enquiry Commission at Brandon and there were certain recommendations made. I wonder if the Attorney-General can tell us if and when any action will be taken on the recommendations made by Judge Lindal.

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q. C. (Attorney-General and Minister of Public Utilities) (Fort Garry): Madam Speaker, I wish to thank the honourable member for giving me notice of this question through his Leader. The answer very briefly is that I cannot tell him as to when any criminal proceedings with respect to Canadian Brown and Steel Tank will be in court. A special crown prosecutor has been appointed and he is in the course now of completing his investigation with respect to the recommendations in that Industrial Enquiry Commission.

MR. PETERS: Can the Minister tell us who the special prosecutor is?

MR. LYON: Mr. Kenneth Houston of Winnipeg, a barrister of Winnipeg.

MADAM SPEAKER: Before the Orders of the Day, I would like to attract your attention to the gallery on my left where there are seated nine pupils from an upgrading school from Indian Affairs Branch, Indian children from various northern reserves. They are with their teacher, Mr. R. J. Shaw. This school is situated in the constituency of the Honourable Minister of Education. We welcome you to the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba. We sincerely hope you will enjoy and benefit from your observations, the observations you will make here this afternoon. It is our wish that you will come back and visit us again.

Address for Papers. The Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. LYON: Madam Speaker, before you pass on into the Orders of the Day I wonder if I might have leave from the House to make a very brief statement with respect to the Liquor Control Commission?

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed.

MR. LYON: Madam Speaker, I'd merely like to advise the members of the House that the Public Utilities Board tomorrow will be giving notice that a public hearing will be held on March 22nd concerning prices to be paid for beer by the Liquor Control Commission in the brewers in Manitoba. Pursuant to the Liquor Control Act the Commission recently submitted for the Board's approval prices that would achieve reductions of 2 1/4 cents per dozen on bottled beer and 18 cents per half keg in prices paid to the brewers for beer. These changes will reduce the cost of beer to the Commission, based on 1962 volume, by approximately \$300,000. I am also advised by the Commission that the brewers have indicated acceptance of the prices suggested.

HON. O. BAIZLEY (Minister of Labour)(Osborne): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to lay on the table the annual report of the Department of Labour for the calendar year ending December 31, 1962, and to inform the members of the House that a copy of this report will be made available to each member.

MADAM SPEAKER: Address for Papers. The Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. LYON: agreement with the Honourable Member for St. George, I'd like to have this matter stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: The matter stands. Orders for Returns. The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. MORRIS A. GRAY (Inkster): Madam Speaker, I beg leave to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from St. John's, that an Order of the House do issue for a return showing the amounts and costs of (a) butter; and (b) margarine purchased by each institution of the Manitoba Government in the fiscal year of 1961-62.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

MR. E. R. SCHREYER (Brokenhead): Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks, that an Order of the House do issue for a return showing a copy of the transcript of testimony as given in the Arbitration Hearing -- Mike Faryna vs. The Rural Municipality of St. Andrews -- held before the responsible minister on Friday, November 4th, 1955, 10:00 A.M. in Room 232 Legislative Buildings, and that this copy of testimony specifically include the testimony of one Mr. Grant Pearson employed at that time as an engineer with the provincial Department of Public Works.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

HON. GEORGE HUTTON (Minister of Agriculture)(Rockwood-Iberville): Madam Speaker, I am informed that there are current proceedings pending between the principals stated in this Order for a Return, and under the circumstances I am advised that it would not be proper for me to table the evidence that has been requested in this Order and on those grounds, I would decline to table the information asked.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party)(Radisson): Madam Speaker, if you don't mind I would like to say a word in connection with the statement of the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture. I cannot agree with his contention that because of the fact that this matter may or may not be under litigation and before the courts at the present time, that he is unable or cannot produce the documents as requested by my colleague, the Honourable Member for Brokenhead, because, as I understand this particular matter, the transcript of testimony requested by my honourable colleague was given at a public hearing, and as a result of that was public information, and I would suggest, Madam Speaker, that it being public information and given in testimony at that time publicly, then it is not a document of any secret nature, that it does not constitute evidence that cannot be produced by way of an Order of Return, and I would respectfully suggest to the Minister of Agriculture that if what I'm saying is correct -- and I believe it can be verified by my colleague from Brokenhead -- that this is now public, or was public information, and the testimony itself is not a matter that is before the court, and therefore should be made available to the Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

MR. HUTTON: Madam Speaker, I think we can end the debate here because there is no transcript of evidence.

MR. SCHREYER: Madam Speaker, there is a copy of evidence that was given at that particular hearing. It has been seen by one of the litigants, the litigant mentioned here in this Order for Return, and therefore it exists. Now the problem is that one specific part of that testimony has not been made available to Mr. Faryna whose name is mentioned here. That's one point. The second is that it is essential to his -- in the matter of justice here it is essential that Mr. Faryna be provided with this information. This is not inter-departmental correspondence. This is correspondence, or rather material of a public nature, and quite frankly I don't understand what possible grounds the Minister could have for refusing it.

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier and Provincial Treasurer)(Wolseley): Madam Speaker, I'm really not allowed to speak at this moment because we speak once on these matters, and it may be that my honourable friend has closed the debate, I don't know. If so, he probably shouldn't have spoken twice, but I just want to suggest that we allow this matter to stand because there is quite a difference of opinion as regards to matters of fact here, and I would like to get that quite clear before we dealt with this matter, and also there is the very delicate question as to whether we should be dealing with matters, no matter how public they may be, when the subject under discussion is before the courts. Our general rule is that we do not. There may be some rule in this case, but I would like to have the matter stand so that we can have a

(Mr. Roblin, Cont'd.) . . . very good look at it and see if we can't come to a mutual understanding on it.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I wonder if I may have the indulgence of the House to ask the Minister of Agriculture one question pertaining to this? I would like to ask the Honourable Minister of Agriculture why he first of all said that the material requested by my colleague from Brokenhead could not be given to him because the matter was before the courts, and then in a subsequent statement said that there isn't any evidence.

MR. HUTTON: Madam Speaker, both statements were true according to the information that was given to me. In the first place I was told it was not the proper thing to do. In the second place, I was told that the transcript of evidence requested did not exist.

MADAM SPEAKER: Stand. The Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, that an Order of the House do issue for a return showing the total cost for the report of the committee on Manitoba's Economic Future. What did this report cost the Province of Manitoba? What is the total amount of money received from private concerns and individuals toward the cost of this survey?

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. EVANS: Madam Speaker, I would like to provide my honourable friend with the information he is seeking and would ask his consideration of some variation in the wording which would enable me to do so. In the first place, the costs of this study were met from two sources, one as referred to in here, money, and the other the services of individuals and corporations provided without charge or in lieu of money, and consequently if he would -- and furthermore, that the description of private concerns and individuals doesn't quite cover all of the people who did contribute, which included other organizations such as labour unions and other organizations of various kinds, and so if the Order could be varied to read that an Order of the House do issue for a return showing the total cost for the report of the committee on Manitoba's Economic Future, what did this report cost the Province of Manitoba, and what is the total cost met by private concerns, individuals and other agencies, I would be glad to accept the Order.

MR. GUTTORMSON: I am prepared to go along with the Minister's suggestion.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Inkster. The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. J. COWAN, Q. C. (Winnipeg Centre): Madam Speaker, in the absence of the Honourable Member for Pembina, I would ask that this motion be allowed to stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed.

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

MR. GRAY: Madam Speaker, I beg leave to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Seven Oaks, the resolution standing in my name.

MADAM SPEAKER: Moved by the Honourable Member for Inkster, seconded by the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks, whereas the deaf and blind children of this province must, at present, attend special schools outside of Manitoba; and whereas experience has demonstrated the value derived by handicapped children when they are afforded the opportunity of special education closer to home and loved ones; therefore be it resolved that, in the opinion of this House, the government should give consideration to the advisability of expanding the educational facilities for the deaf, crippled and retarded children of this province by re-opening a school, in Winnipeg, to provide specialized education for these children.

MR. GRAY: Madam Speaker, my introduction of this resolution will be very brief, for two reasons. First of all I'll probably concentrate my time if, God forbid, the resolution will not carry -- will carry that is, and I have no other premonition -- and secondly, as I have already informed before, I did not get the additional information required, but I shall go ahead today. Firstly, I do not want to have it stand any longer, and secondly, this is the last day of the Throne Speech and we shall perhaps have to spend some time on this speech before ten o'clock tonight.

First, let me tell you briefly the history of the School for the Deaf and the Blind in Winnipeg. We had a wonderful school built by the administration of that time, realizing the very great importance of having a school for the unfortunate children who are handicapped, and a

(Mr. Gray, Cont'd.) . . . strong effort they tried to make to rehabilitate them, and see whether they could still with their handicaps do something for them in the coming days in their future life. That school was built at -- the building is at the present school for the teachers. It is a beautiful building, built in a very fine location, and I wish to congratulate the powers that be at that time for their interest in the unfortunate children, unfortunate in themselves and very tragic to their parents. At the outbreak of the war when the army needed accommodation, this school was taken over by them, and after the war it was given to the school for the teachers, which is also very important -- I don't deny it -- and now they are occupying it and doing well, and it perhaps would be very unbusinesslike, so to speak, to have them move and move those handicapped children back to this building which was their own originally. And who knows, perhaps if this building had not been taken away, chances are the curriculum and the program for the unfortunate children would have been better than they are today.

In proposing this resolution I do so on behalf of those who have eyes but cannot see, those who have ears and cannot hear, and those who cannot speak and let us know their needs. I am eliminating the figures and the number of children in the deaf school in the province and outside the province because I haven't got the up-to-date figures, but perhaps if the Honourable Minister in charge may do me the honour of replying yes or no, he may give you the figures later on. If not, I promise to submit them to this House in my closing debate. I believe there are about 60 left in Saskatoon and several outside of those two provinces. I am sure of one thing, from personal experience, as limited as they are, as a father, and from speaking to some parents, I know that physically handicapped children acquire a serious inferiority complex as they cannot enjoy everything in life as other children do, and the only thing that helps them, psychologically if nothing else, is to have their parents and their dear ones see them as often as possible. They need their love and their comfort. To be away from home and away from their parents and being unable to visit them as often as they do outside the province, is something which delays, in my humble opinion, their improvement. It is true that I am not a psychologist, but I must go on the advice of other trained men in the field of better ways to teach handicapped children and particularly those who are deaf. I have here, which I am not going to read today, a number of articles, a number of experiences of great men in Canada and America who have made a lifelong study of this particular situation. I am not claiming that the Saskatoon school is not the best in Canada. My claim is only one -- an inferiority complex child must have his parents close to him to comfort him, to love him, which no other service man or woman can do, in spite of their training in this particular field. They have many; they have a curriculum; they have a program and they just follow it; and as kind as they are and as interested as they are, they are not mothers to these children. I saw a child out in Saskatoon -- and I understand there are many outside of Saskatoon -- there are some in Ontario and I understand there are some also in the United States -- but this alone does not solve a problem of the heart and of the soul and you, Madam Speaker, as a mother realize that no one can take the place of a mother. It's true we need institutions. Those children cannot get this training in the home, the practical training and the official training of experts, but a child should have a chance, an opportunity for the mother or the father or a sister or a brother to see them, embrace them, talk to them, whether they can hear or not, but pay them individual attention if we want those children at some time to rehabilitate themselves and even that would make their life a little bit easier and more comfortable.

As I stated before, I shall not take your time in reading, which I have here, opinions not of ordinary, perhaps uneducated men in this field like myself, but I do know that there is something else in the ordinary day by day training and teaching, and the teachers themselves, as good as they are, cannot give an individual love and attention and training to the children who are now in the institutions. I cannot for the life of me understand why you had a school here, closed up -- you have another one for a number of children. Why not have one complete school? And I believe the center is in Winnipeg. There may be one in Brandon, if it's too far for the mothers to come to Winnipeg in those rural districts. True, you couldn't have it in every village. Here in Winnipeg, because we are paying Saskatoon anyway -- perhaps more, costs us more than if we would have one in Winnipeg, and in my humble opinion, and I apologize for using the term "stubbornness" or perhaps comes from the other side of the bench. At the Canadian Conference on Children attended by 300 experts on child development

(Mr. Gray, Cont'd.) . . . in Quebec some time ago, it was decided that the love of parents -- they feel it is worth more than all the books on psychology, as love can make up for a lot of errors. So I appeal to you, Madam Speaker, to see that serious consideration, and not side track it -- serious consideration be given, if not now next year, although I have already requested this very same resolution for many years and I shall continue doing so until such time as the powers that be will realize, not from the expert point of view, but sometimes when we deal with social welfare cases, when we deal with tragedies and hardships and tears and broken hearts, we should sometimes forget the legal little . . . so to speak -- I have no other word for it just now -- in order to find that this . . . is in the interest of the ministers -- not in the interests, I'm sorry -- in the opinion of the ministers and in the opinion of the government to act, and let me tell you something else. Sometimes people have been asking, "Where is the money coming from?" In this particular case no money is required. All that is required is fatherly and motherly consideration -- the feeling, the tragedies when a child is away for six months, a year, and they stay home and cry day after day, "What is my little child in Saskatoon, or United States, or in Canada, doing?" From a practical point of view they may have some justification, but from the point of view of human interest -- and I do not say that the minister has no human interest -- but in interest which it was given to me and which I feel myself, and without bringing was evidence which I have here, I respectfully ask that this matter be given serious consideration.

MR. W. G. MARTIN (St. Matthews): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Springfield that the debate be adjourned.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate standing in the name of the Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party. The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. K. ALEXANDER (Roblin): Madam Speaker, I would ask that this be allowed to stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: Stand. Proposed resolution, the Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. D. L. CAMPBELL (Lakeside): I ask for this to stand, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed? The proposed resolution, the Honourable Member for Portage La Prairie.

MR. JOHNSTON: Madam Speaker, I would ask that this be allowed to stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed? The proposed resolution in the name of the Honourable Member for Portage La Prairie.

MR. JOHNSTON: Madam Speaker, I would ask that this be allowed to stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed? The proposed resolution, the Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker, I would make the same request.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed? The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Selkirk, the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. PAULLEY: It seems to me, Madam Speaker, as though we are getting along very nicely standing everything; maybe we could stand this one also.

MADAM SPEAKER: Agreed? Second reading of Bill No. 17, the Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. S. PATRICK (Assiniboia) presented Bill No. 17, an Act to incorporate Bel Acres Golf and Country Club, for second reading.

MADAM SPEAKER: Second reading of Bill No. 22. The Honourable the Minister of Health.

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Health)(Gimli) presented Bill No. 22, an Act to amend The Vital Statistics Act, for second reading.

MR. JOHNSON: Madam Speaker, this change in The Vital Statistics Act is a technical matter concerning the change of name under the Change of Name Act, and clarifies that before the Change of Name Act was brought in, at certain times a change of name was carried out through a deed poll, or declaration -- what they called deed poll mechanism. Now they want to regularize the registration of this and give guidance to the Department of Vital Statistics in bringing all this under -- giving firm direction -- changing this under the present legal Change of Name Act, and I think it can be better explained in Law Amendments when the head of the

(Mr. Johnson, Cont'd.) . . . department and myself can be there to give some of the reasons for the change. It's really something that has been carried out as a matter of procedure by the Director of Vital Statistics, but he is looking for firm direction from the Legislature in this regard. It's called a change of name under the Deed Poll Act that is in conflict with the present legislation. I think that's really all -- the only principle involved in the bill before us.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain. The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q. C. (Selkirk): Madam Speaker, I congratulate you on being the first woman elected to the Legislative Assembly of the Province of Manitoba, and to assure you of my respect and of my obedience, which I consider to be incidental to your high office and so necessary for the preservation of our democratic parliament. To the new members I extend my sincere congratulations on their election, expressing the hope and wish that their efforts here will be objective, constructive and solely directed towards the good and welfare of our province. To the mover and seconder of the Address in Reply, I join with those who have already expressed their congratulations. I publicly confirm the private congratulations which I have already offered to our two new ministers. As to the Minister of Labour, after listening to the Member from La Verendrye expressing his thanks to him in respect of the relationship which previously existed between them, I hope that the Minister's professional manipulation of the human anatomy will stand him in good stead in the human relations he will be called upon to adjust and manipulate within the Department of Labour. I am sure that the Honourable Member from Russell will make an excellent Minister of Municipal Affairs. I wish him every success in his office and I believe that his office will from time to time assume greater importance in the political life of this province. Municipal affairs is a field in which there is much to be done; a field which lies very close to the common man, and wherein there lies many unsolved problems affecting the lives of every individual in this province. I have every faith and I have every confidence that the new Minister of Municipal Affairs has the necessary ability, the necessary will, and the necessary desire to make our municipal machinery in Manitoba more perfect and more smoothly running.

Today the most pressing problem facing Manitobans is taxation at the local field. In 1960 this problem was recognized by two municipal associations, the Union of Manitoba Municipalities and the Manitoba Urban Association, as a result of which a joint committee -- a commission of these two important bodies -- was set up under the name of the Municipal Enquiry Commission, chaired by the Dean of municipal affairs in this province, Dr. R. M. Fisher. The provincial government made a grant, I believe, of \$2,000 towards the work of this association, and the two municipal associations in Manitoba, outside of the Greater Winnipeg area, made two grants of \$10,000 each. Unfortunately, this commission did not have the necessary expert and specialized help for such an undertaking, but nevertheless what it lacked in money was made up one hundredfold in the ability, knowledge, energy and devotion to the task at hand of the best available municipal men in this province, to all of whom we owe a great deal of gratitude. This commission made some 32 recommendations, all of which were considered at a joint meeting of the executives of the two sponsoring associations on February 27th and 28th last, and these recommendations will be submitted to a joint convention of the two associations to be held in Winnipeg on April 2nd and 3rd next. I have been fortunate, Madam, in obtaining a copy of this report, and feel that some reference thereto will be relevant to my remarks this afternoon. The first reference to which I would like to make is to recommendation 9 (1) and (2) to be found on page 30 of that report. Nine (1) reads: "The province should now assume complete responsibility, financial and administrative, for secondary education and eventually for all education." Nine (2) reads: "The Commission believes it is impractical to suggest at this time that the province assume the complete cost of education. Until the province assumes the complete cost of education, the contribution of the municipalities to education should be by way of a fixed uniform annual mill rate against their balanced assessment, and reviewed at least every five years. The proceeds of this municipal levy should be paid over to the province. The province should provide the additional monies required to meet provincial standards. The province should decide on the method of administering secondary education. The definition of balanced assessment could be improved if business assessment was equalized with real and personal property assessment."

(Mr. Hillhouse, Cont'd.)

On page 32 of this report the following comment was made: "The Commission realizes it is impracticable to suggest that the province forthwith assume full responsibility for education. The evolution of responsibility for education will have to be by stages, and at the present time the municipalities will have to make a contribution to this service. The Commission is more interested in having the municipal financial liability for education fixed by a uniform mill rate levy, subject to review at least every five years, than in requesting additional grants for education." This comment goes on to say, "In Manitoba the amount contributed in 1961 by all municipalities to school purposes amounted to \$39.53 percent of the total municipal budgets. According to the Canadian Tax Foundation, the expenditure in 1960 for school purposes by the municipal and school authorities of Manitoba was 51.1 percent of the total expenditure for that purpose. According to the same authority, there seems to be no doubt among informed observers that school costs will continue to rise. On the present basis of sharing school costs in Manitoba there will be, as a result, a continuing rise in the municipal share of these costs. While the Commission believes that eventually the province should assume the full cost of education, it realizes it is impractical to suggest that this be done forthwith, and it should be considered in conjunction with the other recommendations of the Commission. The Commission therefore suggests that, pending the result of the proposed enquiry by the government into provincial-municipal relations, the municipal cost of education be frozen immediately at the 1962 level. This could be done by revising the formula for grants to education in such a manner that, without affecting other existing grants to municipalities, the total increased costs of education be assumed by the province and no share of these increased costs be permitted to fall upon the municipality."

On page 33 there is a further comment. It reads: "People interested in the financial position of the municipality mainly look at the taxable assessment, the source of municipal revenues. In considering municipal taxation it might be well to point out that if we take the average over a five-year period during the depression, 1933 to 1937, of the total municipal and school levies in the whole of Manitoba, and compare this with the average of a five-year period 1957 to 1961, and reduce the latter average to a common level of dollar value with the depression average, we find that over this twenty-five year period total municipal and school levies in the whole province increased by some 67.66 percent, while the total school levies increased by some 124.95 percent. An analysis of these figures shows that the increase of purely municipal levies is only 26 percent. A comparison of the average total equalized assessment values, again reduced to a common level of dollar value, shows that the increase in assessment values is only some 5.2 percent. The financial difficulties of the municipality and the increasing burden of land taxation undoubtedly arises from the increasing municipal costs of education. If this cost could be reasonably stabilized, municipalities could, by fully utilizing their present sources of revenue, look forward to the future with confidence.

Madam, in view of these recommendations, I would in all seriousness suggest at this session of the Legislature that the government enact the necessary legislation, freezing the municipal costs of education at the 1962 level, and to retain this freeze until such time as we receive the report and recommendations of the Michener Commission.

On the question of municipal taxation I have within my own constituency a very special problem, one which has given rise to a great deal of recriminations, charges and counter-charges, and one which has created distrust and ill-will among friends and neighbours. This problem has arisen through a provincial-municipal assessment made in the rural municipality of St. Andrews in 1962. I know that certain members of this government have some knowledge of the problem and of the dissatisfaction resulting therefrom, and although I make no charge of incompetence, or of anything improper on the part of any of the provincial-municipal assessment officials, I must admit, Madam Speaker, that my views are not held by my constituents.

Before dealing with specifics, I make it quite clear that the complaints arising from this assessment are almost wholly confined to an area of the Municipality of St. Andrews bounded on the south by the southern boundary of the municipality, on the east by the Red River, on the west by the CPR right-of-way, and on the north by the southern boundary of the Town of Selkirk. I believe that these people have a just complaint and I feel that it is my duty to speak on their behalf. In so speaking, I want to make it abundantly clear that very little dissatisfaction

(Mr. Hillhouse, Cont'd.) . . . has been voiced by the residents of the municipality living west of the CPR right-of-way, excepting the usual beefs that you hear about taxes nobody likes to pay. To better understand the basis of complaint, I believe that in the land assessment the following procedure was followed. First, a basic acreage or lot value was established. Secondly, on lands fronting on PTH No. 4 and PTH 9A an additional value of \$2.00 per frontage foot was added to the valuation. On lands with river frontage an additional of -- I think it ranged as high as \$3.00 a foot -- was added to land value. On lands with highways flanking, whether the municipal highways, secondary highways or any kind of a highway, there was an additional valuation ranging from \$1.00 to \$1.50 per foot added to the assessment. In addition to that, building assessments are higher, on the average, in this area than they are in the metropolitan area of Winnipeg, and I have, Madam, compared assessments in the metropolitan area with the assessments in that area, and some of the residents of that area have done likewise, and Madam, I wish to submit that these assessments there are much higher on the average than they are in the metropolitan area of Winnipeg.

I think I can best, perhaps, illustrate the highness of these assessments and the resulting increase in taxes by referring to tax statements which I have obtained from certain residents of that area. I have one tax statement here. It starts with the year 1958. Now this property is on the Red River just south of the Town of Selkirk. The building is fairly new. In 1958 it was assessed at, land \$160.00, building \$2,920.00, or a total assessment of \$3,080.00. In 1962 with the provincial-municipal assessment it was assessed at \$6,710, and I might say, Madam, that in 1958 the school levy there was \$128.74; in 1962 the school levy was \$216.06. I have another property here which is just south of the southern boundary of the Town of Selkirk. This property in 1960 had a total assessment of \$3,120.00. In 1962, it has a total assessment of \$10,480.00. The taxes have risen on that property during the period 1960 to 1962 from \$236.98 to \$549.88. I have another property at a place called Old England just south of the Town of Selkirk. The assessment of that property, including lands and buildings, in 1961 was \$990.00. Today the assessment is \$4,200.00. The land has increased to \$1,420 and the buildings have increased to \$2,780, and the tax position has changed from \$94.25 to \$226.80. I have another property here which is in the same area, known as the Old England area, and this is a lulu. In 1959 the total assessment was \$3,550.00. The total taxes were \$319.30. In 1962 assessment has jumped from \$3,550 to \$9,060.00. The taxes have increased between 1959 from \$320.91 to \$489.24.

I have another property in the same area; the assessment in 1957 was \$1,500.00. The taxes in 1957 were \$116.25. The 1962 assessment has gone from \$1,500 to \$6,550, and the taxes have increased from \$116.25 to \$347.15. Here's another property in the same area. 1959 the total assessment was \$1,590.00. Total taxes were \$142.14; 1962 the assessment increased to \$4,580 and the taxes increased to \$242.74. There's a piece of property down around St. Andrew's; the house is over 50 years of age; it had an original assessment back in 1958 of \$1,030 and taxes of \$75.60. Today it has an assessment of \$2,600 with taxes of \$129.48. That house is not modern -- it only has a dug-out. The largest area of that house is the land.

Now here's a man who has some 34 acres of land just north of Lockport. Unfortunately, he cannot make sufficient off the land on which to live, and he consequently has to go out and do extra work. His chief source of livelihood is not from the land so therefore his buildings are assessed, but his assessment has risen from 1957 of \$2,500 to \$10,490 in 1962.

Now, I might point out that in that area in land valuations they have followed a system of adding \$2.00 a foot frontage on to land valuation. If there's a highway flanking, they have added \$1.00 to \$1.50 on to the valuation. If you have river frontage, in some areas you're charged \$1.00 or \$1.50. Now here is a man here -- to give you an idea -- and this man is a farmer. He's a dairy farmer. He has 504 acres of land. Now his assessment from 1957 to 1961 remained constant. It's true that there were increases in taxes during those years, but the increases were not of any great amount. In 1961 his total assessment was \$13,160.00. His total taxes were \$1,239.10. In 1962 this man's total assessment rose to \$30,390 and his total taxes rose to \$1,810.67. Now that man's a dairy farmer.

There's a man right behind him -- let me say in connection with this particular assessment that this man has over 6,000 feet frontage on PTH No. 9. He is charged \$2.00 a foot on that frontage and that is added to his valuation. He has some 23 acres between the CPR track

(Mr. Hillhouse, Cont'd.) . . . and the main highway, which he uses as a pasture and which he uses for his barns and buildings. Now on that 6,000 feet approximately, with \$2.00 a foot added to the valuation, it adds \$12,000 to that man's valuation for taxation purposes. He also has land -- the south side of his farm is on what is known as the "Little Britain Road." There's 600 feet of that road on the south side of his farm for which his valuation is increased by \$1.50 a foot, adding another \$900.00 to his valuation for taxation purposes. On the north side of his farm is the Fort Garry Road, and it extends about 300 feet on the north bound of his property. He is taxed -- his land value has increased by \$1.50 a foot, so there's \$450.00 there. Now right behind him is a farm which I consider to be as good, if not better, than this individual's farm. There's greater acreage, and the total taxes on his farm are \$1,296.85, but even that \$1,296.85 is an increase of almost 45 or 50 percent over the previous assessment.

Now here's a farm which is on the main highway as well -- no, which is back a piece -- and this man's taxes -- back west of the CPR tracks -- this man's taxes between 1959 and 1962 have been reduced from \$396.80 to \$336.42.

Now the point that I want to make, Madam Speaker, is this: I consider that farmlands should not be assessed at their potential value for other purposes. I submit that farmlands should be assessed at their productive value, and that man who is paying \$1,810 a year in taxes -- that represents approximately \$5.00 a day which he is paying towards taxes, and yet his livelihood is obtained from milking cows. Now I would like to ask the Minister of Municipal Affairs or the Minister of Agriculture whether you get more milk from a cow which is pastured on a four lane highway than you do on a mud road, because the only equitable way to assess farms in Manitoba or any other agricultural place is on the basis of the productive value, and I submit that that individual should not be penalized simply on account of the fact that the mountain came to Mohammed -- he didn't go to the mountain. That area has built up since then, but that man has farmed there for years and he intends to farm there, and if we are going to keep our farmers on the land, surely to goodness just because progress advances towards this man's farm, we shouldn't expropriate his land by increasing the taxes to the point where it's impossible for him to remain there.

Now I have another case here, Madam, where -- I think I've mentioned that. Now in 1959 this government said that they were going to lighten the tax load of the people of Manitoba. I would like to know if this provincial assessment in the Municipality of St. Andrews is an example of how they're going to lighten the tax load. I think these people are willing to pay their proper share of taxes. They're willing to pay for education; they're willing to pay for all services, but I don't think that they should be burdened with what I consider to be an inequitable portion or share of these costs. I suggest, Madam Speaker, that a reassessment of this whole area should be made, having in mind the use made of the various lands and having in mind that taxes, as far as the farmer is concerned, are part of his overhead, and if you're going to start a farmer off with a taxload of \$1,810 a year before he makes a cent, to me it's not a very good way to keep people on the land.

Now I notice there's a great deal of discontent in my area over this assessment. I know that numerous individuals have appealed against it; they've gone to the council sitting as a court of revision; they've gone from the council as a court of revision to the Municipal Board, but at no place have they received any relief, and the simple reason is that the taxation is equitable in the sense that it bears a fair relationship to other taxation in that particular area, and that is the only yardstick which is used by the Municipal Board when they consider a tax appeal. They only consider the fact as to whether or no your taxation is equitable in relation to your neighbour's, but I submit that on the basis of the whole assessment in that area that it's not equitable, because it's going to drive these people off the land. It's perfectly true that that is desirable property down there -- it's some 20 miles from Winnipeg -- but at the same time the increase in taxes that have been imposed upon these people as a result of this 1962 assessment is causing these people to consider whether it's worth it to stay there and pay these taxes, and as a result there's quite a few properties now being advertised for sale. I know of several that have been trying to get out from under, but so far they have been unable to realize sufficient so that they could break even on their original investment. Now these people down there are quite angry about this whole thing. They've had various ministers of the government down there; certain promises have been made to them. They've even got a petition signed by 98 percent of

(Mr. Hillhouse, Cont'd.) the people in that area asking to be taken out of the Municipality of St. Andrews and a new municipal corporation set up. Now, Madam, I don't intend to support any petition of that nature for the simple reason that I don't consider that the solution to their problem lies in pulling away from anybody. I think the solution to their problem lies in a more realistic tax approach by this government in respect of suburban lands. I would suggest, Madam Speaker, that this government make a complete reassessment of that area in St. Andrews Municipality lying east of the CPR tracks, and that they try and come up with an assessment which is less confiscating than the present one.

MR. GRAY: Madam Chairman. -- (Interjection) -- Have I done anything wrong? Tell me.

MR. ROBLIN: There's just a little competition between my honourable friend and I as to who is to catch the Speaker's eye, but I defer to experience.

MR. GRAY: I have rheumatism, it me up. I can assure the First Minister that my speeches were always short, if not interesting. I have listened with great interest to the address made now by my learned friend the Honourable Member from Selkirk, and not knowing whether the First Minister wishes to speak or not, I was reluctant to speak for awhile because he has discussed this subject which is very important, and the reason I know it's important is first from personal experience; from the digs I get from my constituents about the taxes, and particularly from the reason that the Press was continuously busy when my honourable friend from Selkirk made the address.

Madam Speaker, first of all, I do most sincerely congratulate you on the honour that the present administration has bestowed upon you in appointing you Speaker of this House. Firstly, on your own ability to carry out such a responsible position; and secondly with the acknowledgement of the progressive trend that a woman can also carry out great responsibilities. I followed, all my life, the Suffragist Movement in many countries and particularly in England, and I have always been sympathetic towards their struggle for equality knowing how little freedom their sex in the European countries which I have visited and lived have. History has recorded many heroines and leaders among the so-called "weaker sex". Who knows, perhaps if many more privileges and rights were accorded to our women we would have a better world to live in. Personally, I feel that we have suffered in our own family life, and in public life in general over the centuries through discrimination by those who have felt that a woman's place was in the kitchen only. And, Madam Speaker, I shall as long as I am in this House obey orders and co-operate with you. I wish you much success.

I also wish to congratulate the mover and the seconder; they made brief and very interesting speeches. We, the city people who have no opportunity to travel all over the province, as we should do, are very anxious and very pleased to get a report from their own village, from their own constituencies telling us about the lakes and the homes and the social life, and the buildings they are putting up. I never miss listening to the mover or the seconder because it is enlightening to many who do not life of the rural district; and being just new in this House, I think that they have done very well and I enjoyed them very much, and I hope that we will hear from them again in due course.

As to the government, actually they were elected, and we congratulate them, but I would make one appeal -- congratulate them on their election; but we have one appeal to the House. The elections are over and why fight them again in this House when we have so many important matters to deal with. I don't think anyone wants to see them now after spending so much money on an election. When I entered this House I believe that the budget at that time was about 20 million dollars -- I wish to be corrected if I am wrong. Now, I understand it may go up to \$135 million. I have no quarrel with this -- progress has been made in the interests of the population of this Province in Welfare, Health and better conditions in general. I shall mention a few; but definitely in my humble opinion, not enough.

The rural electrification which stopped the exodus of the farmers to the city -- particularly during the depression years. It came too late -- but better late than never. It has enabled the farmers, in the most essential industry of the Province -- the bread basket of the world -- to produce commodities not only for the people of this Province but for the hungry people the world over -- something that our Party has advanced for the last thirty years, in municipal ownership of the main industry known as electrification. And that was a great historic venture.

(Mr. Gray Cont'd.)

The great improvement in health and social services are providing better facilities such as medical hospitalization and social aid. We are still striving for improvement. Improved education and scientific research, which has created a better and more useful economic society. There is no doubt there is a great deal more to be done, by way of reducing the net debt that would not have to be mortgaged -- we would not have, not be mortgaged and chained to the money lenders. For example: the net public debt -- as the information I have -- in British Columbia is Nil; Alberta, 22 million; Manitoba, 156 million and Saskatchewan, 56 million. Again I state if I am wrong, I stand corrected. The financial position of the municipalities in Manitoba is growing steadily worse. In no small measure, this is true -- I believe -- to the high cost of education. Sixty percent of the money collected from taxes on property in Winnipeg goes to pay for education -- nothing wrong about that -- . . . still not sufficient. Thousands of these home owners cannot afford the taxes imposed on them. The Province of Manitoba pays only 20 percent of the cost of education in Winnipeg, yet it gets the greater part of its revenue from the citizens of this city. This whole system of municipal taxation is unjust and out-of-date. It places far too big a burden on those in the low income bracket. I believe that efforts should be made to get the Federal Government to assume some if not all of the responsibility -- particularly the education of retarded children.

Now, may I say a word about the plight of the Indian population in this Province which has created so much prominence recently, although something should have been done years and years ago. Recently, as I said there was a lot of discussion in the Press as to the suffering, starvation, lack of employment and security for these people. I believe that this is due in a large measure to the fact of their isolation. The idea of reservations reminds me of the concentration camps in Canada during the last war, and of the ghettos in the European countries -- keeping human beings in an enclosure. I believe they should have more freedom, more independence, more education, better housing and a higher standard of living, and let them choose whether they wish to remain on the reserves or mingle with the so-called better class of people in the urban centers. They are supposed to be the first natives of Canada. It is claimed that they are not too well educated -- let's have schools for them. It is claimed that they cannot control liquor -- but who can if they drink too much. In my opinion, one solution to the problem of the Indians and Metis is to bring them into our midst, give them all the privileges which the rest of us enjoy -- work, education, training and friendship. Television viewers were given a most graphic picture and a greater understanding of this problem on two recent Eye-to-Eye programs following an extensive investigation which was made into conditions of need amongst our Indian population of northern Manitoba. It was suggested that they could still remain on the reservation if they wished, and amongst their own people if they were employed in tree-clearing, and making roads which would give them access to the nearby towns; and that lumber mills could be built for the processing of woods into much-needed building materials. This program would have a double purpose by giving them employment, make them self-sustaining, in their own communities, and would further develop our northern province.

Now I may say a word about the political football of the so-called Metro. I supported the creation of Metro. I still think they are doing a good job. Moreover, I believe that one organization could do a better job than 19 individual municipalities, in general. Now, I admit it is a very unpopular agency, mainly because property taxes are being increased and naturally somebody has to be the scapegoat. But some people do not realize that they're always demanding increased services. They want the best of education for their children, which I don't blame them, and they are perfectly right in demanding it. At the same time, they demand increased services in all other phases of daily life; but they must also realize that somebody has to pay for these services. The only solution is that some system should be worked out whereby the additional burden of education be taken over by the Federal Government and the taxpayer could then assume responsibility for the other local expenditures. Blaming Metro for all the sins of the world is, in my opinion, not justified. Let's wait a little longer. There is always time to destroy, but it takes a long time to build.

And finally may I say a word about Education. I realize, Madam Speaker, that this would be better discussed under the Estimates and perhaps discussed by those who are academically -- have full knowledge of discussing education, but I do not intend to say anything about

(Mr. Gray, Cont'd.) the academic end of education right now -- I only want to stress the importance of good school buildings, qualified teachers and medical aid -- as much as possible -- in the schools for the welfare of the children whose parents are financially in the low income bracket and where the mother of the family is compelled to go to work and to be absent from home.

A child is left with his teacher from nine in the morning until four o'clock in the afternoon. It is the teacher's responsibility to mold the child's mind in the proper direction and try to make that child an asset to the community instead of a liability, thus saving the taxpayer's money in the future and avoiding tragedy. For this we need smaller classes, trained teachers, teachers with a heart and soul -- I don't say they are not -- but take a personal interest in each child, almost, if possible, to take the place of the mother who is unfortunately and not of her own good will -- some of them, but not all have to go to work, and under the present high cost of living, many, many mothers are almost compelled, in order to maintain a home, to help out her husband. Naturally, the teacher should be able to make a comfortable living, free from worry of their salaries and not enough for their livelihood. The teacher is often the mother who raises the child in important ways and habits. In other words, I'm saying a word now about the physical equipment and not the academic training. So I would urge, in addition to our worries about the academic training, about the curriculum, about what to teach, we should also give the same consideration to the physical needs of the child, and particularly those who are left alone at home, and hand the future over, so to speak, of the child to the teacher.

. Continued on next page.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I think I can slip quite comfortably into the rather drowsy debate this Tuesday afternoon when we are winding up our consideration of the Speech from the Throne. I am happy to offer my good wishes to you, ma'am as others have done and to express my confidence that you will amply justify the trust placed in you upon your election to the Speaker of this House; and I take some satisfaction in knowing that in this election we have created a precedent in the Legislative Assembly in Manitoba which I hope may be followed from time to time as occasion serves in years to come. I am rather proud of the fact that for the first time in the history of the province two women have been elected as members and both of them support the administration. I look forward with hope that we may even increase on that score as time goes on.

I say this has been a drowsy debate; I think it has--in particular insofar as other older members of the House are concerned; the bright spots in the debate I think have been provided by those who have just joined the Assembly-- the new members, I followed their contributions with great interest and with some real sense of appreciation because I think that we have heard a number of very commendable maiden speeches, and I offer my good wishes to those concerned. I was also very happy with the contribution made by the mover and seconder to the gracious speech, which I think fully lived up to the good standard that has been set in this respect and on the opening of this debate in days gone by. And I also want to take the opportunity of saying a word about the Dean of the House, the Honourable Member for Lakeside, who has certainly created a record. He is enjoying a career, which as far as I can see is far from finished, with respect to service to the people of this province, which must be a record in Canada if not among the parliamentary assemblies of the Commonwealth of Nations itself. Though we contest the election with him as heartily as we know how, it is really a matter of some satisfaction to know that he is still here to keep a paternal eye on the proceedings. This is a new parliament Madam Speaker, and I look forward to a constructive period of service for the next few years on the part of all members of the House as they discharge their various responsibilities, either in government or in the opposition.

I suppose it would be expected that I might make a few remarks on some of the observations made this afternoon by the Honourable Member for Selkirk, and I will do so, because I must admit he is a very effective advocate. But as advocates are expected to do, particularly in courts of law, he adopts a particular point of view, and has not shown us the other side of the question to which he refers, because if one were to listen to him on the question of assessment one would consider that this was the most arbitrary and unfair arrangement for taxation that had yet been invented --and believe me there's been a few arbitrary and unfair ones invented --when he presented the figures that he did present to us today. He was good enough to say and I thank him for this, that the provincial municipal assessment department is acting not on behalf of the province, but on behalf of the municipalities, in order that we may have an assessment that is based on uniform principles throughout Manitoba, and that there is a proper method of appeal from those who object to their assessment, first to the municipal council which is a body that ought to know -- they're right on the spot -- they've been at the job for awhile, and all things considered it is a good thing that the Municipal Corporation is established as a court of reference or the first court of appeal, if assessments are complained of; and in addition to that there is an appeal to the Municipal Board as my honourable friend was also good enough to say. He put his finger on the trouble, namely, that the question of assessment is based on capital values -- namely what the land will sell for, which is not always, let me say, the same thing as what a land may be earning at a particular time, because that depends upon the type of management to which that land is put. But the basis of assessment is the capital value of land. Now is that right or is that wrong? How did we come by it? Well the honourable member knows very well that it is enshrined in the statutes; it's a matter of statute law, the principle on which assessment is calculated -- and he was a member of the government that passed the law. That doesn't mean he's not entitled to complain about it now, and I should not like to leave that impression. But I would like to say that the question of assessment and the method of assessment -- the principles of assessment, were established in Manitoba many years ago, after a very careful study, and there have been no changes introduced into those principles by the present administration. We have carried on on the same basis. That's not to say that it's right; that's not to say that we may not be able to devise a better system. But so far we haven't been able to do it, because if you depart from capital

(Mr. Roblin (cont'd)....value to earning power as my honourable friend suggests, then of course you run into a whole host of problems of real equity and justice that he hasn't touched upon and apparently has not considered in his suggestion, which is the reason why it hasn't been done already. If someone could have invented a fairer method, I think likely my predecessors might have had a try at it, and I am sure we might have had a try at it. I don't despair of the matter; I think probably that representations made before the Royal Commission that is seating and which is dealing with this exact point, may further elucidate the problems of the present system and suggestions for its improvement, which can then be considered for adoption in the House.

I understand the concern of the people whose assessment has gone up. That is something that is clear. It has happened not only in the area that my honourable friend speaks of. There has been, and I say this advisedly, the most distressing problem of the same nature in the Village of LaBroquerie with which I am somewhat acquainted, and yet it has proved impossible to fault the assessment branch for the way in which they have interpreted their responsibilities because, having gone into this at some length, they can produce a solid argument for what they have done -- like it or not -- and based on the statute as it is, it is something that must be changed in a statutory way and not by the whim of government. I remember so well, to illustrate that this is no new thing, the Municipality of Grey -- and I am sure the Honourable Member for Lakeside will recall this question as well -- that they had the same problem back in 1956, I think it was. They threatened to secede from the Province I think. Certainly they wanted to split their municipality in two just as some other people have done, in order to deal with this problem. Fortunately they did not proceed to extreme methods and although it was over their very strong objections, they accepted the system as it worked there.

But I don't want to think that I am unduly critical of the point my honourable friend is making because no one can be more conscious than those who are the "first port of call" for those who want to complain. There are plenty. No one could be more conscious than we are of the dislocation that happens particularly when a rural area is being developed into a suburban or urban area. When you get a situation that land values are changing because the main purpose of some of that land may be agricultural now, but really is high priced commercial property -- if it were put up for sale tomorrow it wouldn't sell for agricultural prices; it would sell for commercial prices -- what do we do? Tax it at agricultural and then put in a capital gains tax to recover when the thing is sold for commercial purposes? You get into pretty dangerous ground and pretty difficult ground, which illustrates the point I am trying to make about the fact that these principles of assessment were established many years ago; they have not been changed. When you get this move from rural to urban you run into problems of the nature that has been suggested. Now this is part of the reason, not all, certainly a reason why we want the question of municipal taxes investigated. There isn't a thing that's been said about the impact of municipal taxes in this House that we haven't got a considerable measure of sympathy for, because this is a pressing problem in the Province of Manitoba and I have no intention of trying to dodge it or to minimize it or to say that it doesn't exist, because it's there in dollars and cents. That is why we want this Royal Commission of ours to get to work.

Referring to the suggestions of the Municipal Enquiry Commission that are recommended to us by my honourable friend who spoke, the Honourable Member for Selkirk, I must say that this is certainly a most stimulating document. I agree heartily with what he said about those who wrote it, that they have given their best, and I shall be delighted to see what happens to it when it is reviewed by their principals, the municipal officers of this province because -- it's stimulating certainly in this instance because my honourable friend didn't read us all the report. I don't blame him for that. He picked the points that fitted his argument, and that's not unfair. But there is a third point that I will take the liberty of mentioning, namely, the suggestion that all existing school districts, including unions, be abolished, and municipal school districts with elected school boards be established to administer elementary education, and the province to take over the full responsibility for administering secondary education. And I think one must admit that that recommendation about a fundamental change in the management of education -- a revolutionary change in every sense of the word -- is part and parcel of this idea, and that if we are to consider change in the other recommendations we should consider that one as well.

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd)

Now I doubt that my honourable friend wished to leave the impression with the House that he had no views on that point, although he didn't mention it. He might be for it, he might be against it, but I say that it is certainly something that is going to require the most careful consideration, not only by municipal men -- and that is one of the points of the Royal Commission -- not only by municipal men but by school men and by provincial men, and by the public at large and bodies of citizens, parent-teachers and what not that have an interest in this thing. This must all be thoroughly ventilated before decisions are made and then we shall decide what seems to be best in the opinion of this House. Some people say that there's nothing that a little money won't cure in the whole of this system. I'm inclined to think there's something in that. I'm inclined to think that there wouldn't be so much fuss about the basis of municipal taxation, that is the principles of assessment, if taxes, say, were a quarter or a third of what they are today. We probably wouldn't have too much to say about the basis of assessment. But we have to face facts as they are, and one of the facts that this House is going to have to consider before we sit much longer, I think, is this question of municipal finance. The government has requested, and the Royal Commission has agreed, that they will consider this particular point as a special project and hope to give us some word on their views on this point before we meet again. There can be no guarantee that this will be the case because we'll have to see how we get along, but I'd like to tell you what the goal is, that if possible it can be done, because if there is to be a transfer of costs from the municipal taxpayer to some other type of taxation, some other taxpayer, some other level of tax collecting machinery -- and that may well be in the cards -- then we are faced with a new set of decisions and problems that we will have to consider. And I want to say that to those who think, rather lightly in my view, that it will be possible to find the sums of money that are required for any substantial shift from the backs of the home owner and the land owner -- and I think there should be a shift myself -- we'll have to examine other forms of taxation beside the so-called "ability to pay" taxes. I am not going to get into figures today on that subject because I am sure there will be opportunity in the Budget Debate, but I'd like to say that I appreciate the contribution made by the Member for Selkirk because I think he, unlike some of his confreres, I think he introduced a problem which is of real concern to all of us and that is going to be one of the vital problems of provincial administration and consideration in the time to come, and I thank him for his contribution, even though I take the liberty of pointing out what I think to be some gaps in the argument that he presented to us today.

Now, Madam Chairman, in a debate of this kind in the past I have usually found myself under the pressing necessity of defending the very life of the government from the assaults of its enemies -- friendly enemies in most cases -- but today it seems pretty clear that we'll not be turned out this session and I won't have to perhaps deal with matters in the vigorous manner that I sometimes employ when I feel that the existence of the administration may be in jeopardy. So I'm able to say that, of the people who have spoken on this motion, and the Leader of the Opposition is one, I'm able to say that I can thank him for the tone of his speech, because it was pleasant; it was well phrased, it was without rancour, and I think it set a tone that would be good for us to adhere to in the course of our deliberations. I'm sorry I can't be quite as complimentary of the subject matter as I have been about the tone because I think that he was having a hard time making bricks without straw. But let me start, with respect to his contribution, on one point of agreement in which I wish to employ the French language.

J'aimerais faire allusion aux remarques de l'Honorable Chef de l'Opposition concernant la décision prise par le gouvernement du Manitoba de participer à la conférence convoquée par le gouvernement fédéral -- conférence qui aura pour but la considération du développement biculturel de notre pays.

Nous croyons que des mesures positives doivent être unanimement adoptées afin de préserver les nobles desseins de la Confédération et afin de les faire saillir en termes appropriés au deuxième siècle de notre existence comme nation indépendante.

J'apprécie tout particulièrement les bons vœux du Chef de l'Opposition. Il n'y a certes aucune discorde dans cette Chambre lorsqu'il s'agit de servir notre nation canadienne et de préserver, pour les générations à venir, l'unique et splendide héritage du Canada.

Afin d'encourager un plus ample usage de nos deux langues officielles, le Ministre de

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd) l'Education écrivait l'automne dernier au Secrétaire du Bureau des Aviseurs du Département lui demandant de prendre les mesures nécessaires afin que l'enseignement du français soit initié aux grades un, deux et trois. J'espère que nous recevrons bientôt un rapport favorable du Bureau des Aviseurs à ce sujet. Dans l'intervalle, je crois que tous les députés seront d'accord que l'enseignement du français dans nos écoles dès la première année est un moyen efficace de bénéficier de l'héritage bicultural de notre pays.

And Madam Speaker, for the benefit of those who have difficulty in following French spoken with a rather thick English accent, I will table now a translation of what I have said for the record.

I should like to make special reference to the remarks of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition in regard to the government's decision to take part in the conference which has been called by the Government of Canada to consider the bicultural development of our country.

We believe that some positive steps should be taken by general consent to preserve the high purposes of Confederation and to project them in terms which will be suited to the second century of our existence as an independent country. I particularly appreciate the good wishes of the Leader of the Opposition. There is certainly no division in this House when it is a question of serving the Canadian nation and of preserving Canada's unique and splendid heritage for future generations.

So as to encourage the wider use of both our official languages, the Minister of Education wrote last autumn to the Secretary of the Advisory Board of the Department of Education to request that steps be taken to begin instruction in French in Grades 1, 2 and 3. I hope that the Advisory Board will soon report favourably on this proposal. In the meantime I believe the House will agree that the teaching of French from Grade I in our school system is an effective means of participating in Canada's bicultural heritage.

I am not going to make much of a reference to those members of the House who have got into this game of "it's mine, it's yours; or I thought of it first, we want the credit," because to the "me too" boys, I can say that while they've been trying to take the credit, the government has been taking action. If we carefully research the record, and I guess we could to establish the political parentage of any political idea, it can be done. We could take agricultural credit. I remember the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition led the hosts of median in two general campaigns dedicated to the proposition that credit to farmers was no good. He wasn't quite able to carry the conviction of the people with him, and having learned the error of that way he's now got on the band wagon.

Talking about urban renewal from 1946 to 1958, when the problems started to arise, there was plenty of time for a willing administration to do something, but the fact was that it wasn't done in those days, and just as soon as the City of Winnipeg was ready to proceed with their measures in this respect there was provincial legislation and provincial help; and it amused me during the election campaign to read the advertisements of members of the Liberal Party who felt that something should be done about urban renewal. Well, I'm happy to accept their support, because that's just what we've done and in the Throne Speech which we are being asked to consider today further measures in this respect are available.

The Thompson road. The Conservatives, he said, talked about building highways but they didn't talk about building a road to Thompson until the election was called -- Author: Leader of the Liberal Party. Occasion: annual meeting at the Fort Garry Hotel. Fact: The Conservative Party was not talking about the road, they were building it, because 60 percent of that road was completed before the election was called and we see in the Throne Speech today, the measures that are being recommended to this House for its completion. If it served any useful purpose, I suppose we could have a fine time deciding about our claims. This is mine -- I thought of it first. You know, I think that kind of an argument belongs to the nursery, not to the Legislature. I don't intend to pursue it any farther. It's no trouble really to think up ideas. My honourable friend the Leader of the New Democratic Party is a man of ideas. He thought of about all that's likely to occur to anybody in the field of government for some time I should say, and he's advocating them all... (interjection)... Maybe so, but it is the conjunction, it's the conjunction of the time and the resources and the needs in implementing a policy that is the essence of good government.

MR. PAULLEY: And expedience.

MR. ROBLIN: We will continue to do our best to do the right thing at the right time for the people of the Province of Manitoba. Well we had a little dissertation about planning; some questions were asked about what the government means about planning. I think probably some other folks around here could well unburden themselves of their views. I have a hunch there may be two different views about planning within the ranks of the Liberal Party; I may be wrong, but it is not unlikely. Anyway, we believe that we cannot comfortably expect the natural play of economic forces to accomplish our economic goals without effort on our part -- and when I say our part, I mean the government, I mean industry, I mean labour, I mean the professions, I mean the society as a whole. In today's complex economy positive action and positive leadership among the people and on the part of government is something we have to have. We do not espouse the planned economy as exemplified by the policy of the New Democratic Party, but we do accept economic planning being a thoughtful concern for the future, because that type of planning, that type of thoughtful concern of the future is something that we know as individuals is good for us; and we know as men and women who may be responsible for economic organizations, enterprises, it's good for them; and I say it's good for the government too. A free, voluntary, co-ordinated and co-operative type of planning is the kind of thing which we advocate in this province and in this House. Now, whether the Liberal Party will agree with that, I don't know. I think it's about time they made a few efforts to define their views. They've been having a fine time being critical, a fine time getting on both sides of almost every question that comes along. I see that in this particular question of planning, they may have something to consider because my Honourable friend the Leader of that party was asked the other day, what he thought about a coalition between the CCF, I'm sorry, the New Democratic Party and the Liberals in Ottawa. I just don't know whether he's authorized to speak in this connection but he's quoted as saying: "We'll invite the NDP to give us their support," says Mr. Molgat; in the long run their aspirations are the same as ours... (interjection)... Well, I'm inclined to agree with that statement. I don't want to tread too far along that path myself. I think that there is a narrow path that leadeth to salvation and not that broad path that leadeth to destruction, that my honourable friend, the Leader of the New Democratic Party would recommend. But I hope that in the course of the debates of the House, we're going to have a good chance on this when we come to this committee, this consultant planning committee of ours to stake out the ground and see who believes in what, what our policies and principles are; and we'll have a little less of these oratorical questions, and a little more of solid contribution to what is a pressing problem of the community today.

Well, whatever the grits may think about planning, there is one thing I am mighty sure about, and that is they don't think anything of the planning by the government. Now they made that perfectly clear, and I want to say that that point registered. They don't like our plans; in fact in some instances they say we haven't got any -- a little trouble following their arguments sometimes because on one occasion they'll say you are too much of a planner and on the other side they say well you haven't got any plans and they introduced the question of land use on that score. I won't spend any time on that; the Minister of Agriculture covered that with such effectiveness yesterday that he left me high and dry. I have nothing to say on that subject. Criticized the labour laws; demand far reaching reforms; don't like to say we've got no plans for labour or for management relations and things of that description. Well, I have to admit that it's perfectly true that labour and management seek changes in the laws affecting them pretty regularly. They come before us with their recommendations, and from time to time those recommendations are accepted and are eventually introduced as government policy. But I think that I may fairly say that in recent times neither body has come to the government demanding changes of a basic or radical character of the sort that I read into the suggestions of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. They are just not seeking those kind of changes. There are important changes, to be true, that we discuss with them, and a surprising number of them are accepted; but I think basically they seek a regular improvement in the present code and neither have suggested that the present system is basically unsound. And, of course, it would be rather strange if they did because between the two of them they have been the principal architects of it over the years. True, governments have introduced legislation, but it has been largely as a result of the experience gained and presented to us by the two sides of industry.

Labour tell us very very frankly and leave us in no doubt about the fact that they don't

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd)like our law about the secret strike ballot or the question of union legal entity -- they dislike those laws; they say so, and I respect their right to say so. But I venture the opinion here, as I have done elsewhere, that the years will show that these two laws do not weaken labour -- on the contrary -- that they strengthen and enhance their status and their position in our society. I know that the leaders of labour and perhaps the rank and file, too, would question that observation today. But I think time will show that this has not proved to be legislation that is aimed at the legitimate interests of the trade union movement and will, in fact, enhance their status in the community. But I want to say this -- let's stop, for Heaven's sakepicking -- if I can use that expression -- when we have such challenging development in this labour management field before us now. Why has everybody in this House so far missed one of the most important and encouraging developments in the field of labour and management, indeed labour community relations in these recent years, because I think that there are hopeful signs that we are reaching a significant turning point in the relations of the organized labour movement of the community as a whole, because they are accepting a role of responsibility not only to their members but to the community as a whole in a way that has not been done heretofore. And furthermore . . .(interjection).. furthermore, it does follow, it's a corollary -- the two go together, make no mistake about it -- management and, I hope, government, are according to labour a recognition that is rightfully due to them of their place and function in the society.

I will not pretend in this Assembly this afternoon that we have done anything more than make a start in developing that new atmosphere on both sides of the economic see saw, but we are trying to define and to sketch out the place and function of responsibility of labour as a leading partner in the economic community. A significant evidence, although some may be inclined not to think it important, is the presence of labour on the trade mission. They've got just as big an interest in trade and just as big a right to have a say about it as anybody else -- the 40 men was it, the 40 men of the trade union movement who worked with us and with everybody in Manitoba on comment with a contribution that was second to none and which I think had an important fact in shaping the direction in which that report went -- their influence and contribution has been vital. And I want to say they are going to receive another invitation and that is when the economic consultative committee or board is ready for development they will be asked to take their share of carrying the heat and burden of the day, of framing theand sharing in the responsibility for the decisions and policies that will be involved. And I'll say that if we can't get that kind of co-operation from all the sectors of society involved, then we can't do the job that we want to do. It's a delicate plan; it's hardly taken root. We saw it working in other countries and working well; in Sweden in particular, a magnificent example. Nourish this plan; let it grow, because we have to have this full pledged co-operation for 75,000 jobs in Manitoba for 1975. That's the great field of action and of movement in labour and management relations today. And I want to express as sincerely as I can the appreciation of those of us who have responsibility in office today for this kind of attitude and response from the labour movement in our province.

What shall I say about the question of no plans on roads? We were really treated to a pretty emphatic statement about our road planning system and I got the general impression it wasn't very good. I was told, for example, that a particularly bad example of lack of planning was in Metro; told that Metro didn't do any planning; there wasn't any planning being done there. What on earth did we set Metro up for if not to plan the arterial roads and streets? As far as that goes, all you have to do is read the newspapers to find out that the statement made by the Leader of the Opposition is completely divorced from the fact, because on the 23rd of November they produced their plan map showing sites for a freeway, new bridges, all here. What did they do? They visited every home in Greater Winnipeg, it says, to assemble the data that went into this traffic road plan of theirs. That takes in a lot of territory; I wonder if they really did. Well if they did anything like that they certainly did a lot of work to develop a good plan. And where is the plan now? The plan now is before the municipalities in the metro area for their consideration. When this plan has been through those essential steps in its development it will be referred to us, and we will be dealing with this plan for the development of roads and streets in the metro area. And to say as my honourable friend, the Leader of the Opposition did, that there's no such thing and there hasn't been any planning of this sort,

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd) makes me wonder the basis for his charge, because the facts are all here, and when Metro have finished their study and have shown it to us, we'll be sitting down with them to evolve the policy and the expenditure system that we will jointly employ in carrying into effect those parts of this plan which are deemed essential for the movement of traffic in this area. And of all the weak-kneed allegations against the government to say we don't plan for roads, particularly with Metro -- well, what more need I say about it.

Well, he says, "you're no better off in your own Department of Highways here in Manitoba." Well it's perfectly true that before 1959, Madam Speaker, there was no central planning bureau in the Department of Public Works in the Province of Manitoba -- no central planning before we came into office, in the Department of Public Works. Now there are 45 people; 31 engineers and helpers and 14 casual, and it's no secret -- it's all in the estimates-- turn to page 25 of last year's estimates and you'll see the money that's being spent in the Planning Department of the Province of Manitoba. And as far as other municipalities are concerned, and we're accused of neglecting them, if you look at the same set of estimates you'll see money that's appropriated for assistance to the municipalities in their road problems. And it is no secret that an inventory has been underway for the past two years of a main market in municipal roads in this province with traffic counts and projections of future traffic movement and all that kind of thing, which is necessary for a sound plan; and that this work has all been on foot for some considerable period of time. And yet we've been told that we've got no planning in the department and certainly we're not planning for the municipalities. Well that's an extraordinary charge indeed. It's all the more extraordinary when I asked somebody to get for me the report that was made to this Legislature in 1960, called "Manitoba Highways Planning for Tomorrow." How extraordinary that this wasn't referred to by my honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition. In 1960 the Automotive Safety Foundation came in and supervised the work that was done by the department in setting out the highway plans from now until 1980 for the Province of Manitoba -- a 20 year program. Well I'm not surprised that my honourable friend has forgotten it because it was exceedingly uncomplimentary -- far from flattering -- about the road system that we inherited when we came in. If you want to find out just how badly the roads had been mismanaged in that period, read the report; it's easy doing. The facts are here and you can draw your own conclusions. I want to tell my honourable friend that this constitutes highway planning. He may not be aware, but this constitutes highway planning. It consists of traffic counts; it consists of economic projections; it consists of forecasts of population movement and trend; it consists of estimates as to how traffic will move from the rails to the roads and all that kind of thing. It is a proper all inclusive highway programming plan -- and we're accused of not having one. Well I want to tell my honourable friend that ever since this plan came in we have been spending on roads the amount of money that they recommend here that we should spend per year for the implementation of that plan. To make good the sins of omission and commission of my honourable friend and to produce the kind of road system the province ought to have in 1980, And I can tell you that we have some 3,000 miles of roads that have been improved on this schedule since we came in and we are proceeding with the plan of action outlined here.

This report is the basis of our highway planning. It is modified as needs may modify from time to time and we schedule our annual construction project on the basis of economic priority to achieve a suitable system of highways for this province for 1980. And so if we are to be criticized on the grounds that we haven't got a highway program, I think the criticism falls short the mark, because we have spent a lot of time and a lot of effort in planning our highway system; and we are using the plans that were prepared for us and the basis of action outlined by this very competent group of people of the Automotive Safety Foundation, to make sure that we build the right roads and that we get the most value for money out of our road system in the Province of Manitoba. Now I'm not claiming perfection for this -- not claiming perfection for any plan. They've all got to be reviewed and modified and watched as time goes on, to see how well the forecasts of planners have borne out in fact. But to say that we don't plan is to fly in the face of the facts that should have been known to every member of the Legislature who cared to follow our proceedings here.

Well Madam, I don't know what else there is for me to say this afternoon; I hardly think we've been subjected to a life and death struggle in this debate. Nevertheless we are glad to

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd). . . . deal with the points that are brought forward by various members who like to speak. The Member for Emerson -- I didn't hear him -- I like to hear him. He has a nice wit. I think he was speaking with that wit of his when he was talking about pork barrel politics in Emerson constituency. I want to tell you that I had my initiation into pork barrel politics in Emerson constituency -- was it in 1956 or '57 when they had the famous by-election -- and I can trade him story for story as to what's been going on down there with respect to the operations of the Liberal Party in the constituency of Emerson. I think we could have a very good time relating our experiences to one another. I take some of the stories I hear about his party with a grain of salt, because I know some of the people involved and I just don't believe that some of them are so naughty as these stories suggest. I think probably he could take the same view just the same. He doesn't like commissions; too many boards. Well he's not alone in that subject, I think the Honourable Member for Gladstone is an anti-commission man too. They never get around, so far, to telling us what commissions they don't like. Maybe they should go over and join the Honourable Member for Rhineland. He doesn't like any of our commissions; he'd do away with the Hydro Board and the telephones and everything else in sight if he got his chance. Well I wonder just what commissions they're opposed to. I also wonder how they reconcile their stand with the principal suggestion made by their leader, namely that there should be another commission -- the Commission on Highway Construction. Now that's a commission to end all commissions, if you ask me. That's going to take the largest item of expenditure, if you add up both capital and current, I think. The Minister of Education is always fighting for this privileged position and he may be right; it'll certainly be the second largest. Take that right out of the competence of the Legislature and place that in commission -- it might be a good idea. I certainly would be glad to hear any arguments in favour of it; there weren't any induced the other day.

Well what do my friends opposite think about this question of commissions? You know that party over there is afflicted with political schizophrenia, because they don't all say the same thing or anything approaching it at the same time. I remember so well when the favourite theme over there was "too fast and too far." My did they have a good time with that one. Even the education program came under the heading of "too fast and too far"; and not only did it come under the heading of "too fast and too far" but at the very last sitting of this House, before we adjourned for the election, the leader of the opposition, who is the same gentleman who occupies that place today, was moving a resolution prior to which was concerned with "too fast and too far" and he mentioned the school system in particular. Now of course it's procrastination and delay. Well of course they found out that "too fast and too far" didn't get anywhere with the electorate so they're on another tack now -- procrastination and delay -- and I wonder whether they'll get any farther with that than they did with the first item. I'm inclined to think not. I'm inclined to think that it would be a good thing if the members of the Liberal Party could develop a coherent philosophy; if they could develop a self-contained line of action that they could recommend to the House as to what we ought to do, instead of starting at every hare that runs across the prairie and chasing it off into the distance and finding themselves completely out of touch with reality, including the electorate of the Province of Manitoba, and come in with a policy that's got some consistency.

Now the Honourable Member from Burrows he believes in referendums; he gave us a little piece of that the other day. Well his leader doesn't. His leader voted against a referendum on Metro and I was wondering -- well I looked up the votes and proceedings and I think that the vote definitely showed that my honourable friend on third reading voted for Metro without a referendum.

MR. G. MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): That's right. Just on a point if I may, this decision had come originally in committee, when the referendum was proposed in committee I voted in favour of referendum.

MR. ROBLIN: Well, thank you. I'm glad that's clarified. Well anyway, you're for the referendum and he isn't, and I think that that's a point that's worth noting.

My honourable friend from Burrows rather disappointed me I must say. He made a speech that would probably sound very good to the electorate of Burrows but it'll add very little to his stature as a thoughtful member of this House. I really must say that I don't like making such a harsh remark at this particular moment, but I really must say that in respect of

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd)..... Metro. I got the impression from him that he would like to do away with the wholething. Now I may be wrong on that but I feel that if that is his view, that it's not one that will commend itself to many of his friends who expect from him a real contribution to the affairs of this legislature.

Now Madam Speaker, I must draw my observations to a close because we really have had nothing of any great consequence to talk about in this debate. That is, insofar as the charges made by people in the opposition are concerned. Thank goodness it's nearly over; thank goodness we can get down to the reason why we are here -- the fundamental reason why we are here -- and that is to get on with constructive measures for our province. Thank goodness we can get on with the recommendations in this Throne Speech for vocational and technical education in this province -- one of the most badly needed areas of improvement. Thank goodness we can get on with establishing new classes for pre-vocational training for those members of the unemployed who haven't got regular education or the skill to get a job in this situation. Thank goodness we can get on with the job of improving and enlarging the matter of curriculum revision in this Province of Manitoba -- never mentioned by anybody on the other side -- very important. Thank goodness we can -- I must apologize -- my honourable friend mentioned it; he's a little bit late as usual, because we got to it in the Throne Speech. But thank goodness we can get on with the University of Manitoba, the developments that we have out there, and the special research centre for the training of these children who are so tragically deformed with congenital malformation. Thank goodness that we can get on with expanding our assistance to the mentally disturbed and the medically ill; in the out-patient services and all the important developments that the Minister of Health wants to tell this House about and seek its support. Thank goodness we can get on with the hospital building program. The Honourable Member for Gladstone asks: "What did you do with the report on this subject?" All we did was agree to spend to a total program of some \$65 million and, as the Throne Speech indicates, eight institutions are being worked on this year and eighteen new projects are in the coming year. Thank goodness we can get on with this question of coming to grips with some of these terrible and depressing human problems in the field of welfare, of how to get able-bodied men and women who don't seem to be able to fit into our society back into the field where they can make a constructive contribution, to say nothing of what --(interjection)-- I think that I allowed my honourable friend to speak without too much interruption; he might accord me the same courtesy. I won't trespass on his patience very much longer.

Legislation to permit us to get on with our limited dividend housing plan and to expand very considerably the program for Indian and Metis development. You will be asked to get on with the highway system of the Province of Manitoba. The question of the Nelson River, the most far-reaching and important natural resource project that has ever been considered in the history of Manitoba, will be before this House, and it is time that we get down to these important and essential matters. It's time that we allowed the Minister of Agriculture an opportunity to place before us his plans for the development of that pioneer and basic industry of the province, to make it better and to make it more effective in its contribution to the livelihood of those employed and to the province as a whole. And it's high time we got on with what is the single most important problem that will be facing the people of Manitoba during the course of the next 10 years -- if I may dare to make such a prediction -- and that is to bring into focus and into practical application that program that has been placed before us by the Committee on Manitoba's Economic Future. Procrastination and delay they say; and here already we are coming before this House with half a dozen measures that will be important in that project that lies before us in the question of employment and economic development of our province.

Madam Speaker we are ready to go to work on this side. We are ready for action. We are ready to vote this gracious speech and get on with the business of the Province of Manitoba.

MR. M.N. HRYHORCZUK, Q.C. (Ethelbert Plains): Madam Speaker I don't want to be one of those that stops the government from going ahead with their work but I do want to make a slight contribution to this debate. May I take the opportunity of congratulating the First Minister on his victory last December. Had he had the kindness of heart and waited for another six months or so before he called that election probably things would have been much more uncomfortable than what he found them. The popular vote was getting pretty close there in December and I'm quite sure that after we see the program that is going to be placed before the

(Mr. Hryhorczuk cont'd) people during this session, that if the election had taken place after it, the margin would have been considerably smaller. Now the First Minister wants to get on with the work of the House. Well, during the past seven days of this debate there was plenty of opportunity to go on with the work of the House. In fact, if my memory serves me right, there were times when we only sat for five or ten minutes, fifteen minutes, and then we adjourned because the government had no business to present to this House, and I don't think that we're to take any blame for that.

Now I want to restrict my comments today to what was said by the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture yesterday, and I never was more surprised than to hear that tirade. He's a great man at going on the offensive when he has no defence and it appears that he's going to follow that particular line of thinking through this session too, because yesterday he offered nothing constructive; he had nothing to say insofar as what was accomplished by this government. He did have a lot to say about what the Liberals didn't do or what the Liberals could have done when they were there, and he also had something to say about the Liberal policies, Federal Liberal policies, during the present campaign. Well, I may be misinformed but I think that the Honourable Minister has made a complete about face in the last four years. Why he has done so, probably he has good and sufficient reasons. If he has them he should have given them to the members of this House before making the statements that he did yesterday. I don't think it was the Liberal party that coined the phrase "parity not charity". I think the honourable minister knows where that phrase was coined. I do believe that the Honourable Minister was in Ottawa with that delegation that left here — that thousand strong or something -- or am I wrong? Anyhow he expressed his full support of what that delegation was seeking and he even made that statement on the floor of the House here. And what was that delegation seeking? That delegation was seeking deficiency payments or guaranteed floor prices, and now the minister turns around and says that that is the wrong attitude to take, that we don't want to make any guarantees on the price of wheat, but he overlooks that we already have guarantees on certain farm commodities. We have guarantees, a floor price, on hogs, on butter, on eggs, on cattle. Does the honourable minister mean that all these should be discarded; that by having those floor prices we are encouraging the production of food stuffs that we do not need? I couldn't gather any other conclusion but that. If he was opposed to the \$2.00 price on wheat he was opposed to all the other floor prices; and if he is he should stand up and say so, not let us draw our own conclusions as to what he does believe in. Does he believe in a floor price on any farm commodity or does he not; or does he restrict this objection to wheat only? He completely overlooks the fact that the farmers in asking for a guarantee are not asking for something for nothing. I don't think that there is a better free enterpriser than the farmer, but it is because the government has taken part in giving protection to other sections of the community, which places the farmer in the position where he has no choice but to ask for similar protection, and the Honourable Minister of Agriculture, as Minister of Agriculture, who has the interests, or should have the interests of the farmer at heart, should have explained why the farmer asked for this guarantee instead of speaking against it.

What is the situation here in Canada today? We hear about this cost price squeeze. What has brought it on? Because there is protection offered to other segments of our society. The manufacturer is protected by tariffs and recently and at present by surcharges, which add to the cost of the equipment and of the purchases that the farmer must make. There is also the cost of labour, which has contributed to the cost of this equipment, and I'm not complaining about that, but I want to give the reasons, Madam Speaker, why the farmer is asking for this particular guarantee. Labour has protection in various pieces of legislation: the minimum wage, the hours of work, the closed shop, the unemployment insurance benefits. All these things are costing the people of this country, including the farmers, millions of dollars annually. And we're not begrudging them that, they've probably earned it. But the point is that under a system such as now exists the farmer finds himself in the position where he has to ask for similar protection because he cannot compete under the circumstances, and the Minister is well aware of this. He made another point and he tried to connect the two of them, that it is the farmer on marginal, or sub-marginal land that is causing most of this trouble and we have to uproot him and get him out of the way. Well it isn't the small farmer that is adding to the glut of wheat on our markets. The amount of wheat that the small farmer, the family farmer produces is insignificant. It's the farmer that farms thousands of acres of land that goes into straight wheat

(Mr. Hryhorczuk cont'd) production, not so much here in Manitoba as in the west, that causes this glut, and with a \$2.00 price per bushel on wheat if there were a ceiling placed on the number of bushels per farmer I think that is an answer to our problem. I still believe that this small farmer, this family farmer, must be protected and needs our assistance, and I hope to come to him before I'm through today.

The dust bowls in Saskatchewan were caused by what? By the big farmers who were exploiting the land without putting anything back into it; and it is these big farmers that we have to worry about and not the small ones. Now what about our small farmers? These fellows that the minister said last night, or yesterday, that he would buy them out and make community pastures out of those lands, and he went on to say that "we'll try to buy up these lands; we're buying them up for community pastures." Those were his exact words. He says: "These people have been a great problem to us in the past." Well, I'm sorry to say that the Honourable Minister is completely ignorant of what has brought the situation about. He has blamed, he tried to blame the Liberals for the situation. He says it was the Liberal Government of the day that let this happen, and because they let it happen now we have deserted -- abandoned homes and abandoned hydro lines and a lot of other bunkum.

Well, Madam Speaker, I represent a constituency in which I was born and have spent all my life in, and in this constituency pretty nearly 75 percent of the farmers are what we call on family farms. About 75 percent of the arable land in my constituency could be classed as marginal and sub-marginal. Now how did these people find themselves on these lands; what brought it about and who is to blame for the situation that now exists? I would say, Madam Speaker, that no particular party, no particular section of our society was to blame for what happened at that particular time. That particular portion of the province was settled in the late nineties. My grandfather settled on one of these farms in 1897 -- and with the interjection from the Minister I'll just drop that for a moment and see what he has to say here about the hydros and the roads and everything else. There was something he made a statement about that's very pertinent to his idea of what is the right thing to do for these farmers. Somewhere in this speech he said that the government went ahead and they built roads, put in hydro lines and everything else, and that isn't what he's going to do; that they're not going to put in any roads or hydro lines or any other facilities until they are sure that they want to settle that area. Well, Madam Speaker, of all the nonsense. Back, towards the end of the last century and the beginning of this century there was no such thought or question of roads and hydro and everything else, because there was no demand for it, and if the Honourable Minister knew how these places were settled, he wouldn't be talking in the manner that he is. These people came in here as immigrants -- some of them with families -- in fact most of them with families and all they had to their name, most of them, was not anymore than \$100.00 -- most of them came in with less than that -- and they were given homesteads at \$10.00 a piece. There were no such things as welfare assistance; there were no such things as Mother's allowances; there was no state help, they had to go out and help themselves. Now I know that my grandfather when he came into this country, for the first two years they lived in a hole in the side of a hill. They were a family of four and my father was the oldest of the four children and he was nine years old. They had no garden; they had no livestock; they had no source of income. Why did they settle in what we feel should not have been settled at that time? Why did they settle in this area? Simply because that was the only or one of the few places that there was work available -- and the work consisted of bush work and the building of railroads. The railroad which runs through that town of Ethelbert today was in the process of being built from Dauphin -- starting at Dauphin at this particular time. These families had no other choice. There were good lands down west, but what was a 160 acres of land when you had no farm equipment, you had no livestock, you had no money with which to buy it. The first concern was a source of revenue. And that is why these families settled there -- where work was near home; where they could walk to work 15 or 20 miles and come back for the weekend; and during the weekends they used to scrub their little plots of bush in order to make room for a garden in the coming year. These people contributed in no small measure to the development of this country, and they're proud of their contribution, and I think that the attitude that the minister has taken towards them is completely uncalled for. These people were farmers in the Old Land; farming is what they knew and farming is what they wanted to do; and they settled in areas that were so

(Mr. Hryhorczuk cont'd) heavily bushed that it took years of back breaking effort to bring that land under cultivation. It was a matter of a pick and an axe; there were no bulldozers; there was no power equipment with which this bush could be cut down and the land brought under cultivation. And all this was done with the help of the members of the family. A child 9, 10, 11, 12, 13 years old helped in this work. They helped to pick the roots, to pick the stones; and the women did a great deal of work on them also. Without the combined efforts of the families these farms would never been developed and these farmers would have never been able to maintain their families. Not only that, but the children as they grew up and became 14, 15 years of age, each and every child went out to work elsewhere when work was available, and every penny that the child earned was brought back home for the purpose of helping to improve that farm and make it revenue bearing. Without the assistance of the children, which is going on today in the same fashion, none of these farmers could have lived on these farms. The farmers themselves have always sought work outside the farm. Many of the old timers tell the story of how they used to walk 50, 75, 100 miles in the fall of the year to go harvesting to some well-established farmer in the Portage or the Neepawa area, for the purpose of making extra dollars to maintain the family and also to give an education to those members of the family who were suitable for that purpose. And may I say that with this joint effort, there were thousands upon thousands of young men and women that obtained an education and are found in all the professions that we have here in Canada, scattered throughout the whole of the country. We can thank the family farm for this; without that joint effort of the family in trying to improve its own economic conditions, and working together to make members of a family find a better life for themselves, was it possible to see the progress and the development that we have today. Now the Honourable Minister says "We'll have to eradicate them, we'll have to pull them up by the roots." He doesn't say what he intends to do with them, but he's going to get rid of them, if he can.

MR. HUTTON: I think that the honourable member should apologize for putting words into my mouth that are nowhere in Hansard, nor can you find any place, either in or outside of the House, as a basis for the sort of charges that he's making at the present time.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Alright, Madam Speaker, I throw that right back in the Honourable Minister's face. Here's what he said and I'm quoting from Hansard, these are your words; "sure it's an arbitrary thing, but either you believe in one thing or you believe in the other; you can't be on both sides of the fence. What has been done -- we are trying to buy up these lands; we are buying them up for community pastures; we're just buying them up to get control of them and we intend to lease them in the future." Well you are buying them up; you are forcing them off the land.

MR. HUTTON: You just stick to the text.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: That's alright, I am. In the first place there was no context to your speech yesterday. Now it's well and good for him to say we'll take this little fellow off the land, because he's little. I would suggest to him that he buy out all these heavy grain growers -- buy those lands out, put them back into something else; we don't need the wheat they're growing. What is good for the goose must be good for the gander. And where is the Honourable Minister going to stop? Is he going to do the same thing with inefficient labour where he finds it, or the small businessman that can't make it go. Is he going to start buying out everybody. Is that the ultimate goal of this government?

Well, Madam Chairman, I don't agree with that type of thinking, because I know that these people want to farm; their lot is not a sweet one, but they love the soil; soil is in their blood. If you can give them enough for their holdings to give them the opportunity to buy something better in the way of farms, there would be no objection; but if you're going to buy them up for the figure that has been paid for this type of land in the past, then you leave them without a home and you don't give them sufficient to even think about buying another one. I know of established farmers that were bought out in the areas that have been established as pastures and they had no place to go and no place to move, because they didn't have what it takes to get established again. And if the Honourable Minister has no feeling or compassion for these people then, of course, he may be following the right route; but, Madam Speaker, a well-fed person doesn't understand the pangs of hunger and I think that is the Honourable Minister's trouble. Now what can be done? Do we have to take these people out of there?

(Mr. Hryhorczuk, cont'd) The answer is no, Madam Chairman, we do not. I do not believe that there is a square foot of land on this earth that cannot be used for some good purpose and I think it is a matter of finding out what these soils are suitable for -- (Interjection) -- yes, even the Sahara is being turned into a green valley and we know that. But it takes enterprise; it doesn't take this lazy attitude that the Honourable Minister's taking, the easiest way out -- get rid of them. Let's do something about it. And what can we do? First as far as a community pasture is concerned, I have always been an advocate of community pastures and I continue to be one, but there is something that has been overlooked and I hope that it isn't overlooked in the future. Two years ago when we were talking about community pasture before this House I suggested to the Honourable Minister that a buffer zone or a strip of land be left around the community pasture in order that the farmers who are farming adjacent to them would have pasture lands. This was not done. I hope that in the future it is done; and the reason I say that, Madam Speaker, is this, community pastures are made primarily for beef cattle or the carry-over of say, dairy herds which are still young and not ready for production. But that does not answer the grazing problems -- the grazing problems of the mixed farmer who is dependent upon the small herd of milk cows for the bulk of his revenue -- and right around these proposed community pastures, that is the type of farmer you find there. He can't line his milk cows into the community pasture because he must have them at home every day to milk them. He must have a pasture adjacent to his farm, and to protect him I would suggest, as I have suggested in the past, that we have a buffer zone -- a zone a mile or half a mile wide, right around the community pasture, which the adjacent farmers can lease for their own grazing requirements. I hope that the Honourable Minister does not overlook that in any future pastures that are established, because if he does, he's going to accomplish his end of getting rid of those farmers, but what the Department of Health will do with them or the Department of Welfare will do with them after that I don't know; but I think it's the wrong attitude to take, and their ages would not lend towards rehabilitation.

Now in these lands -- the Honourable Minister said yesterday that -- about the abandoned houses and so forth and so on. What he doesn't seem to know is that there is good and sufficient reason for the abandonment, and these homes and the farmsteads were not abandoned, not within the last 20 years. In fact within the last 15 years in my own municipality where the municipality owned in excess of 100 quarters of land that had reverted to the municipality by way of taxes, these lands have all been picked up by resident adjacent farmers, and the holdings in these areas have been on the increase. It's only a matter of 15 or 16 years ago when the average holding was below 160 acres. Today it's about the 320 acre mark. I would say that more than half our farms have not been abandoned, they have been sold to the adjoining neighbors. You will see many an empty house not due to abandonment, and if the Honourable Minister felt that these farms had been abandoned, then he was wrong. What had actually happened is farmers are extending their holdings and I expect that this will carry on for some time; but there are no more municipal lands available in the Rural Municipality of Ethelbert, probably the odd one. They have all been taken up by the resident farmers. What is left in the municipality are Crown lands; and some of these Crown lands are going to be turned into pastures. Now I am in agreement with the policy that a piece of land should not be sold by the Crown just because somebody wants to buy it. I'm in complete agreement with that policy. If the land can be put to use by a resident farmer and he can show that he can make good use of it in the operation of his lands I think he should be able to buy it so he can plan his own long-term operations.

Now what else can we do for these farmers -- and I think we're on the right track. I think that in the plans of the Department of Agriculture under the Minister there is a lot to be gained by the programs that he has in mind but these programs are kind of slow in coming. We hear so much about planning from all the departments and so little about action. What about a little bit of action, especially in the Department of Agriculture. Now I would say that insofar as the farmers are concerned in this particular area, what they require is some help from the government -- and I'm not talking about money -- but I'd like to see each and every one of them being able to get their soils tested gratis, and I think it would be a good investment. I would like to see them given some help in regard to the type and quantity of fertilizer they should use on these lands. That would not be expensive. I'm not asking you to supply the

(Mr. Hryhorczuk, cont'd)fertilizer. You're not doing too badly but I wouldn't ask you to do that. -- (Interjection) -- Well yes, from the way you use things maybe there is too much for your good. But there is a factor or a program that I think would be well worthwhile, and that is to give them an opportunity or give them the knowledge of what type of soil they have, what type of fertilizer they should use and the quantity of fertilizer that should be used per acre. I'd like a little more of this drainage and water conservation ideas placed into these areas. I know there's a little bit done; but it's too little. That little bit is generally done just before an election, at least up our way it is. I'd like to see that as a part of a permanent program of this department, not political expediency. I would like to see a lowering of the tax burden on these properties, and I also agree that there is in the Farm Credit Corporation -- although down where we are we're not able to qualify for assistance. There is the odd farmer, I'd say about one in 50 or 100 that would qualify for financial assistance. Under the present Act probably the Minister, during this Session, will bring in a thing or two that will help the farmers a little further than what he has.

Now in closing I want to say, Madam Speaker, that I think it would be a terrible mistake if the Minister started off by trying to eradicate these farmers, or uproot them, that are settled on these marginal and sub-marginal lands. I think it would be a mistake because in my constituency I do not think that there is an able-bodied farmer, no matter how small his holdings, no matter how poor he is, that has asked for or is receiving social assistance of any kind from this government. They are independent and they are doing their very best to provide for themselves and their families. They are not asking for any handouts. They want the kind of help that will make them more self-sufficient than they are; and with the type of help that I have suggested I think that you will find them to be self-sufficient and will not become a burden upon the government, either this or any other government.

Now I did want to say a few things about the constituency that do not exactly pertain to agriculture, but we have a community pasture in the making, in the municipality, which takes in parts of two municipalities, and that is the Rural Municipality of Ethelbert and the Rural Municipality of Mossey River, an area that I have spoken about in the past but not under the heading of agriculture but under the heading of mines and natural resources. There is a strip of land there approximately six miles wide, in some places more than that, that could have been turned into wildlife habitat with very little expense; and while we're going to be making a community pasture in this area I would suggest to this government that they also look at the possibility of turning this area into a wildlife refuge. Not so very many years ago this whole area was covered with very heavy timbered land. I, myself, have seen millions of feet of lumber come out of the area. I have seen thousands upon thousands of railroad ties come out of the area; numberless cords of firewood and other timber products come out of the area. Today, owing to fires throughout the years, the area has been denuded of heavy growth and all you have is brush and small trees throughout the area, but it lends itself to water conservation and water for our wildlife. In fact all the waters running off the Duck Mountains run into Lake Winnipegosis in this area and they run through this particular proposed community pasture. And throughout the whole of this community pasture there are ridges, natural gravel ridges that run from the south to the north cutting right across these pastures and these ridges are anywhere from a half a mile to a mile and a half apart. It would be a very simple matter to store water against these ridges -- and there is no limit to the amount of water that could be stored, the quantities along these ridges. This used to be one of the finest habitats for deer and elk, not too long past, and I think that we could see that return again with the proper care and attention that it requires and the planning that is needed. I suggest to the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources that he do a little bit of planning in this regard and to the already numerous plans that exist; but knowing the Minister as I do, I know that it will not only be a plan; if he undertakes it he will not only plan, but he's going to carry out his plans and I'm looking forward to the day when this will be done.

MR. SCHREYER: Madam Speaker, I suppose that -- if you wouldn't mind, Madam Speaker, would you call it 5:30?

MR. EVANS: Madam Speaker, I'm sure that if you care to call it 5:30 that would suit the Honourable members.

MADAM SPEAKER: I will call it 5:30 and I'll leave the Chair until 8 o'clock this evening.