

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Thursday, April 18, 1968

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions.

MR. DOUGLAS M. STANES (St. James): I beg to present the petition of The Women's Tribute Memorial Lodge Foundation praying for the passing of an Act to amend an Act to incorporate "The Women's Tribute Memorial Lodge Foundation."

MR. JAMES COWAN, Q. C. (Winnipeg Centre): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the petition of The Winnipeg General Hospital praying for the passing of an Act of The Winnipeg General Hospital Act; and the petition of Manuel Brickers and others praying for the passing of An Act to incorporate Home and Research Centre for Retarded; and the petition of Maitland Bernard Steinkopf and others praying for the passing of An Act to incorporate Home and Research Centre for Retarded Foundation; and the petition of George Edward Sharpe and others praying for the passing of An Act to incorporate The Westminster United Church Foundation.

MR. SPEAKER: Reading and Receiving Petitions

Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q.C. (Attorney-General) (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the first report of the Standing Committee on Law Amendments.

MR. CLERK: Your Standing Committee on Law Amendments beg leave to present the following as their first report.

Your Committee met for organization and appointed Honourable Mr. Lyon as Chairman. Your Committee agreed that for the remainder of this session the quorum of the committee shall consist of ten members.

Your Committee has considered Bills: No. 2 - An Act to amend The Insurance Act (1); No. 3 - An Act to amend The Insurance Act (2); No. 4 - An Act to repeal certain Acts relating to certain Corporations; No. 5 - An Act to amend The Coat of Arms, Floral Emblem and Tartan Act; No. 6 - An Act to amend The Unsatisfied Judgment Fund Act; and has agreed to report the same without amendment.

Your committee has also considered Bills: No. 10 - The Securities Act, 1968; and No. 37 - an Act to amend The Highway Traffic Act; and has agreed to report the same with certain amendments.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer, that the report of the Committee be received.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motion

Introduction of Bills

Orders of the Day

HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Minister of Agriculture) (Rockwood-Iberville): Mr. Speaker, if I may have the permission of the Members, I agreed yesterday to inform the House as to the developments involving the Souris Creamery. I would now like to inform the House that after a great deal of discussion with officials involved in the Milk Control Board, it was found necessary in the interests of the producers to rescind the licence yesterday of the Souris Creamery, and I can report to the House that it is regrettable that this action was a measure that had to be taken at this particular time.

I would want to inform, Mr. Speaker, the members of the House that the interests of the producers are being looked after insofar as their milk deliveries - their milk deliveries are being diverted to the Brandon milkshed area; discussions are continuing with department representatives, both of my department and the Department of Industry and Commerce with IDB officials, and there is every reason to believe that given the necessary time to reorganize themselves, and with the feeling and spirit that I know exists in the Souris area for this industry, that this industry will find the necessary ways and means to resolve their present difficulties and to re-establish themselves.

It would be my hope, Mr. Speaker, that we allow them this privilege and that we gain little in attempting to debate the question in the House here. I don't think, as the Leader of the Opposition indicated when he first introduced it in the House, there is certainly no politics in this. I am confident that the negotiations presently under way will eventually succeed in re-establishing the creamery at Souris. Thank you.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): I would like to thank the Minister for his statement. I had hoped it would come yesterday afternoon. When it didn't come I phoned his office immediately on conclusion of the Session yesterday but could not reach him. Does the statement of the Minister then mean that the creamery is now closed and is no longer supplying milk in that area - the shippers are no longer in a position to ship milk to that creamery? Is that the situation?

MR. ENNS: That's correct, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, is it not correct that if this situation lasts even for a few days that the possibility of reviving this industry will be almost impossible then, because the question of obviously the staff is going to arise unless the staff are assured that it will be re-opened. Will they not seek employment elsewhere?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I can only assure the House on this one particular point that involves the department, that the Milk Control Board and other interested people in this particular situation are all concerned with attempting to resolve the problems that they face. The Milk Control Board is prepared at any time to re-issue the licence upon reorganization of the company. The hard fact has to be faced, and of course the immediate people facing it are realizing it, that is the owners and the employees, that during this interval cessation of activities is taking place.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I think I am entitled to one more subsidiary question. On Monday night when I brought this -- or Tuesday night when I brought the matter to the attention of the House, the Minister said then, "the issue is as simple as this, that the offer of financial support within the community is not yet firm. If this can be established by a reasonable hour - you know, a reasonable time tomorrow - I'm certainly prepared to exercise what influence I have with the Milk Control Board." Was the financial offer not confirmed yesterday?

MR. ENNS: No, Mr. Speaker, the offer never was firmed up.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q. C. (Selkirk): A question of the Minister of Agriculture, Mr. Speaker. Has your department been negotiating with any Winnipeg creamery regarding this creamery at Souris?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I would ask the indulgence of the House that we accept the plea, if we may take it as that, that really no gain can be had from further discussing this issue here. Negotiations are taking place, as I have indicated, in many areas in an attempt to resolve the question. They involve many different aspects of it, different companies, different individuals. Solicitors of the company are doing this in conjunction with the IDB officials, that is the Industrial Development Bank, who is the major holder, the mortgagee. I'm not prepared -- I don't think it would serve no purpose to speculate or comment on precisely what these negotiations are; they would be purely speculative at this particular point of time.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Would the Minister advise me when these negotiations started?

MR. SPEAKER: If I may interrupt the proceedings of the House and direct the attention of the members to the gallery, we have 13 members of the 93rd Company of Girl Guides. This group of girls is under the direction of Mrs. Ross and their homes are in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

On behalf of all the honourable members of the Legislative Assembly, I welcome you all here today. I must say they look very smart.

Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders are proceeded with, I would like to direct a question to my honourable friend the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. I understand that a week or ten days ago he received a request from the town council at The Pas to appear before them and answer questions in respect to Churchill Forest Products, probably others. Is it his intention to accept that invitation and can he inform the House on what day he will appear at The Pas?

HON. DONALD W. CRAIK (Minister of Mines and Natural Resources) (St. Vital): The answer is yes, Mr. Speaker. Providing The Pas is willing to meet a week from this Saturday, we'll meet on that date. I haven't had confirmation back from The Pas as yet.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Well, Mr. Speaker, a subsequent question. Yesterday's paper, The Pas Herald, indicates that my honourable friend will meet with them this coming Saturday. My honourable friend says it will be a week Saturday - right?

MR. CRAIK: A week from this Saturday, Mr. Speaker, the 27th of April.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Turtle Mountain.

MR. EDWARD I. DOW (Turtle Mountain): I'd like to direct a question, Mr. Speaker, to the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs. Last night on television and in today's paper, a certain letter was received by the Minister in regard to some municipal affairs in Carberry. Would this letter be tabled or read to the House?

HON. THELMA FORBES (Minister of Urban Development and Municipal Affairs)(Cypress): No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Portage.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): I would like to address a question to the Honourable Minister - Acting Minister of Highways. In today's Tribune there is a short article concerning land purchased for an inner beltway, Metro Winnipeg, and it states that two parcels of land in Assiniboia will be purchased by Metro for the proposed suburban beltway. It also states that Metro has received approval from the Provincial Department of Public Works to complete the transaction.

Now, Mr. Speaker, on Page 708 of Hansard in answer to the honourable member's query - the Honourable Member for Assiniboia - the Minister said this: "If I might take this opportunity to answer a question by the Honourable Member from Assiniboia with respect to the Inner Perimeter road development, the government has not approved any location of the Inner Perimeter Highway in the Assiniboia or St. James and Charleswood area. There are several possible locations and they are being considered and the government has, in a few instances, authorized purchase of property."

Now, Mr. Speaker, my question is this. It's quite well known that there are many thousands of people in that area objecting to this inner beltway's location, so I would ask the Honourable Minister if he will entertain a delegation who wish to oppose this. They have already been to Metro, but now the province is actively associated with the project. So my question is: will the Minister see a delegation who wish to present counter-proposals?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, the answer that I gave on a previous occasion to this matter really doesn't change the matter much. While it is true that the province has agreed to participate in the purchase of some property in some areas, there has been no firm decision as to the location of the site. And certainly on the second matter raised by the Honourable Member from Portage, the Acting Minister of Highways is very often -- the office of the Acting Minister of Highways is very often somewhat akin to that of the Highway and I have no objection to meeting delegations of any kind at any time if the time and place can be arrived at.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the First Minister. In view of the recent player trade between the Liberal and Conservative parties, in particular the announcement that Jack McGurran, a long-time Liberal, has now joined the Conservative Party, does the Minister have any more player trades to announce and is he putting the Member for Souris-Lansdowne on waivers?

HON. WALTER WEIR (Premier) (Minnedosa): None, Mr. Speaker. No, Mr. Speaker, and if I might add, I admire the judgment that is being shown by this latest move.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs. In view of the rapid devaluation of property, farmland especially, would the department consider revising the assessments of various municipalities where you have high assessments as a result of this?

MRS. FORBES: I am not sure what your question is. Would you mind repeating it please?

MR. FORESE: Yes, in view of the rapid devaluation of farm properties in several municipalities where the assessment has been raised a year to two ago to a very high level, would the Minister consider revising the assessments of these municipalities now that the devaluation has gone down on farm properties?

MRS. FORBES: Mr. Speaker, it is our hope that we will have enough assessors in the field to have an assessment every five years.

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Did I understand her correctly to say that she would refuse to table the letter she received from Carberry?

MRS. FORBES: No.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Will the Minister table the letter?

MRS. FORBES: I have not been asked to table the letter and I think it requires an Order.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Speaker, I'm asking the Minister to table the letter now.

MRS. FORBES: I think the honourable member needs an Address for Papers.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Mr. Speaker, there is no need to put in an Address for Papers. I just asked for one letter to be tabled and there is no reason why it should go through that formality.

MRS. FORBES: Mr. Speaker, I don't think there's any need to table it. I think it's a public document; it's been spread around.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party) (Radisson): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I may address a question to the Honourable Minister of Urban Development and Municipal Affairs. In view of the discussions yesterday dealing with the Arthur D. Jones and Associates report and the publicity given to the matter in the Winnipeg Tribune yesterday, and also the anxiety of the community of Churchill respecting the same, is the Minister now in a position to table the report of the Murray V. Jones and the Port of Churchill?

MRS. FORBES: No, Mr. Speaker, I have not yet received a release from Ottawa for tabling the report.

MR. PAULLEY: A subsequent question. The Honourable the Minister refers to permission from Ottawa for a release. Does this require the consent of the Government of Canada? It seems to me that this is a little unusual with a document of this nature. It's not confidential between two governmental bodies, as I understand the situation.

MRS. FORBES: Yes, Mr. Speaker, it's a partnership. It does require the permission for release from Ottawa.

MR. PAULLEY: One more, and it's my last I believe, Mr. Speaker. Do I understand the Minister that she indicates that the report can not be released until such time as the approval is given by the Parliament of Canada.

MRS. FORBES: Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to my honourable friend the Minister of Public Utilities. Is it his intention to introduce breathalyzer legislation at this session of the Legislature?

MR. McLEAN (Minister of Public Utilities) (Dauphin): That is a matter of policy which will be announced in due course.

MR. SHOEMAKER: A further question to my honourable friend the Minister of Public Utilities. Every member of the House is presently in receipt of an announcement from -- oh, pardon me, I guess my question is to the Minister of Agriculture and Acting Minister of Highways. We are in receipt of a public notice setting out the pounds per inch width of tire, gross weight per axle assembly, on various highways and provincial roads. Now in consideration of the fact that many truckers, as of today - because I do believe that this is effective today - will be going down side roads in rural municipalities. What action can a municipality take to use the same restrictions as you have placed on the list of highways in provincial roads as per Bulletin No. 3?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I really believe the question should perhaps be directed at a different source because I'm not fully familiar with the powers that the municipalities have under the Municipalities Act. I believe that under the authority vested in the transportation authority of the municipalities that they would have it within their power and within their jurisdiction to pass the type of restrictions that they would feel necessary from time to time to safeguard or to look after the welfare of their roads.

MR. SHOEMAKER: A supplemental question then, I suppose, should be directed to the Minister of Municipal Affairs - if I can get her attention. The question was simply this, Madam Minister. Can any rural municipality enact legislation to limit load weights on any road within their municipality to the extent that the province has done by the issuing of the Bulletin No. 3 which you and every Member of the House presently has?

MRS. FORBES: The question is not mine; it should be directed to the Minister of Public Utilities.

MR. SHOEMAKER: We'll eventually get around to the right Minister, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: to rise, so probably the honourable member may not have to repeat it.

MR. SHOEMAKER: I should not have to repeat it then should I? You have comprehended the import of my question? Okay.

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Speaker, there are provisions in the Highway Traffic Act which

(MR. McLEAN cont'd)... authorize local authorities, which means municipal councils to impose restrictions on the use of their roads. There are certain requirements that require notice and posting and that sort of thing. Specifically, whether the same limits can be imposed as are imposed by the Department of Highways on provincial trunk highways, I would say yes, that is the limits that can be imposed would be similar to those imposed by the Department of Highways itself on their roads.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member from Morris.

MR. HARRY P. SHEWMAN (Morris): Mr. Speaker, I have a very pleasant duty to perform this afternoon. I would like to invite the members of this House, along with their wives - and the bachelor over there, make sure you bring a girl friend - to the Big M stampede that's held at Morris. The date is July 16th to the 20th, but we are sending complimentary tickets to all members of the House for the 17th of July at 1:30.

Now, we are holding the second largest stampede and rodeo in Western Canada. There's only one spot in Canada that surpasses us to date and we're going after them pretty hard, and that's Calgary. We're just trailing right along on Calgary's heels because the lads, the men and the women that take part in the Calgary stampede, are coming direct to Morris and they have for the last four years. We are going after our livestock entries in a big way this year. Last year we built a stable to accommodate a little better than 600 head of livestock, so we'll guarantee you a good heavy draft horse show and one of the best light horse shows held in the Province of Manitoba. We're expecting a large exhibit of dairy cattle; also of beef cattle. Our grandstand accommodation is right in round figures around 12,000 people, and I know when you accept this invitation and attend the Big M stampede, as we call it - Big M stands for the Province of Manitoba - and M also stands for that thriving town of Morris, Manitoba.

There is parking space available on the grounds. There will be this year for you lads that come out, and if you want to bring a trailer, bring the family with you and spend the five days with us at the stampede, we have trailer accommodation for you on the grounds. We just hope that you will all remember the 17th of July at 1:30.

MR. SPEAKER: And they learned it all from Swan River. The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer -- I beg your pardon. The Minister of Agriculture.

MR. ENNS: With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if in the interest of the House I would be allowed to make just a further announcement regarding a change of personnel in the Manitoba Marketing Board. This change will take place in the next day or two and I feel I'd like to inform the members of the House. For some time the member Mr. Searle, Jr., who has served the board very capably and with distinction during the last three years, has requested to be relieved of this duty due to pressures of his private business, and he will be replaced on this important board by the President of United Grain Growers, Mr. Runciman, I'm sure the members will agree with me that Mr. Runciman will bring to this important area of agriculture activity, that is the service of the Manitoba Marketing Board, the kind of capability and expertise that we require in this field. This change will take place within the next day or two.

I should also inform the members while I'm dealing with the subject of marketing that letters will be going forth from my office today inviting the provisional members of the proposed Turkey Marketing Board to meet with me for an inaugural meeting of this board, hopefully in the beginning of the next week or the following week, so that progress is being made in this particular area too. Thank you.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the Minister for his statement. Certainly the Board has been well served by the man who was on it for some years and the new addition is equally a most capable man. I want to commend the Minister for getting men of that calibre on this most important Board. I wonder if I might ask the Minister a question regarding the broiler marketing. Is he planning on having a vote on a broiler board in the Province of Manitoba?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, that matter is still before Cabinet for consideration.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the Attorney-General.

MR. LYON: Before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I was asked by the Honourable Member for St. George a question concerning wire-tapping. His exact question was: "Have the government purchased any wire-tapping devices?" The short answer to that question is "no". A distinction must be made of course between what is known as wire-tapping and

(MR. LYON cont'd)...recording devices. A questionnaire has been circulated to the departments of the Provincial Government and the General Purchasing Agent of the government and has been answered "no".

There are the following qualifications with respect to recording equipment that comes with certain recording or dictating machines. The Department of Mines and Resources, through the Manitoba Telephone System, installed a device in one of their branches which permits telephone conversations to be recorded on tape. There are also one or more magnetic pick-up devices with dictating equipment in the department.

The Department of Education has a few dictating machines which have telephone attachments for recording conversations. Apparently such attachments are seldom used, but they are used on occasion to record messages with the permission of the sender. This recording device does not emit a signal when it is recording.

The Manitoba Telephone System advises that while they have not purchased wire-tapping devices, they do use equipment that can cut in on conversations for service reasons or purposes, as sanctioned by Section 37, subsection (5) of The Manitoba Telephone Act.

There's also a pen-writing machine used by the Telephone System that can detect annoying or obscene telephone calls. This machine apparently records the telephone numbers called by the suspect but the conversations are not listened to nor are they recorded.

The Emergency Measures Organization reports that they have a telephone stenorette dictating adapter which can be attached to the telephone with a rubber suction cup. The adapter is used to record long messages received by phone from the Federal regional representative of the organization and to receive commercial telegrams. The adapter is also used in cases of emergency to make certain that the telephone message is accurately received. In the case of these telephone conversations, they assure us that the caller is informed that the message is being taken on tape. That completes the survey of the government organizations.

I reiterate that the recorder equipment that was referred to in these exceptions that I have just enumerated is not technically wire-tapping equipment; it is equipment that can be bought in any commercial market.

He also asks the question: "Do any of the police departments in Manitoba have telephone-tapping devices?" We sent a questionnaire to the following police departments and agencies in Manitoba: The Royal Canadian Mounted Police, Fort Garry Police, Tuxedo Police, City of Winnipeg Police Department, West Kildonan Police Department, North Kildonan Police Department, East Kildonan Police Department, St. Vital, Transcona, St. Boniface, Assiniboia, St. James and Brandon, and all of them replied in the negative. Numerous smaller forces in Manitoba have of course not been canvassed.

If my honourable friend has any particular information or problem that he wants us to enquire into further, we would be happy to do so. Just off the top of my head, I do know that with respect to the 999 system of emergency calls that are used in Metropolitan Winnipeg area, those calls are recorded. I'm not personally certain whether a beep signal is emitted when that number is dialed or not, but they are recorded for check-back purposes. But if there's any further information that we can get for my honourable friend, we'll be happy to do so.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brokenhead.

MR. SAMUEL USKIW (Brokenhead): Mr. Speaker, if I may say a few words in connection with the statement made by the Minister of Agriculture with respect to an appointment to the Manitoba Marketing Board, I just want to share the opinion that I was quite happy with the services rendered to the Province of Manitoba by Mr. Searle and I'm sorry that he has chosen to leave that position. However, I want to say that I'm also pleased to see a man of the calibre of Mr. Runciman appointed to that position.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster

MR. SIDNEY GREEN (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I just want to get clarification from the Honourable the Attorney-General with regard to the statement that he has just made. I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, if I've wrongly characterized his remarks. I wanted to find out whether it is possible for a member of the Legislature or the Legislature or for anybody else to be in discussion with somebody in a government department and not know that his voice is being recorded and that discussion is being recorded.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, judging from the information that has been given to us, I would say that anything is possible, but there is a section of the Telephone System Act which requires conversations that are being recorded to have a signal emitted, or a beep signal

(MR. LYON cont'd)...emitted, so that the person knows. I'm not aware of any conversations of members of the Legislative Assembly being recorded.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, that's my very point. If the Act requires that a beep signal be emitted, then can the Attorney-General explain why some of the equipment which is in the hands of some government departments permits such conversations without the emission of a beep. That's what I understood him to say, or am I wrong in that?

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, according to the information that I have, the equipment that is available, that is the Stenorette or Phillips recording machines, are sold commercially on the market to anyone who wishes to purchase them, and some of them I am told - I have not seen them - some of them apparently have suction cups that can be attached to a telephone, whether in government or private office or anywhere else. My honourable friend might have one; I don't know. It's theoretically possible that this could be done, but if it is done it is technically an infringement of the Telephone Act.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I wish to assure my honourable friend that I don't have one. What he's assured me is that the government does have some, and I just wonder why they would have the suction-type equipment without a machine that emits a beep, and if they do have and if there is absolutely no use for it, then it should be done away with.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I wanted to ask the Minister a question in a similar vein. For years this type of equipment has been sold, recording equipment for tape recorders that doesn't emit a beep. Why is it legally possible to sell it or purchase it when it is technically ruled out that it must have that beep device?

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, my understanding is - and I'm not an authority on the Telephone Act - but my understanding is that it is not illegal to possess such equipment; it is technically illegal to use it.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I have one further question. Does the Attorney-General consider that the government should have this material which is legal to sell but illegal to use?

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, any tape recorder can record a telephone conversation.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the Attorney-General a question. Do I now understand that the Telephone System has equipment for which they can trace harrassment calls and obscene phone calls, and when did this come into effect?

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I can't answer for the Telephone System, that's the province of my honourable friend the Minister of Public Utilities, but in answer to our enquiry, they gave us the information that I've just reported to the House.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer and the proposed motion of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition in amendment thereto, and the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for St. John's in further amendment thereto. The Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I have been informed by a number of people that I have approximately five minutes to wind up what I was saying yesterday, and I may not even take the five minutes. When I concluded my remarks just prior to the adjournment yesterday afternoon, I was touching on some of the matters pertaining to the Port of Churchill as contained in a Tribune news report under the by-line of Mr. Steve Melnyk, who apparently had some information pertaining to the very important matter of Churchill. As you understand, Mr. Speaker, I asked the Honourable the Minister of Urban Development and Municipal Affairs today whether we could not have that information transmitted to the House, and it seems to me rather peculiar that apparently others can obtain the information allegedly contained in the report and we cannot receive that information here in the House. To say the least, Mr. Speaker, this seems very very peculiar to me.

Dealing with the matter of the Jones report, the Minister has referred on a couple of occasions to the report being a draft report. I sincerely trust and hope that she's not awaiting a revision to be made of the draft report. If she means draft report in that it may not be set up in proper print or type, then I would accept that, but if the use of the word "draft" is to indicate that there may be some changes in the report, I want to assure my honourable friend that there will be grave exceptions to that on the receipt of a report which deviates from the draft.

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd)

Another point that I was raising yesterday was the apparent lack of interest of the front bench to the matters under consideration during the budget debate. I pointed out that my colleague from St. John's had listed a number of propositions and proposals for the consideration of the government that had been ignored, and that the Minister of Health has been the only participant in the debate. He suggested in his remarks that there were no proposals from this side of the House that could advance the well-being of the people of Manitoba or the economy of the Province of Manitoba, and I take strong exception to that.

Now today, Mr. Speaker, we'll find a vote being taken on three propositions - in effect, three votes based on two propositions - one proposed by my colleague from St. John's; the other the Leader of the Opposition's amendment to the motion to go into committee, and as yet we have not heard anything of any substantive nature from the front benches of government. I think this is most deplorable. I did think for a moment or two yesterday afternoon that if we had of gone on in session for another 15 minutes or so, or five minutes or so, that the Honourable the Minister of Education was going to jump into the firing line on behalf of the government. I hope that he will this afternoon, because I touched on the deplorable situation in some areas of Manitoba in respect of education. I thought at that time my honourable friend was just ready to jump out of the trenches and into the battlefield, and I trust and hope that he will.

I also trust and hope that possibly the First Minister will give us of the benefits of his knowledge as to the destiny of Manitoba, and before 9:30 this evening will take part in the debate on the budget. I also hope of course, and I'm sure everybody else does as well, that the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer would get up from his comfortable pew and give us the benefit of his observations of the debate on this side.

With these remarks, Mr. Speaker, I enjoin my honourable friends to -- I beg your pardon? Well, I would like to hear something from the Minister of Welfare. Mr. Speaker, he has been in this House now I believe for, let us see, somewhere going on eight or nine years and I haven't heard anything from him as yet, although he has taken part in some of the debates, but I still would like to hear something with emphasis from my honourable friend, and ask him too and his deskmate and the rest of the front benchers to take part. You'll have to be brief, as I am being brief at this particular time, because the vote does come at 9:30 this evening.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, this government, led by a divided and somewhat disinterested Cabinet, has been failing and is still failing the people of Manitoba. Finally, after a month and a half, the Minister had enough courage to finally get up. This is the first time I think, other than the Ministers speaking in their estimates or presenting a Bill, is all.

Now his presentation was terrific and I certainly want to congratulate him on this, but he didn't say very much. He didn't say very much about the present and he didn't say very much about the future. He talked about the last ten years, and with the Minister of Education tugging at his sleeve, he told us about what they've done in education in the last ten years and asked us, what would you have done? Well, what did these people do in education? They took a popular part of a report of a royal commission, a royal commission set up by a former government, and with the help of practically all the members of this House implemented it. What did it do with the controversial part of this commission? Nothing; you couldn't even get an answer for ten years on these things.

Then the Minister talked about health, told us about all these hospitals that they have built, and he asked us, what would you do? Well, this government was forced into a compulsory -- I think that the hospitalization plan was in before this government took office and they went along with it. I can tell you something, Mr. Speaker, that we wouldn't be building all kinds of beds the way they are now, I'll say that. We would start by taking a long look at home care - improving this. The Minister challenged me yesterday to give him some of our ideas and I'm going to do that today.

The nursing home - we'd build more beds on this. You can't get a bed, it's practically impossible. Before starting to build all these beds in these acute cases, these acute care beds that are so costly -- we're building all these beds, and the former Premier told us about this big project that he had. It's going to be the health centre of North America. We can't even take care of the Medicare plan, and we need this in Manitoba. What kind of a monument

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd)...are we trying to build?

We have a shortage of personnel as you know, Mr. Speaker. The members of the staff and my honourable friend the Minister of Health will admit that himself. We're building more beds so we can close wards. We'll have more wards to close because we haven't the proper personnel. This is what he said on health, this is what he said on education - ten years ago - on Medicare, not a word. This is his department, but in all fairness he has the adjournment of my motion and I hope that he will come in with something a little better than the Minister of Welfare did.

I don't want to hear about this voluntary plan and so on. We heard about that last year. That speech of the Minister of Welfare could have been delivered last year, should have been delivered last year, and was delivered last year by some of the members. I want the Minister of Health, when he has his chance, to tell us what's going to happen now. Other people of Manitoba - will they be told? The Premier, when he was contesting the nomination, said that he would like to see no one suffer because of lack of being able to pay for themselves. Will that be enough or will this government do something? This is what we want to hear.

Then he told us about the floodway, about containing the waters. "What would you do?" he said. Well, what was done in the first flood or the big flood? How much would it have cost this department to go back to the permanent dikes that were established? Not a word about that - not a word about that.

Then my honourable friend took the credit for -- I think he said something about colored TV up north, we'll have this pretty soon. And this is the same government that didn't want it, did not want to encourage the use of TV in the field of education, especially my friend who is not in his seat now - oh, he's in the second row, I see him - the Minister of Public Utilities. You remember the scene he put on that year? We don't believe in TV. I'd like to kick it out; I don't believe in that idiot box. Now they've taken the credit for this colored TV up north.

And then the Minister had the audacity to talk about youth and recreation. What have they done? What would we have done? Every year for three or four years we've suggested a department of youth, a department of recreation, a department that would do something for the leisure time that was growing more and more for the people of Manitoba. We've done that for years and years. Now we've got a Department of Tourism and Recreation, and what does it do? It's counting the dollars; it's taking care of tourism and it's taking all the credit for a year that was a prosperous year all across Canada with the Pan Am Games and the EXPO and our centennial and so on. Now, this is the credit.

Now we were told about the roads in the last ten years. What did he expect? Does the Minister want to tell me that this province has progressed more than the Province of Quebec, the Province of Ontario, that nothing has been done? You're going to talk about ten years ago and say you should have had these roads then? Is that what he wants to say? We have nice roads, but the people pretty soon will not be able to afford to drive their cars on these roads with the high tax that we have in this province.

Well, this is some of the things the Minister said. Well, I say that we don't want to talk about ten years ago. I wasn't in the House ten years ago - very few of us were - the Minister wasn't in the House ten years ago. I want to know about now, not ten years ago; that's past. Maybe this government had a mandate but they haven't got a mandate now. The Weir government hasn't got a mandate, and if the Premier is an honest man and I believe that he is, I think that he must go to the people of Manitoba now. Two hundred and eighty Conservatives elected the Premier of Manitoba. This is not a mandate, not a mandate for this kind of government at all.

We started, Mr. Speaker, we started this session in a spirit of friendship, co-operation. The Premier is a likeable fellow, we wanted to help him, he's a new First Minister and he should be given a chance. Everything was very quiet for about a month, expecting - a month, a month and a half - expecting well, finally something will come out. And remember that between sessions we had nothing; no action from this government. You couldn't even find a Minister. I tried to get the Minister of Health many times. He was all over Ottawa for Duff, and then all over the province for George or one of the others, but never in his office - never in his office - and that goes for all these ministers, or practically all. You couldn't get any action at all, and that is true.

This is what happened between the sessions, but we were patient enough. All right, you have another election, give the fellow a chance, he's a likeable fellow, give him a chance. We

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd) . . . had committees; they were all killed, first by the election of 1966. All kinds of committees were set up so we can hide things, so Mr. Roblin wouldn't have to make a decision until the election. All those committees were dead without even having spoken a word. Now we've had the committees again for two or three years. One committee that I'm on, we met the day that this session opened and then at 2:30 the committee was finished. This is the kind of government that we have. This is the Minister that is insulted because we dare question them, we dare make suggestions. How could we do such a thing from this side of the House?

Then, well as I say, the session started. We had the Throne Speech, which was a nothing speech. One of the most important - have you ever heard that in the Throne Speech - were this horned cattle; that was one of the major pieces of legislation. A new Minister that should have vision, that should have ideas, a brand new Minister talking about horned cattle in the Throne Speech. It took us about a month and a half to decide what we're going to do with it.

Then we had the Robarts Conference of Tomorrow. Manitoba's part - nil, nil. All right, then we're going for a new First Minister. What about the member from Wolseley? That had been his platform just a few months ago, this national unity. Why didn't they send him? He had a role to play; he hasn't done a darn thing around here. Why wasn't he sent? He had the experience, he could have represented Manitoba quite well. No, not a word, Manitoba didn't do anything there at all. And I'm not blaming the Minister that was there, he had no directive at all and he was pretty well lost with all the division going in the Cabinet at that time, stick-handling for the leadership.

Then we have the Federal-Provincial Constitutional Conference. Again, Manitoba nil. I think that finally the Minister, the First Minister must have learned that you needed more qualifications than just kicking the manure off a tractor. Now, in all fairness, I know what he means by that, he means that he wants to be one of the boys, and this is true, this is a good qualification but this is not enough, and I think we've learned that when we saw some of the people in discussions that we had on this constitutional conference. But Manitoba, what role did it play? Nil, nothing at all again.

Then in the Throne Speech, would we hear something about this all-important question of national unity again? Nothing, nothing has been said in this House again by the Minister in the Throne Speech.

MR. SPEAKER: I have endeavored to be tolerant throughout this debate on the budget and I want the honourable member to know that I would like to be tolerant with him too, but I would hope that he would come back to the matter under discussion and that is the budget debate, the matter of raising funds, and I know I can count on his co-operation.

MR. DESJARDINS: Thanks very much, Mr. Speaker. The matter under consideration is the lack of mandate also, the lack of confidence in this government, and I was endeavoring to show the patience that the people of Manitoba and the loyal opposition had and I'm saying that this patience is pretty well up to the end now.

We've had the Throne Speech, as I said, and then the -- well, one and a half -- excuse me, my friend the Minister of Agriculture is laughing. We haven't even got the farmers who have been trying to appeal to -- haven't any confidence the people of Manitoba, in this government at all. One of your own backbenchers has no confidence at all. And you think that this is a mandate to stay where you are because 280 people said, "This is the man that's going to lead the destiny of the people of Manitoba." I think that this is wrong. There are other people that could fill your position. I think that the Minister would like to get away from that. I don't think he knows too much about Agriculture. I think he wants to go on the road, and there are a lot of members that are ready, willing and probably able, just as able as he is - the Member from Souris, from Dufferin, from Virden, Arthur, Rock Lake, Roblin - they are all eager and willing but we have to wait, we have to re-assess everything, we have to be careful before we name the Minister, the new Minister. He has been in this House - I think this is his second session or something. We didn't wait for him. Of course he was a campaign manager, but as soon as my friend took office, the next day he was sworn in as a Minister. What was the matter then? This is not a mandate; this is not what the people of Manitoba deserve.

Even then, Sir, we said, well things will pick up; things will straighten out; we will finally see leadership, vision, ideas, a convinced man will finally stand up for what he believes. And we felt that he should have a chance to do it, but the Premier, he spoke twice, a kind of poor speech I'm afraid and it was based on the Speech from the Throne where he tried to blame

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd)... Ottawa again. This was his first chance and he's blaming Ottawa instead of telling us what he is going to do. He is blaming Ottawa. Of course he learned under a master.

And then this red herring about Medicare that he brought in, that didn't catch at all. Then this feeble attempt a few days ago to explain and justify his lack of action in appointing a proper Minister. We still waited. We are pretty easy to get along with and we wanted to give him all the chance in the world, then finally this famous budget speech by a tired Provincial Treasurer. If the word was parliamentary, I'd say a gutless speech, but I guess maybe I should say a spineless speech. Again, a speech that blamed Ottawa for everything that was wrong. A speech so well termed in The Winnipeg Tribune as a masterful buck-passing budget speech.

Well, Sir, this is the last straw. The people of Manitoba have run out of patience; the people of Manitoba cannot afford to be patient any more. I think it's like the Minister of Health said yesterday, it is time for the Members of the Opposition to do their work, to start showing how wrong this government is, and this is what we aim to do. These twelve members, they are not sacred cows, and if we feel that they are wrong - these Cabinet Ministers - we will tell them, Mr. Speaker. If they like it or not, if the Minister of Welfare likes it or not.

I started to say that this was a divided Cabinet. The Minister of Welfare didn't like that because I started naming the different cliques or groups or bunches, but I was asked to do so by the Minister of Education. This is why I did so and it's true that this government is divided. You have the Premier, the Minister of Agriculture, the Minister of Public Utilities, the Minister of Labour, of Mines and Natural Resources, and they are -- they want to stop all of a sudden. They want to stop. They are not following along the lines of the Roblin government at all. They have no mandate for this. The Roblin government was elected. And then we have the Attorney-General, Minister of Industry and Commerce - and that's the one by the way who is accused of losing the fight for the Attorney-General - and this is what was said. I'm quoting from the Brandon Sun. "Those people have lost two campaigns in a row, he said, referring to Industry and Commerce Minister Sidney Spivak and the machine working for Attorney-General Sterling Lyon, and they are losing today the same way they lost for Duff in Toronto. A couple of greenhorns like us have beaten them, he added, taking part of the credit for the Weir win for himself and Don Craik, St. Vital, an MLA who shared Weir's campaign chairmanship duties." That's my friend the Minister of Agriculture, and you say that this is not a divided Cabinet?

No wonder the Attorney-General is subdued. No wonder. I don't blame him a darn bit. He is the only one -- I'm sorry, I used to have some good battles with him but I always respected him, at least we brought things in the open, we discussed the affairs of Manitoba here, and I would like him to wake up a bit. I know it's difficult. Why should he fight somebody else's battles? I think he was the logical man to lead this government. I say this sincerely, I think that he would have -- if I said you, that would be a laughing matter. I think that he would have gone along with some of the programs. He wouldn't change everything with this Medicare Act all of a sudden, after passing this Bill and costing the people of Manitoba all kinds of money. He probably would have had a little restraint. So I don't blame him for being restrained. His heart's not in it, it's easy to see.

And then you have the other group which my friend said I called the left wingers - here's a left winger coming in now - that's the Minister of Education, the Minister of Health, the Minister of Welfare. The poor Minister of Health, no wonder he said that he was so mixed up yesterday when he heard these people. He would like to tell us that he wants to go with Medicare, I'm sure. So does the Minister of Education. I'm sure, because they did last year, and this is a red herring when the First Minister said things are different now and when the Minister of Welfare says things are different now. Things are not different now. They were hoping that -- maybe they saw an article in the paper by Sharp, which wasn't actually what he said at all, because I asked Mr. Sharp. He says you cannot stop Medicare from coming this year. They said -- what was that?

MR. McLEAN: He wanted your vote.

MR. DESJARDINS: He what? -- (Interjection) -- He wasn't even in the campaign. All right, but forget he's not elected, and you are still saying things were different. If you read all the account of this day of the election where they say the main thing -- this Minister here, the new First Minister of this Province said we will not have Medicare, and that's when you changed your mind. It has nothing to do with Ottawa. Be man enough, be strong enough to

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd)... stand up and say we've changed our mind - we've changed our mind - if this is what you want. You are just punishing - this is just the way you want to show the people of Manitoba, well all right, let's have a scapegoat, let's show that we want to save money. All right, we are going back, none of this socialism, we are not going to have Medicare. You are punishing the people of Manitoba. If you want to show this, be a man, cut off this propaganda machine, quit this duplication and so on, you'll achieve the same thing and the people of Manitoba will be a lot better off.

MR. DOUGLAS CAMPBELL (Lakeside): What about the Minister of Labour?

MR. DESJARDINS: Who's he?

HON. OBIE BAIZLEY (Minister of Labour) (Osborne): I think I'm going to be forced to get into this.

MR. DESJARDINS: You'd better go put . . . That's good news indeed. Finally, another one is going to wake up. I thought rigor mortis had set in.

Then we are told about priorities. The government of Manitoba must be prudent, it must be efficient, it must establish priorities and live by them, he said. That's the new First Minister. What priority? You are talking about priority; Duff spoke about priorities; what are your priorities? Tell us once and for all. Medicare was on the list. The health of the people of Manitoba is not important? We are at a loss on this side of the House. What are your priorities?

MR. WEIR: That's the best speech you've made yet.

MR. DESJARDINS: That's right - that's right - and standing in front of you. This is the best speech you ever made. Are you going to make another one? This makes three now. I hope you get in this debate. You'll have your chance. Get up. You've got an important job to do, now you're a big boy. Get up and take your licks like the others. Let's have one of those eyeball to eyeball confrontations - you know, the one you like to talk about.

Now your member from Wolseley, of course he's got his 20 minutes, he packed, told the Whip and he's gone - he's not very far in case you have a vote, I know. What is he doing in this House? They say his place is not to take over. That's true - that's true - but it's clear that he's not interested at all. He's only interested in the federal field. He was offered Marquette. He's afraid, he's not going to take Marquette. He wanted Lisgar. You even try to create a job, an \$18,000 job to get rid of somebody so he'd walk. But to his credit, the Member from Lisgar didn't want any part of that at all. He was elected to do a job. Maybe he wanted \$20,000, I don't know. This was the vice-chairmanship of the Manitoba Hydro. I say that the Minister of Wolseley should have resigned immediately. The people of that constituency were good to him. Why isn't he honest? I know that the First Minister doesn't want that because you need his vote, but if that's a mandate you receive -- I know that when you saw the election in Turtle Mountain you were afraid. I say you have to go to the people of Manitoba if you are honest.

MR. LYON: Would the honourable member permit a question?

MR. DESJARDINS: Certainly - certainly from you, I've told you how much I like you.

MR. LYON: Would he suggest that the Right Honourable Lester Pearson resign from the House of Commons on the 23rd of April of this year?

MR. DESJARDINS: I didn't quite get the question. I think I got part of it.

MR. LYON: Would he suggest that his national leader the Right Honourable Lester Pearson resign from the House of Commons when he ceases to be Prime Minister?

MR. DESJARDINS: I think that he'll have a role to play, but this one is never in the House. He's not interested in feathering his nest and going to the federal; he's reached the top. I think that Mr. Pearson would do a good job. I think that Duff could have gone and did a good job, as I said, in this conference, but he's not doing it. He's just getting ready for the federal field. This is what I don't like. And I think that we should have an election in Ottawa too. I'll say that, but I also want to say that I represent Manitoba, like I've said many times, and I'm not responsible for what happens in Ottawa.

I know that you want to go there too, but I'm trying to keep you. You're one of the only guys that we can have a little bit of life and I want to keep you here. We have had other Ministers -- the Minister of Public Utilities, we are told, he wants to seek other fields, and my honourable friend - I'd be sorry to miss them because they have their value - this is one of the most honest Ministers that -- the Minister of Public Utilities, he tells you, "I run the show in Dauphin, the others don't. I run the show in Dauphin". And this is honesty that you've

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd)...got to keep. This is valuable around here.

You think that I'm exaggerating maybe, you think that I'm playing politics in what I'm saying. Well let's look a little bit at some of the things that happened here. Have you ever seen a government abdicate their responsibility like this government did? There are more Boards and Commissions - independent, non-political - formed with defeated Conservative candidates that are set up for one thing and one thing only, to shield this government, like what happened at the - what is it, the Interlake? The government does not take the responsibility. They do what they want.

As I said, the Minister got up and -- gee whiz, I think I'll read that again, this is something. "Having dealt two cards, Mr. McLean pulled out a third. 'If you have a Conservative MLA', he said, 'you will have a better entry to the department of the government, of having adequate consideration given to your problems'." No, that's not the one. That's pretty good too. I wanted to get that one in anyway. "In direct answer to the mayor's statement that we can no longer sit and wait for the decision by civil servants located at Winnipeg, Mr. McLean emphatically stated, 'let's be quite clear, the decision on vocational schools will be made by the Cabinet of Manitoba, as they have been in the past and will be made in the future'."

So what are those commissions for? Just a shield because you don't want to take the responsibility. You have to scrap all the reports on the Interlake now and start over, but it's not the First Minister; it's not the government; no, it's this part-time Boundary Commission. It's their fault. This is not fair. This is not what the people of Manitoba want. Maybe I can read here from Mr. Henry Jolly, President of the Canadian Manufacturers Association. This is what he has to say in one of his speeches. "I refer to the municipality of quasi-official boards, commissions and committees which have mushroomed over the years to the point where collectively they now wield extensive authority over our lives, even though they are for the most part appointed and not elected." And this is what we have with this government. This is all we have. We have more boards and so on, for what reason I don't know.

There's so much good stuff in here I don't want to -- and what do we spend on this famous commission, this Boundary Commission, this Boundary Commission where a defeated Cabinet Minister was supposed to be full-time and is half-time. He's practising law; he's appearing in front of these municipalities and he'll decide what they are going to do later on. Isn't there a conflict of interests there? The government doesn't know. The Minister accepted my question and then told me that we'd know if there would be a full-time chairman, and now we'll hear about it in due course, that's after the next election.

Now the Minister of Health wanted to know where we would save money. Well there was three quarters of a million dollars I think that we approved for this commission. We would do away with that commission; we'd take our own responsibility. This is what we'd do. Not only when it suited us, we'd accept the responsibility also. We wouldn't have so many. This is just one commission; there's a lot of other commissions that would disappear, you can be sure of that.

And then we wouldn't have a committee running around living in the best hotels and so on studying the denturists. What about that report? Don't laugh. You're eating candy and that's bad for your teeth; you might need them pretty soon. What about the denturists? How much money did that cost the people of Manitoba? Why are you hiding behind that group? Not a word. Why didn't you tell us about that yesterday instead of saying something about ten years ago. I know you started a committee about ten years ago. What about that?

Then we have heard about this duplication of this TED Commission. We would save money on that too. And this strong propaganda department that we have - that's one thing I have to congratulate this government - they are really strong on that; they are doing a heck of a job. This propaganda sheet is really terrific. They are all over the place, and probably two or three of them waiting out there. But they don't present facts and that's not quite right.

Now this great government of decision. This detention home - isn't that a crime the way things are going? That's the government of priority. Here's the Winnipeg Free Press of Tuesday, August 15th - a picture of a beautiful building - "Work to Start in Autumn on Animal Home in Elmwood - \$100,000." I'm not against that. And then on the same page, "Shelter Case Removed from Detention Home - Too Crowded." That's the government or priority, the great government of priorities.

Then the Manitoba Development Fund. For years we heard "don't interfere; why should they tell anybody why they are borrowing money?" This is money of the people of Manitoba,

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd) . . . and all of a sudden this year the 12 sacred cows are the 12 directors of the Manitoba Development Fund. Do you mean to tell me that we have confidence, the people of Manitoba have confidence in this kind of directors? As I say, my honest friend here, the Minister from Dauphin of the Public Utilities, tells you - and it's obvious and he talks about all he did himself - he used his position to do for his people. Do you think that the people of Manitoba trust him more than the Member for Lakeside? Do you really think that? Don't you think you could have had an independent group of this House to sit on this Board? I think there's a lot of people here who can do just as good a job. I don't think that you have to reveal all the information from the rooftop, but I think that you have to have an impartial committee.

This is what I suggest and what we suggested for the last few years, have a committee, an independent committee of this House, where you can take care of the funds, the public money here in Manitoba. And all of a sudden you mean there's no danger of playing politics on that? Do you really think that I'm that gullible, the people of Manitoba that gullible, that we feel this is all right, that the Manitoba Development Fund is your toy and you can play with it? This is all right, the twelve sacred cows will decide? This is right? This is the kind of mandate you have? I say you are failing Canada. You are being a government, a negative government, a government governing by boards, hiding between commission shields, anything that you can, and having your propaganda sheet to tell you what you want the people of Manitoba to hear.

All right, we can come back to this Medicare again. Be honest in your debate. Tell us what you are going to do now. Tell us what happens to the people of Manitoba who must now pay, because of your action of last year, must now pay up to 45 percent more. We told you that we would go with you as much as possible to try to change this and we will, but what is that going to do now; this year? What is it going to do? What is it doing to do? What's my friend the Minister of Health going to say about that? He's taking credit for this coloured TV up north. What about these people here and their health - this year, not tomorrow. Why bring this thing to show how strong and how tough the First Minister is? He can make a tough decision, but not necessarily the right decision. Make a tough decision. You want help from this side, you want suggestions, do away with your propaganda sheet. Do away with that and quit giving all your defeated candidates jobs and then hiding behind them. That's a tough decision, a real tough decision, but it would be a good decision.

What about all this economic revolution that we have heard in the north? Are we behind schedule? We don't hear too much about it now. I'd better be careful because the Member from Churchill will make a speech on the North. But this is not the kind of speech I want, I want to know what's really happening.

This hospitalization field. What have we done? As I said, build, build beds, and we take a lot of -- this is terrific, a new Grace Hospital; close another ward in another hospital but build another hospital. This is what we're having here and then we're talking about -- the First Minister is talking about this is going to be the health centre of the world. How ridiculous can that be with our population. Who can afford that? Who's going to pay for that? Or a monument for the memory of Mr. Duff Roblin, is that what we want? What about Medicare? What about our people of Manitoba now?

Now the taxes the famous budget speech. We don't get anything from Ottawa, but one-fourth of what the people of Manitoba pay on income tax comes back to the province. That's a fair start. The sales tax brought 38 1/2 millions, \$5 million more than apparently was needed. And you say we have no increase in tax? What is that 5 million? Where is it going? Where is that \$5 million going? You didn't expect this at all. Did you return it to the people of Manitoba? Did you? You're not talking about this, this is your education tax, and then because of your action now it's 45 percent more, a 45 percent increase on school taxes. And just a few months ago, this is the government that introduced legislation for the removal of the majority burden for education costs from real property owners. How ridiculous is this! And then this famous budget speech, the people of Manitoba are not spending any more money -- are not paying any more taxes. Introduction of tax on tax on liquor; that doesn't count - that doesn't count. We're even taxing taxes now in Manitoba. Higher Hydro rates. That doesn't count. Who do you think pays for this? And probably higher hospital premiums, Mr. Speaker.

Isn't that a lot of gall of making a speech like this? The government hides behind the

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd)... Federal Government, the Metro, the Municipal, the Hydro Board, the Liquor Commission, and apparently soon even the Manitoba Hospital Commission. You can't blame these people at all. No, you can't blame them at all. They've got an excuse, they've got that shield in front of them. Blame that defeated Cabinet Minister. Blame that \$12,000 part-time man, that's what he's getting paid for; but not us, not us.

I say to the Premier - be honest. You must realize that you haven't got the mandate of the people of Manitoba; you must now know that kicking manure off tractor wheels is one thing but leading a government is another. I think that you should be fair to your native province. I say go to the people and go to the people now. Let go; let Duff go to the federal; let a few other members go to the Federal if they want; and some of the tired members might quit. Get a little bit of new blood and try to get your mandate, and if you can, well then more power to you and go along with your campaign, with your program. But you haven't got the right because 280 Conservative friends of yours elected you and said this is the one, this is the man we want to lead the destiny of Manitoba. I don't think you have the right to accept this as a mandate and I say that you have no alternative, no alternative at all but to go to the people of Manitoba and get the proper mandate.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. LEMUEL HARRIS (Logan): I listened to the Honourable Member for St. Boniface and he talked on various taxes. I agree with him wholeheartedly and I want to touch a little on taxes too.

I am a city member from the City of Winnipeg and I live in a constituency which is a working class constituency. It is bounded on the north by the CPR and goes out to Notre Dame, and in that constituency there are a bunch of homes that I feel have no right to bear the tax that is put upon them. There are people in there that have fixed incomes, pensioners and such like. Who is to look after them if we, the MLAs in this Chamber, can't do something for them. It seems that taxes on homes are higher than at any time in Winnipeg's history. For some there has also been a big increase in assessment. Rents will rise sharply. The City Council and Provincial Government have failed to act. We the MLAs must act now for a new deal, for a new tax deal for Manitoba.

It is no use to say this thing can go on forever because our people can only take so much, and when I think of what happened to one of the Kings of France - you'll hear of this holiday, the 14th of July - and I often wonder when that is going to happen in Manitoba here, the 14th of July.

You talk about the provincial jails. By golly, we'll go down there, we won't have a bastille there, we'll have -- (Interjection) -- That's right. No, not Headingley. This jail down across the street here, at Vaughan Street, so we'll have a Vaughan Day here instead of a bastille day. Yes.

Well, as I said, I am here today to speak for the people in my constituency, and for all of Manitoba, not for my own constituency in particular. The pensioners and low income groups - how would we protect them? We would protect them if we would exempt them from the first \$2,000 of assessment on owner-occupied homes. I don't think that is out of the way at all, but as I say, when you speak of something like this, it is out of this world according to some people, they can't possibly do it. But I remember the other day the strike in Memphis was settled at last, after a man had come in there and been killed. After all the strife and trouble, they finally settled this thing. Why didn't they do it in the first place? I ask you that again. Why didn't they do it? No, no there had to be bloodshed, there had to be everything before they could go out and do a thing. I don't like to lead you around by the nose and I don't want you to do the same thing, but I say let's be men and let's sit down and just deliberate and see what we can do. Some kind of succour for our poor people, that's what I would ask you today. Not only you, but the various councils and municipalities throughout Manitoba.

Apartments were given tax concessions last year. A rent increase now is unjustified. How would we stop that? By putting a ceiling on rents; protect the tenants from rent gouging. You know, today in Manitoba a man goes out - and I'll tell you if he's earning \$300.00 a month, after he's had everything taken off he hasn't very much left to go home with - and if somebody is going to come along and stick him for another \$20.00 a month extra for rent, I'm sure that man can't possibly do it. Something has to go by the board, either his kids has to go without food or they have to go without clothing. Something has to be done. So I would say we have to do something, we are here today, we are gathered here in this place so that we can formulate laws

(MR. HARRIS cont'd.) for our people and give them some justice.

Now, I hear them talking of Medicare. The need for medicare - it is all-inclusive and comprehensive medicare. The plan has never been more urgent than now, but such a plan has been obstructed over the years by the old line parties, the party to my right and the party in front of me. The Liberals promised it in 1919, but 49 years later it is still to be implemented. It's not too long. The Member for Lakeside says that. The Conservative Party, when it come into power, set up a Royal Commission, the Hall Commission, to study the problem - slow but sure, the usual delaying tactics - federal and provincial governments are still stalling medicare. You've heard our Premier say, "Oh, I don't want medicare in here. I believe a private plan is better for us all. We don't need it in Manitoba. We are rugged; we are all strong." I wonder how strong we are. We smell strong - that's it.

The Pearson government, after finally accepting some of the recommendations of the Royal Commission and promising to implement it on July, 1967, postponed it for a year to July, 1968. Only two provinces had any guts in this Canada of ours to say that they were going into this plan. That was not Manitoba, surely not, they're in the centre. The heat isn't on them at all. They're always behind everybody else - plod, plod, plod, just like a horse going down the road -- (Interjection) -- I don't know about that. They should be a very young province around here, you know, and they should have very good ideas, I would say, but I don't know what is wrong with us. As I've said before, the forest is fossilized, and so are our Ministers over there, they are fossilized. They want to get going; they want to get a little bit more electricity in them and get that gear going properly, then we would get some place.

Our people today, we are paying for medicare - we are paying for medicare. And you say, "How are we paying for medicare?" As I have said, only two provinces have said they will join the medicare plan which makes it ineffective. The recent parliamentary crisis, the likelihood of an early federal election, the possibility that the new Liberal leader will not consider himself bound by the promise of the Pearson administration to start the medicare plan in July of 1968. Always there's a big question mark as to whether the plan will actually go into effect on that date. We have heard people saying, now there is a new man coming into Ottawa maybe things are going to be different, maybe this plan is going to be washed down again, that there's no plan at all. That is what a lot of people have wishful thinking, and I feel that our Canadians here today across Canada have a right to this medicare and it should be something that is for them today. I have tried in all ways to protect myself against sickness. I go and I pay for hospitalization. The only way that I can -- I can't go to a Doctor, the only way that I can go in the hospital, I pay this hospitalization. I paid it all the way along and I've never gone to the hospital. I don't begrudge that because it's just the same as unemployment insurance. In my estimation, it is there in case something comes along. If I don't use it, somebody else will. -- (Interjection) -- Yes, but life insurance - I can't use it.

In 1966, the Minister of Health told Parliament that the costs to the Federal Government would be \$340 million for all Canada. It would be doubled -- for all Canada, it would be doubled - \$680 million. But in 1967 Canadians spent on medical services \$600 million, so that the additional costs for medicare would be \$80 million since the \$600 million would not mean new expenditures but a transfer from private to public spending. The Saskatchewan medicare plan in 1966 cost only \$27.22 per person. By 1969, they expect it to raise to \$30.00 per person. So, you see it can be done. It was done in that province and we know that they have gone along and got for their people this medicare plan. They've had a change of government in there since but that government dare not throw that plan out because that plan is in there to stay. No doubt in my mind that they would like to go ahead like this government does over there, bring in here and bring in there a little extra - a little extra - a little extra - because who is it pays for all of this? The average Joe on the street, and I am one of them.

I say that I would like to see this medicare plan going in. We can do it, but no, we cater to the big insurance companies. We cater to all these various peoples; they all sit on our backs. It's about time we woke up and said, "Now you stand on your own two feet. Don't expect me to carry you all the while, but stand on your own two feet." Thank you very much gentlemen.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the Minister of Labour.

MR. BAIZLEY: Well, Mr. Speaker, in rising to take part in this debate, I first would like to congratulate my colleague the Provincial Treasurer, but I think before I enter into the series of congratulations which I think he is deserving of, I would like to suggest to the

(MR. BAIZLEY cont'd.) Honourable Member from St. Boniface, knowing as much about hockey as he does that you have an awful time blowing the puck into the net.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that the Provincial Treasurer has a very enviable job, or at least a unenviable job, because the making of a budget is hard work; because the decisions of a Provincial Treasurer are often unpopular decisions when he has to hit programs on the head he's unpopular with his colleagues; and if he raises taxes he's unpopular with all of us. So that in these particularly difficult times and in this particular year of 1968 when we the Manitoba Government are not doing anything, we're only spending \$377 million of the taxpayers' money, I can't help but wonder as I hear the anguish about taxes; I hear the anguish for expanded programs and spend more money, and at the same time we are told, and we know where the money comes from, so it would be nice if we could get some consistency -- we might not be able to get agreement, but at least we might be able to get some consistency in these matters, and I would suggest to the people of Manitoba that then if spending \$377 million in worthwhile investments for the people of this province, if this is do nothing then I for one as a member of the Cabinet of this government am guilty of doing nothing.

The budget which my colleague has brought down, Mr. Speaker, is a balanced budget. I realize that there are tedious arguments, tedious arguments that charge that any change in the power rates is tax increase, but just the same, Mr. Speaker, that don't detract from the fact that it is a balanced budget. And neither, Mr. Speaker, do the arguments on changes in municipal taxes, the fact still remains that the budget of this government is balanced. I am sure that all members of this House have read what the local papers have said about our current budget, and I know that each of us will disagree with some of the things that have been said, and others of us will agree with it. But I'd like, Mr. Speaker, to quote from the Globe and Mail an article under the by-line of Mr. Ronald Anderson, and it was published on April 9th, the day after my colleague brought down his budget: "Provincial budgets are being stretched to the breaking point this year by the rising costs of education and public welfare. Now despite massive tax increases all but a few provinces are running deeply in the red. The Provincial Treasurers said they have pared nonessential spending to the bone, but they see no way out of their fiscal difficulties within the existing system of tax-sharing between Ottawa and the provinces. The Manitoba Government last night was the ninth province to table its budget for the 1968-1969 fiscal year. The budget was not typical of other provincial statements in two respects, Manitoba was one of only three to predict a small surplus instead of a large deficit." Well, there we have an objective view of the job which has been done by the Provincial Treasurer.

Now the Globe and Mail has no ax to grind like my honourable friend from St. Boniface, but they notice two differences between our budget and that of most of the other provinces. They notice first that there is no tax increase, and they also notice that there is no deficit. So, Mr. Speaker, they noted something else, they noted that Provincial Treasurers have pared expenditures to the bone.

Now some rather harsh remarks have been directed toward my colleague because he said that he has pared spending estimates to the bone this year, and I don't think these remarks were very fair. Budget-making is not an easy job. There are many worthwhile projects, many excellent programs, and we have to realize that there are some of these that we cannot afford, and it's not easy to reject . . .

MR. SHOEMAKER: On a point of order. It appears that our honourable friend is reading his speech, and I thought that we had rules in the House that prevented members from reading speeches.

MR. BAIZLEY: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to advise the honourable member that I'm following my notes rather closely knowing how he takes these speeches and reads them back, I wouldn't want to be in error. -- (Interjection)-- I beg your pardon?

MR. DESJARDINS: . . . anyone from the propaganda department who wrote it for you? . . .

MR. BAIZLEY: I haven't got one of those.

MR. DESJARDINS: It's just a question.

MR. BAIZLEY: Mr. Speaker, my colleague stated in his budget speech that the only long-term solution to the fiscal problems of this province lies in a re-distribution of taxes between provincial and federal governments. Now the Globe and Mail said of all the provinces that - they see no way out of their fiscal difficulties within the existing tax-sharing arrangements between Ottawa and the Federal Government. Now let those who criticize the views of

(MR. BAIZLEY cont'd.) my colleague consider this: let them consider that his views are shared by nine other Provincial Treasurers - these are nine other men who have similar responsibilities throughout Canada. And let them consider whether Manitoba is served well by those who attempt to refute the views of a man who speaks for Manitoba and whose views are shared by the nine other Provincial Treasurers. These are difficult times for making up budgets; and it is true that our economy is expanding; and it is true that Canadians have more money to spend after taxes each year than they had the year before.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Speaker, is my honourable friend reading a quotation or is he reading his own speech?

A MEMBER: Well, that's the quotation.

MR. BAIZLEY: Mr. Speaker, I'm following my notes. I'm sure the honourable member wouldn't object to that because he utilizes the notes that come from the front benches so much that you wouldn't want them to be in error. -- (Interjection) --

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable the Minister of Labour has the floor, or has he completed his speech?

MR. BAIZLEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, that in these difficult times in trying to make budgets we should tax and we should borrow. International monetary conditions and international affairs presently leave the best money men in the world perplexed -- but no, we can borrow, we can tax, we have to be cautious, we want to be prudent. But this government are giving the people of Manitoba good government; we are being prudent with their money; we have a balanced budget; we haven't a deficit. And I'm sure in due course the people of Manitoba will be able to tell my honourable friend from St. Boniface how much they appreciate the services that the Progressive Conservative Government of Manitoba have contributed to the well-being and expansion of the economy of the Province of Manitoba.

MR. DESJARDINS: Ask them now. Go on.

MR. BAIZLEY: All right, we have a good budget, Mr. Speaker, and a balanced budget, a progressive budget and a budget that will encourage growth -- it won't impede growth -- a budget that will encourage new industry and the jobs that new industry brings with it. And I must say that I don't share the views with my honourable friend the Member from Inkster, when he says that new industries bring increased taxes and broken homes. Now, I looked at this part of his speech the other day and, Mr. Speaker, I really don't know what he means by that - but I'm sure that I couldn't agree with it.

And I think it's worthwhile noting that last year average wages in the Province of Manitoba increased nine percent -- that's been the highest increase in wages in Manitoba since 1951. And if you want to play around with figures you find out that Manitoba's percentage in absolute increase in wages, in average wages, was the highest of any province in Canada, and that Manitoba improved its relationship to the Canadian average, in average wages, more than any province in Canada.

So, Mr. Speaker, we have sorted out our priorities and we have separated our wants from our needs, and at least for this year we have brought down a balanced budget. And I think this is a fact that attracts considerable national attention and we have done all this without increasing taxes, and this is another fact that has attracted national attention. So therefore I suggest to my honourable friends, Mr. Speaker, that my colleague the Provincial Treasurer is to be congratulated rather than to be condemned. Popularity is not part of his portfolio but surely we can agree, Mr. Speaker, that this is a good budget and it has been well presented.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member from St. George.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Would the Minister of Labour permit a question? Who's the author of the article that you quoted from the Globe and Mail?

MR. BAIZLEY: Ronald Anderson - Ronald Anderson, April 9th.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. DOUGLAS CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, in the House that I first had the privilege of sitting in a few years back, there was an honourable gentleman who occupied the seat that the Honourable Member for Gladstone now adorns, and that honourable gentleman used to rise quite frequently and say: "Mr. Speaker, there are a few things that should be said," and then he would proceed to give us about a three-hour speech, because that was before the days of the 40-minute rule, and he frequently went the whole time of the sitting - not once in a while, but regularly. And on one occasion on a filibuster night he spoke seven hours straight on end, and the Honourable Member for Winnipeg, the father of the present Provincial Treasurer, and I were two that in order to keep a quorum stayed the whole night through -- it was from midnight till 7:00 o'clock in the morning straight through.

Well, I'm not going to try and emulate my late honourable friend's performance in all regards, but I -- the 40-minute rule prevents me, Mr. Speaker, for one reason, and a lot of other people would try and prevent me for another -- but I, like the late William Ivans, I do wish to say that there are a few things that I think should be said. And I must confess, Mr. Speaker, if a man should confess under these circumstances, that the honourable gentleman who is mainly to blame, or who gets the credit, as the case may be, for getting me to my feet is the Honourable the Minister of Health, because in the course of his remarks yesterday he made a couple of statements that I think should be dealt with briefly. They were brief statements but it seemed to me that they were so far off the mark that they should be answered. I answer my honourable friend with no thought of bitterness at all, because he is one of the most popular of all the members of the House and this is the first time that I have heard him, in my opinion, be so far afield.

Now if I understood him correctly - and it could be that I was wrong - I thought I heard him say that in northern Manitoba, in northern Manitoba, that until the advent of this government there was just bush, just bush, and that since the advent of this government that there had been Thompson and Chisel and Squall and extensions to this, that and the other one. Surely, did my honourable friend really say that? That's what I thought he said. Because he must know that the arrangements under which Thompson was developed were made during the time of the previous administration not this one. Surely my honourable friend wasn't trying to take credit for that. I just want to mention that point and ask my honourable friend if he got so far led away by his exuberance as to say what I thought he said then I would ask him to check his records in that regard.

International Nickel made the arrangements to come in here during the time the predecessor government was in office. This is one of the things that I have argued with my honourable friends time and time again. It wasn't then necessary to have the kind of propaganda departments that we have now; it wasn't necessary to have the number of people writing press releases and all the rest -- the climate was good then. These people came, and they didn't come because we were the government of the day, they didn't - they came because extensive exploration up in that area had shown them that there was nickel there and there were other minerals there and they come for that reason, not because we're the government and they don't come now because these people are here. I'm beginning to think that they come in spite of them. But anyway, and many others, and I have said before and I'd like my honourable friends to check this just as an example of the fact that a good climate that he speaks of existed before the advent of this government. I think maybe that the one development of the International Nickel Company was just about as big as everything that's come in in the whole ten years that my honourable friends have been here -- and I repeat that they came because of the riches that exist in the old mother earth up in the north part of the province.

Then if I heard my honourable friend correctly -- and I doubted this too, I definitely doubted my ears on this -- but if I heard aright, he said that there'd been no action by the government of that day regarding power and that somebody, people undefined, had been urging and urging that the Saskatchewan River should be developed and that the Nelson should be developed. Mr. Speaker, no person in his right mind was urging the development of those rivers at that time. To have developed a power site on the Nelson River under those conditions and at that time would have broken the Hydro Electric Board of Manitoba, maybe would have broken the province as a whole, would have bankrupted it. Nobody was thinking of that. They were looking at the Saskatchewan, they were looking at it as an alternative site -- it was later decided on. But for my honourable friend to say that some of his friends or his people had been

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd.) urging this for years -- that's what he said -- it's so far off the mark that I find it unworthy of my honourable friend.

Mr. Speaker, no one I suppose will be shocked by the fact that I intend to take the opportunity afforded me of saying a few words on the financial situation. It is a matter that I pay a lot of attention to, and while I do not pretend to be an expert on it, I have tried diligently through the years, particularly through the years that we were in office, especially through the years when I had the honour of heading the government, and even during the time it's carried through into my years in the wilderness, to at least understand what the situation is financially for the Province of Manitoba, because I hold that it's vital to the future well-being of this province that we should have a sound financial situation. And what is the situation today? I give my honourable friend the Provincial Treasurer credit for wanting to do a good job, certainly he's anxious to keep the finances in good order; but it's a pretty difficult job to undertake, Mr. Speaker, in view of what has been happening in the past few years. And one of the criticisms that I have of the budget speech that was delivered recently in this province was that this government, and my honourable friend the Provincial Treasurer, bemoans and bewails the fact that they are not getting the support that they say they are entitled to from the Federal Government. And everything, well almost everything, is based on the fact that if we could just get this awful government at Ottawa to give us the money which we want, then we could do some of these things that we've been talking about. But, Mr. Speaker, this government has been in office for ten years; they've been here; they've had the opportunity of getting a lot more money than was available to the predecessor government.

Let me review the figures as I know them - and I acknowledge that I'm not a wizard with financial figures but I've tried to keep closely in touch with them. Mr. Speaker, the money that we received in the last year that we were the government of the Province of Manitoba; the money that we received through the federal channels taking all of them together, the federal, provincial, financial arrangements, the assistance to programs, the subsidy and all the rest, as I remember them, totalled something in the neighborhood of \$37 million, and we were mightily glad to be getting that \$37 million, Mr. Speaker. As a matter of fact you can go back to the statements that were made on behalf of the governments of those days and we pointed out that it was because we had these stabilized revenues, the stabilizing effect of these increased revenues guaranteed to us from the - at least for a five year period - from the Federal Government that we were able to engage in some of the programs that we put in at that time; and the considerable expansion in government services of those times; and the considerable increase in expenditure. And that \$37 million amounted to something in the neighborhood of 46 percent of our total revenues, and it was because we had the guarantee of those revenues that we were able to do some of the things that we were, and able to pass a good portion of the benefits along to the municipalities. It happens of course that the last year of our term was the first year of this administration. And during the time of the first five years, so far as I can work out the figures, these increases, the amount of federal payments, federal revenues of all kind that came to Manitoba, progressively increased by a million, or a million and a half, or thereabouts per year, for five years, with the big increase coming on the fifth year itself -- and if anybody wants to talk about the fact that that was an election year, that's all right with me, I'm not charging that it became because of that time -- but by 1963, a five year period, those revenues had grown to 62 million-plus - from 37 to 62 in the five year period, and I think that you will find that that averages something in the neighborhood of \$5 million per year - although it wasn't an even distribution, the last one did come in the last year. And in the next five years, in other words the five years up to now, they increased from \$62 million-odd up to what the Provincial Treasurer himself shows in these figures that are before us in the budget, to a \$196 million-odd in that five year period; and the Provincial Treasurer's forecast of next year's increase is \$22 million-odd. And if you average those out through the five years, you will find that they have been something in the neighborhood of \$26 million-plus for five years, with an estimated \$22 million-plus coming next year.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I'm - as my honourable friend the Leader of this Party said the other day - I'm not here to defend the Federal Government; I share the views of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface; we're here to transact the business of the Province of Manitoba. But I don't see where my honourable friends have too much to complain about in the fact that there has been that increase in the revenues from those sources and they now amount, Mr. Speaker, in my rough figuring, to something like 57 percent of this huge budget that the

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd.) Province of Manitoba lays before us today; 50 percent now coming from these sources, and of course we are entitled to them, of course we are entitled to a share of the personal income tax, the corporation income tax, the succession duties, and all the rest, of course we are entitled to them. And of course we are entitled to try and get more if we can, and I certainly share the opinion expressed by the Leader of this group the other day in saying that I would counsel the government to try and arrange, try and arrange that the basic premise be that equalization grant, because that's the one that's the stabilizer for the Province of Manitoba, the national equalization rather than increasing the percentage of income tax and the corporation tax because to the extent that you grant percentage increases to the provinces from those sources, you are simply helping the big central and the other rich provinces and not helping us to that extent.

But I do say to my honourable friends, why in the light of these figures, why can they continue to blame all of their troubles, or the most of their troubles, upon the Federal Government. Why do they say, that if we could just get the government, the Federal Government to do this, that then we'd be able to give this tax relief that we have promised for so long to the municipalities. If we could just do this we might be back where we could hire 700 extra civil servants a year; we might even reinstate that \$70 million that my honourable friend thinks he saved the Province of Manitoba just because he cut it off the estimates that were first supplied to him. I can't equal the colourful language that the Honourable Member for St. John's used but I share with him the view that that is the oddest piece of budgetary explanation that I have ever heard in my time. Why I can save tremendous amounts of money by that system myself, but it doesn't seem to help out on the meager services that I am able to afford and the financial situation in general.

Well now, I've placed those figures on the record, if they aren't right, then let somebody correct them. And if they are right, I think that the case that blames all the trouble of this government on the Federal Government, simply falls to the ground.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to speak at any length on the question of taxes. That ground has been well covered and I agree completely with those who have charged the government with having laid increasing and almost unbearable taxes upon the people of the Province of Manitoba -- taxes which in my opinion are working definitely against their attempts to encourage industry to come to this province, or industry to expand in this province; taxes which in my opinion have been pushed onto the people least able of all to afford it, the property owners, and taxes which are an almost unendurable burden upon the taxpayers of the province at this time.

But if I dwell very very briefly, if at all on taxes, you will not be astonished if I do say a few words about the debt of the province. And I am unable to come to even close agreement with the figures that my honourable friend the Provincial Treasurer would like to get us to believe and which he seems to have been reasonably successful in getting the news media of this province to pay some attention to. Now my honourable friend the Provincial Treasurer in his budget speech, says that many -- I'm quoting -- "Many many have been confused by the variety of ways that the public debt of our province has been shown, etc." The various ways that it has been shown to the people of Manitoba and throughout Canada.

Well now, Mr. Speaker, it's no wonder that a lot of people are confused because do you know that on the very page that my honourable friend makes that statement, page 25 of the budget speech, on that very page he himself, on that one page, refers to debt in seven different ways, seven different ways. He refers to direct provincial debt; he refers to public debt; he refers to debt, to per capita debt; to traditional direct debt; to net direct public debt; net general purpose debt, all on that one page, the very one where he makes that statement. Now no wonder the public is confused. I'm not blaming my honourable friend; I'm agreeing with him; I'm trying to reinforce the argument that he makes that we should understand where we're at on this question of debt. And then if you go over a page or two, there's one more, the eighth -- net general debt. Well now, having at least got some definitions, some terms to talk about debt, I'll proceed to give my assessment of it.

I asked in Public Accounts -- was it yesterday, the day before yesterday -- I asked in Public Accounts for the Comptroller-General to furnish, not just me but members of the Committee, with an up-to-date, or as up to date as they could, statement of the debt of the Province of Manitoba, including all kinds of debt, direct, guaranteed, whatever other kinds that they considered to be debt, and then to give us a statement also in connection with it because

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd.) everybody should try to be fair about this subject, Mr. Speaker, to give us as well, all the sinking funds and the other funds held or accumulated for the retirement of debt — and that will be forthcoming in due course, no doubt. But in the meantime I have been making my computations from the sources that are available: the Manitoba Telephone Commission Report, and I got their debt right up to March 31st of this year; the Manitoba Hydro debt, and I got their total debt right up to January the 31st of this year; and then a good many of the other guaranteed debts are given, as well as those, in the budget speech.

And I have made my computations and they are these: the total direct debt — that's the one where the province issues its own securities — as at December 31, 1967 is given in the budget speech as \$395,250,000 round figures. The total guaranteed debt given in the budget speech December 31, 1967, \$584,860,000 round figures. The total, and I'm adding this, direct and guaranteed is therefore \$980,110,000. So, Mr. Speaker, you will have caught on that we are knocking right at the door of the billion dollars there but the budget speech gives sinking funds and funds held for debt retirement of \$104,000,000—odd which reduces that figure to \$875,799,000 — \$875,799,000, and I think when the Comptroller-General furnishes the figures it won't be too far from that.

Now the two people in the House that are certainly shuddering at this moment are my honourable friend the Member for Rhineland and myself because we, to use the politician's phrase, "view with the greatest alarm" provincial debt of this magnitude. And this I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, is the figure that should be used rather than the \$102,000,000 that my honourable friend the Provincial Treasurer has used. Now that's a pretty big disparity isn't it between two such competent individuals as my honourable friend the Provincial Treasurer and myself. We may be poles apart on a lot of things, but in a matter of figures we wouldn't usually be as far apart as 876,000,000, in round figures, to \$102,000,000 in round figures — that's a long ways. And why are we that far apart, Mr. Speaker? We're that far apart because my honourable friend the Provincial Treasurer says as has been said before, that because of the fact that Hydro and Telephone, and some of the other enterprises, carry their total costs themselves, that that indebtedness should therefore not be added to the debt of the province. I say, and I'm no more of an authority than anybody in this matter, but I say that all the debt should be considered because, Mr. Speaker, if we did not have the debt on the Hydro, the Telephones, the Water Supply Board, then the people who use those services would get them that much cheaper. The reason that they don't get them cheaper is because they have to pay the interest on the debt. And so it all belongs to the people but the people are paying the debt. So I say, you consider all of this amount as debts. For my honourable friend to argue that because it's self-supporting, seems to me to be just as illogical as if I would argue that on my farm at Flee Island I purchase a combine, sign a note for 12 or \$13,000 for it, but because I expect it to pay its way, through threshing my crop, I don't really owe that 12 or \$13,000 because it's going to be self-supporting. It's a good investment, so I don't really owe that. But the chap that I sign the note for, he thinks I owe it. — (Interjection) — Yes, and I've got the combine. So I think it's debt, or if I purchased another piece of land, and I borrow the money for it, or I pay to the direct seller, agree to pay to the direct seller, according to my honourable friend's figuring this is not debt because I wouldn't have bought that land if it wasn't going to be self-supporting. It's not only going to be self-supporting, it's going to make me some money, same as hydro and telephones do. And therefore, because it's going to be self-supporting, I don't owe for that land, no; it's not a debt of mine at all.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this to me is illogical and I must say that the Canadian Tax Foundation whom my honourable colleague and Leader quoted the other day, who are specialists in this field, they agree with my definition — not with the one that the honourable the Provincial Treasurer uses. And I don't want in saying this to charge that there's anything wrong about this, I only say that we must realize the situation for what it is. But I do want however, to quote another authority on this question of debt. I wish the Honourable Member for Wolseley were here because he always seemed to be delighted when I read to him what he had said about debts. I consider him to be an expert on this subject because he acquired so much of it in the Province of Manitoba and even though this was in his budding days and he hadn't been so experienced as he became later on, yet I think this time he was certainly right, and when I have read this back to him on other occasions, he seemed very pleased about the stand that he had taken in those days. Now, my honourable friend the Leader of this Party restrained himself

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd.) from reading this the other day. I haven't got his will power, I can't let the occasion go by and so I have to read it - not only that I don't want to take it out of context, I think the whole text is worthwhile.

This, Mr. Speaker, is a speech that the Honourable Member for Wolseley made when he was sitting on this side of the House, it was made on March 25th, 1952. And why did he make this speech then? He made it, Mr. Speaker, because he was in the process of beginning a campaign to achieve the Leadership of the Conservative Party and he wanted to appear at that time to be a Conservative and so he wanted to be espousing what might be termed Conservative policy and so he made a conservative speech - and you know it's interesting and I do give my honourable friend the Member for Wolseley credit for consistency because he did the same thing this past year when he was aspiring to be the Leader of the Conservative Party in Ottawa. Again he dragged out these arguments and brushed them off and dusted them up and here they were, this same kind of Conservative argument because he was aspiring to the Leadership of the Conservative Party in Ottawa, and he warned his successor coming along to take up his mantle in the Province of Manitoba that from now on you must be careful, you must have financial restraint, you can't go on wild spending sprees for public consumption. And it worked pretty well down at Ottawa, didn't it? I'll tell you that he made a good run down there and part of the reason was this same old thing that had worked in Manitoba years before. Well anyway whatever the reason, here's what he said in 1952, March 25th. "There is another consideration", I'm quoting from now on, Mr. Speaker, directly from the speech which was taken off the record. We didn't have a Hansard in those days but we had the recording equipment. I believe the same gentleman was in charge of it. We had a system that when anyone asked for a speech then it was typed out and the Leaders of all groups got every speech so that copies were made available to everyone. Naturally, my honourable friend being the Leader of the Opposition at that time, his were frequently taken off - and they were good speeches and I'm glad I've still got this one. — (Interjection) — This is a quote. I've got some of yours too. "There is another consideration which we should not overlook and surely that is the size of the provincial debt. We were told the other night that last year it was \$135 million; this year it will be \$158 million; next year it will be \$175 million which will be the peak that we have ever aspired to in this particular connection. And we hear a lot of definitions; we hear about gross debt; we hear about self-sustaining debt; we hear about gross dead-weight debt and net gross dead-weight debt. Let us be careful lest we deceive ourselves with words. What is this phrase self-sustaining debt? Well, let's take an example here. The highways right now, when they are covered by capital borrowing are considered to be dead-weight debt; but, Mr. Speaker, if you had a Highway Commission as they have in some parts of the world with a right to levy the gasoline tax and that sort of thing, in other words to sell the highway, they could come to this government and borrow funds, we would lend them the funds and they could sell the highway to the public and pay us back the interest on our money, and we would call that self-sustaining debt. That is precisely the procedure that takes place when you authorize the telephone system to have a monopoly on phones in this province, or the power commission to have a monopoly on power in this province. You could call anything self-sustaining debt provided you balance and define your terms nicely. We know what happened in hard times, whether you call them self-sustaining or dead-weight debt or whatever you call it, the people do not use the roads, the people who don't use them, take out their telephones and we have seen them do so. They economize on electric light. Some of these self-sustaining debts may require a prop or two before we are through. There is a funny thing about debt, Mr. Speaker, no matter what you call it, you still have to pay it back. And I say that we should regard this steady increase in the gross total of the debt of this province with some concern." My honourable friend was speaking sensibly and well and that was when the debt of the province was \$158 million. And he lived to see the day, through his administration, where with the highest rates of taxes ever imposed in this province, the second highest per capita taxes in Canada that he got the gross debt - I'm using his term - up to practically \$1 billion.

Now I'm going to turn over three pages and read another quotation from the same speech of my honourable friend - and remember it wasn't long after this until he did achieve the Leadership of the Conservative Party. This is part of the same speech on page 14. "These accounts, Sir, show that there is a continuous tendency for the administrative services to expand and to increase without, in our view, a proper regard for the need involved. This tendency is well expressed in terms of money and it is visible throughout the Public Accounts.

April 18, 1968

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd.) You will see there, Sir, the tremendous inertia of government establishments when it comes to economy. It takes the stern hand of necessity it seems to make any government economize and that necessity must seem very abstract to the gentlemen sitting opposite when they compare it with their rising and buoyant revenues. But I want to say, Sir, something that anyone who is connected with business in this province at the present time, I want to say, Sir, that there is a certain fluttering of the economic pulse of business in this part of the country. I am not a prophet of doom I assure you but I think it would be well to face the reality and the possibility that we may have to do some of this economizing about which I talk."

My honourable friend the Minister of Health was berating us yesterday about why hadn't we done more when we were in office. Thank goodness, we didn't listen to my honourable friend who became his Leader. Do you see what he was counselling? Does my honourable friend get the point? Well if not I'll give him one more and this was when he was . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder if I may interrupt the honourable gentleman and tell him he has five minutes.

MR. CAMPBELL: That will be sufficient, thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I appreciate you . . . I'll have time to read this and I'd like to get it on the record.

My honourable friend the Minister of Health was talking about the situation with regard to roads. This is from a speech that my honourable friend the Member for Wolseley made when he was one year closer to the Conservative Leadership. This is on April 9th, 1953, and here's what he said: "Now I say, Sir, referring to this budget, I see a sum of \$16 million allotted to roads in the Province of Manitoba. A very handsome figure and I have no doubt it can be put to good use. But in my view, Sir, we should have taken \$1 million out of the \$16 million, we should have taken a sixteenth of it and we should have applied it to the development of agriculture. We should have applied it to the development of industry and if we had done those two things, we would in my opinion, have made a better use and a more productive use of the funds that are at the disposal of this government."

My honourable friend the Minister of Health would like to know why we weren't doing more on roads. We didn't pay any attention to what his future leader said; we went ahead with the road program and we went ahead and expanded it; we expanded the economic base of the Province of Manitoba. And when my honourable friend the Minister of Health talked about the fact that the electrical industry of this province had not been doing its job as well as it should of, I commented on this a few days ago and it will bear repetition, that, Mr. Speaker, the foundation of the industrial advance in the Province of Manitoba was laid and the foundation for economic expansion in rural Manitoba was laid by the government that was in office at the time that he was talking about when they had the courage and took the money in order to reorganize the electrical industry in the Province of Manitoba. Neither the public body nor the private body could go ahead with the electrification that the Province of Manitoba needed at that time - neither one of them could under the circumstances - and it required governmental action by a government that was considered to be pretty cautious about spending money to buy out the private company with a good deal of public criticism for so doing and to reorganize that industry and to go ahead with that firm base to work on. And the farm electrification and rural electrification program that was put in in connection with it, that wouldn't have been possible without doing this, laid the foundation of an electrical industry that is not surpassed in Canada, and we're one of the few provinces in Canada that didn't have either a blackout or a brownout - not one. And when my honourable friend the Minister of Health tries to say that somebody undetermined was attempting to get us to go ahead with some electrical project that he's talking about, he is unfamiliar with what happened.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry that I haven't time to deal with some other few matters that I was going to pay a little bit of attention to but I'll get another opportunity. In the meantime I want to say to the Honourable Provincial Treasurer, I sympathize with him in the difficult position in which he finds himself; I know that he rather proudly suggests in here that he has reduced the debt of the Province of Manitoba. I say that the Province of Manitoba has increased greatly during the time that he's claiming a reduction because of the fact that while he shows a reduction on the net debt, the debt of the public utilities, which is our debt, has gone up by something in the neighborhood of \$82 million. So, he faces a difficult position; I don't want to make it any more difficult for him but I did want to put what I consider to be the facts of the situation on the record.

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

MR. PETER FOX (Kildonan): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wasn't too prone to follow the Member for Lakeside, the honourable member is so eloquent that one hesitates to follow him, but nevertheless I do want to put a few of my remarks on the record.

You know I come from a constituency which happens to be a dormitory type of constituency, the people living there are working people, retired people, people on fixed incomes and this business that our present government is boasting so much about the balanced budget certainly doesn't impress them because their budget isn't balanced. They still have to pay taxes at the municipal level, they still have to try and get along with a lower income, this government's record in regards to minimum wages and many of my people do work for minimum wages even though the Minister of Labour discounts this as being a sizeable item in our economy. His attitude in this respect and his colleagues on the front bench I would say is deplorable. I've had numerous calls since the debate on the minimum wage took place in this House and many people are saying they just cannot understand the attitude of this government.

Now speaking, Mr. Speaker, in respect to what happens in a dormitory constituency. In our constituency there is very little industry, the tax base is all on the homeowners and as I said the homeowners, most of them are living on salaries, wages and fixed incomes, and consequently when this government boasts about having a balanced budget, those people don't find that their budget is balanced because as indicated in today's Free Press, Mr. Speaker, in an article that says. "Local taxes hop, skip and jump - up as much as 23.7 mills. Education costs alarming." And just to put it on the record, Mr. Speaker, I would like to indicate to the House what is happening, and this is also very true of my own constituency which I shall name as I go along. Charleswood, the mill rate is up to 43.43 mills from 39.19 - an increase of 4.24 over the 1967 budget. Is that holding the line for that municipality, Mr. Speaker?

East Kildonan, my own constituency ... did you have a comment?

MR. LYON: ... holding the line in Charleswood, that's a good ...

MR. FOX: East Kildonan, 59.25 mills from 50 - an increase of 9.25 mills. Is that holding the line, Mr. Speaker? Is that a balanced budget for the taxpayer in that municipality? Fort Garry, 62.41 mills at the present time from 50.76 - an increase of 11.65. Again I should say, is that holding the budget balance for these people that have to pay it? And so on down the line. North Kildonan, 53.85 from 42.95 - 9.9 mill increase; Old Kildonan, 58.5 from 34.8; St. Vital 58.58 from 51.17; Transcona, 55.89 from 43.19; Tuxedo 36 mills from 30 - and of course they have a large industry out there which pays for half of their taxes to begin with. But this doesn't happen in a dormitory constituency, Mr. Speaker. West Kildona, 60.47 from 47.5 - and increase of 12.07. Winnipeg 64.4 from 52.2 - an increase of 12.2 mills.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as I said, this government boasts about having a balanced budget. I wonder what the taxpayer thinks about a balanced budget of that kind where he has got to pay more money in taxes. On top of that, Mr. Speaker, as everyone is well aware, costs are increasing continually. People that are working in industries where they have bargaining strength can from year to year or sometimes on a two year basis, increase their earning power by negotiating, but what about the people who haven't got organizations to help them out, the ones that are working at the bottom of the economic ladder as I said the other day. Those people are in fear of their jobs. They have no security; they have no one to fight for them, because individually they have no strength. If they don't like what they are getting the employer says to them, you can leave. That's free enterprise. They are free to leave but they are also free to starve at the same time the minute they quit.

So consequently when I introduced a motion on minimum wages, I expected the Minister of Labour and his cabinet to have some sympathy for those people because the cost of living is going up for those people more than for anyone else. They are working at a very very bare subsistence level but the Minister said we're not talking about the same thing - we're talking about fair wages and minimum wages. I should have brought the article in that was in the Winnipeg Free Press "Under the Dome" in respect of the Scrooges, etc., and I'm certain that the Minister of Labour would have agreed with the writer in what was said there, but of course he can't say that publicly because that would put him at odds with his colleagues. But there are people that are really having a tough time in this province of ours and we are talking about balanced budgets; those people couldn't care less. They want relief, they want help and all we do is just say to them, well this is a free enterprise country, go out and get it.

Mr. Speaker, let me ask a few more questions. This government says they have been

(MR. FOX cont'd.) building a base for ten years. I'm just a fledgling member in this House, but I have listened to two speeches from the Throne; they covered everything from soup to nuts including the kitchen sink or the proverbial kitchen sink. But I didn't find that there was that much legislation when it came down to the essentials, to the facts of the matter, that really were improving our economy. You know we've spent a lot of time and we're making a lot of noise about going into 70, "roaring into 70" or whatever else the phrase is. That's for industry. But what are we doing in respect to the labour sector of that part of our economy? We are afraid to institute a 40-hour week. In fact, we're even afraid to speak on it. There wasn't one member from the government bench had the courage to say why we should vote down the 40-hour week, but they voted it down. Not one of them mentioned why it wasn't good to have the 40-hour week. If they could have given me some statistics or some reasons I could have understood it; but not even that, Mr. Speaker.

Let me say something else about this business of building a base for ten years. I agree with building roads; I agree with designing and developing this province, but I also think if you are building a base you want to tell us what the superstructure is going to be on top of that base. But as I said, for two years now, I've seen the Throne Speech debate; it doesn't tell us what our plans are for the future. It just says, hope and wait and see. In many instances we have debated, Mr. Speaker, that certain things should be elucidated in this House but we won't get the answers for them. One way of telling us what the superstructure on this base is, is telling us how well we are utilizing the MDF, but as often as we have tried on this side of the House to get the answers to that, we have not been able to do that. We have arrived at this point, where now the Cabinet have taken on the responsibility of doing a little bit of looking at it but that still doesn't mean to say that the rest of the legislative members that have been elected will have a say-so or a knowledge of what is going on, with provincial money, the taxpayers' money, the people who have been offered a balanced budget but who in spite of a balanced budget still have to pay higher taxes this year, and their costs have gone up in other areas as well.

You know we speak about doing good things, like developing Thompson, and no doubt it has been developed to an extent. But what have we done about the human factor that is enjoined over there, the people that work - what have we done in respect to housing at Thompson, Mr. Speaker? What have we done in respect to the cost of living up there, which is a lot higher than it is down here. What about the taxes; the crowded living conditions? None of those things have been taken into account by this government. The base is there but they still haven't told us what their plans are for the future.

Oh yes, they told us their plans for the future in respect to TV. This is an important item. Let's place the idiot box up there, maybe that will distract the people from the problems of living 6 - 7 to a room, 3 or 4 families to a house, and possibly then they won't complain too bitterly that conditions are that severe up there.

You know, Mr. Speaker, I could go on at this rate and say that government claims to be progressive but in my estimation I don't think they have done that job of being progressive. They've paid lip service to it and no more. I would like to have from that government not a balanced budget, not a stand pat attitude, but some priorities. They've talked about priorities, but they're nebulous things. They are not enumerated in one way or another, what they shall do for the people in the labouring sector of our province. Certainly we are going to do a lot through Industry and Commerce propaganda department to try to develop industry, but even that record, Mr. Speaker, isn't anything to be boasting about. I believe I have it here in my desk. We had some 60-odd industries that were developed, or so they claim, by this Industry and Commerce propaganda department, Mr. Speaker. But as I look at it, I find - and it was in the Order for Return - that 37 of them were in the Greater Winnipeg area. I happen to be one of the members on the Board of Directors of the Industrial Development Board, Mr. Speaker. We operate with a budget of about \$60,000, the greatest share of which is paid by the Metro Corporation and the remainder by the business establishments that are interested in developing industrial development, and at these meetings we discuss the progress that is made from time to time. But you know, Mr. Speaker, one of the underlying currents that I have noticed is that we haven't been getting the co-operation from the Department of Industry and Commerce as much as we could have or I think we should have. Their aim has been to develop rural Manitoba. I can't put my finger on it why it's more important for the Provincial Department to do it at that level than it is at any other level, because after all half the

(MR. FOX cont'd.) population is in Metro Winnipeg and the other half is in the rural areas, it should be share and share alike. But speaking to what has gone on at these Industrial Development Board meetings, Mr. Chairman, and after looking at the areas that this Order for Return indicates have been developed, I recall that many of them were at and through the efforts of the Industrial Development Board. Now I'm not going to deny that there may have been some peripheral assistance offered by the Department of Industry and Commerce and I must also say that besides Winnipeg having an Industrial Development Board, so has Brandon, so have a number of other areas, and they too are working diligently yet while we were under the Estimates of the Department of Industry and Commerce, it seemed to me that there wasn't one real credit given to the other areas that were working in the same interests as the Department of Industry and Commerce. All was being done by the Minister's own department and no one else apparently.

Now it's good to beat the drums for yourself but I think once in awhile you should realize that other people are working in the same interests and that brings me back to the other point I wish to make: what is this government doing in respect to moving our labour sector up in and roaring into the 70s. Are we expending the same kind of money, same type of energy, initiative, to develop the labour sector to get more jobs or are we just interested in getting industry, because the industry that we have had so far has produced very few jobs, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I think I shall end on that note, because apparently the design or the plan that has been designed by that government over there is not built for the future. They started out with a design, they made a base, but as I said, in the two years that I have been here, I have yet to hear what the superstructure to that base is; and I'm afraid that for that reason I don't have very much confidence that they are going to be able to produce in the future. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WALLY MCKENZIE (Roblin): Mr. Speaker, I have sat here during the course of this debate and can't believe that this is the same province that I live in, as I listen to the chatter from the Opposition that comes booming over on this side of the table. I stand now to support my Minister who presented this budget, and I think it is a wonderful budget, and I stand here now to talk on two things : our development has been well established and has given basic strength to the province.

I give great credit to the Honourable Member for Lakeside when he was the premier of this province and I think he done a good job. I also give credit to the government of the coalition period and I think they did a good job. But nobody can tell me that this government hasn't done a good job. This has been one of the great periods in our province. Manitoba today stands one of the great provinces of Canada and can you make me believe with the type of chatter that is coming over here that this is not a fact? Now we are moving into the new stage, we have a new Premier, who I support. I think you'll be hearing lots from our Premier and I support him all the way. I think Manitoba is going to have many interesting things for it in the future and we are going to be supporting Weir as he does these things. No doubt we have our problems. I don't think there's a government in Canada today that hasn't got a problem. I really don't. I think that we are on solid ground but I think the Manitoba government which I support is one that is showing a sort of path of restraint and I support them for it at this time in our particular day and age when there is a period that we should be restraining and holding back.

I just can't understand people like the Honourable Member from St. Boniface who I think drives the biggest car in Winnipeg, to tell me that this is a horrible place to live. I just can't take it. The Leader of the New Democratic dared a backbencher to stand up and talk in this House. Does he mean that he owns this Assembly? Certainly we'll talk and we got lots to talk about, and we'll be talking for a long time to come. Trace the budgets back in my limited experience in this House, but each budget that I have had the experience to enjoy in the Assembly has been presented to me by the Honourable Minister in front of me and has showed me that Manitoba is a province that is going ahead. We have problems as I said before, but there are not that many problems as they keep rolling it across to me over here. And I can assure the Honourable Member from Gladstone that I'm not reading my speech. — (Interjection) —

No clippings, no press releases. Our party and our caucus has been criticized as being divided and I can assure the members opposite that our caucus has never more solid than as I stand here before you tonight. Our front bench is solid. Our front bench is solid; and have no fear, we are going to move ahead and Manitoba will be hearing from the Tories for many years

(MR. MCKENZIE cont'd.) to come.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. MCKENZIE: Let me refer to page 8 of the budget if the Honourable Member from Gladstone will share the budget speech with me, where it says "Investments must continue to be made to provide roads, schools, hospitals and all the many other facilities required for a progressive community" - and that will include Medicare. If you want a debate on Medicare - I'm prepared to debate on Medicare at another time when my Honourable Minister brings his budget in and I'll debate with you on Medicare.

At the bottom of page 8, Mr. Speaker, "The quality of life in Manitoba has been brought to levels equal to and often far greater than those in any other part of Canada." Is there anybody here who would like to challenge that statement? This is Manitoba and I'm proud to be a Manitoban. I was born in Saskatchewan and I was ...

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. MCKENZIE: I was born in Saskatchewan, Mr. Speaker. I know the Saskatchewan experience real well. I make my four or five trips over there. They have political problems. I wouldn't be surprised if they've got a lot more than we've got and they are more difficult to handle. One of them that is causing them the most concern is this one which you raised a moment ago - Medicare. They have a problem.

Let's turn to page 9. Would the Honourable Member from Gladstone share page 9 with me? "Local governments must continue to make an essential contribution to the development of this province." Is there anything wrong with that statement, Mr. Speaker? That is a fair statement and one that we must take a real close look at because the way things have changed - and the Honourable Member from Lakeside pointed out I think that the great changes that this province has gone through since the document he read there, which is 1953, and no doubt those were the issues of the day, in 1953 as you read from that document.

But we're facing much different issues in our society today, and this is the one now where I think government must decide at what level costs are to be shared - municipal, provincial or federal. We've debated this subject I think through the course of the budget debate. There is a problem here and I think that this is one that this government is going to take a real close look at and no doubt will solve, and I think in the meantime that we are going to have to have the local government at the municipal level take a very active part in the development of our province for the years ahead because they are the ones that are going to have to bear the costs and they are the ones I think that should have at least a 50 percent say on how it's going to be done.

Would you like to carry on in the statement of the budget and refer to Page 18? The Honourable Member for Gladstone, if he would, please. "The expenditures already placed before you come to ...

MR. SHOEMAKER: I wonder if my honourable friend would go in to more detail though on Page 9 as to the contribution he expects the local government ...

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin has the floor. -- (Interjection) -- ... the Member for Gladstone to accompany him while he read it, as I understood it.

MR. MCKENZIE: I'm reading from Page 18: "The expenditure estimates already placed before you come to \$377 million." Now can you imagine how many things are going on in this province with an expenditure at that level - \$377 million? Manitoba's booming; no doubt about it.

Let us refer to Page 30 - Page 30, where it says - the Minister has said "I am nevertheless optimistic that the province can continue to achieve substantial progress and prosperity in 1968." Does anybody here want to challenge that statement? I sure don't, because I see progress in my constituency, all kinds of it. People are driving good cars, they're well dressed, we have recreational facilities in my constituency which we didn't have before, and these are things that have happened through the government. My great friend over there from Lakeside, he helped, but don't think that we didn't help. We just carried on and carried the ball, and now Manitoba is really becoming one of our real great provinces. I enjoyed that statement of the Honourable Minister when he said, "I am optimistic" - and I am optimistic about Manitoba, Mr. speaker, I really am, and I challenge those opposite to ...

MR. DOERN: Would the honourable member submit to a question?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone has the floor.

MR. DOERN: Well, Mr. Speaker, it's ...

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Is my honourable friend finished?

MR. McKENZIE: No, I'm ...

MR. SPEAKER: Does the Honourable Member for Elmwood have a question?

MR. DOERN: Yes. Did I understand the honourable member to say that he did have recreational facilities in his area, because he told us some time ago I thought, he didn't have a thing.

MR. McKENZIE: May I ask the Honourable Member from Elmwood of a -- have you never been out there? You have missed, my friend, the greatest part of Manitoba -- Roblin constituency. Come out some time at my expense and I'll show you Manitoba, Manitoba at its best -- Manitoba at its best, where I don't hear all the kind of static that I hear in the Assembly here.

Let us refer to Page -- this is not a numbered page unfortunately, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: I would at this time appeal to the Honourable Member for Roblin to avoid attempting to provoke an argument for the balance of the ...

MR. McKENZIE: This is the subject where it dealt with income, Mr. Speaker, where it says, "It is estimated that the gross provincial income rose seven percent above 1966, a growth equal to or slightly ahead of that for Canada's gross national product." What a wonderful statement, Mr. Speaker. This is Manitoba, this is the Manitoba that I belong to, and this is the Manitoba that I'm betting on. This is a good province, not the type of province that I hear from over there; this is the one that I'm proud to be a citizen of. "Income from employment alone climbed over 11 percent," Mr. Speaker. Would you believe that last year -- 11 percent? "Farm cash income from the year is estimated to equal last year's record of \$374 million. In all, these factors drove our personal income above the 1966 level." Manitoba -- Manitoba's booming; and it's unfortunate that there are people like the Honourable Member for Elmwood who has never been out to Roblin to see where it is really booming out there. It's unfortunate. In fact ...

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder if the honourable member could have the indulgence of the House for just two more minutes?

MR. McKENZIE: May I refer to the next page, it's No. 2, Mr. Speaker, where it says, "But the year's experience showed retail sales up over 1966 by nearly eight percent, a level of \$1.083 million, an increase for Manitoba above that experienced for Canada as a whole." Who isn't proud to be a Manitoban living under those conditions.

We move on, Mr. Speaker, through the budget speech, and let's turn to Page 4. "The value of farm production during 1967 is now estimated at \$483 million" -- this is the image that I get from my constituency, Mr. Speaker, I come from a farming area -- "the second highest level of any year on record." Who will challenge our Minister of Agriculture as being a part-time Minister under those conditions, Mr. Speaker. This man is doing his job. "The province's wheat crop of 90 million bushels was the largest ever produced" is there anything wrong with our agricultural policy under those conditions -- "and well exceeded the year's production of 79 million bushels."

And move on down to the bottom of Page 4 -- the Honourable Member for Gladstone, if you would please. "The value of the province's mineral production came up nearly to \$200 million." This is a Conservative Government -- a conservative Government -- the Conservative Government which -- I'm glad to see my great friend the Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party back in his seat, who challenged a backbencher to stand up and defend this government, and I'm defending it, and I will defend it as long as I have a chance.

Would you turn to Page 7, the Honourable Member from Gladstone. "In the manufacturing sector, the value of shipments from Manitoba plants passed a billion" -- the billion dollar mark.

Now let's move down into the one where I think my constituency is going to be able to contribute ...

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I deeply regret I must call it 5:30. I'm leaving the Chair to return again at 8:00 this evening.