

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Thursday, February 10, 1966.

Opening Prayer by Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions.

The Honourable Member for St. George.

MR. ELMAN GUTTORMSON (St. George): Madam Speaker, I beg to present the petition of the J. W. Dafoe Foundation.

MADAM SPEAKER: Reading and Receiving Petitions.

MR. CLERK: The Petition of St. Paul's College Limited and Others, Praying for the passing of an Act to incorporate St. Paul's College.

MADAM SPEAKER: Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees

Notices of Motion

Introduction of Bills

The Honourable the Attorney-General.

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN, Q. C. (Attorney-General) (Dauphin) introduced Bills Nos. 12, An Act to amend the Jury Act; Bill No. 20, An Act to amend The Public Libraries Act.

HON. MAITLAND B. STEINKOPF (Minister of Public Utilities) (River Heights) (in absence of Minister of Municipal Affairs) introduced Bill No. 28, an Act to establish the Wards in the Rural Municipality of North Kildonan and to decrease the number of members of the Council of the Municipality.

MR. JAMES COWAN, Q. C. (Winnipeg Centre) introduced Bill No. 15, an Act respecting Transfer of the Assets and Liabilities of the Community Chest of Greater Winnipeg to the United Way of Greater Winnipeg and to repeal the Acts of Incorporation of The Community Chest of Greater Winnipeg.

MADAM SPEAKER: Before the Orders of the Day, I would like to attract your attention to the Gallery on my left where there are some 28 students from Grade XI of St. Benedict's Academy accompanied by their teachers, Sisters Clara, Anselm, Mark and Romaine. This school is situated in the constituency of the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture and Conservation. On behalf of all members of this Legislative Assembly I welcome you.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce) (Fort Rouge): Madam Speaker, before you proceed with the Orders, may I lay on the Table the Seventh Annual Report of the Manitoba Development Fund for the year 1964-65.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party) (Radisson): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to direct a question to the Honourable the First Minister. Mention was made in the Throne Speech of the question of automobile insurance. I wonder if the Minister could indicate how soon would the House be in possession of what is meant by the referral in the Throne Speech. As you know, Madam Speaker, I have on the Order Paper a resolution pertaining to the subject. I have been made aware of the fact that a lobby has begun respecting automobile insurance, copies of which were not forwarded to the members of my group; however, I would like to as quickly as possible, proceed with the resolution, but I cannot until we know the contents of the reference in the Throne Speech.

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier) (Wolseley): I understand my honourable friend's dilemma. I thought he was leading a pressure group on automobile insurance himself, but we will try and get the resolution or whatever material we have in connection with this matter as soon as we can. I appreciate his attitude in withholding his resolution until he gets that information.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture and Conservation.

HON. GEORGE HUTTON (Minister of Agriculture and Conservation) (Rockwood-Iberville): Before the Orders of the Day, Madam Speaker, I would like to table three nil reports. One under the Water Power Act, an Annual Report for the year ended December 31, 1965. This report is incorporated in the annual report of the Department of Agriculture and Conservation under the Water Control and Conservation Branch. The Watershed Conservation Districts Act's annual report; it's a nil report for the year ended December 31, 1965; and a nil report under the Water Rights Act for the year ended December 31, 1965. The Orders and Regulations are published in the Manitoba Gazette.

At the same time, I was requested by the Leader of the Opposition with respect to the availability of a Paper that was presented to the Dominion Conference on Poverty by the representatives of the Manitoba Government. I have several copies of that paper here and we are

(MR. HUTTON cont'd.) . . . making them available to you. It is a very provocative and thought-provoking paper and should be a working paper and should be read with those conditions in mind.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Selkirk.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE QC (Selkirk): Madam, I would like to direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Public Works. First of all I must ask him whether or no he is aware of the soot that was dispersed over a large area this morning as a result of the cleaning out of flues or cleaning out of chimneys of the government powerhouse behind the Land Titles Office and Courthouse. And if his answer to that question is in the affirmative, is he aware of anything that could be done to prevent a similar occurrence?

HON. WALTER WEIR (Minister of Public Works) (Minnedosa): Madam Speaker, the answer is in the affirmative and I have asked that it be investigated to find out if there is some means of preventing it in the future.

MR. STEINKOPF: Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to lay on the Table of the House and for distribution a new, and I think improved seating plan of the Assembly. This was prepared by Mr. Prud'homme and Mr. Evans.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the Second Reading of Bill No. 7. The Honourable the Member for Rhineland.

MR. J. M. FROESE (Rhineland): Madam Speaker, I adjourned the debate on this bill yesterday afternoon in order to better acquaint myself with the provisions and I was also particularly interested in what the Honourable the Minister had to say, as well as members of the Opposition in connection with this bill.

I'm afraid we're conditioning our people to consent even when there is an element of doubt as to being guilty of charges when they're being made and I just wonder whether this is a good thing for our people in Manitoba. I also note that the two-year time limit for suspension under section 10 is dropped or removed, and I would like to know just why is this done. This is part 4 of the bill. Then my main concern is that people quite often are advised to consent to charges or infractions when an individual is not aware of what he is actually letting himself in for, and in certain cases as a result, he might find himself with a license suspended and having trouble later on in getting such suspension removed or lifted. I don't know whether this comes particularly under this part of this bill but maybe the Honourable Attorney-General could advise us of this case, because I think this is an area that we should take great care of because I have actually had occasions to be connected with people who come to you for help after these things have happened and I think we should try and prevent these things from happening rather than trying to correct them and help these people after they have already taken place. So this is all I have to say at this point and I hope the Minister can clear up some of these points. Thanks.

MR. S. PETERS (Elmwood): Madam Speaker, if no one else cares to speak on this bill, I would beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks that the debate be adjourned.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable the Member for Neepawa.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): A year ago I said that it seemed as if the whole process of the law in this day and age was designed to encourage people to plead guilty -- and I certainly haven't changed my mind in the last twelve months; in fact I'm more convinced that that statement is right now than I was a year ago. I said, too, that I thought that the way that the J. P. 's were appointed, or the method used to appoint J. P. 's -- political appointments as they were they were not necessarily qualified to determine justice. You will recall, Madam Speaker, that I asked for the qualifications that were required of J. P. 's, and I never did get an intelligent answer. I got a few snickers and that's about all. I'm not satisfied that the J. P. 's by and large are qualified to determine justice just because they have been a good political party henchman.

One of the duties as a member seems to be that each and every one of us are Ombudsman in our own constituency, and in a 12 month period, quite a number of people come to me who have pleaded guilty to driving while impaired or some infraction of The Highway Traffic Act. They've had their license privileges suspended and in certain cases their car impounded. I said they had pleaded guilty. They pleaded guilty; they have then come to me to see what they can do or what provision there is for them to register an appeal against the ruling of the courts. And I always ask them why did they plead guilty; why did they plead guilty and then come to me to want to reverse their decision in this regard. And in each and every case they say, well we're led to believe that the penalty would be less if we pleaded guilty, said nothing and get it over with. I think that this is wrong. In fact, I think that if the man is in fact guilty, then there

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd.) . . . is not much excuse for a suspension and Appeal Board. Now twice in the last 12 month period I had the privilege -- I suppose that's what I could say -- of coming before the Courts myself. I got a parking ticket; a parking ticket -- this had to do with the Metro laws. I went down to the Rupert Street to pay it -- to see whether or not I had to pay it -- and there was about a dozen girls like you would see in a bank, ready to take your money. I walked up to one of them and this nice attractive young girl said, "is there anything I can do for you?" and I said "Well I suppose that you would be delighted to take my three dollars if I wanted to part with it, but I haven't made up my mind yet whether I want to part with it or not." And she said, "well you better go downstairs and talk to the sargeant down there." As a result of going down there and talking to the sargeant he dismissed the case. Now there was two dozen people upstairs paying their fine. I was the only one that went downstairs and he looked amazed, he looked amazed that somebody would come down and question, and question this. Well this is the point that I'm trying to raise.

Now the other one had to do with a speeding ticket. Now let me say this, let me say this, Madam Speaker, in both of these cases, the person that was administering the law didn't know that I was a member of the Legislature, and they still don't know as far as I'm concerned, so I wasn't trying to influence anybody. But, I have read, I believe -- and the Honourable the Minister of Public Utilities can correct me if I am wrong -- but I think that I saw a news article not too long ago in which he said in respect to Highway Safety, that if you were overtaking a car and about to pass it, to go past that car as quickly as you possibly could to avoid -- well so that you wouldn't be a hazard on the road. Now that is good advice I say, that's good advice. When I appeared before the judge right across the street here, a year or so ago, the girl at the desk said, as the other one did, "is there something I can do for you." Again I said, "I suppose that you would be quite willing to accept my 12:50 or whatever it was, but I have not yet decided whether I am going to plead guilty or not." And she said "well probably you had better come in and talk to the judge -- I think it was a judge in this case. And he said "What can I do for you," and I said "the first thing I want to get settled right now is this: is the penalty going to be any less if I plead guilty and get it over with right now, than it would be if I pleaded not guilty but was found guilty?" You know what his answer was. He said "No, there is no difference." And there shouldn't be. And if there is no difference, then why encourage people to plead guilty? And this seems to be what we are trying to do.

Now to get back to this story. I asked the judge, too, -- there is nothing apparently in the law to say that we as motorists cannot pass a person who is going 59 miles an hour so long as we do not exceed 60 miles a hour in going by him. There's nothing wrong with that. But I would like somebody who is pretty sharp with a pencil to tell me how long it would take to go by him. There is nothing wrong, there is nothing in the law that says you can't go by a person who is going 59.9 miles a hour, if you don't exceed 60 miles a hour in going by him. How long would that take? -- (Interjection) -- I'm not going to try it. But my honourable friend, my honourable friend -- (Interjection) -- why pass him? I'm trying to get an intelligent answer, Madam Speaker, I don't suppose I'll get it from this Assembly. But there's nothing wrong with it. He said why try to pass him. There's nothing wrong with passing him. My honourable friend has said, go by him as quickly as you can, and I say that this is what you should do. But if you do and you're caught in a radar trap they're likely to pinch you. Well this is the argument that I raise. In both of the cases that I was involved in personally the charges were dismissed because I was able to convince them that I wasn't doing any more than a normal intelligent person would have done under exactly the same set of circumstances. And I maintain, regardless of what the opposition say, the government benches say, that I am a normal intelligent person. I know that they will not agree with that statement. -- (Interjection) -- Yes, well, -- Madam Speaker, I am opposed to anything, to any law that is designed to encourage people to plead guilty and get it over with. I think the principle is completely wrong.

MR. PETERS: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Seven Oaks that the debate be adjourned.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne and the proposed amendment thereto by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition, and the proposed amendment to the amendment by the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party. The Honourable the First Minister.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I heartily reciprocate the cordial welcome that I have just received from all members of the House, and trust they will remain in the same happy frame of mind for the duration of my remarks. I must confess that I may detain the Legislature a little longer than I usually do because there has been a singular lack of examination of fact in respect of the debate that's been taking place which I will try to do my best to remedy. I observe that the terms of the sub-amendment we are dealing with comprehend the terms of the amendment so I imagine it will be proper for me to deal into some extent with the remarks that were made by the Leader of the Opposition when he joined in this customary and traditional debate a few days ago.

I want to say of course that I read with the greatest interest the speeches that were made by the mover and the seconder of the Address in Reply as I did not have the opportunity to hear them, and I want to add my congratulations to those kind words that have already been expressed in their behalf. I don't usually join this debate so early in its course, but as I am unavoidably absent from the service of the House for the rest of the day and for tomorrow, I thought perhaps I'd better get my licks in while I had an opportunity, and I am grateful for that chance.

I think that one of the most trenchant comments that was made on the speech of the Honourable Member for St. Rose was made by an observer who stated that it reminded him of a demolition job. Perhaps I'd better pronounce that DEMolition to give a little more flavour to the word. And I must say that I quite agree with that description, and can only add my comment, "How true, and how sad, " because the occasion deserved, and I think the public had a right to expect, a reasoned and convincing analysis of the proposals that were contained in the Speech from the Throne. Criticism of course, is to be expected, and is proper. A constructive alternative may perhaps be hoped for and respect for logic and fact at least is possible; but what we got, was the demolition job. And the casualty in this case I am afraid is not so much the government, the casualty is the constructive proposal and alternative, and perhaps even to a degree the reputation of the province.

Now, Madam Speaker, no government and no human undertaking is free from criticism, or is perfect in intent or performance but the demolition job that we were offered the other day, can only sadden those who are interested in a constructive and responsible opposition. Mind you, the Honourable Member of Ste. Rose at least was trying a new line. Apparently for the time being he's off scandal and Grand Rapids, but I suggest that the new product will be no more saleable than the old confection. And I propose, at the risk of being tiresome, step by step and point by point, to examine the complaints that were set before us and rehearse this so-called litany -- or is it a confession, of failure -- and to do what my honourable friend conspicuously omitted to do, and that is to deal with the facts. Confession of failure. Has a nice ring to it. It was intended I have no doubt to have a certain oratorical flourish but when the oratory wore off there really wasn't too much left.

Take Health, that's the first area of criticism. What's been going on for the last eight years in the Department of Health? Only the biggest advance in our history, that's all. In 1957, '58 the per capita expenditures on health were over 10 dollars, \$10.61. In the year that is coming, they will be over \$43.00 per capita, not including the federal contribution for Hospital Insurance. That's all. A fourfold increase per capita in expenditures in this department. A confession of failure? What did this expenditure consist of? Mental health, for example, has made astonishing strides. We have actually reduced the number of people in our Mental Hospitals. Count them. And if that is not an achievement of some moment in the field of health in these last eight years, then I am much mistaken. And you can see the sheltered workshops we didn't have before, the foster and that miracle of change, the new buildings, the new staff, the new methods. Speak to them about a confession of failure in health. X-ray and laboratory units extended during that same period to tens of thousands of Manitobans to keep them out of the hospital. A new cancer research institute, one of the most advanced of its kind. A rehabilitation hospital to restore people to active life. Have members opposite ever been in it? The Canadian Clinic for babies afflicted with the defects of thalidomide. And so much much that could be mentioned in the field of health.

But we are told that we're not building hospitals when all we've had in the last eight years, Madam Speaker, is the biggest hospital program in the entire history of the Province of Manitoba. The number of beds per thousand have gone up and our bed ratio per thousand is higher than the Canadian average. But, what is a better measure of the availability of hospital service to our people -- and that was the point that my Honourable friend was hammering on -- is in the days of care. The days of care per thousand persons is an excellent index of the quantity

(MR. ROBLIN cont'd.) of hospital service available. In 1959, the first year of the Plan, it was 1,748 days of care per thousand people; in 1965 it was 2,000 days of care per thousand people, an increase on a per capita basis mind you, with the population going up all the time, in spite of some others figures we've heard, of 14 percent more. Ah but he says you don't follow the Willard Report. What about that? There's the guide line as to what you ought to be doing. Well, if you'll examine the Willard Report. What about that? There's the guide line as to what you ought to be doing. Well, if you'll examine the Willard Report, you will see that they set a budget for the Province to spend in the period '61 to '66. And what was that budget? Something over \$35 million. And what did we actually spend in hospital construction from '61 to '66? Thirty-six point eight million dollars above the Willard target. And we have another \$21 million on the planning board which somebody -- for God knows what reason described as a "crash program." Everyone surely understands that those projects will take a period to complete. That must be obvious to the dullest. And if you continue to read the survey report -- if my honourable friend will pursue his studies in "Willard" he will find they suggested that if the \$35 million program which they assigned to us for the period of '61-'66 was too expensive and we couldn't finance it, that it might be stretched over a longer period if the financial situation indicated. So I have a notion that some honourable gentleman opposite should take a refresher course and read that report again. Well he said, what about Deer Lodge Veterans' Hospital? Well of course we're going to use it; of course we are using it. Eighty-three percent of the active treatment days in the Deer Lodge now are for Manitoba civilians. As my honourable friend could have found out for the asking. It isn't difficult to find out that information. But he comes in here and accuses us in respect to the operation of that institution.

And if that isn't enough he tells us about the Children's Hospital. Well that project was approved in principle some time ago and since then the hospital board and the hospital itself have had problems of financing and planning. The estimate started at \$2½ million. Two and one-half million. The program presented last July by the hospital has a price tag of almost eight million. I suggest that prudence demanded a careful review; and that is what has taken place; and that hospital will be going ahead. But says my honourable friend while you are being prudent with your reviews and what not, 400 cases are slated for admission. Well the Hospital Commission tells me that's true. But they also say that the doctors concerned have made it clear that there are neither emergencies or emergency that cannot be accommodated in that hospital. A waiting list by itself is something that cannot be lightly banded about as my honourable friend does. This year when the Children's Hospital is being built there are 20 new pediatric and 20 new teenage beds coming into use at the St. James Grace Hospital with space for hundreds of patients a year. Perhaps, I am told, between a thousand and 15 hundred patients will be admitted to those beds that are now coming into service; and we can add to that 88 new beds in the new extension of the Children's Hospital that come into use in 1968.

Well he says, if it is not the hospital, -- and I suppose I might really persuade him on that point - it's the nurses. What about them? Well what about them? In 1959, we had 2,460 active registered nurses. Let those with their pencils out write the figures down. They're instructive. In 1965, that 2,460 active registered nurses had risen to 4,412. That's not so bad. And what about more nurses? Of course we need more, and we spent four million dollars in opening new nursing schools and residences and have raised the basic pay of nurses in the last two years by \$600 a year. The basic rate. Three new schools of nursing at the St. James Grace and Victoria and at Brandon are either planned or in operation.

And then there's the licensed practical nurses. We started out and -- I'll give you the figures for the Central Training School alone for licensed practical nurses. In 1958 they had a capacity for 50; 1962 that was raised to a 100; in 1965 it went up to 150; this year it is 300, plus the other schools in the province. A steady escalation of effort. No panic. No crash program. A realistic pacing of the facts. So that whereas in 1958 we had 903 licensed practical nurses, we have got 1,553 today, and you may count them. And if anyone thinks that that dramatic rise in the number of nurses, both registered and licenced practical, is insignificant, and is a statement of failure in dealing with the province, then I think he has lost his sense of proportion. I do not claim perfection. There is much to be done. But there is no confession of failure to be found in these figures. And he winds up on hospitals accusing the government of threatening -- that's his choice of language, not mine -- threatening higher premiums. No, Madam, not threats, but a little realism. The main factor in higher costs is more beds. Our policy rate rests on the best possible ballast between more beds and increased costs. Members

(MR. ROBLIN cont'd.) on the opposite side are not such fools that they do not know that more beds mean more costs; but members on the other side will panic for more beds and the very same gentlemen will panic to an even higher degree of intensity if the costs rise. That's irresponsibility of an unusually distinguished order. Will my honourable friends opposite never learn that if you will the ends, you must will the means. Confession of failure in the health field? I think probably there's a rather larger beam in the eyes of members opposite than the mote that they have discerned in our eyes.

Well, he moves on to agriculture. Must say, Madam Speaker, he tripped over that one rather lightly if you ask me. But I quite understand because that's what they did at the Grit Convention. In fact I don't think they tripped over it at all because they didn't even get it on the Agenda, if the reports that I read were correct -- at least it never got discussed. And what surprises him about agriculture these days? Why, he says, with a note of astonishment in his voice, many farmers in Manitoba are in a state of poverty -- some two-fifths of them if the quotation is right. Well so he's finally twigged; he's finally twigged to a situation which is not only true of this province but of this nation, and indeed, depending on the definition of poverty, in the United States as well. What does he think, pray, that the multi-million dollar ARDA program is for? What does he think, pray, that the millions that he has been voting for to increase agricultural productivity is for? Well I'll tell him. It's because there is poverty on the farm, and because we want to do something about it. Gentlemen of the complexion opposite have steadily opposed -- and I'll give him chapter and verse -- the measures of this government to help deal with the basic problem of low productivity on the farm. But he says to us, in effect, I don't need your program. I've got one of my own. I've got a farm implement price spread committee. Well, Madam Speaker, that idea has at least the virtue of being familiar, and if it wasn't I dare say my honourable friend would not have thought of it.

In 1960 the federal house had an extensive study into this subject. In 1963 the Ontario Legislature looked into this matter, and now in 1966 he wants one for Manitoba. To do what? Well he told us in his speech what it was going to do. He told us that he needed it so that we could make recommendations to Ottawa. Just great. Well I suppose that they need to be told about this matter. They're certainly the only ones who can do anything about it. But the thought rings rather strange on my ears when in the very same speech honourable gentleman opposite shied off because we ask Ottawa to look into things that we're unable to cope with ourselves. A little consistency would be more to the point.

Ah, but that's not all in the farm program. There's something else. We're going to solve the farmer's problem with purple gas. We're going to put the Manitoba farmer on the same footing as the Saskatchewan farmer who has purple gas. What about the 4 percent sales tax in Saskatchewan? How are you going to take care of that particular factor and where does that fit into your equation of equality and equity? Right today the Manitoba farmer pays far less in taxes to his province and to his municipality and school board than does the farmer of Saskatchewan -- and right well my honourable friend knows it. Far less in this province, today, 1966, February 10th, less, and he says, put them on an equal footing. Well you know this purple gas idea fits, it fits my honourable friend perfectly, it's just about as superficial a recommendation as you could find in dealing with basic, deep-rooted farm problems. He knows of course, perfectly well, that in terms of dollars and cents, most farmers receive far more benefit from the school tax rebate than they do from what purple gas will ever give them. He opposes the rebate and he wants purple gas. Well I'm willing to bet that if given a choice between the school tax rebate and the purple gas, the majority would be far better off with a school tax rebate. And why? Because that tax remission is doing far more to reduce farming costs and farming taxes than ever the purple gas will do.

But you know, these proposals of my honourable friends opposite are kites they fly, not really very serious. Like so many good ideas they merely skim the surface of the problem. Has he any real ideas of farm help. We're pretty well in the dark on the subject. But there is one thing we know about my honourable friends; we know what they're against and sometimes that's a pretty revealing situation. Millions of dollars have been invested in agricultural research at the University of Manitoba, producing millions of dollars worth of benefits and productivity to our farmers, and that policy when first introduced by the Conservative Party was bitterly opposed. Bitterly opposed by the Grits in this Legislature. When we took over drainage to help the problem of excess water on the main drains of Manitoba, we got precious little encouragement from my friend. When the Farm Credit Act came in -- incidentally, we have lent over \$34 million to hundreds of farmers to expand their farm and to increase their

(MR. ROBLIN cont'd.) . . . productivity, one of the biggest aids to productivity -- it was violently condemned by honourable gentlemen opposite as being unnecessary in the Province of Manitoba. And today they still go around talking about the debt of the Province of Manitoba and the burden that it is, and a major item of that debt burden is this very money that's lent out to the farmers of our province in farm credit and who have a repayment record which is so close to perfection as to make no debt.

Well, crop insurance. Never never never if the Grits had had their way would there be crop insurance. And their present attitude of conversion will fool nobody, certainly not the Honourable Member from Morris who understands when I say that this policy was condemned as improvident and fruitless and useless, when we know what a stabilizer it is to farm income. Confession of failure? Well in the words of the late George Bernard Shaw, "Not bloody likely". It's a record of achievement. Are we satisfied with ourselves? No, Mr. Speaker, we're not. We are far from satisfied with ourselves. We intend to pursue to the farthest possible limits the opportunities we have to increase productivity through ARDA. We have called for a National Farm Conference to put all the minds in agriculture and all the governments of this country together to help deal with this terrible problem of poverty on our farms. To raise farm sales to \$10,000 a year per farm by 1971; when 60 percent of our farmers today have a gross production of less than \$5,000.00. We're going to work away at that. We're going to continue to do the best we can ourselves. We're going to continue to enlist the support of other provinces and the federal government, no matter how much noise the Grits in this House make offstage. Because that's where they are, offstage; and if they don't get any better than they are now they're going to remain offstage into the foreseeable future. Well, says my honourable friend, he's got further positive resolutions to offer. I may be permitted a certain scepticism. But we'll give him the benefit of the doubt. But if there is a good idea among them it will be for the first time in eight long years, and I'm waiting for it.

Now let's move on to the failure in education. That's an interesting topic. I'd like to give a few facts for the edification of the House in respect of this matter. When we came into office what were the school grants that my honourable friends were paying out? They can't remember. But the public can. There were 10.6 million dollars. Today, with the school rebates the expenditure is 42.4 million dollars -- over four times. And an interesting comment is that of that sum 19½ million is for teachers' salaries. In 1965 the grants for teachers' salaries alone are almost twice the entire grant for everything in 1958. And when you see the recommendation for 1966, which shall be before you next week, we'll certainly be going over the top. In 1958 we had 6900 teachers; we have over 9,000 today. In 1958, 1,070 had university degrees; we've doubled that today. When we came in there had been up to 20 percent permit teachers in one year. There were 5.1 percent in 1958. There are 3 percent today. We're not proud of that. We want to get it down to zero. Our honourable friends opposite complain we're losing our teachers. Fourteen hundred and seventy-four teachers did not return to the classroom in September of last year, and that's right. Where did they go? Well to judge from some of the implications we get from across the way, any place but the Province of Manitoba is where they went. Well let me give you the facts. Of that 1,474 teachers, 324 went to home duties. I suppose that's a nice way of saying they got married. That happens to charming young ladies and there is plenty of them in the teaching profession. Well 117 retired, and they'd had an average of 37 years service. Fifty of them went to other schools in Manitoba, mainly Indian and Metis -- I don't call that much of a loss; 72 left the teaching profession for other calls; 244 were unqualified, so they weren't much of a loss to us; 236 returned to the university to become better teachers. I suppose my honourable friend would approve of that. Two hundred and eighteen left to teach outside of the Province of Manitoba, and there's another 200 or so that are unspecified. Yes, we lost 218 teachers outside the province. But, Madam Chairman, we gained 172 teachers that came into Manitoba from other provinces and from other jurisdictions, plus 58 teachers with Manitoba certificates who came back into the Province. So you place a loss of 218 beside a gain of 172, and most of the 58 as well went back to full time teaching, and I don't think we have to take any posture of aura at the fact that like other professions and other members of the population, the teaching profession is mobile. The fact is that we were able to replace the whole of that loss of 1,474 teachers and then some. But are we satisfied with it? We are certainly not satisfied with it. We need more teachers. That is why last year we authorized the construction of a new 300 place Teachers' College at Brandon. That is why we enlarged the Teachers' College in Tuxedo when we removed it to the University site, to make more room; and that is why we have an intensive recruitment

(MR. ROBLIN cont'd.) campaign -- of which you will hear more from my honourable friend the Minister of Education. But if you are looking for a confession of failure, I think you will have to look somewhere else.

All right, what about the other provinces, curriculum, technical training, research, retarded children, vocational education, small high schools. Well, here again, a little less rodomontade and a few more facts might enlighten even the members of the official opposition. Ten years ago there were 38 classes for retarded, 38. Today there are 158, up five times, and over and above that. In the plans that my colleague will place before this House there will be a sweeping reform that will bring in an educational program for every one of these educable and trainable children. A new front forward.

Curriculum reform. Well my honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition better talk to the late, not the late, but the former Honourable Robert Bend, his friend and Minister of Education, because he's been giving public testimony -- just the other day the paper was full of it, headline on the third page of the Tribune, I think -- of the heavy demand that the new reformed curricula, my friend says we haven't got, is making on the teachers and children of the Province of Manitoba. Well, when we came into office, the curriculum branch consisted of one officer and one stenographer. That was the scale effort in 1958 when my honourable friends gave up the Seal. Today there are hundreds of teachers working on these reforms, any one of whom could have instructed my honourable friends and given them the facts, if they had chosen to find out.

Modern improvements are coming thick and fast, and everybody knows it. Too many small high schools? Yes, more small high schools than I like to see. But I remind you, Madam Speaker, who was it that moved in this House to modify the high school building grant structure to favour small high schools as against the program the government brought in? Why it was the official educational critic of the Liberal Party. Well, thank God they can learn something. In 1958 we had 288 -- jot the figure down, I ask honourable members to make a note of this. In 1958 we had 288 really small high schools in the province, and in 1965 we have 49 of them left. That's quite a change. In 1958 we had 68 collegiate institutes in Manitoba and in 1965 we have 161, of which by far the greatest has well over four rooms, and I suggest to you that's quite a change. In 1955 there were 8,123 people in these small tiny high schools. Last year there are 1,515 children in the same category of school, decrease to about one-sixth I suppose, or one-fifth of what it was when we came in. Better still, in 1958 there were 16,744 children attending our collegiate institute and in 1965 that 16 thousand figure had risen to 50 thousand, and more -- an increase of over three times. And we are told that our educational policy for the first eight years in this province is a failure.

Today, 96 of our high schools including 65 in rural Manitoba, offered a general course, mostly, as well as the university entrance; and 41 teach commercial courses, of which 21 are outside the main centres of Metro and Portage and Brandon and Flin Flon and Dauphin. Are we satisfied? Not by a long shot. But progress can plainly be seen. And to charge us with failure in this respect is, I think, a complete failure to understand the change that's taken place. And that, I think is the only possible explanation for the charge, is ignorance of the facts that were and are freely available. In 1966 the vocational school program that you will be hearing about adds another dramatic new dimension to variety and quality in Manitoba education. And there is much more to come because we are not satisfied and we intend to keep up the rate of progress that we have been making over these past eight years.

Well what about vocational education, seeing the subject's been raised. Well let me give you the facts on that, Madam Speaker. We inherited just 800 places in the vocational sub-high school in the vocational school system of the province, 800. Today in 1965 we have created another 2,440. We are right now building some 2,775 more, and the program that's being placed before you in this session calls for 3,300 more vocational places, so that we will have completed in that program, over 9,000. That's 11 times what we had when we came in. I'm sorry, if I find it impossible to blush over that record of development and achievement. And I think within the next five years some 30 perhaps to 50 percent -- and that's an astonishing forecast that's been given to me -- of our high school children may be taking courses in these vocational schools. All my honourable friend had to do if he wanted to assess education in Manitoba, was to look around him in his own town, in any town, and see the new schools; but what is much better, see the new scholars -- the new scholars. The thousands -- and I'm not exaggerating -- the thousands of boys and girls that otherwise, under the old plan, would have been drop-outs -- and that's not a nice name these days an it doesn't deserve to be

(MR. ROBLIN cont'd.) . . . a nice name. But they're not drop-outs now because there is a place for them and they're in that place. And they talk to me about confession of failure.

Did my honourable friends opposite ever take advantage of a nice Sunday afternoon to visit the University of Manitoba, to take a look at the mushroom explosion of growth? Did he ever check the estimates to see the sums that they are voting each year for operating and for capital expenses, to know what's going on out there? Well I suppose they do, because when my honourable friend wound up on education, he couldn't help but eject the phrase -- and I hope I quote him correctly: "How much is it going to cost?" Well that's the Grits all over. They've been unwilling year by year, to face up to cost. Today the Leader of the Opposition seems to be on a new tack full of bright ideas for spending money, as he himself admitted in his speech, but he has a bad habit of looking the other way when the bill comes down. It reminds me of certain people I entertain at the restaurant.

What does he say about the new program from the Throne Speech? You'd have thought he'd have devoted some attention to that. You'd have thought we would have heard whether he was in favour of this expansion of the kindergarten system or the new dimension in regional vocational schools, or what we're doing for retarded children, or the new Institute of Applied Arts for the commercial high schools and all the rest. Is he in favour? Well I suspect he is. I have a hunch if you watch him he'll vote for it, but when it comes to pay for it, he'll be off and running down the next alley, counting on courting popularity by the profit of some tax cuts. Well, I think the public of this province is just a little too sophisticated. They're not just that easy to fool, and the Liberal Party gravely under-estimate the good sense of our people and their understanding of the demands. You're going to hear all you want about the heat tax before we get through with that subject.

Well, having exhausted the possibilities of the Department of Education, we then moved on to "development." Now we all want more growth; there's no division of opinion. And we on this side of the House are not so proud that we will refuse to accept constructive proposals if we get them. The problem is to get them. But I wonder, Madam, who benefits when the Leader of the Opposition sells Manitoba short. I suspect that even he will not benefit. Eight years of failure in the field of development? Well, I've got some more work for the men with the pencils, because I want to give you some figures about our development from 1958 to 1965, and I'm going to compare those figures with the Province of Saskatchewan, not because I haven't the highest regard for the people of that province, but both leaders of parties opposite seem to like it as a standard of comparison for one reason or another. So I'm going to let them have it.

From 1958 to 1965, population, Manitoba up 87,000; Saskatchewan 60,000. In fact, we overtook the Province of Saskatchewan in total population during this government's term of office. We're going to do our best to stay ahead of them if we possibly can.

Capital investment in manufacturing for the same period 1958-65: Manitoba 320 million, Saskatchewan 128 million.

Electrical power generation in thousands of kilowatts: Manitoba increased by 2,210,000; Saskatchewan 1,744,000.

Telephones installed, another indicator of activity: Manitoba 101; Saskatchewan 82.

Value of manufacturing shipments: Manitoba 281 million; Saskatchewan 118 million.

And here's one of interest: mineral production, in the wide sense: the increase in Manitoba from 1958 to 1965, \$125 million; the increase in Saskatchewan, \$118 million. Yield of the Canada Pension Plan. --(Interjection) -- Well I don't think Premier Thatcher discovered the sulphur beds, if the truth were known. I haven't heard that he drilled an oil well, but my honourable friend would like to give him the credit for it. Yield of the Canada Pension Plan. Here's another indicator. Manitoba 23.8 million, Saskatchewan 17.9 million.

Personal income, non-farm sources: Manitoba, went up \$330.00, Saskatchewan up \$187.00. And right today the personal per capita income for 1965 in Manitoba is \$2,006 for the non-farm sector versus \$1,849 in Saskatchewan.

But there is one statistic which does not show the same trend, and I intend to give it to the House, and that is in connection with farm income, because in this year of grace 1965, the farm income in Manitoba is barely, on a per capita basis, half the farm income in Saskatchewan: \$1,288 versus \$2,406, and it would be wrong of me not to place that fact before you as well. It will come as no surprise, however, because everybody knows that when Saskatchewan has a big wheat crop, it's as good as a gold mine any day. When there's a big wheat crop in that province it puts our farmers in the shade. Our size of farm, our type of farming, the nature

(MR. ROBLIN cont'd.) of our soils, dictate the fact and we must struggle with it as best we can, but it's not a fact to be ashamed of. It's a fact of life.

Well, there's an eight-year record with a few statistics. Not much of a confession of failure to be extracted from that. And in this year, 1965, 10,000 jobs created in Manitoba over what we had the previous year mopping up practically every able-bodied person we can find, creating a situation where what our neediest population -- people to come in and to do the jobs that are in this province. We're not satisfied. We intend to take every effort to improve, and we'll accept every honest and useful suggestion to help us do it.

What's the record of the Liberal Party in industrial development during those same eight years? Well, here again it's so difficult to find anything they were in favour of. We brought in the Manitoba Development Fund. What gales of laughter that produced on the benches opposite. In their term of existence they lent over \$16 million. This is gone to an increased factory production and tourist revenue of \$42 million. The borrowers have been responsible for providing over 2,400 new jobs for an annual payroll of \$8 million; 51.5 percent was in rural Manitoba, and 1.6 million has been lent for tourist operators to assist in the growth of their industry in the province. It's not a bad record. Not a bad idea when you come to it, the MDF, and it's made possible a multi-million dollar fertilizer plant in Brandon. -- (Interjection) -- Well, if my honourable friend proposed it first, I congratulate him. We, at any rate, had the satisfaction of putting it into effect. But I'll tell you one thing: the gentlemen that sit beside him didn't propose it, and they didn't put it into effect, and they to prevent it from coming into effect. In fact, you can search the record to find ideas on their part that would help in the industrial development of this province. Export Corporation, the Research Council, the Design Institute, the Economic Council. All modern tools that every province is employing to improve the economy, all working well, and there isn't a Grit who could find a good word to say for any of them. And I daresay they'll repeat the performance this year. But they haven't got any ideas of their own. Well they know how to read, because one of the interesting parts of my honourable friend's speech had to do with a quotation from the Throne Speech of 1959 about Northern Manitoba, and I'm glad he read it. I'm a little sorry that he didn't take the trouble to see what happened after 1959 in carrying out that pledge for Northern Manitoba.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): Ask your member for Churchill.

MR. ROBLIN: We contended that power and communication was the secret to development there and we delivered the goods, and I want to tell my honourable friends we're going to deliver a few more little parcels of that kind before he or I are much older. We put roads into that country. We paved that No. 10 Highway, yes we did. The tourist trade, when that was completed, has risen at least three times in Northern Manitoba from what it was before. We built the road to Thompson and it didn't take us 20 years to do it either, like the Flin Flon Highway my friends started. We put in new roads around The Pas, even at Churchill, and we're developing the line to Lynn Lake. We put communication into Northern Manitoba on a scale it's never seen before. We moved in with the Northern Health Service and we reduced the death rate among the Indian and Metis children which was a shocking standing scandal, which my honourable friends ignored in their term of office. Too something more the death rate among white children. You should have seen the Town of Churchill, for example, before we moved in with some sanitary services to clean it up.

What about the diesel electric tracks that we have installed in remote areas throughout the north? What about the takeover for Churchill and The Pas, power supply, to the great benefit and advantage of the people? What about the power development at Grand Rapids and what about the Nelson River? What about the MTS radio links in the North, the new system they've installed, and the low rates? What about the absolute transformation in the facilities for education in Northern Manitoba, with the Vocational School and the Frontier School Division and Cranberry Portage and Churchill and Norway House, and the fact that we have a five-year program on foot now to upgrade the whole of that educational system, and the fact that we have a residential school to give these children the high school education they should have. Failure in the north? What about the new mines? Hasn't my friend heard about them? What about Soab and Birch Tree and the second concentrate that Inco is putting in now. What about Anderson and Ghost and White and Snow and Osborne and Stall and Chisel. What about towns like Snow Lake that sprung to life in this eight years of desolation that we've heard so much about? What about the news on Fox Lake which is going to almost double the size of the townsite of Lynn? Confession of failure? Not much. Look at the northern mines, listing as

(MR. ROBLIN cont'd.) of February 3rd, the people that are conducting exploration in our north; Falconbridge and Coningco, Noranda, Kenico, and Inco and Hudson Bay Mining, Marion Mining, Kerr-Addison, and Texas Gulf Sulphur. They're hardly being left in the lurch. It doesn't sound like the complete stagnation that my honourable friend has heard of. Let me also tell him that if he thinks he's heard the last about forest development, we've already got one pulp mill, don't forget it. It's been expanded in recent years. I venture to say there'll be more to be said about that subject before we get through.

But then my honourable friend gets on to the subject of population and he speaks of Greater Winnipeg with the slowest growth in the nation at 2.9 percent in 1965. Well, there's food for thought, but that's not what Metro Winnipeg say. They say the growth in Greater Winnipeg is more like 7.7 percent, and there's quite a difference between 2.9 and 7.7. Somebody has got to be wrong. The Dominion Bureau of Statistics estimate these figures by counting. They count the family allowance cheques and the births and deaths. They get their figure. The Metro Winnipeg people estimate their figures by counting but they count people. They make a physical enumeration at the time of the assessment each year, and for my money I'll take the Metro count.

Then we come to the climax of his speech. Completely ignores the fact that over the eight-year period there's been an 87,000 growth in the population of the province and tells us in the last few months Manitoba has lost a thousand persons, and I'm afraid I'll have to reserve judgment on the accuracy of that assertion, but nevertheless he has a solution. His solution on this question of population, development, and all the rest is to say, "If I am premier I will go out and personally sell Manitoba all over the world." Well, Madam Speaker, he needn't wait till then - it might be some time - and he needn't go so far. Just take a trip at government expense to Ottawa and ask your federal friends to restore our Air Canada base to us. That's just one of the federal national policies working to downgrade Manitoba. Bring back our base from Montreal and you'll give our industry the shot in the arm you say they need, and the population as well. The gentlemen opposite laughed at me last year when I told the Thompson Commission that taking Air Canada away was like ripping our heart out. They laughed at me and they held me up to a degree of ridicule, but I say questions like the Air Canada questions are basic to Manitoba's development problem. We need federal policies to support regional growth and while I'm at it, may I say that so does the Province of Saskatchewan, and I'm with them 100 percent. We've got a federal tariff that doesn't do us much good. We've got a federal feed grain subsidy and we're threatened with a new eastern feed plan that'll hurt. The Minister of Agriculture and Conservation gave the facts on Tuesday, now this will hurt our livestock production and hurt our feed grain return. We've got a federal air policy that hurts us. Winnipeg and Manitoba sacrificed on the altar of the international agreement for air routes to Winnipeg. We've got an automobile free trade deal that hurts us, not because we're jealous or envious of the good fortune of another province, but when we know that when 25,000 new jobs in this high-priced industry are created, they act like a magnet in drawing the young men out of the Province of Manitoba. And we say that if you bring in a policy like that that bleeds us, give us the countervailing policy here in this province so that we can get on with our own business in building our own part of the nation. But we don't get -- if he wants to take a little trip, I can tell him where to go.

What about high freight rates? Talk about Northern development, with the freight rate structure we've got in this country. We have called upon the Federal Government - and this will be news to the House - to set up a joint Manitoba-Canada task force to look at the Hudson Bay Railway and its connections with the rest of this country to bring our freight rates down and get the elemental rates that we've got to have.

We need national policies that work for our region and not against it, and if you think I'm arguing from a particular position of prejudice, read the report, the second report of the Economic Council of Canada, because it documents in some detail the regional inequalities that other nations, like the United States and Australia, have overcome under a federal system but which still plague us and which cry aloud for national action. The Government of Manitoba stood before the Federal-Provincial Conference on several occasions on that stand - national policies to support regional growth - and everything we have maintained has been underlined and substantiated by the impartial view of John Deutsch and his colleagues. But I'll tell you one thing. Whatever our problem - and we have them - there's no place in Manitoba for Mr. Poormouth. Manitoba just won't buy that. The record of the last eight years is a record that Mr. Poormouth cannot wave away, and it gives us good reason for courage and determination.

(MR. ROBLIN cont'd.) There's no room for self-satisfaction and there's no room for self-pity, but there's plenty of room for new and better effort. Not partisan squabbling, but united and joint effort on the part of all of us, and that's what the Throne Speech calls for. Manitobans just won't buy this confession of failure bit, because they can see with their own eyes the progress of recent years. You can't ignore the roads and the schools and the industries and the new homes and the jobs, and I think the people of our province appreciate the program for action that the Throne Speech is. It's a good program; it speaks for itself. I wish I could have devoted my time this afternoon to enlarging upon its opportunity because it challenges every one of us to achieve and to do more. It touches on the vital policies for human betterment and growth and it is fully consistent with our past program and achievements.

Madam Speaker, we will not despise constructive criticism, and we will not avoid reasoned debate, but we will spurn the poor mouth rant of the liberal wrecking crew. The government program looks forward, for example, to the Nelson, and I'll have something more to say about that, as I intimated earlier. The greatest single investment of government funds or any other in our history, the biggest opportunity for job building, the greatest magnet to attract population and increase it, a fantastic natural resource project. If we haven't the oil and the potash, at least we have got rivers and we're going to make the most of them. It will be the biggest program that was ever considered in this Legislature, and it's part of an even bigger program, as the Throne Speech outlined, designed for human betterment and to help us to make the most of what God gave us. We are challenged by its magnitude. It will not be easy, but we will strive earnestly until we reach the sunny upland of achievement and advance.

. continued on next page

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Matthews.

MR. W. G. MARTIN (St. Matthews): Madam Speaker, may I first of all express our good wishes to you, our prayers that you may long remain to keep the exalted position which you now occupy. You have carried on your work with great patience and firmness and skill; and with your hand upon the lever, the ship of state has weathered many a gale and has reached its desired haven, perhaps not the desired haven of all members of the crew, but certainly the desired haven of the captain of the crew. Also, to express our appreciation of the contribution of the mover and seconder of the reply to the Speech from the Throne. They made a very worthy contribution and we thank them very much for it.

Also, to express our appreciation of the contribution and we thank them very much for it.

I wasn't sure, Madam Speaker, that I would like to stand up just now and make any contribution to this debate, but I do feel in a very grateful mood to our leader, the First Minister of this province, for the admirable speech which he has given this afternoon and which in my estimation is a clear-cut and complete answer to the criticisms which have been offered by the other side and particularly by the Leader of the Opposition. We are grateful to him for what he has done, and the thought that went through our minds this afternoon, I'm sure, was that we are thankful that he is with us today in Manitoba, leading the forces of the government and directing the destinies of the people of this province to a greater future than they have ever known.

The one word that seems to have dominated the speeches from the opposition, the Leader of the Opposition particularly, was lack of confidence. He said, as did the leader of the New Democratic Party, that this government has lost the confidence of the people, and for 52 minutes we listened to an oration which was a negative and fruitless dissertation and adverse criticism of the government and its policies.

The duty of the opposition we are told from time to time is to oppose, but a wise opposition, Madam Speaker, will seek to present his work and do his duty in an atmosphere of constructive thought and opinion. That was utterly absent from the speech of the Leader of the Opposition. He charged the government with failure and neglect. He suggested that there was lack of vision and of enterprise, that the government was guilty of adopting a macabre-like attitude of sitting down and waiting for something to turn up. The terms of the amendment state the failure of the government to provide the necessary growth of Manitoba. He suggested, you remember, Madam Speaker, that it was a question of talk, talk, talk, words, words, words, but no action.

I recall that there were some points of approval in his speech, for instance when he referred to the Nelson Power project. You know on Monday last when he took his seat, he looked across at the government benches and waited expectantly for the First Minister to arrive, and he could scarcely contain himself, waiting for the opportunity to say to the First Minister, "Who did you see in Ottawa; what took place; when may we expect some details and some report?" Just like a little boy on Christmas morning waiting for Santa Claus to open his bag. Concerning the Nelson River project, the Leader of the Opposition made some complimentary statements. "A logical step," he said, "in the long range development of power resources. It will open up tremendous opportunities for Manitoba. It is vital as a measure of attracting a multitude of new industries to Manitoba". So as we listened to those complimentary remarks, we patted him on the back and congratulated him.

Then he came to agriculture. He referred to the Crop Insurance program. He said, "It is one of rich benefit to agriculture". Then he went on to point out the shocking revelation of the Manitoba brief - government brief at the Conference on Poverty - that the Manitoba brief stated that two-thirds of the farmers of Manitoba are in a state of poverty. Well, Madam Speaker, that was all said for a purpose, and that purpose was to awaken the conscience of the Federal Government to a sense of their duty and responsibility in giving increased aid to agriculture. Well has the government failed, as he suggested. Well we won't find the answer as we listen to the arguments about the adversaries, but we can find the answer in the records of the departments. These things have been thoroughly covered this afternoon by our leader.

The question of health. In the last eight years there has been a tremendous and notable advance in all branches of the Department of Health. Your references to the crowded situation and the lack of beds in our hospitals, the shortage of nurses, but we have to remember that with the coming of the hospital insurance plan that there is a great problem and there are thousands of citizens of Manitoba who do not pay any hospital premium because of their financial condition, but they're all entitled to hospitalization. That, of course, is a real problem. But what has been done? The First Minister referred to the Rehabilitation Hospital; the grants that are being made to hospitals. I would like to sum it up this way, Madam Speaker. If there

(MR. W. G. MARTIN, cont'd) . . . is any doubt at all about whether the government is guilty of failure in the department of health, all you have to do is to make a close study of the report which has been placed upon our desks this afternoon and there you will have a very illuminating account of what this department is doing.

I happened just now to open it to Page 9, and referring to the grants paid out by Ottawa and the corresponding amount by the Province of Manitoba to the hospitals throughout the province and also in our city hospitals. Then when you come further you read about the laboratory and x-ray units; the research that is going on. And over towards the end an interesting part for those who are critics of the government and saying that they failed the north, there's a very wonderful story of what the health department of this province is doing in the northern regions of our province. Then our psychiatric institutions, the aids to the retarded and physically handicapped.

Some time ago the Department of Health produced a list of slides, and I would suggest to our friends who are critical of what the government is doing, that I am quite sure that you can receive the use of these slides from the Department of Health and you will find they give you a very dramatic and telling story of what is being done, such as the Psychiatric Institute at Selkirk, the recreational therapy project at Brandon, the Brandon psychiatry work, the group therapy at Selkirk Hospital, the mobile dental clinics, vaccination against smallpox, public health nursing service, industrial therapy at the Rehabilitation Hospital. All these are just a few of the slides which illustrate the work which is being done by the Department of Health, and so I think that perhaps these things -- sufficient to say that these things are evidence, dramatic evidence of what is being done.

Education. We've had an illuminating address today on what Manitoba is doing in the field of education, and I would like to refer to the speech made by the Minister of Education at the Annual Meeting of the Association of Trustees, and the figures I'm going to quote here, I am quite sure, will be acceptable to the Leader of the Opposition because he asked us to accept certain figures issued by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, but this is a wonderful paragraph on vocational education. New residential technical vocational school at The Pas creates 500 places at the cost of \$3.4 million; at Brandon to create 800 places at a cost of over \$3 million; detailed plans prepared for an experimental junior vocational school in Winnipeg creates 700 places at a cost of \$2.5 million; despite the development of 16 more classrooms at the MIT in the last year, the architects are preparing plans for the addition of 575 places at the MIT at a cost of \$1 1/3 million; and a substantial grant given by the province to the Winnipeg School Division to extend their technical-vocational facility to create 200 more places in that institution. In addition to this the Premier at the last meeting of our development committee in connection with the Brandon Vocational Centre announced that we hope to present further plans at the forthcoming session through which we estimate the program will add a further \$12 million in capital expenditure.

Then he goes on to say, "and look at the change since 1958. In 1958 we had one centre for vocational education in the Ford building with 800 students; the total high school population at that time, 22,000. Since then we have created 2,440 new educational places and have a high school population of 55,000 - a three-fold increase on both fronts. This means our 1965 program, which is under way, adds to the above, 2,775 places in a \$10 million program. This is a doubling of our present program, or a six-fold increase over 1958. This has occurred because of new advanced technologies and skills required, as we mentioned. Our further plans under consideration at the present time call for another large increase in our MIT of Winnipeg, perhaps a doubling of its capacity, plus, as I've indicated, action in the development of regional vocational high schools". Well, Madam Speaker, one might add this thought, that it is the aim of the Department of Education to provide 3,000 more places for a total increase, or a nine-fold increase over the 1958 situation.

The Manitoba Teachers College is now out on the university campus. When it was in its other site it had a maximum of 600 students; now it's raised to 700. The new Faculty of Education at Brandon College, creating 300 new students at a cost of three quarters of a million, and we hope that through this enabling committee that it won't be long before Brandon will boast of its university. I would like to go further than that and say that I hope it won't be too long in the development of our province, and of our glorious north, before we shall have a university with full status in the north of the province which, in its designation, will pay tribute to the pioneer work and development of our far north. Since 1958 we can sum it up and say that we have spent 80 millions - 80 millions on new schools in Manitoba. We've doubled and nearly tripled

(MR. W.G. MARTIN, cont'd) . . . the high school enrolment; university and the affiliated colleges have shown remarkable growth; and in the Throne Speech there was suggested a four million capital construction program at the university with added scholarships and bursaries.

Then another thing which was very pleasing was a new provincial commercial high school in the metropolitan area; and in the program of expansion which we've heard so eloquently this afternoon, the northern school system with new facilities - one at Cranberry Portage which will be opened in a few days and at Norway House and at Churchill and throughout the Frontier School Division. Capital grants for public school kindergartens. Then of course some weeks ago we went out to Tuxedo and we witnessed the opening of a school for the deaf, a wonderful institution second to none in the country; and as in years gone by we continue to send our blind boys and girls to that great school in Ontario.

Perhaps one of the most important factors in connection with our education program is our education of the mentally retarded and the physically handicapped. Fitting the defective to his environment and the environment to the defective, enabling them to find out occupations suited to their abilities and safeguarding them against unequal competition from those who are better equipped, mentally or physically, as the case may be.

And so, Madam Speaker, when we just look over this very sketchy reference, who can say with a clear conscience that in this vital sphere of education that the Province of Manitoba is lagging. In this modern world of social and economic disorder, I think it is a profound satisfaction and we shouldn't tire of saying this, to know that we are living in a land where, despite social inequalities, the uneven distribution of wealth, and the difficulty that some people, many people have to make ends meet, that in this situation there is a spirit of humanitarianism abroad which recognizes the God-given injunction that a man in his brother's keeper, and this is challenging poverty and suffering and ignorance and disease, and that top-rate priority is given to those things which can be expressed in terms of the human equation. This is the situation in this land of Canada and there is no province of Canada which is doing more in this important work than our Province of Manitoba. We are not lagging. In welfare for the needy and the handicapped, and our unceasing warfare with physical and mental disease, economic revaluation and reconstruction, housing conditions, unemployment insurance, workmen's compensation, child welfare, mother's allowance, the province is aggressing itself with ever-increasing vigor to the accompaniment of ever-increasing financial aid in order to bring about the fulfillment of the ideal of social justice and freedom as the foundation stone of a secure and enduring civilization.

My great quarrel, Madam Speaker, with the speech of the Leader of the Opposition was - and it was well expressed by the Leader of the New Democratic Party - that while he criticized, he had no objective. It was just carping, negative criticism. In fact as I listened to it I said to myself, you know if this speech was delivered the night before a provincial election, the opposition would be relegated to oblivion. The people are asking - everywhere you go you hear this question, "Well, they're criticizing you fellows but what would they do if they came into power? What is their answer? What is their policy?" Well it goes unanswered - this demolition, as the First Minister suggested this afternoon. But one day, Madam Speaker, the answer will be provided, and it will be provided by the people when they go to the polls and their answer will be clear-cut and decisive, that the administration which has been entrusted with the task of fashioning the destiny of the province during the past eight years has earned the right to carry on.

Now there was a glorious peroration at the end to which our leader has referred, and he says, "Madam Speaker, I would consider it my first and foremost responsibility to go out and personally sell Manitoba; to personally convince investors and industrialists the world over that Manitoba is a good province in which to establish; that we have top quality labour forces; plenty of natural resources, water and a great opportunity for the future." Well, Madam Speaker, that's our creed. We're not only saying it, but for eight years we've been going out and doing it and doing it effectively.

Then may I refer to one other theme of the Leader of the Opposition when he says, "There's no end in sight to improvements, in advances in education, in health, in all the human aspects". Well, of course there is no end in sight. We've done a tremendous job in the last eight years but we're going on from good to better, from better to best. There's no end in sight of what's going to be done in health and education and other improvements.

Just before I sit down, I'd like to refer again to something in the speech of the Leader of the Opposition. He says, "There's crisis" - very dramatic - "crisis in health, crisis in

(MR. W. G. MARTIN, cont'd) . . . education, crisis in agriculture". Of course there's crisis. There's crisis all over the world. There's crisis in every land and in every government. There's crisis in Manitoba. Yes, but perhaps you have heard some time that the Chinese word which is translated "crisis" is made up of two words, has a double meaning. To the Chinese the word "crisis" means danger and opportunity. Well there can be no great crusade worthwhile that does not encounter danger, but there's opportunity with the danger, and the opportunity is to scale heights and place the flag of victory at the summit. Well, Madam Speaker, in the midst of the inescapable dangers of a rapidly changing world, Manitoba has seized the opportunity which the crisis provides, and like the tide taken at the flood, it will lead this province forward to an era of prosperity, that would be the heritage of all classes of our citizenry, and in the words of the speech from the Throne, the peoples also of other cultures and other origins. Thank you.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, we're having a very interesting afternoon. I regret that the Leader of the House after the great peroration he gave us felt that he had to be elsewhere, because I had certain matters I would have liked to have conveyed to him on this occasion. I was very interested, as well, in what the member for St. Matthews said.

But certainly one thing that has come out very clearly from the government statements today is that the government is satisfied. That is a very clear situation. The government and its supporters are highly satisfied. They are quite content that they have done a great job for the past eight years. It's unfortunate that the people of Manitoba aren't as equally satisfied, because in spite of the brave words of my honourable friend, if they would check into the various fields that I covered, they will find that the people of Manitoba are not nearly as satisfied as my friends claim they are.

Go, for example, in the field of education, Madam Speaker, and find out there what the people who are in education - the people who are involved directly with schools - what they are saying. What are they saying? The teachers of Manitoba have been saying for some months now that there is a major teacher shortage developing. It didn't come up all of a sudden. Just look at the various news stories. They've been saying this for months: "Teacher shortage discussed; loss of graduate teachers serious problem in Manitoba". On and on in this way they have been telling the government - the teachers themselves - and for the Premier to get up and say, well we have more teachers than before is no answer to the problem. No answer to the situation at all. The facts are that the government has not kept pace with the development that was required and they had been told about this. The very fact that the headlines, just after the turn of the year -- here it is, January 19, 1966, "Qualified people not available to fill in, untrained substitutes teach". That's the situation in the City of Winnipeg. That situation has been building up. Our friends have known about it, and for them to get up today and say, "oh well, we've got more teachers than before", is no satisfactory answer insofar as the people of Manitoba. They have failed in producing enough teachers to meet the situation.

Go on then to the matters of curriculum. Who is it that's complaining mostly about curriculum, Madam Speaker. It's the teacher of the province themselves who are not satisfied with the curriculum that's been set up. Now for our honourable friends to say across there, "What have we done about it?" We've been telling the government now for four years to get going with curriculum reform. We have recommended to the government that instead of doing it with part-time committees, that they appoint someone - back three years ago - to take curriculum and get on with the job. It was a specific recommendation to make. Today they say to us, "Oh well you complain but you don't propose". We did propose it but it hasn't happened. I say to the government that the teachers of Manitoba are not satisfied with the way curriculum goes.

I brought into this House some textbooks indicating to the Minister of Education how we are not keeping up-to-date in text books. I brought in here a geography text which was never designed for Canadian schools. Some months ago I spoke about a text in the field of science which is completely out of date. It talks about television as something that you will find if you go to a world's fair. We've brought these matters to the attention of the government and the government only very reluctantly acts upon them but then they turn around and say, "Well you're always negative". We make proposals and the government very frequently won't act.

Now the field of vocational training. Well I ask you, Madam Speaker, I ask you, how can this government claim that they have kept pace in the field of vocational training? And again, what did they say to us? "You didn't propose anything". Madam Speaker, I propose in 1962 that we should accept the Federal Government monies that were offered to us and proceed with

(MR. MOLGAT, cont'd) a vocational training plan; that we needed not only senior vocational schools, we needed junior vocational schools as well. When did the government start to act? Just recently. Oh, they made some promises. Back in the summer of 1962 there was a vocational school promised for The Pas - a promise was made. Then during the course of the election campaign in December, 1962, in Brandon there was a promise made there as a result of the campaign by the Premier that there should be a vocational school in Brandon - 1962, Madam Speaker - here we are in 1966 and they are not available as yet. They just turned the sod on them last summer.

Now again, is it we in this group who have been the only ones who are complaining about this and urging the government to act? Not at all. The trustees of this province told this government -- the trustees of this province had a news release specifically on that subject some months ago. Who, in fact, was speaking on that? Well the gentleman who was speaking in that press release, Madam Speaker, was none other than the gentleman my honourable friends wanted to make a Cabinet Minister of one day back in 1962. You will recall the occasion. They brought him in at nine o'clock in the morning to have him sworn in as a Cabinet Minister and there was a change of opinion shortly after that. He certainly can't be rated to be a Grit as my honourable friends today are belabouring us about. A friend of theirs - that was his statement, that the Province of Manitoba was lagging behind other provinces, and the figures were produced that we were far behind every other province in Canada. Now is that imagination, Madam Speaker? Is that carping criticism, I ask the member for St. Matthews. It's the facts. Now the facts aren't very pleasant to you. I admit that the government doesn't enjoy those facts, but those are the facts. We didn't dream them up. That's the situation, and it's a program that Ottawa has set up. It's been there; Ottawa offers the money and my honourable friends don't make use of it. Don't let them talk about carping criticism. I say to you, accept your responsibilities and accept the facts. Do something about them.

Well, let's go on into other fields. My honourable friend spoke about agriculture. Well, during the course of his speech he referred on many occasions back to the pre-1958 days. Whenever my honourable friends are in a corner that's the answer - go back to pre-1958 and discuss the situation in pre-1958. Well let's have a look at agriculture in those terms. In pre-1958 days the leader of the government, who was then the leader of the Opposition, was belabouring the government of the day that they were not shouldering or accepting their responsibilities in agriculture, that they were blaming Ottawa, or passing on the responsibilities to Ottawa for agriculture, but that he was going to correct the situation; he was going to change all of that; the Province of Manitoba would enter a new era once he was elected. Well, has the new era dawned in agriculture, when after eight years the government admits at a conference that some two-fifths, over 40% of the farmers in the province are in poverty? Is this the new era in agriculture? Can my honourable friends say that they're satisfied that after eight years they have achieved in agriculture that which they set out to do? We didn't give out the figure of 40% or two fifths; it's their own figure. Their statement. And I ask the Government, what is it that you have been doing in these eight years if you are going to revolutionize agriculture? And that's the situation we find ourselves in.

Then, of course, we were told about farm credit. We were told that there has been some \$30 million invested in farm credit, and undoubtedly this has helped a number of the farmers in the province. I think there's a fair amount of duplication in the farm credit structure. I think there's duplication with the federal Act as it stands now. I find that, except for young farmers, there is an advantage for most of them to go to the federal borrowing agency today rather than use the provincial borrowing agency. I find that most of those who speak to me find it a great deal easier to get money from the federal farm credit body than they do from the provincial. But I don't criticize the fact that the young farmers do get an advantage under our scheme. But the premier uses this -- as an example, he says that we are complaining about the debts of the province and this is a large part of the debt of the province. I ask you, Madam Speaker, some \$30 million lent in that particular field, compared to the over-all debts of this province. That isn't what has created the debts of Manitoba, and let not the Premier go around telling the farmers of this province that it's because the loans have been made to them that there's a high debt load in the Province of Manitoba.

Let's turn now to the field of health for a moment. There again, according to the government, they are completely satisfied and presumably everybody else is completely satisfied too. And we shouldn't be saying anything because everything is fine. We shouldn't be criticizing; we shouldn't be pointing out the weaknesses. No, No; everything's fine. Well, let's find out

(MR. MOUGAT, cont'd) what other people are saying, Madam Speaker. Find out what they are saying, for example, in the field of The Association of Retarded Children in Greater Winnipeg. Now this is partly health and partly education. What do these people say? Well, they're saying that Winnipeg, the birthplace of the Canadian Association for Retarded Children, will no longer be a leader in the country, and Manitoba will be lagging still farther behind than most other provinces. Now is that us saying that? No. The people who are involved in the field of retarded children themselves. This is their statement as reported in the Tribune, the first of February, 1966. This is their statement, I didn't dream it up; that's it.

Let's go into other fields. Well, we were told a great deal about mental health, how everything was now apparently settled in mental health. Well, that isn't what the Canadian Mental Health Association says, because in a recent letter addressed to the Premier himself by that Association, the Manitoba Division, they say here, "The Manitoba Division of the Canadian Mental Health Association, a voluntary association composed of some 10,000 members organized in more than 30 Manitoba communities, wishes to express concern about the apparent lack of adequate social rehabilitation programs available in our province for patients and former patients from our hospitals for mental diseases, and again repeat its concern about the dearth of facilities and help available in Manitoba in the field of childhood mental illness". Is that the Grits speaking, Madam Speaker? This is the Canadian Mental Health Association. This is what they have recently written to the Government itself. But the Government declares itself completely satisfied with everything and there should be no criticism from this side of the House. We shouldn't be pointing out these facts to them. They don't like them; they're unpleasant facts.

Then look at the question of hospital construction. My friends point to the dollars that have been spent in building hospitals. That's usually one of the answers that we get - the number of dollars spent - because this Government seems to feel that provided you spend dollars you are accomplishing things. But it doesn't work that way. You certainly don't accomplish as much with your dollars when you spend them in crisis periods and in pre-election periods to have a great big program to present to the public. You'll get proper value for your dollars by proper planning and working in advance. My friends can say all they want about hospital construction, they have not followed the Michener Commission Report. That report was requested by the government itself. That report set specific guide lines. It set specific dates, Madam Speaker, when certain things were to happen in the Province of Manitoba. It was requested by the government itself. They laid down the guide lines to the Commission, but they have not followed what the Commission has said, and we have been pointing this out to the Minister now for three years. For three years we've been warning him of this growing hospital shortage. Last year I spoke about it again, I indicated to my honourable friends one particular case: a lady from Lynn Lake, Manitoba who had come down to Winnipeg, could not get in a hospital, was forced to go back to Lynn Lake at her own expense, come back down some two weeks later in order to get in for the operation that she needed. And that same lady has been paying hospital premiums ever since the inception of the plan. Whether my friends want to believe it or not, all they need to do is go and check with the hospitals. There is a shortage of beds, and for them to say that all is well merely indicates that they are satisfied, not the rest of the province.

Well, let's go on then to the question of development. My honourable friend says he enjoyed my quotation from the 1959 Throne Speech, glad that he did. Then he proceeded to tell us everything that happened in the North. Well there's something wrong, Madam Speaker, and it wasn't a Grit who was telling the government what hadn't happened in the North. It was their own member, the member for Churchill himself. A Conservative member elected, sitting on the government side since 1962, and he was preceded before that, since 1958 or, it would be 59, by another Conservative member then their representation, and they've had Conservative members representing every other constituency in the north too: Flin Flon, The Pas, Swan River, Churchill and Rupertsland. A nice solid block. They can't say they didn't know, Madam Speaker. But who told the government last Friday that things hadn't been happening in the north? Who got up in this House and said that he thought they'd have to wait for the Centenary before anything was going to be done in Northern Manitoba? The government's own member. Was it a Grit that was talking? Not a bit. Our honourable friends' own member told them that the North had been forgotten, that they had not been doing things in the North; and he was being truthful. And I know that if some of the other members in this House were to speak exactly what they think had been happening in their own constituency, we would be hearing the same sort of a story.

(MR. MOLGAT, cont'd) . . . It was not the Grits that were speaking, Madam Speaker, but their own member, because it's the facts - unpleasant facts for the government, but the facts, nevertheless.

Well, now, that then led us to the great, final emotional pitch in the Premier's reply where he took off like a rocket against Ottawa. Well I had warned the other day in my own comments that this would obviously be the tactic of the government, that here they had a great whipping boy and for whatever it was that they were unhappy about, they are not prepared to admit that Manitoba isn't growing, they are not prepared to accept the Dominion Bureau of Statistics figure. They prefer other kinds of figures -- well, I'll let them suit themselves. That's a question of choice. It seems to me the DBS has been a reasonably acceptable factual source of information and they say the population is going down. They say - and I challenge my honourable friends to check it with them, because I did. The answer they gave me is that Manitoba dropped by 1,000 in the past year. That's the information I get from DBS.

(interjection) The honourable member would like to ask me a question?

MR. EVANS: The period, I think, was October to January.

MR. MOLGAT: October -- a year and a quarter --

MR. EVANS: No, just whatever -- four or five months.

MR. MOLGAT: Oh, three months. My God, it's even worse. I thank my honourable friend for the correction. I was prepared to give them the benefit of the doubt that it was over a period of a year but he now tells me it's from October to January. Well, things are really accelerating then, Madam Speaker. (interjection) However, I prefer to be factual even if the facts don't particularly help my case, and the facts are as I have them from DBS that the period in question is really from October, 1964 until the 1st of January 1966, which is a period of some 15 months. I think that is the reply that I got. I'll check my notes to make this precise, but I'm almost certain that's it. However, as I say if it was in a three months period then the situation is worse, but it's going to be Ottawa that will be blamed for all of this.

Then my honourable friend took off on a great course so far as the Air Canada base, and suggested that he'd be prepared to pay my way to go down to Ottawa to fight for it. Well, I can tell the government that I've paid my own way on many occasions to go down to Ottawa to fight for the air base, because every time I've been down there with a delegation, I have paid my own expenses. I don't travel at government expense. But I was quite satisfied to go down to fight for the Province of Manitoba and I was quite prepared to go down regardless of what government was in Ottawa, whether it happened to be a Liberal Government or a Conservative Government. It didn't make any difference to me, because the interests of the Province of Manitoba come ahead of my political allegiances when the Province of Manitoba is going to be hurt. But I challenge my honourable friend, the Minister of Industry and Commerce, to tell me what he did back in the days when his friends were in Ottawa, because my honourable friend was conspicuously silent during that time, and for the Premier of this province to get up this afternoon in this House and give us the sort of a speech that he gave us, flailing madly at Ottawa, listing international air agreements, Air Canada Base, Ottawa agreements, feed grain policy, freight rates, tariff policies, being Ottawa's fault - and I agree that it's Ottawa's responsibility, but the responsibility, Madam Speaker, was in Ottawa when my honourable friend's friends were in office just as much as it is today. But my honourable friend wasn't as anxious to do anything in those days because one need only to go back over the records of this dismal story of Air Canada, and I would like to hear from the Minister of Industry of Commerce of this province what he was doing, because this honourable gentleman - and presumably his colleagues on the front bench - knew in 1960 that that base was going to be removed. They knew in 1960, and what did they do, Madam Speaker? We didn't hear a thing about it until 1962. We didn't hear a thing about it until 1962 when, during the course of that fall, and the election that was then on, statements appeared; there were letters to the staff at TCA. One of those letters was brought to my attention, brought to the attention of the Mayor of the City of Winnipeg, in the latter days of November of 1962, and I can prove the matter without any hesitation. I may not have all the material here at the moment, because I'm speaking unprepared, I can bring my honourable friend the clippings, where I took after the government and said they must do something about this. The Mayor of Winnipeg did the same thing. The Mayor of St. James did the same thing. The employees of Air Canada took the matter in their hands and spoke to all the people they could. Oh my, how tough it was to get any action out of my honourable friends then. How reluctant they were, reluctant to the point, Madam Speaker, that they tried to exclude me from the delegation that went to Ottawa. They excluded the Leader of the N. D. P. --

(MR. MOLGAT, cont'd) . . . (Interjection) -- It's not correct? I challenge the Minister to prove it's not correct. He knows it's correct. I got on that plane by my own decision. Finally, when we got to Ottawa they felt they couldn't keep me out, but until then I was deliberately left off.

Perhaps my friend will check with the Air Canada employees. I don't know if those who were involved are still here. They were deliberately told -- (Interjection) -- Well that may well be. Not because -- if they've been moved, it's because you did nothing for two years -- when you do -- because there was a lot of correspondence going on then, Madam Speaker. Going back now over two years -- back in 1960 -- my humble friend, in 1960, the Minister of Industry and Commerce of this province on the 11th of March, 1960, made his first representation to the then Minister of Transport in Ottawa, Mr. Hees, and he received a general reply from him giving him the same usual assurances which undoubtedly came from the TCA manager.

Well, he wasn't satisfied with that, so some three months later, in June -- he was really acting fast -- first time in March, finally he woke up again in June -- it was the same year at least -- then he requested an appointment with the Minister. Well it took a little time again because it wasn't until the 8th of August that there was the next step, and that was a letter from Hees, and the letter said that he would talk to Mr. McGregor again.

Then on the 16th of August, 1960 -- it really wasn't very pressing seeing as he started off in March -- but on the 16th of August, Mr. Hees wrote to the Minister, and he told him that the base will be moved. He told him that it was going to be moved. -- (Interjection) -- Well I asked the Minister. What action was taken from the 16th of August, 1960 until 1962? What action was taken? Was there any delegation to Ottawa, Madam Speaker? Were there any meetings in the Norquay Building to mobilize the people of Winnipeg to go and clobber the Federal Government? Oh no: No. No. No. That wouldn't be proper. We sat back -- there may have been letters, I don't know. I'd be happy to have them tabled if there were -- delighted -- but there were certainly no delegations to Ottawa. There was no attempt to get other people in the province of Manitoba involved; no indication that the Mayors, the Reeves, the Chambers of Commerce, the various political parties -- we were certainly never contacted on the matter; no indication that the government wanted to go down to Ottawa with a delegation to fight this matter in the early stages when they first found out what went on; but there sure has been a change since 1962 -- great change. Delegation after delegation, and I'm not saying that's wrong, I agree with those delegations, but they should have started before. They should have started when the Minister first knew, and not waited for two and a half years before acting. That's the record of this government. That's the record of these people who are now saying all these things are Ottawa's fault.

I'm prepared to fight Ottawa whenever Manitoba is involved, and I say to the government, fight them regardless of what party is in power in Ottawa; fight them for Manitoba's interest. This talk now of this great development and so on, but the facts prove that there isn't, Madam Speaker. My honourable friends can trot out all the information that they want, but the facts are that Manitoba's population not only is it not growing, it's dropping.

Look at many of our other records; it's the same thing. Now my friends say, "You shouldn't say that because it's damaging to the Province of Manitoba". It's damaging to the government of this province because they haven't taken the steps that are needed to get Manitoba growing, Madam Speaker. They have been talking and talking and talking; they've been studying and studying and studying, as my honourable friend says for his pulp mill for some seven years, but there's no action. I can tell my honourable friends, and I will keep on repeating this across the Province of Manitoba, because I think that Manitoba can do better; Manitoba can do a great deal better than it's doing right now, but this government isn't taking the steps to do it. I'm so convinced, Madam Speaker, of the future for our province if we run our affairs properly, that it's disheartening to see the record of this government in this field.

Well now, the Premier of the Province invited me to go to Ottawa. Madam Speaker, I'd like to make an announcement. I'm going to Ottawa. I'm going to Ottawa on Sunday and I intend to spend Monday in Ottawa at my own expense, and I'm going down there to see what I can do with Ottawa so far as the particular problems of Manitoba. I'm going down there to discuss with them the question of Nelson Power, because I'm satisfied that if the feasibility studies show that this can be done, then there must be joint effort to get it done, and I have my appointments in Ottawa now. But I say to this government, don't give us this business that it's all Ottawa's fault. This is a job that's got to be done first and foremost by Manitobans. It's our job as Manitobans to see to it that we develop our province. My honourable friends across the way

(MR. MOLGAT, cont'd) are satisfied - obviously from their speeches, they are satisfied - but the people of Manitoba are not.

MADAM SPEAKER put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion lost.

MR. S. PETERS (Elmwood): Yeas and Nays please, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the members. The question before the House is the proposed motion in amendment to the admendment by the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party.

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

YEAS: Messrs. Barkman, Cherniack, Desjardins, Froese, Guttormson, Harris, Hillhouse, Hryhorczuk, Johnston, Molgat, Patrick, Paulley, Peters, Shoemaker, Tanchak, Vielfaure, and Wright.

NAYS: Messrs. Alexander, Baizley, Beard, Bilton, Bjornson, Cowan, Evans, Groves, Hamilton, Harrison, Hutton, Jeannotte, Johnson, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McDonald, McGregor, McLean, Martin, Mills, Moeller, Seaborn, Shewman, Stanes, Steinkopf, Strickland, Watt, Weir, Witney, and Mrs. Morrison.

MR. CLERK: YEAs, 17; NAYs, 31.

MADAM SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost. The proposed motion in amendment thereto by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER, (Gladstone): Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, that the debate be adjourned.

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

..... continued on next page

MADAM SPEAKER: The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

HON. STERLING R. LYON, QC (Minister of Mines & Natural Resources) (Fort Garry) Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce, that this House doth concur in the report of the Special Committee of the House appointed to give consideration to the Rules, Orders and Forms of Proceeding of the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba received by this House on Friday, February 4th, 1966.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. LYON: Madam Speaker, it might be helpful to members of the House, particularly those who were not members of this Committee, if I were to give a brief review of the substantive changes to the rules which are recommended by this report to the House. I should say by way of preface, Madam Speaker, that I acknowledge the Chairmanship of this Committee which was handled so capably by yourself, and I'm merely making this report as one of the government members which was privileged to serve upon the Committee.

I wish to point out first of all that there was general agreement by the House that we should have this committee established in order that we could give a periodic review of the rules which govern our activities in this Chamber. The last such Rule review took place in 1960, and resulting therefrom are the present rules under which we operate. In the five-year interval I think it had become apparent to members on all sides of the House that there were some changes that could be proposed, not with the idea of inhibiting debate in any way but rather with the idea of presenting debate in a more expedient manner, facilitating the work of the House, and generally gaining more, or an optimum value of time and benefit from the debates that occurred in this Chamber.

I must confess, Madam Speaker, that speaking only personally, the one fact that has always interested me in looking at the matters of Rules of Legislative Assemblies across the country and the duration of time that is spent by Legislatures during their regular annual sessions was this, that while one would expect the Province of Ontario and the Province of Quebec to sit several months, which is in fact the case, one would hardly expect that the Province of Manitoba would - at least in recent years - be the province whose Legislature sat the third longest in Canada. Now I don't say that this has been the prevailing rule for every year, but certainly I think that we do rank third with respect to length of sitting time, certainly in recent years, and having regard to the size of our estimates in relation to such provinces as the Province of British Columbia, Province of Alberta, one begins to wonder whether we should deserve this special distinction that we have of being the third most talkative Legislative Assembly in the Dominion of Canada. And so it seemed to us, and I think I'm speaking for members from all sides of the House, that this review could be undertaken to see whether or not changes could be made.

I might say that the one document that was of particular value to us was the rule change which was proposed at the last session of the House of Commons at Ottawa and from which we derived many of the new proposals which are before the House in this committee report. I think of such things as the question of limitation on debate; I think of such things as compulsory times for debate on estimates; I think of such things, one of which was certainly not adopted by our committee as questioning of the Speaker's rulings, and so on; all of these new ideas which are being tried on a test basis in the House of Commons, the senior Parliament in Canada, in order to determine whether they have applicability in 1966 and to facilitate the work of that House.

I should also say by way of preface at this point, Madam Speaker, that it is my opinion, and certainly it is the opinion of the government of the day, that the rules of the House are no stronger than the desire of the members individually of the House to enforce those rules. No government, regardless of what its majority may be, can enforce certain rules upon the House if the House is not of mind to adopt those rules and to follow those rules with some general consent; and certainly the government comes before the House supporting these recommendations that are in the report of the committee, but the government is the first to realize that unless there is some general consensus among all members of the House in favor, particularly of some of the items that have been recommended here, then it would be foolhardy on the part of government and indeed foolhardy on the part of the House to adopt rules which do not enjoy, shall we say, a general consensus.

(MR. LYON cont'd).

Furthermore, I think that the precedent from Ottawa is one that we should pay some attention to. We suggest that during the course of the Rules Committee that some of the changes, because we had not operated with these proposed changes in our House before, should certainly be tried out say on the basis of a one-year period; and again I would suggest that the government's attitude in this regard is that we would like to see some of these proposals tried out for a period of a year. I think it will then become apparent that to many of us, perhaps to all of the House, as to whether or not these rules are well founded, whether or not they should be discarded - some of the ideas should be discarded, or perhaps some compromise could be arrived at which would better meet the practice of the House in debates on certain matters.

Now having said all of those things by way of preface, Madam Speaker, it might now be helpful if I were to mention just briefly some of the substantive points in which changes have been made. I do not intend this to be an exhaustive treatment of the recommendations of the committee, but rather to pick out the highlights upon which undoubtedly there will be debate as this resolution is pursued in the House, and I am going through merely as the report is before honourable members. Dealing with the schedule which is attached to the committee's report and dealing with Page 1, we find new definitions of the Official Opposition, the Leader of the Opposition, a new definition of a recognized Opposition Party, and new definition of a Leader of a recognized Opposition Party. The purpose of these recommendations, or proposals, is to accord to the Leader of the third opposition or the third party in this House - a party which, if the rules are adopted, would have to have four or more members - the same rights and privileges that appertain to a Minister of the Crown making a speech; the same rights and privileges that appertain to the Leader of the Opposition in his speaking in this House. These rights and privileges would now be accorded, not as a matter of courtesy but as a matter of right to the Leader of the third Opposition Party in the House, provided always that he was the leader of a party which had four or more members in the Chamber.

Under Chapter I, the Regulation and Management of the House, there was a double-barrelled recommendation put before the committee that had to do first of all with the sittings of the House; and secondly and conjointly, a recommendation having to do with the length of time that would be devoted by the House to the annual discussion of estimates. And I stress again, Madam Speaker, that these propositions or proposals were placed before the committee as a package because they would have the effect slightly of reducing the amount of time that the House would be sitting during its sitting hours, and yet at the same time that could only be accomplished, it was thought, by putting some reasonable limitation upon the time that the House would devote in Committee of the Whole to the discussion of the estimates of the various departments of government.

While the recommendations in that regard are quite clear, on Page 2, to run over them just very briefly, the changes would be as follows: there would be no sitting of the House on Wednesday evening as at present; furthermore, there would be no sitting of the House on Friday evening. In lieu of that the House would meet on Friday mornings at 10 a. m., would adjourn at 12:30 p. m., would sit again at 2:30 p. m., and would adjourn at 5:30 p. m. that date. There would be a cutback of approximately four hours in the time devoted to private members' resolutions on the Tuesday of the regular week, when, as at the present time, the whole day is theoretically devoted to private members' resolutions.

I join with that of course the recommendation that is contained in the proposed rule that there be a limitation placed on the time to be spent in estimates, a limitation period of 80 hours -- I don't have the exact rule in front of me. Now let me hesitate and say just a word about this item. Again, here particularly, government can not and does not intend to say by the virtue of its majority in the House, 80 hours and that's it. We think this is a proposal that is worth trying out however for a year. If it doesn't work, we'll all soon find out. We were persuaded to this point of view - why? Because we find out that in looking at the proceedings of the United Kingdom Parliament where they have a budget that is scores of times in excess of the estimates that we deal with in this Legislature, they devote 26 sitting days in the United Kingdom Parliament to the discussion of estimates. We find out that under the new rules as proposed in the House of Commons in Ottawa, there will be a similar limitation on the time that is devoted to estimates discussion in that House and we think that it is only logical, at least to think that if the senior parliaments can find that they can limit debate on estimates to some reasonable time, that surely we could try the same rule here in Manitoba.

(MR. LYON cont'd)

Now we looked as a Committee at the times that had been spent in estimates, and of course they have been getting progressively larger each year. Members will recall, Madam Speaker, that in the 1960 changes the rule was put in that the House should adjourn each evening at 11 p. m. until such time as we had reached 65 hours of discussion in Committee of the Whole on estimates, thereafter the Leader of the House could adjourn the House at any time he chose after 11 p. m. In 1960 the average length of time that the House had spent in estimates was 65 hours. Today, in 1966, that average has gone up even more, and the 80 hour figure that is suggested, I think, is the generous average that could be struck from the past five years of the length of time that it has taken for us to conclude estimate debate.

Let me stress that it is not with the intention of debarring honourable members from making comments - destructive, constructive or whatever - during estimate debate. The idea rather is to cut down on the excessive amount of duplication in debate, the excessive amount of repetition that our present rules seem to encourage. We have no one to blame but ourselves. I speak collectively now. Every member of the House, whether he's on the government or the opposition side, has no one to blame but himself. We talk too much and too repetitiously in the course of estimate debate. I'm not pointing a finger at anybody because I would have to start with myself, and I know that topics have been discussed in this House three, four, five, six times - the same subject matter, the same old speech given by me or by somebody on the other side of the House. We think that with the proper application of this rule, and with a proper and reasonable approach to it by honourable members, that certainly we could cut down the amount of time that is spent by this House in estimate debate.

So this was put forward on that basis; not, I stress, with the idea of trying to inhibit debate or cut down the amount of time the opposition has to discuss estimates or in any way to say to the opposition, "well the government will use up the first 80 hours and then there will be four departments left and you won't have any time to discuss these matters." That's not the intention of government. Certainly it's not the intention so far as I could ascertain of any member of the Committee. This was put forward as a moderation, if you will, of the present untrammelled and unlimited rule whereby you can spend any amount of time in estimates, with the result, as we have found I think from our own experience, that repetition is certainly encouraged under our present system.

Now there are other items. There is similarly suggested a limitation of eight days on the Budget Debate, a similar limitation to that which was imposed in 1960 on the Throne Speech Debate. I recall to honourable members that when we suggested in 1960 to Committee that the Throne Speech Debate be limited to seven days there were some speeches made which decried this as the downfall of democracy in the Manitoba Legislature and so on. We have now lived with that system for six years. We're now into the Sixth Throne Speech Debate under that limitation period, a limitation period which by the way is followed in every other province in Canada and indeed by the Federal House. I for one can say that it has not, to my knowledge, affected in any way the right of any member to participate in the Throne Speech Debate. We had an example here only this afternoon, Madam Speaker, on the debate on the sub-amendment by the Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party coming to a vote in this House approximately some four hours before it was necessary for it to come to a vote, because obviously honourable members had exhausted what they wished to say on that particular topic. They will resume again on the amendment.

So whereas those fears were expressed, quite honestly I think, in 1960, by some honourable members that this was inhibiting on the rights of debate of the House, I suggest that those fears have just not materialized, and I suggest similarly that with respect to the Budget Speech the proposed limitation of eight days, which is a longer period than was first proposed, any fears that honourable members might have in that regard would not materialize. Again, a precedent exists in Ottawa, and if my memory serves me, a precedent also exists in the Province of Saskatchewan for this type of limitation. It ensures that debate will proceed at a reasonable pace and that it will not be adjourned from day to day or from week to week as has been the custom and the practice. This is not finding fault with anyone; this is merely to say that the past practice has not been all that it might be. If we are to have a Budget Debate, let us have a Budget Debate and let us have it within eight days. Again, a suggestion that I think should bear merit among members of the House.

The one other ancillary rule that follows with respect to the Budget would be that while the Budget Debate is in progress, that matter would be called as the first item on the Order

(MR. LYON cont'd) . . . Paper after the Orders of the Day as the first order of business in order that it could not, on a crowded Order Paper, be placed down out of sight and never be called.

We ran into a problem last year, as Madam Speaker will well recall, with respect to the counting of the days that would be devoted to the Throne Speech. Without going into the details, I would call honourable members' attention to Page 12 and suggest hopefully that that matter has now been concluded to the satisfaction of everyone, and that a rule that is more easily interpreted will cover that situation from now on.

There are a number of very minor grammatical and other structural changes in the rules, none of which I will propose to deal with. One that you see most often is the designation of -- the change of the word "Mr. Speaker" to "The Speaker." We thought that after the number of distinguished years that Madam Speaker had spent in the Chair, we ought to at least pay some acknowledgment to her sex and to admit the fact that a Legislature of a province in Canada in the sixties can have a Madam Speaker who serves with such distinction as she does, so we thought that "The Speaker" was more appropriate than "Mr. Speaker" even though we know - the lawyers know - that "Mr" means "Mrs." in The Interpretation Act, it certainly doesn't mean "Mrs." with respect to Madam Speaker. So "The Speaker" is the terminology that is suggested from here on.

I believe that these are all of the major items that I would wish to comment upon at the present time, Madam Speaker. I hope that these remarks have been of some help to honourable members to highlight some of the items that are contained within the proposals of the Rules Committee. I repeat and reiterate again that we require, or we should have, if these are to be adopted a general consensus from the members of the House; that the Government does not support these proposals which emerge from the Committee with any idea of pushing these rules down the throats of the members because I come back to my basic proposition, which is, namely, that a rule of the House is as strong only as the support which that rule enjoys from each individual member of the House. So it is with this thought in mind, with the thought that these proposals should be considered in a reasonable fashion, that they should perhaps be tried out for a year, that I place this report before the House for concurrence.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. GUTTORMSON: I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Boniface, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. EVANS: Madam Speaker, I imagine the procedure would be to call the resolutions and either rule that they are to stand for the present or ask whether the honourable gentlemen would like to proceed.

MADAM SPEAKER: The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. PAULLEY: resolution to stand, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Selkirk.

MR. HILLHOUSE: This resolution is also to stand, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Selkirk.

MR. HILLHOUSE: This resolution is also to stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): I would like to have this one stand also, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Ethelbert Plains.

MR. M. N. HRYHORCZUK, QC (Ethelbert Plains): I would ask for the indulgence of the House, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for St. Boniface.

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): I would ask the house, Madam Speaker, to have this matter stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for La Verendrye.

MR. GUTTORMSON: We beg the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Elmwood.

MR. PETERS: I would have this stand also, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Carillon.

MR. LEONARD A. BARKMAN (Carillon): I would ask the House to have this matter stand please, Madam.

MADAM SPEAKER: The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for Seven Oaks.

ARTHUR E. WRIGHT (Seven Oaks): Madam Speaker, may I please have permission to have this resolution stand, please.

MADAM SPEAKER: The proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Member for La Verendrye.

MR. GUTTORMSON: May we have this stand, Madam Speaker.

MR. EVANS: As we have come to the end of the Order Paper, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, that the House do now adjourn.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House adjourned until 2:30 Friday afternoon.