

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Wednesday, March 13, 1968

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions

Reading and Receiving Petitions

Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees

Notices of Motion

Introduction of Bills

MR. JAMES COWAN Q. C., (Winnipeg Centre): introduced Bill No. 42, an Act to Amend, Revise and Consolidate an Act respecting The Congregation Shaarey Zedek; Bill No. 46, an Act to incorporate Lutheran Council in Canada; and Bill No. 45, an Act to incorporate Luther Home.

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): introduced Bill No. 43, an Act to amend an Act to incorporate Les Chanoines Regulieres des Cinq Plaies.

MR. WALLY MCKENZIE (Roblin): in the absence of the Honourable Member for Churchill, introduced Bill No. 44, an Act to incorporate Thompson Golf Club.

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed to the Orders of the Day, I would like to direct the attention of the honourable members to our guests in the gallery. We have 24 students of Grade 10 and 11 standing of the Sprague School. These students are under the direction of Mr. J. Garwood. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Emerson.

On behalf of all the Members of the Legislative Assembly, I welcome you here today.

HON. STEWART E. MCLEAN Q. C., (Provincial Secretary): Before the Orders of the Day, I wish to place on the table the report of the Land Value Appraisal Commission for the year ending March 31, 1967.

HON. THELMA FORBES (Minister of Urban Development and Municipal Affairs: Mr. Speaker, I would like to lay on the table of the House, the Annual Report of the Municipal Board; and I would also like to table the report of the Winter Employment Act and inform the House that there have been no regulations made under this Act during the year ending December 31, 1967.

HON. HARRY J. ENNS (Minister of Agriculture and Conservation) (Rockwood-Iberville): Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to table the following annual reports: the Annual Report for the Department of Agriculture for the year ending March 31, 1967; the Annual Report for the Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation, year ending March 31, 1967; the Annual Report of the Milk Control Board, year ending September 30, 1967; the Co-operative Promotion Board Annual Report for the year ending March 31, 1967; and the Second Annual Report of the Horseracing Commission.

If I may, Mr. Speaker, just take this opportunity while I'm up to announce to the House, for those who may or may not have noticed, with some pleasure the final payments on barley and oats. I know this comes as good news to all of us on the farms of Manitoba and it certainly couldn't have come at a more opportune time.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the Honourable the Attorney-General. What steps is the Attorney-General's Department taking to curb the use of drugs such as LSD, STP and marijuana in the universities and high schools of Winnipeg.

HON. STERLING R. LYON Q. C., (Attorney-General) (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, this is not the kind of a question that could be usefully answered on the Orders of the Day. I think there will be a proper opportunity when the estimates of the department are up for discussion to enter into the subject in more detail. All I could say in brief answer to my honourable friend is that the matter is receiving, according to my advice, the closest attention from the enforcement officers of this province, whether they are municipal or RCMP. It is a growing problem.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Provincial Secretary or whoever is responsible for information on the Pan American Games. Could the Minister tell me whether he has received a final report and, in particular, a financial statement on the games.

MR. MCLEAN: Mr. Speaker, I think I am not the right Minister. My impression is that it is probably the Provincial Treasurer, because our relations with the Pan American

(MR. McLEAN cont'd.)....Games were of a financial nature.

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Provincial Treasurer) (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, I am quite accustomed to the idea that when a matter comes to a question of a deficit or not a deficit, it is the Provincial Treasurer who is concerned. I have received no such report. I am not aware of what the size of the deficit, if any, may be.

MR. DOERN: A supplementary question. Is the Provincial Government responsible for a specific share of a deficit should one occur?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I think under the original agreement, yes there is a specific share. I don't carry the amount in mind at the moment. This has an upper limit to which the sharing is carried but, as you see, I am not at this moment able to give further details.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the Provincial Treasurer. Does he plan on having a further issue of the Manitoba Savings Bonds this year?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, there are no present plans for an issue of Manitoba Savings Bonds. I do not eliminate the possibility for the future, but at the moment there are no present plans.

MR. JOHN P. TANCHAK (Emerson): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Health. It's related to the question asked by my colleague from Portage. I would like to know, in the past twelve months, how many patients have been admitted to Winnipeg City Hospitals suffering from overdoses of drugs in any form or attempted suicide. If the Minister can't precisely answer, maybe he can give us an indication whether it's extensive or non-existent.

HON. CHARLES H. WITNEY (Minister of Health) (Flin Flon): Mr. Speaker, I think possibly this would be best handled by an Order for Return. There may be some difficulties involved in it because of the confidentiality of records with the hospitals, but if the honourable member likes to place an Order for Return, I'll see what can be done with it.

MR. TANCHAK: Another question. Could the Minister indicate if it's extensive, or doesn't wish to comment? Quite a number?

MR. WITNEY: Mr. Speaker, as far as we are concerned in the Department of Health, we have no indications that it is extensive.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, could I go back to the Provincial Treasurer and ask him whether he would endeavour to get the information of the final Pan Am Games report and to present it to this House?

MR. EVANS: I would expect a report to come to the government in due course, and I am not in a position to say. I have not, as Treasurer, handled the negotiations with the Pan American Games personally, but we would give consideration to providing information to the House. I can't give any further answer at this time.

MR. DOUGLAS CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, might I direct a question to the Honourable Provincial Secretary? Has the report of the Civil Service Commission been tabled?

MR. McLEAN: Not yet, Mr. Speaker. It is in the process of being printed and will be tabled within the statutory time limit.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I would like to enquire as to whether the honourable the Attorney-General has a statement to make with regard to the question I posed yesterday respecting Bertha Rand.

MR. LYON: Yes, Mr. Speaker, and I thank the honourable member for reminding me. I was intending to make this short statement to the House in response to my honourable friend's question of yesterday. It might be worthwhile to give some brief background as to the history of this particular case in order that honourable members will understand, and I suggest to the members of the House that it is difficult to discuss the matter without doing offence to this lady and I will try to just give the highlights, if I may, of the background of the case as we know it and its present status.

This lady was charged with common assault under the Criminal Code, the alleged assault having taken place on Sunday, October 8, 1967. She was summonsed to appear in the Provincial Magistrate's Court on Thursday, October 19th. At that time she was represented by counsel and he indicated to the court that he was acting on behalf of Miss Rand and entered a plea of not guilty on her behalf. Trial was then set subsequently for that same court January 11, 1968. On that date, January 11th, Miss Rand showed up in court with her

(MR. LYON Cont'd.) counsel, Mr. Krawchuk. The counsel on that occasion entered a plea of guilty to the charge of common assault on behalf of his client. The particulars of the offence were then given to the court and the counsel acting for Miss Rand at that time advised the court that he agreed with Crown Counsel that the actions of Miss Rand were such that they should really be perhaps reviewed by medical authority - and I stress the point that this was agreed to by her own counsel - and a subsequent remand was agreed upon for one week in order that she might be voluntarily examined by her own medical doctor.

The matter was then remanded from week to week until the 13th of February, 1968, when Miss Rand's counsel filed in court a letter from her own personal physician, whose name is really of no significance for these purposes - a general practitioner - which letter indicated that there should be a further examination of Miss Rand along psychiatric lines. At this point Mr. Krawchuk, with the Crown's concurrence, suggested that the Magistrate make an order under Section 710, subsection (5) of the Criminal Code, that based on the evidence in writing supplied by Miss Rand's own medical practitioner that she be remanded in custody to the Psychiatric Institute for the purpose of observation for a period not to exceed thirty days, and I stress again that this suggestion was made by her own counsel. She was then subsequently remanded in custody to the Psychiatric Institute for further examination.

Her case was on the docket for this morning, and this morning in Provincial Magistrate's Court her name was called and the circumstances under which she had been detained in custody at the Psychiatric Institute were reviewed again before the Magistrate. The Crown then advised the court that a report had been submitted by the Psychiatric Institute and read the contents of that psychiatric report into the record of the court. The court was advised, in view of the circumstances of the contents of that report, the Crown would and in fact did at that moment stay proceedings on any charges outstanding against Miss Rand, that is with respect to the assault, provided her counsel were permitted to withdraw the previous plea of guilty that had been entered on her behalf.

Mr. Krawchuk who appeared again this morning on behalf of Miss Rand advised the court that he was making the motion for permission to withdraw the plea of guilty and this was granted. Following this, a stay of proceedings was formally entered by the Crown on the charge of assault, and I can only say with respect to the medical report that was read in court this morning that it did indicate that she had been examined at the Psychiatric Institute and that the examination and investigation indicated that she was suffering from a disease and that the disease would require her to receive fairly extensive treatment, and for this purpose a Committal Order was being sought under the appropriate provincial statute, and this was done in open court this morning.

I can also mention to my honourable friend, Mr. Speaker, that an enquiry was made by the department concerning whether or not Miss Rand was allowed to have visitors while she was at the Psychiatric Institute and she was not, as was alleged - not by my honourable friend but by others - she was not held incommunicado according to the information given to our department. She was permitted to have and did have visitors. One person, one woman in particular visited her several times, a friend. The Psychiatric Institute of course did - and I think quite properly - refuse to give or to disclose any information regarding her condition to persons who phoned up or to persons who called into the institute.

That is the current state of the matter at the present time. The report was read in this morning and the committal proceedings are under way at the present time in order that she may have treatment for the disease that has been diagnosed.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I would assume from what the Honourable the Attorney-General has said that the committal proceedings that are now being taken are being initiated by a department of the government. I would like to ask that in view of the surroundings and the fairly extensive background that my honourable friend has himself alluded to, that in this case perhaps additional medical reports, psychiatric reports, should be used in order to use my learned friend's expression - in order that there be an abundance of caution as to what is being done; and secondly, I would like the department to be able to advise this House as to just what circumstances make it necessary for Miss Rand to be treated under a compulsory committal to a mental home rather than by receiving medical care voluntarily, to use an expression that the government likes to employ in other matters.

MR. LYON: It's difficult, if not impossible I think, to answer my honourable friend's

(MR. LYON cont'd.)....question, Mr. Speaker, without delving rather thoroughly into the question of the Mental Diseases Act and the powers that are contained in that legislation with respect to persons who suffer from some form of mental disease. My understanding of course is that the examinations that have been made pursuant to the referral order under the Criminal Code have been such as to indicate that the proper steps should now be taken under the provincial statute with respect to persons who are suffering from these diseases, and I reiterate - we all of course share the concern of my honourable friend for any person who is in these circumstances - I reiterate she is represented by counsel and that he is fully apprised of all of the steps that have been taken. In fact the steps were initiated by him, that is the psychiatric reviews were initiated by him, and I'm sure that if our department or any department of government can be of assistance to him in furthering the interests of his client that they will be only too happy to co-operate.

MR. GREEN: I thank my honourable friend for that last comment because I think it certainly would help the case.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Public Utilities. Is it true that the Manitoba Hydro sells power to house trailers in a non-park area but will not sell power to house trailers in a trailer park, and if this statement is correct, I would like to know why not.

MR. McLEAN: Mr. Speaker, this is essentially the same question as the Honourable Member for Assiniboia asked me yesterday, at which time I indicated I was not aware of this matter. I have forwarded the question to Manitoba Hydro for such information as they can give me and I'll be glad to take the appropriate action so far as the question is concerned. I would remind the honourable member that within a short time the Manitoba Hydro will be appearing, as has been our custom, before a committee of the Legislature, at which time perhaps that question might be more properly directed to them for such explanation or endeavour to persuade them to change their policy, whatever that policy may be.

MR. PHILIP PETURSSON (Wellington): Mr. Speaker, I have a question which I would wish to direct to the Minister of Education. I provided him with a copy of the question and with the motion that was passed at the board meeting of the Winnipeg School Board, and I wish to ask him whether the school board, passing the blanket motion such as it is - and as he has seen that it is in the copy that is submitted to him - delegating to the officers of the board the authority to deal with every application submitted by private schools for shared services in the public school system, and action taken by the officers of the board to be submitted to the board as information. Now the question is, under the terms and regulations of the school act as it pertains to shared services, can such authority be delegated with no other action being taken by the school board itself as the governing body of a school district? I hope you understand what I'm saying.

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Education) (Gimli): Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the Honourable Member for Wellington who provided me with the written question. Since I have received it I have turned it over for a legal opinion into one aspect of it, and as soon as I have a reply I will reply to the honourable member.

MR. BEN HANUSCHAK, (Burrows): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Honourable Minister of Education. Has he received a communication from the Manitoba Association of School Trustees dealing with the matter of some personnel employed by schools having the right to strike and others not having such a right?

MR. JOHNSON: No, Mr. Speaker, there is nothing that has come to my attention at this point.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Education. Does the Minister approve or examine each shared services agreement? Does he have that power?

MR. JOHNSON: Yes, I sign them.

MR. DOERN: A supplementary question. Do you contemplate any changes in the Public Schools Act to facilitate these agreements or will you work under the rules and regulations as they now presently exist.

MR. JOHNSON: The rules and regulations as presently exist are proving quite satisfactory to this point.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable Minister for

(MR. GREEN cont'd.).... Municipal Affairs. I would like to know whether her department is in any way playing cupid to the obvious proliferation of marriages that appear to be contemplated as between various municipalities in Greater Winnipeg.

MRS. FORBES: Mr. Speaker, no.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of N. D. P.) (Radisson): Does this mean that she is no cupid, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SAMUEL USKIW (Brokenhead): Mr. Speaker, yesterday I asked the question of the Minister of Agriculture as to whether or not his department has made representation to the Government of Canada on the question of value for duty on United States potatoes entering the western zones and the answer he gave me was "no". I wonder if he could elaborate and tell me why they made no representations.

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Speaker, representation was made from Manitoba - that is the Province of Manitoba - through our vegetable commission on King Edward Street. We certainly supported this action in the Provincial Government, but we felt that as the commission operates within the jurisdiction of governments, you might say, that this was the proper source that such a move be taken, or that this move be taken by them. I had no specific request on the part of the potato growers in the Province of Manitoba to do anything other than what the potato commission was already doing on their behalf.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Attorney-General. Does the government have a specific date for the construction of a new detention centre to replace Vaughan Street?

MR. LYON: Not a specific date - no.

MR. DOERN: A supplementary question. Would it be possible that construction will begin in 1968? Is there a specific, in terms of at least this year - beginning this year?

MR. LYON: That would be our hope.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. Recalling that yesterday I asked the Minister about the number of employees that were employed by Churchill Forest Products at The Pas he appeared to reply that he did not know and that I should contact this company myself. So I would like to stay within the orders of the question period and ask the Honourable Minister, is he aware that the company employs around six or seven employees?

HON. DONALD W. CRAIK (Minister of Mines and Natural Resources) (St. Vital): Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the Honourable Member for Portage for his initiative and if he - I don't think he indicated whether he actually contacted the company - then I'm sure that the answer they gave him was probably correct, and I suppose the next question will be did they say was this at The Pas or in Winnipeg or at what other location?

MR. JOHNSTON: Was the Honourable Minister aware that I was speaking about the operation at The Pas, that they had to have six or seven employees there?

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to direct a question to the Honourable the First Minister. I wonder if he would be kind enough to supply all members of the House with an up-to-date list of the Ministers and all of the acting Ministers so that, in event of the Minister being absent, we could direct our question to the acting Ministers. I have a list but it's not up-to-date.

HON. WALTER WEIF (Premier) (Minnedosa): Mr. Speaker, I would be more than pleased to.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: Order for Return. The Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. John's, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing:

1. Names of departments (excluding crown corporations) which issue departmental newsletters or issue informational bulletins.
2. Number of employees in each department concerned above.
3. Title and salary of each employee in each department referred to above that receive a salary in excess of \$6500 per year.
4. Length of employment of each employee concerned under question number 3.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. PAULLEY: I'd like to make a brief reference or two to the Order for Return and explain, if I may, the reasons why I introduced this motion.

For some considerable number of years now, particularly during the considerations of estimates, I have raised, as indeed a number of other members on this side of the House, the question of the use of informational bulletins emanating from various departments of government, and it seems to me that much of the information contained within the news bulletins or newsletters were nothing more nor less than governmental propaganda, that the prime use of the bulletins was for the purpose of the glorification of those opposite, if indeed it is glorification. There's not a sufficient expose really in the news bulletins that emanate from that side of the House and under the control.

I want to make it clearly understood, Mr. Speaker, that as far as I am concerned I think that there is an area of usefulness for information going out from the various government departments, providing however that that is used for the purpose of informing the public as to government services that are available and providing the news media is for the purpose of letting the citizens of Manitoba know of the activity within government. But, Mr. Speaker, when on the other hand one gets constant issues of newsletters which refers to the running around of the Minister of Industry and Commerce or some other Minister -- (Interjection) -- well yes, I believe the Honourable Member for Lakeside really hit the proper description when he used the word "junketing." Oh, just a holiday, I would suggest, at the expense of others; possibly that's just as good a description or definition of the word as it applies in the instances that I'm referring to. -- (Interjection) -- I do really believe it. I'll tell my honourable friend why I believe it, and I just want to use him as an example, and I didn't intend to until my honourable friend asked me the question. You ask me if I believed it and I will tell you now why I believe it.

You know, Mr. Speaker, long before my honourable friend the Minister of Industry and Commerce came into this House there was a department of government in London to take care of enquiries of industrial development and allied matters - immigration - on behalf of the government of Manitoba. It was a proposition, if I recall correctly, that the present Provincial Treasurer introduced - as indeed a former colleague of mine, Donovan Swailes, introduced - when the Honourable Member for Lakeside was Premier of the Province. It was rejected, if I recall correctly, at that time by the Liberal administration, but on the taking over of the reigns of government by the Conservative administration there was established an Agent-General or somebody with a title similar to that in London -- (Interjection) -- in London was it? Then I'm glad for the correction if there was. In any case -- (Interjection) -- Was it Ron Turner that started it?

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, in any case there was an agent over there to assist Manitoba in its endeavours to attract industries and personnel and immigrants to Manitoba, and it was considered the individual was performing a useful function. But from what I am able to gather, since that person has been removed from that position and brought back here, it's cost us more for the junkets of the Minister of Industry and Commerce and his entourage than it ever cost us before, and as yet - and as yet - despite enquiries we have not received from the government any real evidence - any real evidence - that substantiates its expenditure or indicates that it was worthwhile.

But getting back to the newsletters themselves, as I indicated speaking yesterday, my honourable friend the new Minister of Mines and Natural Resources has started out another newsletter. I guess I'm a pretty preferred customer, in a sense, Mr. Speaker, in that I get three or four newsletters from the government. I sometimes wonder whether I'm getting them all and I want to ask the Minister of Industry and Commerce, who I believe is the head propagandist for the government, that if after I've listed the ones that I am getting, if he's aware of any that I'm not getting will he please put me on the mailing list, because at the present time I'm getting the new blue sheet called "News Report". It used to be a red sheet. Maybe that looked as though it was Liberal-oriented in the colour red so now we have a blue one that has taken over from the former publication called "Government Information". So that's No. 1.

I'm now getting this great new one of the Department of Mines and Resources called "People Count" or "Conservation Newsletter" or something - what they're conserving I don't know. And then I'm also pleased that the Department of the Honourable the Minister of

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.)....Agriculture has seen fit to send me the green publication "Farm News". Now I don't know how many more there may be, possibly the Department of Education might have a few more, or the Department of Health, if they have it, I'm sure they'll soon follow the footsteps of the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources and start issuing their own edition.

But many people are concerned, Mr. Speaker. As I say, there are no objections at all to legitimate information of an informational nature going out from government; it's part of their job. But when I find, Mr. Speaker, as I did just recently that this department has expanded -- and I note an advertisement in the paper, I believe it was last August in the Free Press, that the Government Public Information Branch wants three experienced editors. They wanted a news editor between \$9,180 to \$12,300 annual salary; they wanted a radio editor with the same salary; and they wanted a TV editor with the same salary. What's wrong, Mr. Speaker, with the news media that we have at the present time? What does the government want with a TV editor at \$12,000 a year? I would suggest that if the Department of Education were going to have some personnel to assist them in the production of TV programs, and I believe they have for educational purposes for the children of Manitoba, this is quite in order. But what in heaven's name does the department of propaganda need to spend \$12,000 on a TV editor for? We have the services right in this building of the two Anglo-Saxon or the English-speaking news medias that we have. They're right in the building constantly, and I'm sure that the facilities of CKSB TV and the French network is available at any time that they want to produce information that is of interest to the public.

Now it might well be, Mr. Speaker, that my honourable friend opposite will turn around and say that we haven't got a TV editor, so therefore you're out - you're wrong. But they endeavoured, Mr. Speaker, their idea was there and I believe it was only because of some protest at the time, particularly from myself, that this plan went awry. It's my understanding - it's my understanding, Mr. Speaker, that the propaganda department has at the present time appointed two of the editors required or requested; namely, a news editor and a radio editor. But I think they're operating under another one, a super duper sort of an editor. What his salary is I don't know - I don't know - and that's why I'm seeking the information of how many and how much.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that this province has been well served by the news media that we have, by the radio media that we have, by the radio media that we have, and TV. Well it may be, and it is, that I criticize them quite frequently because of some of their articles, the editorials, but nonetheless they are rendering a valuable service to Manitobans. I don't see the necessity, I don't see any justification for the Government of Manitoba to enter into an expanded informational service to the degree that they have at the present time, or at least as it appears to me, and I want to protest. I want to protest particularly when the government of today is considering the necessity for establishing priorities in the use of dollars and cents of the taxpayer of Manitoba. I'm sure that the government will accept my Order for Return; I'm sure that they will give me the correct information; and I'm sure that when the information is tabled in the House the people of Manitoba will be shocked insofar as their expenditures of propaganda, particularly for the Ministers of government rather than the dissemination of information to Manitobans.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Mr. Speaker, I'm not quite as optimistic as my honourable friend the Leader of the NDP. He said he was confident that the Order would be accepted, and not only would it be accepted but he was certain that they would give him all of the facts. Well, I'm not quite that optimistic. I imagine they will accept the Order for Return.

Now, Mr. Speaker, you will recall, and most members of the House will recall, that three or four years ago the Glassco Commission was set up to investigate all government wastes of all kinds. True, it was set up to investigate government wastes of the Federal Government, but there is waste in all governments, particularly this one, and I think that this government should consider the recommendations that Glassco made, and one of the points that Glassco said should be made - in fact he made the investigation and here's what he said - that he was amazed and alarmed at the amount of propaganda that went out - speaking of the Diefenbaker years I think in Ottawa - that emanated from all departments of government at the taxpayers' expense, and he said that it was not a function of any government - it was not a function of any government to use public funds or taxpayers' money to advertise itself, or, as the NDP has just said, glorify themselves. Well Glassco said it was quite in

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd.) . . . order to use Party funds, that is if the Tory Party want to use Tory money, not taxpayers' money but Tory money to glorify themselves or to issue information services bulletins to glorify their own Party, quite in order. Nothing wrong with that. But there certainly is something wrong with using taxpayers' money. That's what is wrong, and it seems to me that if the figures we have are correct that this government has spent well over a million dollars since it has gone into office on information services of one kind and another - well over a million - and that's a staggering amount of money on prop-aganda. It's a staggering amount.

Now it strikes me, Mr. Chairman, and once again I want to refer to something that the Honourable Leader of the NDP said. He said the public and the province had been well served by the daily press in most matters and therefore it was not necessary in many instances for the government to issue their own information services. But there is some reason, I suppose, that they want to come forward with certain propaganda because much of the material that appears in the daily press is adverse to this government. Just in last night's paper there's a big story there on how Manitoba had the highest unemployment in January of any province in Canada - right on the front page of last night's paper - the highest unemployment of any province in Canada and the lowest wage rate of any province in Canada -- in last night's paper. -- (Interjection) -- My honourable friend the Minister of Labour says "Repeat that." Does he not take the Winnipeg Tribune that's delivered free - delivered free to him and his caucus? On the front page. Do you believe it or do you not believe it?

HON. OBIE BAIZLEY (Minister of Labour) (Osborne): . . . your statement. The way I heard it I don't believe it.

MR. SHOEMAKER: "Manitoba Tops the Prairies in January Unemployment." -- (Interjection) -- Pardon?

MR. EVANS: You said the top province in Canada. You made a false statement.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Well then you produce the other statement - use the other provinces -- (Interjection) -- And it said the lowest wage rate - the lowest wage.

MR. EVANS: Of any province where?

MR. SHOEMAKER: Will my honourable

MR. SPEAKER: the honourable gentlemen around the House would direct their remarks to the Chair.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Yes, fine. It's not intended that I should have a debate with my honourable friends opposite, but the point that I was trying to make, Mr. Speaker, was this. Here yesterday we had the Minister of Labour telling us one thing - just yesterday I believe - and last night's Tribune giving us some facts. They're probably a lot more factual than the ones my honourable friend was giving, so it's quite understandable that they would have to issue a bunch of propaganda sheets to offset this. That's what they have to try and do.

Now I too, Mr. Speaker, had the advertisement that my honourable friend had dated August 2nd calling for these three news editors. I don't know whether they've hired them, but my guess is that they did. What's the purpose of calling an ad for experienced help if you have no intention of using the help. But you know, my honourable friend didn't read on further on this. It says: "The responsibility of this news editor is to supervise and assist a team of experienced writers in the preparation of news, features, educational articles and economic reports for newspapers, magazines, special supplements, business and trade journals," and so on and so on. Now not only are you going to have three editors at roughly \$12,000 each - \$12,312 each - but each one of them is going to head up a team, a whole team. So gee, we're really going hogwild here and I say it's wrong.

Now I wonder, Mr. Chairman, if when my honourable friends are considering this Order for Return if they would advise the House whether or not it would not be cheaper rather than hiring all these fellows than to once again give the whole business of advertising to Dalton Camp and associates. Why not try them out? I know that it isn't the policy of this government to call tenders for this kind of stuff, but according to the press again, you just give it to Dalton Camp because he's been fairly good friends on certain occasions, some other occasions not too good, but if you owe him a favour at least ask him what he would charge you to take over the whole branch of Information Services and tie it all up in one package and say, "Here you are, Dalton, how much for the whole program?" Why spend millions of dollars on propaganda like this if Dalton's got a better idea than you have and he has on some occasions. Well offer him a proposition and let him offer you a proposition.

(MR. SHOEMAKER cont'd)...

Now the only objection that I have to that is that you would be --(Interjection)-- well, Dief would be mad my honourable friend says. Well, maybe he would. He's likely mad enough now anyway. But Dalton Camp does not, as I understand it, have an office or a factory to turn out this propaganda in the Province of Manitoba. Maybe he has -- lately he's getting so much business from Manitoba probably he should set up

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. It is normally my practice to give the honourable member considerable latitude which I believe I have done today. I believe he is straying away from the content of the Return which is under discussion. I wonder if he would come back.

MR. SHOEMAKER: Well my honourable friend in the Order for Return, I don't know whether he used the word "propaganda." If he didn't in the Return then he certainly indicated on numerous occasions that it was in fact propaganda and that's the subject matter that I have been discussing.

Now I will get back to some of the sheets of propaganda that do emanate from the various departments and a lot of it is absolutely ridiculous and meaningless. It doesn't mean anything. I read this one to the House once before but I just want to cite it as a striking example of what does emanate -- and it's August 26, 1966 -- and this was when they put it in the red colour. They've changed it to blue, to Tory blue, and it's headed "Manitoba Bears to Control Wild Boars" -- you've heard this one before. There was a whole new industry started, did you know that? A whole new industry, it's a new product to export. And if you don't believe it I will read the first paragraph. It says "Black bears..." --(Interjection)--I'm not the author of it; it's your publication my friends.

A MEMBER: I don't believe it.

MR. SHOEMAKER: "Black bears and wild boars don't get along well together." That's what it says here. "And this has given Manitoba a new product to export to the United States." Well now, what a lot of propaganda that is. We have a new industry in Manitoba, Mr. Chairman, a brand new industry. We're exporting black bears to Arizona or some place. And do you know what we are taking in trade? Wild boars. Well here's what they're saying here.

Further on, it says, "the steps came easy." It was something you didn't think of before, a brand new industry, and lo and behold one day somebody came up with a wonderful idea. It said, "The export began last year when Manitoba conservation officers live trapped and shipped some bear cubs whose mother had been killed and from then on the industry grew until now it's one of the major industries of this province. Well that's a nice little bedtime story--and that's all it is--and it's just that and a lot of propaganda. There's a lot of other ones that I have here but, Mr. Speaker, I just want to once again end up with what I started with, that I insist it is not a function of government to use taxpayers' money to promote or glorify the party that's in office -- and I don't care whether it's in Saskatchewan or Alberta or B. C. or the Federal Government or Manitoba -- it applies all across the board as far as I am concerned.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

HON. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q.C. (Minister of Industry & Commerce) (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, before accepting on behalf of the government the Order for Return, I would like to make just one general statement if I may. First, I would like to quote from the Glassco Report rather than paraphrase it as the Honourable Member from Gladstone did, just so that it will be in the record, and I quote: "Knowledge of government activities is a public right and indeed a necessity. In its broadest sense the provision of information to the public is an integral part of the day to day working relations between all levels of the Federal Government and the Canadian public" --and I think that this would apply as well to Provincial Government. I will refute and the government refute any suggestion that the Information Service is a propaganda machine. It's a proper function of government; in essence it follows the information service of the British Government where the parent of modern democratic government -- and I may say that when the information is supplied to the honourable members and when we have an appropriate time of debating this matter when the estimates come up, I think that you will find that notwithstanding the increases that have occurred in the information service, that it will be the lowest budget of information service of every provincial government in this country with the exception of Newfoundland and Prince Edward Island.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I really didn't intend to get into this, but after the statement by the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce I just had to get up and quote to

(MR. JOHNSTON cont'd)...him one sheet I have of the Public Information Branch and I would like to ask him how this ties in with the statement he just made. Now this is concerning the province winning court cases. If you are going to go into the information and news service, well then you are going to go all the way. You are not going to print one side of the story. Is that a fair assumption?

If you are going to go into the news service, let's print both sides of every story. If you are going to start quoting court cases well then you are going to have to quote them all if you are going to be fair, and I ask you is this the function of government to quote court cases to support what they are doing, and let me quote you this case:

"The Manitoba government has had its land valuation upheld in two separate court cases involving land for the Portage diversion and the Red River Floodway. As a result of these judgments, the claimants in both cases will actually receive less than originally offered. The case concerning the Portage diversion involved 114.71 acres of H. W. Gallaway Estate, three miles NW of Portage la Prairie, expropriated on June 17th, 1965. The Province had offered \$24,256 but the claimant asked \$71,300.00. Judge Frank W. Newman of the County Court in Portage made an award of \$24,000 and ordered that the court costs be paid by the Estate."

Now I won't burden the members with quoting the other case but it was a similar case where the original offer of the expropriation people was reduced by the court.

Now, if you're going to print this, and send this to all the newspapers in the province, then you better start sending out to all these newspapers where you were beat in court. Is this not fair? What about the Tom Lamb case at Moose Lake where he went all the way through the courts, the Manitoba courts, and then he went to the Court of Appeal and it was found in his favour and the Manitoba Government had to pay, and pay a lot more. Why don't you issue that release? Is this the function of government, I ask you? I submit to you that it is not. The function of government information services is to tell the people what the departments are doing, not to be pulling polite bits of blackmail out of the bag - and that's what that is - because you're saying in effect, look out, don't stand up to one of our expropriations; look out, because this is what will happen to you. Isn't that the purpose of this news release? I ask the Minister of Industry and Commerce.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I would remind the honourable members that I do believe we have strayed away from the main purpose of the return and if there are other speakers I would ask them to keep that in mind in order that the business of the House may proceed as it ought to.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Selkirk, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Virden and the proposed motion of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition in amendment thereto, and the proposed motion of the Leader of the New Democratic Party in further amendment thereto. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

..... continued on next page

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, it would be rather difficult to make a job after discussing a new industry such as the black bear industry. It seems to be such a going concern.

First of all, let me congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on your high office and I hope that under your guidance we will have a fruitful session. I also wish to congratulate the new Premier, I note he is not in his seat, the Honourable Member for Minnedosa. I certainly wish him well during his term of office. Actually I had hoped to see more development by this time such as some cabinet changes and bring the conservative element within their party more to the fore. I think you should get started while the broom is still new and make a clean sweep. We certainly need a change in policy of this government of ours, and for one, I would like to advise him to get rid of some of his advisors and use some of his back-benchers because I feel they can do a better job, especially now that we have a new back-bencher in the Honourable Member for Wolseley who apparently has had a change of heart and a change of mind because this seems to be very evident in the speeches that he is making, not only in this province but all across Canada as to what should be done. Certainly he must have read the speeches of the opposition of past years and taken advice from them.

I also would like to congratulate the mover and seconder in their reply to the Speech from the Throne and urge them to take a greater part in formulating policy and getting the government on a different course.

Now coming to the speech itself, it seems to me that it has less velocity than in former years, maybe it's because the loss of the touch of the Old Master who could polish up speeches of this type even though there was not too much in it. However, I welcome some of the announcements that it contains. I note from it that a new fiscal agreement is to be made with the Federal Government and I do hope that the present Premier will be able to strike a better deal than what we have had so far. I also note that there will be a change in debt management policy, that we will have a revision and I hope that this will be for the good. Not knowing just what it will be, it is rather difficult to comment because we might have a letdown later on.

I also note the TED Commission that is to function -- and here again I do not have much faith in the results of commissions as such. Too often we find that very little comes out of these commissions. One thing I wish to make note and I welcome the mention here of police protection for smaller centres, those having a population of 500 to 1500. This will be welcome news indeed for many of the smaller centres in Manitoba who have asked for this very type of protection and assistance and I certainly welcome the announcement that the government is making in this matter.

I also note that the Portage Diversion and the Shellmouth Dam construction is to proceed and no doubt the people in these areas will welcome this decision but I am rather disappointed not to see mention made of the Pembilier Dam in the south central portion of Manitoba. I feel there is an urgent need for the construction of this dam here because it will be of great benefit to the future citizens of this province especially the people in the area concerned.

I have a resolution received from the Red River Water Commission and no doubt the government has received a similar resolution from this commission in support of the construction of the dam. I don't want to go into this at this particular time, however, I feel that I will be speaking on this matter further at a later date. However, the Minister made an announcement the other day that he hoped to have a meeting probably by the end of the month to arrange for construction of this dam and I do hope that this meeting will be successful and that we can have an early start this year on this particular project.

Coming to some of the points that I would like to raise in general, I have a point that I have touched on in previous years and this has to do with interim financial statements. I feel that we should have quarterly statements made available to the members of this House, at least, at the very least, half yearly reports because we as members are shareholders in this government and business. I have asked for this in other years and so far without any results and I feel that opposition members should join me in support to get this type of information. We should be more knowledgeable as members here on this side as to what is going on currently so that we can make proper analysis of the situation as it presently exists. We should be able to check more closely on our Crown Corporations of which we have so many, on the various Crown Agencies that are in existence and this would not be a new thing at all. We have other governments in this Dominion of Canada who do this very thing. They provide

(MR. FROESE cont'd)...interim reports to the members of their particular government and legislature. I have here a copy of a B. C. paper. This covers the months of February and March of this year and they provide very useful and important information to the people of their province. I would like to mention a few of the things that are mentioned in here.

For one, they come out and state that no increase in taxes for citizens will be made this year. This is a very pleasant news item. Certainly one that we in Manitoba would like to hear. They mention further per capita grants to municipalities increased to uniform \$25.00 per capita to give municipalities a net financial gain of \$5 1/2 million. Another very important item and certainly one that our municipal people would be glad to hear if such was made available to our municipalities.

Another point, homeowner grant raised from \$120 in 1967 to \$130 in 1968 and reduces homeowners school and other local taxes by \$45 1/2 million. This is a very substantial amount in reduction of taxes and which is applied to the taxes of home owners, so that people in British Columbia benefit to a very large extent from this type of policy.

Another point I wish to mention - new home acquisition grant of one thousand dollars for new home construction and ten million dollars more will be provided. This I think is also a very important item; this encourages young people to own their home rather than to live in apartments. These then become taxpayers in the community and are as a result more firmly established and this definitely augers well in any community. There are many more points that I could mention here but I'll just bring forth one more and let it go at that.

In B. C. they have the Pacific Great Eastern Railway whose net profit was \$595,322, the largest in 55 years of operation. This is also a crown corporation but this was a railway that started nowhere and ended nowhere at one time but which the B. C. government has completed and is now a profitable business in itself. Now...

MR. SPEAKER: I hate to interrupt the honourable member but I wonder for the record if he would be good enough to quote the title of the document he's reading from.

MR. FROESE: The title of it is British Columbia Government News. --(Interjection)-- Well, I'd be glad to hear and get such information as is in here from our government. You bet. If they could produce what this government is producing I'd be only too happy to hear from them.

Now in connection with the interim provincial financial statements, one was issued as at December 31st, 1967, at the last year end, and I would like to read two paragraphs from a quoted statement here, and I quote: "The Comptroller General's interim financial statements for the period April 1st to December 31st, 1967 which I'll table today, report revenue accruals totalling \$576,672,000 and expenditure accruals including current and capital of \$538,054,000 leaving an excess of revenue over expenditure as at December 31st, 1967 of \$38,618,000.00. Further revenue accruals for this nine month period of the current fiscal year are up \$63,413,000 or 12.4 percent, expenditure accruals are up \$63,771,000 or 13.4 percent from this same period in 1966. Major expenditure increases were education, \$21,972,000; hospital insurance services \$15,794,000; forest fire suppression \$6,265,000; municipal and home owner grants \$5,830,000; highways \$4,361,000 and construction of government buildings \$3,236,000.00". That's the end of the quote.

Certainly we as members of this House would like to have information of this type as to the situation of where we are today or where at the year end. How much money was received, how much was spent and whether we are in a deficit position or not. I think this is information that we as members should have and should be made available to us.

I would like to quote one further article from this paper. This has to do with the revenue estimates and I read as follows: "The assessment of continued buoyant conditions for the British Columbia economy this next fiscal year indicates provincial revenues of \$866,712,000 inclusive of \$21,000,000 from the B. C. ferries - an increase of \$126,712,000 over the current year estimates. No general tax increases are proposed for our citizens but certain adjustments will be made and the rates applied to industries utilizing the provinces natural resources. Careful studies have been completed which have convinced the government that insufficient revenues are being produced from these industries for the benefit of all the citizens, who after all own the resources. Therefore, legislation will be recommended to the mining tax and logging tax Acts."

Then they have further statements here but I would just like to point out that as far as the property taxes which were \$11,665,000 last year are going to be down to \$10,160,000

(MR. FROESE cont'd)... for the current or the year '68-'69 - that's their estimates. This is a far cry from what it is in Manitoba. We in Manitoba continually have to increase our taxes instead of lowering them and I hope our government would follow suit and increase the revenues from our natural resources the way they propose in B. C. Why we have a big nickel industry up north and they are paying hardly anything toward our government coffers. Why can't we go ahead and change the situation so that more revenue would come from our natural resources here in Manitoba?--(Interjection.--) Oh no I'm not talking as a socialist-- a far cry. It's the Social Credit Governments of this country that really provide the incentives and also reap the benefits from the natural resources in their particular provinces.

Now as pointed out we need more current information from the operations of our government and I feel that this would enable us to review actions that have been taken in past years so that we could review them more objectively and see whether they are benefiting us or not, and therefore I would ask the Premier and his government to provide us with financial statements quarterly so that we would know where we're at and we as members of this House would have the information at our disposal. I think this is a must and it's something that can be done and should be done.

I already mentioned debt management a little earlier and said that I welcome any improvements that could be made. Certainly the three percent sinking fund on which we're operating presently is far too small in my opinion. I think this is a poor example that we're setting to the people of this province in drawing out the time in which to pay our debts over such a long period of time. We should be much more current in the repayment of our debts. In fact, I would like to see a pay-as-you-go policy implemented here in the province and that we do not incur any more debts, especially new debts. Naturally the old ones will have to be taken care of and if we can improve the repayment schedule on this I would be heartily in accord.

One thing I would like to know from the government is how much new money was borrowed of the \$100, 000, 000 approved at the last session? This is information that is not at our disposal as yet and certainly I would appreciate getting information of this type. No doubt the interest costs for the ensuing year will be the highest on record. This seems to be the general run here in Manitoba. The same applies to Ottawa no doubt because there too the federal government will spend something like \$1, 400, 000, 000 in interest payments alone. In my opinion we should transfer more of our dead weight debt to the Bank of Canada so that the people of Canada would indirectly effect a saving in that the interest paid would revert back to the consolidated fund which in turn would mean less in taxes the following year. This is practiced presently by the federal government to a certain extent but I think it should be exercised much more in the future and I think we as provincial governments should ask the federal government whether an arrangement could not be made whereby the cost of schools, hospitals, other institutions could not be handled in this way and having the Bank of Canada finance such projects. I think we could even go as far as to include also the projects such as the Pembiller Dam, the Portage Diversion, and Shellmouth Reservoir. I think these all should qualify under such a situation and that we could get the money at a much more reasonable cost.

We have heard from the leaders of the two other opposition parties and I was rather astounded not to hear anything from them in connection with the high cost of money that we're facing up to at the present time. I think our smaller financial organizations in this province are being hurt as a result of what is taking place through the activities of our banks and I wouldn't be surprised if it was not a design to drive our smaller mortgage and loan companies, our credit unions out of business as a result of what's taking place. Our smaller loan companies and credit unions are dealing strictly with the savings dollar plus any borrowings they may make from a central bank or a bank as such. These companies, especially credit unions, are limited under Act as to the return they can make on the shareholdings in their organization - the return that they can pay. Under the Credit Unions Act the limit is 6 percent. This means that they're being placed at a bad disadvantage because the banks are offering 6 1/2 and more than that today at the present time, whereas our credit unions are limited to a 6 percent ceiling. I feel this is wrong; this should be looked at and changed. There are other restrictions in the Credit Unions Act to the effect that you cannot pay a higher dividend on your shareholdings as what you paid the previous years on deposit. So that here's another restriction that should be changed and I feel there are other matters

(MR. FROESE cont'd)... that should be looked at. For instance we have the one percent limit as to what we can charge on borrowings, loans that the credit unions make, so that here is another restriction. If the operating charge is a certain amount this limits them to the amount that they can pay on their savings and shareholdings.

Then two or three years ago when we dealt with the amendments to the Credit Union Act here in the House I tried so hard to get certain amendments made or prevent them from making because at that time the demand loans were not allowed under the Credit Unions Act. This was an imposition made at that time. Now we find the banks issue demand notes with all their loans - practically all of them I would say and they can change the rate of interest as a result at will at any time. All they have to do is call on the loan and either you pay up or you agree to a new interest rate. In most cases they just send out a letter stating that your interest rate will be such and such from here on and an increase is taking place. However, because we are not allowed demand notes in credit unions we find that we have to stay with the interest rates on the paper that is already written and to change the rates on, even if it was put into effect, would take years before you really had a substantial increase of revenue as a result. So that you're handicapped again and I feel that if we as legislators here will not take a real look at the situation of our financial organizations and help them that we will have said results and probably have considerable losses and so on and especially will have a complete stagnation of growth of these, in my opinion, very worthwhile organizations which help many many people throughout this province and this land.

No doubt when the estimates come up I will have further words to say on this particular matter. I already mentioned a pay-as-you-go policy, it appears now that the former Premier at least advises our present government to make a change and go on a pay-as-you-go policy. I am glad to hear it although I wish that he had adhered to this policy a lot sooner. It seems to me that the fat years could be over and that we could have years of famine -- especially the headlines in our newspaper this afternoon seriously indicate that we might be hitting a depression such as the one of 1931. This certainly doesn't sound good by any means. We do not want to be pessimistic but we also have to be realistic.

I wished instead of having the large debt that we presently have as the people of this province that we had accumulated reserves during these good years but the very opposite is true and these debts, payments will have to be made. I already questioned as to how much was being borrowed during the current year. I hope information will be coming forward so that we will know; if not, an Order for Return will be made by myself.

I already mentioned that we should make greater use of the Bank of Canada and the machinery that we have for the development of this country and the Province of Manitoba. After all, this is the people's bank and they have the power to issue credit, and the interest that would accumulate and result would go back into government coffers and the result end would be that the cost would be next to negligible. It would be very very small indeed, and we as the people of this province and of this country would certainly stand to benefit as a result.

Just recently we saw advertisements where the Federal Government was floating another bond issue and this was in two phases. The total amount issued was \$450 million; \$250 million was a six percent due February 15, 1970, and \$200 million December 15, 1971. The yield was to be 6.2 and 6.45 percent respectively. With this notice of floating this bond it was mentioned in the paper that a minimum of \$100 million would be sold to the Bank of Canada. This means that the taxpayers of this country will be saving a substantial sum indeed, because as already mentioned, the interest on this 100 million would naturally accrue and would have to be paid, where it would go back to the government coffers and as a result would mean so much less in taxes to dish out the following year.

Now we find from Hansard that if the Bank of Canada purchases these bonds that they do not necessarily have to hold them and that at some future time they might be sold. The Honourable Mr. Sharp on November 22, 1967, in answering a question of the Honourable D. S. Harkness, made the following statement: "Mr. Speaker" - and I quote - "I thank the honourable gentleman for giving me an opportunity to answer the question. The honourable member may recall that in announcing the bond issue I reserved the right to allot a total of \$250 million minus 10 percent, and the Bank of Canada agreed to acquire a minimum of \$50 million in the event we decided to issue on December 1st a total of \$225 million." Then further on he states, "It has not been the practice to disclose the actual amount of Bank of

(MR. FROESE cont'd)... Canada participation in new issues. This has been the practice for years, although holdings of the Bank of Canada are of course reflected in their regular weekly and monthly financial statements which are issued through the regular channels." So that even if they're purchased originally by the Bank of Canada they can be sold, and as a result we would be that much the poorer off.

But in any event, I feel that here is an avenue that we as government should make use of, and that we should approach the Federal Government to finance some of our capital investments in this way so that we would not be paying interest to a privately owned institution but one that is owned by the people of this country and the results, the accrual of interest that would have to be paid, would be to the benefit of the people of this country. Actually, in this way we could effect a saving on many of our schools and hospitals from 50 to 75 percent of the original cost because of the high cost of financing, and I think in many cases it would be even more than that. Think of the amount, the large amount of money that could be saved for the people of this province, and especially during this time when the cost of financing is so very high and certainly there's no sight of a let-up. Why should we go to New York for capital and borrowings when we have the machinery to create the same within our means and within our country. Legislation allowing the chartered banks to expand the supply of bank credit on the fractional reserve basis, which is roughly 78 percent, enables the banks to make enormous profits in a given year. These are private institutions which have been given the power to create under legislation the medium of exchange that we require for our daily dealings.

In my opinion, there is no need for the high interest rates presently in existence, because under the fractional reserve they can create credit for next to nothing, I don't see the need why we have to remove the ceiling on interest that the banks could charge because this is definitely the result, what we see happening today, because the ceiling was lifted, and I do hope members realize the seriousness of this whole thing.

We did have the farm improvement loan legislation and we still have it. Farmers have been able to make loans from the banks at the rate of five percent for all these years. Now, because of the high interest rates, banks refuse to make loans to farmers under this legislation and no longer can they get these loans. Loans that are being made presently are private loans and the interest rates will vary from 7 to 7 1/2 and even more than that. I feel this is a sad state of affairs when we have legislation on the books, has been in practice for years, and then our private institutions which were set up to give service to the people of Canada refuse to do so.

MR. SPEAKER: I interrupt the honourable gentleman to remind him that he has five minutes.

MR. FROESE: I've just barely started. Certainly, certainly I am not surprised why Quebec wants control over fiscal and monetary policy in their province. I think this is something we could well do for ourselves, too, and contrary to what some people think that they would suffer as a result, I think is wrong. In fact, I think it would enable them to expand their economy at will. We in Manitoba, it seems to me, are just like sheep in allowing ourselves to be cramped by federal policy and action in this way. In connection with trade it seems to me we are content to allow protection of eastern industries by high tariffs, to give the workers of the central provinces, Ontario and Quebec, a higher level of income while the prairie provinces sit back and have to compete on the open world market with their grain and commodities. Hence, a low income for the western worker. Not only that, but the return on investment is very low to the western farmer and probably next to nil. This has been pointed out, too, by the various accounting groups that have been set up throughout the province and we have an actual count of expenditures and so on; that this is not just hearsay, it can be proven.

Now, are we content to let things ride? I think we in Manitoba should exert ourselves. Why does the farmer, the western farmer, have to subsidize Canadian consumers for all these years? And this is exactly what has happened. We in Western Canada, the farmers of Western Canada, subsidize the wheat that is used for human consumption here in Canada. When we take a look at what is happening in Europe under the European common market the situation is vastly different. In checking with the people of the Grain Exchange and the Wheat Board, I find that the countries belonging to the European common market have a basic intervention price and that soft wheat, which is Manitoba wheat in this case, the intervention

(MR. FROESE cont'd)...price is \$98.75 per metric ton. This comes out to roughly \$2.68 a bushel. Barley, the price for barley is \$87.98 per metric ton, and hard wheat, which they classify as durum, is \$117.50 per metric ton and more or less the same prices will be in effect for the ensuing year commencing August 1st, 1968. So that these farmers are getting a much better price for their grain than we are. Likewise, the farmer in Great Britain is fetching a better price and does not have to subsidize the consumer in that country. Naturally, in the European common market they have a range in which this intervention price takes place and they have target prices as well. The target price for soft wheat is \$106.25 and that price will be the same for the new year. Barley, the target price is \$94.44. This price will be reduced, though, to \$91.25 for the coming year and durum or hard wheat \$125.00, and this will apply again in the new year. These are based on the metric ton. Then in addition to that, the farmers receive a storage allowance for nine months of the year at 95 cents per ton amounting to roughly 2.6 cents per bushel of wheat, so that when we take a look at these countries we find that the farmers are in a much better position, getting better prices and also storage as well.

One thing that has surprised me is why do we require the countries that are friendly to us to pay for wheat in American dollars. Why can we not use the Canadian dollar? Why do we perpetuate and remain a party to the Bretton Woods agreement making this requirement necessary? Why do we as Canadians extend credit to Communist countries to purchase our wheat and not extend the same privileges to the countries friendly to us? And I was informed that there are a number of countries that would take advantage of this if this were available. I think it is high time we call our federal MPs to task for this, and I also feel that this is not just a federal matter but a provincial matter as well, and what is this government doing to correct this injustice? We must get better prices for the farmers' commodities. The price of wheat and grains is a shame and an insult to our farmers. Here we have a federal Crown corporation, the Canadian Wheat Board, dictating to farmers income, telling you they sell so many bushels at such a price over such a period of time, and we will be holding back interim and final payments indefinitely. There is no mention of when these other payments will be made. This is the situation, and what a situation. No wonder farmers sell out by the thousands each year to avoid bankruptcy. In my opinion we are spending thousands and thousands on industry and commerce...

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I feel I must interrupt the honourable gentleman and suggest to him that he has used his full time.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the government we would be happy to have the honourable member continue.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have leave?... the honourable gentleman carry on.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, might I at this juncture intervene to ask my honourable friend who has the floor, a question?

MR. FROESE: If I can answer it.

MR. CAMPBELL: I gathered that when my honourable friend was speaking of the intervention prices in the European common market countries that he referred to Manitoba wheat as "soft" wheat.

MR. FROESE: That is correct. That is information that I was given by the people in the Canadian Wheat Board, that under the European common market Manitoba wheat is considered soft wheat and that our durum wheat is considered hard wheat.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, might I ask my honourable friend, though, for the record to make that clear that that is their designation, not ours.

MR. FROESE: That's quite right. This is the designation that the European common market places on it. It's not ours in any way.

Coming back to what I had to say. We are spending thousands upon thousands of dollars on industry and commerce, which in my opinion is hardly anything more than hot air. What actually have we been getting out of the dollars that we are spending in Industry and Commerce Department? How many industries have actually come about as a result, and I feel that we are letting agriculture down and letting it go to the pot. Some of our top people at the University of Manitoba engaged in research, who have been with us for quite some time, are leaving. Why? Because we're not supplying them with the wherewithal to continue. It's a downright shame to undermine one, if not the most, vital established

(MR. FROESE cont'd)... industry in Manitoba - agriculture. I feel very strongly on this that we are not doing our just part in keeping these people on and doing the necessary research work that we should have for an industry of this type to continue and flourish in this province. Surely something can be done about it. For one we should not leave the matter of representation to the Federal Government up to farm organizations when the whole agricultural economy is at stake. We are the proper body to take an interest and intervene on behalf of the agricultural industry of this province.

Secondly, because of supplementary legislation passed by Manitoba this government enabling the set-up of the Canadian Wheat Board and giving it control over marketing and delivery, we have a responsibility to see that the producer is justly rewarded for his effort and a fair return is made on his investment.

Thirdly, we should make demands on the Federal Government and the Treasury Department for a subsidy to the producer of cereal grains consumed in Canada through a two-price system to offset protection of Eastern industry

Fourthly, secure more fair trade practice and that credit will be extended to those countries friendly to us and requiring credit, at least on a par with Communist countries. Further, that it be based on the Canadian rather than on the American dollar.

And another point I would like to make here is that some effort should be made to reduce taxes of farmers by instituting a more fair assessment policy of lands. Presently, farmers are being penalized because of the high assessment that is placed on farm land in areas where you find that smaller centers or towns and villages and even cities are enjoying a much lower assessment than what is made on farm property. I think here we have a great injustice taking place and this definitely needs looking into. Just two years ago the assessment in the two municipalities that I represent was increased, almost doubled in one case and the other one I think was doubled, yet in the towns within the particular area no increase was made, so that the costs of schools, of education and so on, is now falling on the farmers to a much larger degree than ever before and I feel something should be done in this connection.

Turning to the matter of Medicare, which was fully discussed the other day by the Leader of the NDP, or the New Democratic Party I think they like to be called in that way. In my opinion, Mr. Paulley's assumption, or the Member for Radisson, and the conclusion that he reaches are entirely wrong. When he says that 70% of the people only are subscribing to the present program of medical assistance, I feel that only 70% of the people want this type of service. If a larger group wanted it they would no doubt subscribe to it. Certainly I would not like to see this country being bankrupted like Britain as a result of the social programs in effect there, and I am just wondering whether the labour unions whose cause they are trying to champion, whether the rank and file of their unions would even vote for Medicare. I have great doubts on this matter. I think what should be done is we should have a referendum in this province on Medicare and I am sure that the results would be great defeat for those that are proponents of Medicare.

A MEMBER: Fifty-fifty?

MR. FROESE: Oh, I think it would be at least more than two to one. --(Interjection)-- Oh no, the other way around. This would be turned down by more than two to one. I think the government followed the right course this time in rejecting Medicare under its present proposal. After all, I do object to compulsion. I feel that this is a license on freedom when we are instituting compulsory programs such as Medicare would be. We are denying the people the freedom of choice. We are asking everyone to conform. Certainly the experience that Alberta has had is one that is worthy of mention, where better than 80% subscribed to voluntary plans, whereas in Saskatchewan where you had the compulsory plan, I think it was only three or four percent more that subscribed under a compulsory plan than what you had under a voluntary plan. Certainly, because of this few percentage points, it is vital to have and retain a freedom of choice, and certainly the things that are happening today would not take place, that we would be sending people to jail for debts they did not incur.

I would like to mention briefly one paragraph from Gerry Hart's defence, and I quote: "I did not personally request this service. I was not permitted to vote upon its acceptance or otherwise and, in fact, I have coverage which is quite satisfactory to myself, consequently the provincial plan is quite unnecessary and not required. As a supposed free citizen of what is thought to be a democracy, I resent this encroachment on my personal freedom of

(MR. FROESE cont'd)... choice and protest the so-called mass hospitalization about to be rammed down my throat in spite of my feelings, conscience and ability to think as an individual."

There is a small brochure put out by the Free Enterprise Foundation. I have a copy of it. I don't know the people who issue it but they on the following page have an article with a caption "Legislated Security is Bondage" and I'd like to quote a few paragraphs from this pamphlet. I quote: "Compulsory programs are not in the interest of the individual but the necessary tool which government needs to control with complete authority the rights and minds of the individual so the people will be their servants."

Further: "But what is the explanation when freedom declines among men who have known its blessing and yet put up no scrap to stay free? Why the apathy all about us while Canadian citizens submit to one compulsory program after another? Where are the individuals who may forestall this trend towards state control? Surely state control (Communism) could never succeed in the face of determined and concerned Canadians. The modern trend toward state control is the imposition of progressive taxation, especially hidden taxation through compulsory programs."

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if my honourable friend would permit a question?

MR. FROESE: After I am finished. He goes on to say, "To lose awareness of the effect of compulsory programs makes state control possible without a struggle. Are we to let one individual shoulder our responsibility? Are we entitled to take away his right to choose between a compulsory program and one that he requires? We may not agree with him for not wanting to pay a compulsory program, but do we have the right to let our elected representatives put him in prison? Each one of us begins life with certain inherited physical, mental and moral characteristics. Freedom of choice is essential to individual growth and development. In order that each person might have full scope for the development and use of his talents, he must have maximum freedom of choice which should be limited only by the requirement that he may not thereby impair the freedoms of any other person. Are we to be enslaved and put in prison because government is supporting us with our money? Victims who have lost their liberty in Communist countries were unmindful of the fruits of liberty due to the blindness of the true effects of compulsory programs."

Then on the following page there is one further short paragraph that I would like to read: "Seizure through high taxes is time-consuming, but most socialist governments are willing to wait. While they wait the inept laws which make it ever more difficult for business to operate or for persons to get out of debt, the laws become more and more inflicting and the excuse given is always that they are conceived to protect the wage earner and the poor. They instigate class war, envy and division so the poor get poorer and the ranks of the poor are swelled by the middle class who can no longer keep up the heavy struggle."

These are remarks that are being put out by the Free Enterprise Foundation, as I mentioned earlier, and I thought I should mention them here because they are very much applicable.

Now we find that this particular person had to go to jail because he did not pay the premium. What about the thousands who do not pay, the premiums which are picked up by the rural municipalities and cities? Are they all indigent? Or are we picking on Gerald Hart like they pick on Phil Galardi on traffic tickets in BC? I do believe proper laws are essential but I believe the delegation of powers to subsidiaries and Crown corporations should be checked much more closely. I believe in law enforcement. This is essential and I will always endorse it, but I feel that we should take much greater care in the type of laws that we are passing. I stand on principle and certainly would not yield to inducement grants such as are being offered by the Federal Government under Medicare. I too feel, and I want to congratulate the government on their stand, that we should require a change of conditions under the Federal plan before we join in with them.

This brings me to my next point which is the education system set up in Manitoba. It seems to me we have a similar situation with local school boards in relation to the government as the provincial government to the federal government in connection with Medicare. The government should recognize the error of their ways and be more consistent. Certainly we are not consistent if we object to what they propose now and exercise what we are doing in Manitoba in connection with teacher grants. I think we are betraying the people of this province in not providing equal support to all areas in connection with education,

(MR. FROESE cont'd)... especially so when we are accepting large equalization grants from the Federal Government. How can we reconcile this action? I am sure the sins of this government will find them out.

In my opinion it is a sin to purposely deny a large section of people of their rightful due when they pay such large amounts of taxes, especially under the 5% sales tax, and do not get anything out of it. The myth that centralization of administration provides better education in my opinion is a lot of bunk. It is a shameful betrayal of the people to collect 5% education tax and then withhold it. After all, the tax when it was first imposed was tabbed an education tax, later on it was changed to revenue tax, but that was the very purpose why it was imposed.

When can we have justice brought about to bear in our education system? How long must we continue in the present way? Must we have one monopolistic system run by the Civil Service with no alternatives? Where is democracy? Must we all conform? Unless we have alternatives with financial support the future is dark indeed. Give those that believe in freedom of choice equal support in teacher grants for our public schools. If the present course is perpetuated the need for private schools will of necessity become greater even as time goes on. We must have justice in education, and just recently when we got the report of the Boundaries Commission, it seems that the only thing that we have recommended there is further centralization of what was already done.

Mr. Speaker, I beg the government on behalf of the people in this province who are not enjoying equal opportunity of financial support for education, that this be made available to them. This would only be justice; this would only be fair; and I feel that we are perpetrating a grave injustice to the people of this province who want a freedom of choice, and I hope the government will see the error of their ways and change this policy.

Now, coming back to the Throne Speech and the amendments that have been made to the acceptance, I find, for instance, that the original amendment is not hard to go along with except for a few instances. I do not subscribe to total amalgamation in Greater Winnipeg. I feel that there is already an effort made to consolidate and amalgamate into larger units but I don't think we should impose any legislation whatever in having amalgamation, total amalgamation of Greater Winnipeg. I think this should be left up to the people to have a choice in the matter and no doubt that would be the better course.

I certainly agree to the cost-price squeeze that is in effect and that something should be done about it.

The 5% sales tax, I have already mentioned it, and certainly this is the cause of a grave injustice that we are causing our people when we are requiring them to pay thousands and thousands, even millions of dollars, and not getting anything for it. This is outright robbery.

I feel in connection with the Medicare issue that the government is following the right course and certainly that I would like to see a voluntary plan in effect.

A MEMBER: How about no plan?

MR. FROESE: Just as well, because we have the Medical Service, the MMS. It has functioned well and I'd be quite happy to let it remain in effect and let it function. So that I will support the original amendment; however, with qualifications.

Coming to the amendment to the amendment I doubt whether I can go along with the philosophy it contains. I'll take a further look at it before I decide.

MR. PAULLEY: I wonder if my honourable friend would permit me to ask him a question.

MR. SPEAKER: Will the honourable member accept a question?

MR. FROESE: If I can answer I'll try.

MR. PAULLEY: I'm sure my honourable friend will be able to answer this question, Mr. Speaker, it's quite a simple question. The Province of British Columbia being under a Social Credit government is one of two provinces that has entered into the compulsory Medicare scheme as suggested by the federal government. My first question to my honourable friend, is the Social Credit government of British Columbia because of the entry into the plan a Communist government; and my second question to my honourable friend is, if the Medicare plan suggested by the federal authority is communistic why did the Social Credit government of British Columbia enter into the plan?

MR. FROESE: I'd be glad to answer because I never made the statement that it was

(MR. FROESE cont'd)...communistic, I read from an article here which said so, I made the quotation, but I definitely feel that this is socialistic and statism, and I do not subscribe to it and I do not subscribe to that aspect of the Social Credit government administration in British Columbia.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, if I may, a supplementary question to my honourable friend, if he suggests that the Social Credit government in British Columbia is not Communist, will he agree that because they entered into the plan that they are Socialists?

MR. FROESE: No, they're definitely not a socialist administration, I think all the other things point this out very clearly, however, they are in the process of giving this service and here they can get an added financial remuneration and they're accepting it.

MR. PAULLEY: May I ask one further question. Is the question of the contribution from the federal treasury more important than basic philosophy insofar as Communism and Socialism is concerned?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Are you ready for the question?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I didn't want to speak. I do wish to ask the last speaker a question if I may have the Speaker's...

MR. SPEAKER: I'm sure it will be brief and to the point.

MR. GREEN: It will be brief, yes. I wonder whether the honourable member would agree with the press comment that I read yesterday subscribing the view that the President of the Social Credit League of Manitoba said that Walter Weir is a Socialist. I just wonder whether he would agree with that.

MR. FROESE: I didn't make the statement. Certainly some of the policies that they enact and enforce and implement are very socialistic in my...

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member of Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, when one takes part in a Throne Speech debate it is always customary to extend congratulations to you as the guardian of this House and the members who sit in it. It is also customary to extend congratulations to the mover and seconder of the Speech from the Throne.

The Honourable Member for Virden I know has many friends on all sides of the House and gave us pretty good publicity of his constituency and given everybody a sample of the crude oil and cheese that is made in his constituency, but the Honourable Member from Virden made little reference to the Throne Speech. Not only the members of the opposition have found very little substance in the Throne Speech but also the mover and the seconder have found little substance to talk about in the Throne Speech.

The seconder, the Honourable Member for St. Matthews, I thought did a fine job delivering his address and gave us some information of development that is taking place in his constituency. I do not want to miss the new Minister, the Honourable Member for St. Vital; I want to wish him well in his department. And of course I, Mr. Speaker, want to congratulate my colleague who is not here, my desk mate, on his re-election to the House. I know many others and I believe that this by-election was unnecessary and the trend indicates that the performance of this government is not very good and that Manitoba needs a change.

Mr. Speaker, some members have already mentioned that one of the outstanding community projects in 1967 was the fifth Pan American Games. These were billed as a total community involvement and were closely followed by the Paraplegic Wheel Chair Games in conjunction with the Pan American Games. The wheel chair games were the first ones on an international basis and the first time under the Pan American structure. We had some 191 athletes and coaches from six countries participating in the wheel chair games - there was U.S.A., Jamaica, Trinidad, Argentina and Mexico as well as Canada were the participants. Mr. Speaker, through competition and exchange of information I know these wheel chair games benefited many of our paraplegic members and on behalf of the Canadian Paraplegic Association I wish to take this opportunity now to extend my sincere thanks to the many groups and volunteers who have made these games possible.

Mr. Speaker, having observed some of the pleasant duties I now wish to turn to the Throne Speech. I know that some of the other members have already said that the speech was dull and negative. I feel this government watches the Province of Manitoba falling behind while our neighbouring provinces, Saskatchewan and Alberta are marching ahead. We're standing still in spite of the rich natural resources that we have and the healthy

(MR. PATRICK cont'd)... human resources in this province. Reference is made in the Throne Speech that expectations for further growth is expended in the coming year. Mr. Speaker, I had the opportunity to attend a conference on technological change and we were told that Manitoba ranks sixth among provinces in Canada in average weekly wages and salaries, and that Winnipeg has the smallest growth rate in Canada, while the educational qualifications of Manitoba's labour force is much above from the national average, Manitoba's income position is 20 percent lower per capita than that of Ontario, and many of our highly skilled workers are leaving the Province of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, the public information that provides the news service for the government tells us that Manitoba has the highest increase in wages, and this may be true for the last year, but I would like to say that we have a long way to go to catch up.

An analysis of the D. B. S. publications and annual reports of public and voluntary social agencies for the last seven years underlines the fact that metropolitan Winnipeg does have a serious poverty problem. Utilizing the D. B. S. census of the social service audit attests the fact that 16 percent of the families in the metro areas are earning less than \$3,000 annually. A recent survey of the planning division of the Metropolitan Corporation of Winnipeg in 1967 revealed that 2,224 families in the C. P. R. - Notre Dame area are receiving less than \$3,000 a year and 50 percent of these families are living below the minimum requirement, or the minimum level. In 1961 according to the D. B. S. census about 35 percent of the families in that area earned less than \$3,000, and \$3,000 has less buying power today that it had in 1961. The necessity for poverty in the midst of such plenty is to be seriously questioned in this province. The only conclusion one can come to is that this government has failed to come to grips with this serious problem. These unfortunate citizens of our city should have access to adequate living - not as a matter of charity or grace but I think is a matter of right in the affluent society that we're living in.

One would ask what is the solution and I would say it's pretty simple, Mr. Speaker: guaranteed employment for many of these people, adequate education and decent housing. I feel that these would at least remove the greatest obstacle to a better way of life and the government has failed to come to grips with urban problems.

Mr. Speaker, the Throne Speech referred to the remarkable growth of our province. I would like to know how this compares to some of the other neighbouring provinces. For example according to D. B. S. figures the population growth since 1961 shows that the City of Edmonton had somewhere of 18.1 percent growth in this period; the City of Calgary 17 percent; the City of Toronto 17.6 percent and the City of Winnipeg 6.1 percent. I believe it's one of the last on the list. What about the construction that has taken place in our city as compared to some of the other cities in western Canada? For instance the value of building permits in Edmonton for 1966--and that's the last figures that I have which were available -- shows that Edmonton had \$135,568,720 in construction permits; Calgary \$114,392,231, and Winnipeg way down on the list with \$33,737,488.00. If these statistics are any indication I feel this government has no right to be proud of this kind of a record.

The City of Edmonton in a period of 5 years acquired some 41 new buildings and changed its skyline completely. These buildings were anywhere from 7 to 20 storeys high. It is also including in this a 26 storey apartment building, 27 storey hotel and a 35 storey apartment and office structure.

Mr. Speaker, I feel there is reason to believe that the people are in general agreement disappointed in the performance of the present government in Manitoba.

It was also mentioned in the Throne Speech that legislation for condominium ownership of property will be provided. I was delighted to see the government accept recommendations that come from this side of the House, because I had the privilege to introduce a resolution on condominiums last session of the legislature and the resolution was referred for further study. I feel the government could have shown leadership and have this legislation on the statute books for the last couple of years, but it was public pressure from the Winnipeg house builders, the Manitoba Real Estate Association and many other groups that have pressed for this legislation and the opposition and finally the government have to give in to public pressure and mentioned it in the throne speech that they will bring in condominium legislation. I know I have a resolution on the Order Paper now but I would like to wait and see if the legislation is going to be tabled.

Mr. Speaker, I think Manitoba can take a giant step towards better land use while at

(MR. PATRICK cont'd) . . . the same time insuring continuance of high percentage of individual property ownership by adapting this legislation. I feel that condominium projects are incentive to private enterprise in redevelopment of urban areas. For the builder condominiums offer flexibility plus a way to sell to a wider market and for the buyer condominium offers economic of home ownership. Last year Alberta, Ontario and British Columbia all have been developing condominium developments and the Government of Ontario is touting the condominium legislation as the most important piece of legislation in the part of home ownership made easy plan in that province. Surely Manitoba has no need to lag behind the major countries in the world and the other provinces in Manitoba in delaying bringing in this legislation.

The Minister of Urban Affairs I feel could have shown leadership in the direction assisting home ownership and could have brought this legislation in a few years ago instead of waiting until now and following the other provinces that have introduced it three to four years hence.

Mr. Speaker, there was also mention made in the throne speech that the province was host to the largest number of tourists and visitors in our province. I'm sure all members of the assembly will agree and would have expected that during the Pan Am Games it was fully expected that we would have the largest number of tourists in our province. I feel that we should improve some of our sites to make it possible for a tourist to get full value of many of the historic sites that we have in our province. For instance, St. Boniface for example has many historic sites and human interest. I feel that there should be information on all our historic sites in the Province of Manitoba. This may be also the year to open tourist offices in such centres like Minneapolis and Chicago to attract tourists this year from across the line.

Mr. Speaker, I now wish to turn to the most important item which concerns me and many of my constituents in Assiniboia. This government has always pretended that education was the number one priority but the people of Assiniboia have great reservations about this statement. I feel that Manitoba is becoming a poor relation to the other provinces in Canada. Assiniboia parents are blaming the provincial government and the Department of Education because some 1,000 children will have to attend staggered junior high classes in September of this year. The provincial government has been informed of construction plans for the new junior high in September of 1967, and yet there were objections and stalling until this present time. The parents feel staggered classes will result in many problems to the students with the result of only 4 1/2 hours per day of teaching crammed into a straight period, causing frustration because of the concentrated learning involved at this age level. It is my understanding that the need was justified in September of 1967. Proposals were submitted to the government. There were many sets of plans submitted at that time. I understand that every representation that was made for changes in plans took some three weeks for a reply from the government. I now ask the government the following questions:

If education is our No. 1 priority, why then has it taken so long to approve the blueprints? I understand an issue was made of things such as cupboards, rugs, in the plans. Could not these things be debated and time wasted instead of the plans approved and those things could have been ironed out later? As a result there are 1,000 children in Crestview area will have to attend staggered classes. Assiniboia North School Division No. 2 expressed, since the Department of Education has assumed complete financial responsibility for school buildings under the new Foundation Program, this places the blame on the Provincial Government. Mr. Speaker if education is our No. 1 priority, what is the reason for this mess? I think it merely demonstrates inefficiency and I would like an explanation for my constituents.

Mr. Speaker, the other point I wish to raise in education is the vocational school facilities in west Winnipeg, and I am referring to the city of St. James and municipality of Assiniboia. This area combined has a population of some 67,000 people and by 1970 is expected to have 80,000 people

A MEMBER: . . . growth problem?

MR. PATRICK: No, this is one of the fastest ones.

Mr. Speaker, the present vocational facilities in the present schools are limited in scope and capacity. Studies and surveys made in this area reveal that if the facilities were

(MR. PATRICK cont'd). . . available some 25% of the pupils would be interested in enrolling in vocational schools. At the present time there are some 415 students in vocational training at the senior high school level in the two divisions and almost all are enrolled in commercial courses, so this would indicate that the other vocational and trades programs are inadequate. In grades 7 to 9 there are some 4,235 students. If 13% of these take vocational training it would mean 550 vocational students, or 135 more than our present strained facilities. If facilities were extended, 25% of these, or over 1,000 students, could be expected to enroll. In Grades 1 to 6 there are some 10,895 students in the two divisions, so if 13% of these took vocational training it would mean some 1,400 pupils. If 25% took vocational training it would mean an enrollment of 2,500 students. By these figures I hope to demonstrate that if a vocational school were built immediately there would be a demand for such a training by some 750 students, and within one year there would be a demand for facilities for 1,500 students.

As can be seen, we in the St. James and Assiniboia area have the demand to warrant such a project. In fact, I believe the demand warrants the construction of a 1,000-student facility and I believe this would qualify us to obtain federal aid. If not, we will be forced to expand our present facilities within the present high schools in the two divisions which I believe would be just as costly or would cost us more money than to build one vocational school. If a vocational school was built in close proximity to Portage Avenue with easy access from west and east, I think that it would really serve the two divisions and would offer the educational opportunities in this area for all the students. There is no doubt that the proposed school will not create empty classrooms but will relieve the pressure now being experienced in our high schools and make space available to a large number of children approaching high school age. I hope the Minister of Education will give consideration and this vocational school will receive his approval and action can be started on it.

Mr. Speaker, I think that I have raised the points that I wanted to raise on the Throne Speech. I'll be raising some other things as they come up on the estimates.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. McKELLAR: I would like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre, that debate be adjourned.

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

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the report of the Special Committee on Rules, Orders and Forms of Proceeding of the Legislative Assembly, referred to this Committee by resolution of the House on Friday, March 8, 1968.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, before the question is put, and I'm not going to delay going into committee; it has been one of my suggestions that we get the rules forward early during the Session and see if we couldn't have them adopted for use during the course of this Session, so I won't be one of those who will delay the proceedings. I just want to make some comments in general about the work of the committee, which I think was well done. There was certainly a full discussion. It doesn't mean by any means, in my opinion, that we have exhausted all of the improvements that can be made in the rules.

It seemed to me that one of the particular things that my colleague the Member for Lakeside and myself who sat on the committee were proposing, which I would like to re-emphasize now, is this whole matter of the reference to the Ottawa rules or usages when they come up, and this is one that we debated in the committee and which was not settled, in my opinion, in the best way for the House here. The rule in this particular case reads: when our own rules don't cover, we are simply to use the usages and customs of the House of Commons in Ottawa. Well, if we are going to do that much - and I don't disagree with that part of it - I think we should go all the way and say "the rules" in Ottawa as well as the usage and customs, because it seems to me that by putting the Ottawa rules, we at least get something clearer than we do get out of usages and customs, and how frequently we run into difficulties by just going to the usages and customs; then we bring out Beauchesne and someone brings out Bourinot's, and someone brings out May, and the various authorities don't necessarily agree. At least if we said we will start off by taking the rules to the extent that the rules are written and clear, I think we would simplify the situation.

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd)...

The other specific matter which concerned me was that regarding Orders for Returns. Now, in this one there was some discussion at the committee and unfortunately I could not attend the last committee meeting due to an engagement that the Premier and I were involved in in another part of the province, and I had to miss that particular one. We had had some discussion at the committee stage as to the rule that we would adopt in this regard. At the moment our own rule book says nothing at all about Orders for Returns and Address for Papers. The Ottawa rules do, and Beauchesne has a section on it. It happens that the last edition is improperly written but there's a pure grammatical mistake. Now, in our discussion at the committee stage, there were some suggestions that possibly the Orders for Returns might come in between sessions as they were ready, but it seems to me that the final rule as written is simply that they will come down during the following session. (Interjection) Ah. Well this is what I would want to make clear, that it is understood that they will come forward as quickly as possible.

Then the other point, that if they are not ready by the following session, that they be tabled at the very beginning of the session, because the Orders for Returns are really in many cases the only means for members on this side of the House to get specific information. It's information that cannot be obtained from other sources because it's normally understood that if we ask for an Order for Return and that it can be found by our own research, the Ministers are entitled to tell us well you will find the information in the report of that Department or in Public Accounts, or at least advise us where we can get it, so the Orders for Returns are purely for those things that we have no other means of getting the information, and I think it is important for members on this side, if we are going to do our work properly in Opposition, that when we ask the information — and again, the Ministers on occasions, if they find that the information is too difficult to obtain, have said to us: "Look. If you ask us for something like this you are simply going to put our departments to an impossible load of work", and I think generally the members have been agreeable, so it has to be a two-way proposition, and I would appeal here for the understanding of the government that everything will be done possible to get the information to us.

So those are my comments, Mr. Speaker, on the changes, and I think in general what we have proposed here is an improvement. I believe that the suggestions with regard to Private Members resolutions where they will only be allowed to stand on the Order Paper for a limited time and if they are not proceeded with then will be removed, I think is sound for the better functioning of the House.

I think one of the important things in our functioning here is that it of course be fair, that it protects the rights of all the members of the House and thereby the rights of the public, but I think we have to go further than that: that the House is to give an indication to the people of the province that we are conducting our affairs in an intelligent and proper manner, and that any time that there's a reflection that the House itself is either wasting time or that we are involved in needless bickering, that it's harmful to not just the members who are here but to the whole political system, because if people don't have respect for the functioning of this House then the whole of the system suffers, and to this extent whatever improvements we can make in the rules to make sure that we are up-to-date in our methods, I think is useful.

In this regard, Mr. Speaker, I think that one of those areas in which you are directly involved, and that is the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association and the Canadian Parliamentary Association, could possibly be of greater help to us in giving us information from other jurisdictions, and to whatever extent possible, keeping us constantly advised of improvements that we could put into our system of government. It appears to me, frankly, that Britain, from which our own system comes, that the British House really functions in a more efficient manner than our Canadian Houses do, that they have been more prepared to adapt to changed circumstances than we have, and that possibly in certain cases we are a little too tradition bound and reluctant to change and keep up to the times. So in your position, Mr. Speaker, I would hope that you could provide us with constant information as to what other jurisdictions are doing to make sure that we keep our own rules here very much up-to-date.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, like the honourable gentleman who has just spoken, I have no wish at all to delay the matter of this report getting to the Committee of the Whole stage, but I would like to re-emphasize a couple of the points that he has made. I, too, thought that the committee worked expeditiously and well, and in general I am certainly in favour of the changes that have been made.

I would give notice now, as the Honourable the Attorney-General will be expecting, I am sure, that when we get to the committee stage I intend to move that the word "rules" be inserted in subsection (2) of the first general rule, because I think it is so evident that if we are going to go to Ottawa for guidance on a matter that our own rules don't cover, then surely to goodness it's the rule rather than the usage and custom that we should use. Mr. Speaker, if we took usage and custom, we would be using the usage and custom that has been developed in the last two or three weeks down there.--(Interjection)--Yes, that's the one we would be adopting in the absence of one of our own, and surely, surely Mr. Speaker, if we are going to say that where our own rules do not cover the situation then we go to Ottawa, let's not have anything as indefinite as the usages and customs. Let's have something that is at least reasonably definite. Goodness knows, we can disagree enough on the interpretation of a rule but to try and agree on the interpretation of what is a custom or the tradition must be almost impossible, so I propose to move, when we get to the committee stage, that the word "rules" be inserted in the appropriate place.

I agree also with the question of the filing of Orders of Return. No wonder, Mr. Speaker, that some of us on this side of the House become a bit impatient about this question of the Orders for Return because I had last year (and I don't ask many of these questions) but I had one example where an Order for Return which was simply an up-dating of information that had already been laid before the House, was asked for in good time in the session, and was not brought down during the session, has not been brought down since; I have not yet received the information. It was just a question of up-dating an Order that already had been given to the House, and we on this side of the House have had the assurance for some time by the former premier, my honourable friend's predecessor, that the returns would be brought down, that they would be sent out, actually, to the proposer of the Order during the interval. Well it hasn't been implemented and I hope we can get something definite in our rules on this occasion.

But the one matter that I wanted particularly to mention, Mr. Speaker, and I wanted to mention it while you are still in the Chair rather than when we go into committee stage, is the brief discussion that my honourable friend the Attorney-General and I had a few days ago as to this procedure. I said at the time that my honourable friend gave notice that he would be moving us into Committee of the Whole that I thought this had not been the procedure in this House. He assured me that he had taken advice from those who are better informed than himself, and it's infrequently that he admits some are, but that he had taken that advice and that they had proven to him that this was the procedure. Then, Mr. Speaker, he proceeded to make that mistake that is made so often in this House of once again dashing off and reading a citation out of Beauchesne. I maintain that we have here in this Province, in this House, our own rules and our own usages and customs and as long as we have those we don't need to go to Ottawa. They govern. I suggest once again, Mr. Speaker, this is gratuitous advice I know, but I think it's well worth all of us remembering that where our own rules cover the situation, or even our usages and customs, then they obtain rather than those from Ottawa, and if we would keep our Beauchesne closed and our own rule book open, I think it would do a lot more good. But to settle the wee argument between the Honourable the Attorney-General and myself I took the trouble to check carefully and the last two times that we revised the rules here, both under this administration, not in the former time, the last two times this is not the procedure that we used. We used the procedure of the report being received and concurrence being moved a short time after, and the little bit of debate that took place took place while Mr. Speaker was in the Chair, or Madam Speaker as it was on one of the occasions, and the concurrence motion was voted upon and the rules became the rule. The two times that this has happened since my honourable friends were the government of the province, this is not the procedure. If you were going to consider the usages and customs of this House, this is not the recent procedure.

But I must give my honourable friend the Attorney-General credit because he can go back to the time when the predecessor government was in office and the rules were revised and this was the procedure. So I give him credit for having adopted the procedure of some

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd)... people who knew what they were doing and knew the right way to do it, and so he has, belatedly I admit, but he has come to a procedure - which I admit I had forgotten - he has come to a procedure that bears the seal of approval of an administration that did things properly. —(Interjection)—Yes, he is learning, he really is, and I'm happy to join with my honourable friend the Member for St. Boniface in acknowledging that fact and saying how glad all of us are.

Mr. Speaker, I close on the same note as my Leader has done because I do think that it is very important that we try to waste as little time as possible over arguments with regard to the rules and consequently a Committee of the House such as this one which meets and sits around informally and tries to iron out the difficulties - and I think in this case with a good deal of success - is I think doing something worthwhile for the House and I hope that when we finally get these rules adopted that they will cut down to a very great extent the differences of opinion that some of us had in the past, and consequently I am more than happy to see this procedure proceed as fast as possible.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I feel inclined that even though it's the late hour of twenty-five past five on a Wednesday afternoon, and I'm sure that you're going to adjourn the House in accordance with our present rules inside of five minutes, I just want to say that as far as we are concerned in this group that we'll be glad to discuss the question of the rules when we do get into Committee of the Whole House. If this was the precedent established by the administration under the regime of the former Premier, and the present Member for Lakeside, I'm glad that the present government hasn't followed all the precedents established by that administration and deviated at least from some, as capable as they may be on the other side, generally speaking. But I'm glad that the Honourable Member for Lakeside has indicated that in this respect at least the present administration is going back to the procedures of ten or eleven odd years ago or when the last rules - I just don't recall when they were. I believe it was 1955, something like --(Interjection)— Pardon? '51 was it, Mr. Campbell? Thanks.

But anyway, Mr. Speaker, I know that we can't get into the Committee of the Whole House to consider the resolutions this afternoon. I have one or two remarks to make when we do get into Committee. Generally speaking I join with the Leader of the Opposition and the Member for Lakeside, and I'm sure with the members of the government as well, that it is our hope that the revision of the rules will expedite the business of the House. I'm thinking principally as I'm on my feet at this time of some of the conduct of the House today in respect of a certain Order for Return that under the new rules, if and when they are adopted, may be conducted slightly different if we adhere to the principle of the suggested rules, and I was very happy, Mr. Speaker, frankly, that we were not under the new rules this afternoon because I'm sure my honourable friend the Minister of Industry and Commerce was not. I would suggest however, Mr. Speaker, in closing, that if the rules as suggested are adopted after consultation or consideration in the Committee of the Whole House, that they do not apply respecting any incidence or motion where the standing of motions have taken place thus far in this Session. I'm thinking there have been a number of resolutions that have stood so far that under the new rules of the House they would possibly immediately go to the bottom of the Order Paper and I suggest on reflection that when the new rules start we start as of then.

So with those few remarks, Mr. Speaker, and it's obvious we can't get into Committee of the Whole this afternoon, we will reserve our detailed observations - and they're not great observations may I say - until such time as we do get into Committee of the Whole House. I think generally speaking though, Mr. Speaker, that the House can give you a lot of credit as to your Chairmanship of the committee on the rules of the House and your advice to that committee. It isn't very often you know, Mr. Speaker, that you get credit for anything except sitting there listening to our garbled verbiage for hours, but in this particular case --(Interjection) - Yes, I'm speaking for myself, and if my honourable friends opposite would only be as truthful as I am then the conduct of the House would be a lot better than it is. This goes particularly, Mr. Speaker, for the Honourable Member for St. Boniface. However, Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment you as the --(Interjection)—It would take more than a shovel to move my friend. I think, Mr. Speaker, it would take a derrick to move my friend. But anyway, Mr. Speaker, seriously I do want to say how much I appreciated being on this committee and I want the House to know that you--(Interjection)—Yes, it isn't very often we can give halos to anybody on that side of the House, and, Mr. Speaker, if you are the exception

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd)..... of anybody that can get a halo being a Conservative in this House, I want you to wear it.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Inkster, that debate be adjourned.

MR. SPEAKER: I didn't get your seconder.

MR. FROESE: The Honourable...

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

MR. SPEAKER: It is now 5:30. I'm leaving the Chair. The House is adjourned and will stand adjourned until 2:30 tomorrow afternoon.