

## THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Tuesday, February 22, 1966

Opening Prayer by Madam Speaker.

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

MR. JAMES COWAN, Q. C., (Winnipeg Centre) introduced Bill No. 42, an Act for the Relief of Dorothy J. Ungar.

MADAM SPEAKER: Before the Orders of the Day, I have a statement that I would like to make to the members of this House. In the light of certain statements that were made in the House yesterday, I would like to make a statement to the honourable members of this Assembly.

The Speaker, in preparing a ruling, seeks the guidance of our Rules, Orders and Forms of Proceeding of the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba. Where provision is not made in our rules or by sessional or other orders, the usages and customs of the House of Commons of Canada are followed as far as they are applicable to this Assembly. In preparing a ruling, I seek legal advice from my advisers, which I consider as an opinion. Whenever I obtain outside information, that is from another jurisdiction, I also consider it as an opinion. May I state that I respect the opinions, both from my legal advisers of this House and from other jurisdictions, but I do not feel that I am bound by these opinions and the rulings of this House have priority over opinions.

HON. GEORGE JOHNSON (Minister of Education)(Gimli): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I'd like to reply to a request made yesterday that information be given on proposed changes in school grants. It was my view of course, as I indicated, that any prior announcement outside of the House before our Estimates were considered would be out of order and a great discourtesy to the House itself.

In other years, as I have understood it, both this government and former governments brought in grant changes which would be retroactive to January 1st of that year and frequently announced the changes after the date on which budgets were supposed to be submitted to municipalities, and in these cases, boards frequently took advantage of the increased grants to lower their tax requirement by submitting amended statements of the tax requirements to the municipalities. School divisions are required under The Public Schools Act to make their tax needs known to the municipalities on or before the 1st of March in each year and the municipalities then have until April 15th to strike a mill rate, and during the first several weeks in March, I am told, the school divisions do not create any great problems for municipalities by submitting amended and reduced tax requirements.

As I indicated, we would ordinarily have announced the increases in the grant structure when the Department's Estimates were introduced, and as soon as the announcement had been made, letters of information and instruction would have gone out to all boards in the province giving them an opportunity to amend their budgets to take advantage of increased grants. However, since the Honourable Member the Leader of the Opposition has raised the matter, I would like now to announce the changes and the letters which would have gone out to school boards a few days hence will instead go out this afternoon.

The schedule of grants payable toward teachers' salaries is being revised upwards to provide an increase of \$200 in every step of every scale in the elementary grades schedule and \$400 in every step in the secondary schedule. Capital grants have been paid on only the first \$15,000 of cost for authorized classrooms. This ceiling on capital grants will be raised to \$16,500 for authorized elementary classrooms and \$18,000 for authorized secondary classrooms, and both increases will be effective on all construction commenced after the 1st of January, 1966.

Single districts divisions, or divisions which may be formed under Bill 39, and school areas, will receive a 10 percent increase in the provincial share of the combined operational grants to which they are entitled effective the 1st of January this year. If a board wishes to establish a kindergarten or expand its present operation and is required to construct additional space for either purpose, capital grants will be paid on its expenditures for approved kindergarten space at the same rate and under the same conditions as grants are paid for other approved elementary classroom space.

(MR. JOHNSON cont'd).....

Last year, if you recall, special grants were paid to the school divisions which incurred expenditures for the establishment of laboratories, offering the new science courses, and the same grants will again be available in 1966 on the same basis. Grants for classes of the mentally retarded children have been paid for those up to the age of 16, and this will be raised of course to 18. At the same time, enrollment grants for grant qualifications for such classes will be changed. The previous requirement for one grant was a minimum of 10 and it is being reduced to 8; and to obtain two grants required a minimum enrollment of 18, and the minimum enrollment for two grants is being reduced to 14. I might point out that where the enrollment was over 17, the number of grants was obtained by dividing the average enrollment by 13 and adding 1. This has been changed to where the average enrollment is over 14, the number of grants can be calculated by dividing the enrollment by 13 and adding 1.

The government will continue its policy of providing special teacher grant of \$5,000 for each secondary school having at least seven teachers and earning seven grants, where, by reason of offering two or more courses, an additional teacher is engaged over and above the grant entitlement. Effective the 1st of January, 1966, the policy of providing an additional teacher count for single district divisions employing superintendents is being extended to include all districts, divisions and areas which, under existing or new legislation, can legally employ a superintendent.

As said in the beginning, Madam Speaker, this information, now having been given to the House, will be going by mail to all districts this afternoon and local school authorities will be at liberty to amend their budgets to take advantage of these proposed changes. Thank you.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): Madam Speaker, I want to thank the Minister for the statement that he made in reply to my request of yesterday. I think it will be very helpful to the school boards and they can now proceed to finalize their budgets and there won't be funds sitting in reserve as a result of over-taxation. I wonder if the Minister could make available to the members of the House, a copy of the letter that will be going out to the school districts.

MR. JOHNSON: Madam Speaker, I will ask my department to oblige.

MR. MOLGAT: I'd like to ask a question, Madam Speaker, with regard to the teacher salary grants. If I understood the Minister correctly, it is \$200 at the elementary level; \$400 at the secondary level. How will that leave us now in comparison to the Province of Ontario and the Province of Saskatchewan, where I think most of our loss of teachers has been. Is our schedule now up to those provinces or still below them?

MR. JOHNSON: Madam Speaker, in all honesty, I just want to say this. I hear quite frankly from very reliable sources, all of them, different salary schedules, but in some instances I think our secondary salary schedule is superior to some provinces. I haven't got that information immediately at hand but I feel it's very comparable from the information I have had on hand.

MR. DOUGLAS L. CAMPBELL, (Lakeside): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to direct a question to the Honourable the First Minister. I'd like to ask, in view of the reply that we had from the Clerk of the House of Commons at Ottawa regarding the tabling of Orders-in-Council and Orders for Returns and Addresses, is it the intention of the government now to bring before the House, or lay on the Table of the House, the Orders and Addresses that were passed last year and that have not yet been provided?

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier) (Wolseley): Madam Speaker, I thank my honourable friend for the question and can tell him that the whole matter as to this system of making returns is being considered by the government, particularly in the light of the information to which my honourable friend refers. Up to the present time it has never, as far as I'm aware, never been the practice, either under this administration or the previous one, to regard incomplete returns of one session as being tableable in the next and that has been our policy to date; it is our policy at the present time. I acknowledge, however, that a different system is pursued at Ottawa and we are considering this matter, together with the whole question of the rules, to which some attention has already been given in this session. I do not think that we would adopt this rule retroactively, but I would expect to give favourable consideration to adopting it in conjunction with the entire set of new rules that we are considering.

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker, I would like to ask my honourable friend a further question. Is it not a fact that our rules state, as presently in effect and as proposed under the new rules, that where we do not have a rule on the subject, that then the Ottawa practice shall apply, and is it not a fact that we have a clear indication of what the Ottawa practice is? Does it not therefore become a rule of this House that that practice shall be followed?

MR. ROBLIN: I do not think I can add anything to the statement I have already made, Madam Speaker.

MR. CAMPBELL: Then I would ask my honourable friend, can he answer my question?

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, a subsequent question on the same point. I am speaking now from memory - I didn't check the journals or the Hansard - but if I recall correctly, towards the end of the last session you were going to make a ruling on this question and I think that the House rose before your ruling came down on the matter, so I presume that there's a ruling pending from yourself on this subject; and I presume as well that it is to be based on the practice at Ottawa which is the basis for the letters that were sent. Is this not the situation?

MR. ROBLIN: The question is addressed to Madam Speaker who is unable to reply, according to the rules.

LEONARD A. BARKMAN (Carillon): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Has the Municipal Development Loan Fund extended the deadline in regards to grants for completion of an existing project, and if so, to what date?

MR. CAMPBELL: I wish to question the statement of the Honourable the First Minister that Madam Speaker is not able to reply. My Leader's question dealt with a point of order and with a rule of this House, and I'm sure that the proper person to reply under those circumstances is Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: ..... receive a direct question addressed to me from the honourable member. If he wishes to direct a question to me, he may do so.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I would like to - you may not be in a position to reply at this moment - but I would like you to take my question as notice and if you can reply now, fine; if not, later.

MADAM SPEAKER: I will take the request of the honourable member under advisement.

The Honourable Member for Carillon asked a question when he was interrupted. The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. ROBERT G. SMELLIE, Q.C., (Minister of Municipal Affairs)(Birtle-Russell): Madam Speaker, on Tuesday of last week the Ministers of Municipal Affairs of the various provinces contacted the Minister of Finance in Ottawa with a request that the deadline for forgiveness on projects proceeding under the Municipal Development and Loan Fund should be extended. He gave us no reply on that occasion but said that he would take our request under consideration. I have not yet received any word from the Minister of Finance, but I note in the newspapers that this matter is going to be extended until September 30. If my honourable friend has seen the article in the newspaper that I saw, his information is just as extensive as mine.

#### ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Attorney-General, that Madam Speaker do now leave the chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider Bill 19.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried and the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole with the Honourable Member from Winnipeg Centre in the Chair.

#### COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE HOUSE

MR. CHAIRMAN: Bill No. 19. Section 1, 6A--passed; 6B--

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, under 6B, I'd like to ask a question of the Provincial Treasurer. What are the advantages in having the Corporation borrowing directly rather than the previous practice where I understand it was the province who borrowed and then advanced it to the Corporation?

MR. ROBLIN: We may wish to use the facilities of the Canada Pension Plan should there be sufficient money in that fund, and it is deemed convenient to have the Corporation borrow in its own name, with the provincial guarantee, owing to the mechanism which we are setting up to deal with that matter.

MR. M.N. HRYHORCZUK, Q.C., (Ethelbert Plains): Mr. Chairman, on that same point, does this Bill actually make that change under 6B (1)(c) and (d)? The Provincial Treasurer is the agent of the Corporation and he seems to have all the powers that he possesses at present. In what way is this change made? If the Provincial Treasurer is going to act as the

(MR. HRYHORCZUK cont'd).....agent of the Corporation, and further on in the Bill the powers are pretty well left with the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, then does this really make the difference that has been suggested just a moment ago?

MR. CHAIRMAN: (1)(a)--

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Chairman, is the Provincial Treasurer not going to reply to the question?

MR. ROBLIN: I didn't stand up but I said yes, it does do what my honourable friend says.

MR. MOLGAT: Oh, I'm sorry. I have some subsequent questions to ask on the same matter, Mr. Chairman. Did I gather correctly then from the Provincial Treasurer that it is the intention of the government in all cases to guarantee the borrowings of the Corporation, or will the Corporation be empowered to borrow on its own without provincial guarantee?

MR. ROBLIN: I very much doubt that it would be practical at the present time, or desirable, for the Corporation to borrow under its own name without a provincial guarantee, although there's no reason why that should not be possible. I think that we would either continue the present system of borrowing in the name of the province and handing it over to them or, as I say, if we used the Canada Pension Plan route, we'd probably like to have them borrow in their own name but with the provincial guarantee.

MR. MOLGAT: When the Corporation borrows with the provincial guarantee, does it borrow at exactly the same rate as the province itself would borrow directly?

MR. ROBLIN: It will, if it borrows from the Canada Pension Plan.

MR. MOLGAT: But if it's on the open market, it is not likely that it will borrow at as cheap a rate as the government itself, is this not so?

MR. ROBLIN: Well that's speculative; it's highly likely; but I don't think we'll adopt that route of financing.

MR. MOLGAT: By removing the borrowings of the Agricultural Credit Corporation from the direct borrowings of the government, this will mean that in the future these will not show in our Public Accounts as a direct debt of the government. To the extent that this is used, the direct debt of the province will reflect a lower figure but the guaranteed debt and the indirect debt presumably will show a higher figure. Is this so?

MR. ROBLIN: Not necessarily.

MR. MOLGAT: Well if it is used at all, if they do borrow on the open market with the provincial guarantee, surely then this will mean that that debt will not show in the direct debt of the province.

MR. ROBLIN: I think we have a number of instances where we do borrow in this way and where it still shows in the direct debt of the province.

MR. J. M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Chairman, when the Act was first brought into being, funds were secured from the War and Post-War Emergencies Act and its reserves. I would like to ask the First Minister: is this reserve depleted completely by now or are there still funds left?

MR. ROBLIN: I really think the question has got nothing to do with the point under discussion at the moment. However, as my honourable friend has asked, I can say that he can get the answer from me easily either during the Estimates or now, and I don't mind telling him now, the Post-War Reserve is a good deal larger than when we came into office.

MR. MOLGAT: Unless the First Minister has the answer now - I'm not going to press for it because it isn't pertaining directly to this Bill - but in reference to the last answer that he gave me - if he can give it to me now fine, if not, I'll ask the public accounts - which other cases are there where debts of other than the province itself but which the province has a guarantee, are included in the direct debt?

MR. ROBLIN: Yes, I will have to look it up because I cannot give my friend the answer off hand. I rather suspect, unless I have misunderstood the situation, that there are a good many Hydro items at present, and Telephone, in that category. Whether that is so or not I'd have to check to be sure. I'm just giving my impression.

The remainder of Bill No. 19 was read section by section and passed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Call in the Speaker. Madam Speaker, the Committee of the Whole House has adopted Bill No. 19 without amendments and ask leave to sit again.

#### IN SESSION

MR. COWAN: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Pembina, that the report of the Committee be received.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried. BILL NO. 19, an Act to amend The Agricultural Credit Act was read a third time and passed.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party. The Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, as both the Minister and the honourable gentleman who moved the motion are absent, perhaps it would be just as well to let this item stand.

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

MR. S. PETERS (Elmwood): Madam Speaker, could we have this stand?

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

MR. ROBLIN: Another absentee. I presume it will be in order to let this matter stand.

MR. MOLGAT: I was wondering if the honourable member might be prepared to go on one of these resolutions, Madam Speaker. If he's not in his seat, maybe we could come back to it later, I don't know.

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

MR. ROBLIN: Stand.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Portage la Prairie. The Honourable the Member for Burrows.

MR. MARK G. SMERCHANSKI (Burrows): Madam Speaker, I would like to make a few comments on the amendment which was made by the Minister of Industry and Commerce.

I feel that our entire approach in the Province of Manitoba in reference to industrial development has been badly handled. There is a crying need for a sensible and aggressive policy in the Province of Manitoba. I feel that the so-called industrial star of this present government is failing and it has failed to give the people of Manitoba the opportunity to share in the great economic growth that is taking place in the rest of Canada.

This government is in a position to attract industry into this province. This government is able to go out and sell industry in other parts of this continent to come and locate in this Province. Why this has not been done, I do not know. There are ever so many new fields in the industrial development and there is an unlimited number of capable people in this province that have acted as pioneers in the development of the West and have acted as pioneers in the development of new industry. We have the personnel; we have the ability; but I think we have too many qualifying commissions, too many qualifying boards, to know where we are headed. We seem to be headed in the wrong direction on the wrong road. Madam Speaker, the Minister of Industry and Commerce in his amendment -- he can say what he likes, he can quarter it, he can half it, he can change it and he can say what he wants, but the fact remains that our province is at the bottom of all the other provinces in the Dominion of Canada as far as industrial development is concerned.

The climate for industrial development in Manitoba is not here. It is all right for us to say the heating tax wasn't much of a tax; it's all right to say that the telephone and the tax on electricity was not very much; but all these things indirectly do have an effect on industry locating in the Province of Manitoba. I think, Madam Speaker, that in reference to this heating tax, it reminds me of one of the passages I read in Stalin's book when he said, "You take three steps boldly and if you're challenged, you retreat one; the final result is you have gained two steps forward."

I think that this is the kind of policy that our present Roblin administration is carrying out in the field of industrial development in the Province of Manitoba. You have the cost of a direct telephone line from a rural town in the Province of Manitoba into Winnipeg running as high on a per month basis as it does to maintain an open Telex line from Winnipeg to Toronto. Now is this encouraging and helping industrial development in rural Manitoba? Madam Speaker, it's not very complimentary and it's rather difficult for me to have to point out these errors and omissions in the progress of Manitoba. I am an optimist and I have no room for pessimism in my vocabulary nor in my every-day living, but doggone it, there seems to be something wrong at the switch. There seems to be a need for spark plugs in developing the economy of this province, and this spark plug, Madam Speaker, does not seem to be studies, investigations, research programs, a matter of studying the productivity. These are all nice cosy-sounding words, but in the final analysis how much industrial development have they attracted to Manitoba?

(MR. SMERCHANSKI cont'd).....

We hear our Honourable Member from Virden the other night, the other afternoon, in his speech in reply to the Speech from the Throne asking the Minister of Industry and Commerce if he could locate some industry in Virden, as if the Minister of Industry and Commerce can press some magic button or a panic button on some kind of an electrical panel set-up and will create new industry in Virden.

I might mention to my honourable friend from Virden, whom I have a very high respect for, that I think that every member in this House is just as much responsible for the development of industry in Manitoba as any other Minister of the Crown. It is our responsibility, and believe me all of us can do a lot more than we're doing, and the present Roblin administration, for some unknown reason, is not doing a proper job. There's something lacking. Our approach to this whole problem has been wrong. Now if it has been wrong, surely - surely we have the mental ability; surely we have the brains in this province to call a halt to this type of work we're doing, find out what it is that the other parts of Canada are doing to be able to be successful in attracting new industry into their province, and this is the type of a program we should be undertaking.

The Minister in his speech the other day, Madam Speaker, skated around blaming the Federal Government for not opening certain areas, or denying them the right of making certain areas as designated. Madam Speaker, when you make an approach to Ottawa on a certain definite industry you find that there is a bit of pliability, there is a bit of bending, and that you can get some of these areas changed a bit. Now I'd like to ask the Honourable Minister - and it's unfortunate he's not in his chair today, this afternoon - has he made any approach in this direction? I'll tell you what the answer is, Madam Speaker. He has not, because I satisfied myself that he has not done it.

Madam Speaker, the First Minister can say all he wants about equity in taxation. I'm not very much versed in equity in taxation but I am, Madam Speaker, versed in one thing, that if you make it unbearable for new industry to locate in the province, and when you find that this new industry can locate more favourably in another province, then we will continue to play second fiddle to any industries locating in Manitoba. Our tax load is such that industry takes another look at it.

Now just let me give you one example of this, Madam Speaker, which has a direct bearing on the cost of industrial development. Take for instance the improvement on Highway No. 59, which is in the vicinity of the floodway, take it's relocation; the purchase of the right-of-way; take the approaches and the bridge; all these items should have rightfully been charged to Highways -- to the floodway rather. What do we do in this government? All these items are charged to the Department of Public Works. Similarly, a large percentage of our supervision on the floodway, our engineering costs on the floodway, are all being charged into the various departments. The relocation of the Hydro transmission lines, relocation of certain telephone lines, all of these are not charged to the floodway as they properly should be.

Now let's examine the cost of this matter. I'm only using this as an example to show you the discouragement to industrial development because it has to carry a higher than usual load of this taxation responsibility, and this also goes for the taxpayer in this province. Over a million dollars of these items have been charged into the various departments. Now when this is charged directly into a department, we're not sharing the proper costs of the floodway with the Federal Government. The province itself is carrying that charge 100 percent. This is not right, Madam Speaker, because 60 or 40 percent, whatever the sharing proportion is, should be paid by the Federal Government; but it seems, Madam Speaker, that somebody in this government wants to protect and wants to be able to tell the people of Manitoba that "I told you the cost was going to be X dollars on the floodway and it is X dollars on the floodway," whereas in reality that cost is going to be double the original figure if you want properly charged to it all the engineering costs, all the relocation of the highways, the bridges, the Hydro transmission lines.

Now this means that a good percentage of the budget that is being presented for the various departments, a part of that is the cost of the floodway; a part of it has to be raised by the tax dollars that industry pays in this province. I mentioned this last year, that our tax in this province on a per unit basis to industry is unrealistic - completely unrealistic. Now, Madam Speaker, if it's unrealistic, unless we're prepared to change it, you'll have a very difficult time to attract industry to Manitoba, and don't fool ourselves either. All I say to you, Madam Speaker, is that this example of the cost of the floodway is only one of the many examples - and

(MR. SMERCHANSKI cont'd).....I could stand here all afternoon and give you positive examples one after another - but this is complete mismanagement. It is complete tomfoolery as far as the people of the Province of Manitoba are concerned.

In reference to this industrial development, Madam Speaker, it also must be realized, and it also must be recognized, that at the beginning of each sitting of this House we get a kind of a preview - a sneak preview, or call it what you will - of the good things that will take place in reference to industrial development of Manitoba. This year I believe we are going to have some type of a productivity economic study commission made to help small businessmen. Madam Speaker, we have too many commissions in reference to development of industry. We're having too many studies. Somebody has to take these reports - somebody has to take these reports out of the files; somebody has to make a decision as to where we're going and what we're going to do; and because this is not being done, Madam Speaker, this is why for the last five years we have not been growing with the economic development of the rest of Canada. This is the reasons for it as well. This province needs a new aggressive approach and a new approach to industrial development in Manitoba because what has been done before has not been the proper approach, and to simply put in a few more paragraphs or sentences describing that we're going to assist one phase of industrial development, be it big business or small business, this is of no consequence.

Madam Speaker, I have always maintained that if the government would undertake to give the proper climatic background for the attraction of industry, free enterprise will take care of itself. It doesn't necessarily require any bonuses; it doesn't necessarily require any government subsidy; it will carry on its own the same way as free enterprise has existed and has flourished and succeeded in years gone by, and the way it is going to in the future.

Take for instance, in reference to industrial development, the ARDA project - and this is a worthy function. I think that it has a possibility through this agency to do something worthwhile, but, Madam Speaker, for Heaven's sake, whatever studies we're making under ARDA, let's stop discouraging the people in the areas where ARDA are making these studies and telling them to move out of the area or telling them that they are not suited for any industrial development in any particular area, and I now refer to the Interlake area and its industrial development, Madam Speaker. I would like to show the Interlake Resources Conference that was held on April 8, 1964, in Stonewall. I think that my honourable friend the Minister of Agriculture and my friend the Minister of Industry and Commerce were there, and the results of that conference was "exodus by 1977 from the Interlake area."

Madam Speaker, I was associated with a small enterprise since this conference was held and I want to tell you that after this conference was held - a conference of gloom and doom, that's what it was - and I am very much surprised that the Roblin government of the day that is so aggressive, so spiritual, so aggressive, so idealistic, was preaching gloom and doom at this conference, because that's exactly what it was, Madam Speaker. I think that maybe the Honourable Member of Fisher might recall some of the results of this conference, the unsatisfactory results in this Interlake area.

Subsequently we developed an industry that, today, I think there is some over 125 people employed with a payroll of close to \$300,000. Madam Speaker, the \$1 million that the ARDA project have spent in the Interlake area making studies, but never coming to any conclusion - they have been unable to reach any conclusion - that with that \$1 million that has been spent on reports, this is enough to take care of industry to the tune of \$10 million, because with a 10 percent equity you can finance the other 90 percent. And, Madam Speaker, as I stand here before you today, this means work for some six or 700 people in the Interlake area with a take home pay - a yearly take home pay of an excess of \$1 million in payrolls.

Now I think the Honourable Member from Gimli will pay attention to this. What would it do to our Interlake area if there was an additional payroll of \$1 million a year in the Interlake area? Madam Speaker, this would develop to be one of the largest consumer markets in Manitoba, and not only in this area, it could be done in two or three other areas. Now why aren't we doing this? Is it because we lack the ability? Is it because we lack the financial background? Honestly and frankly, Madam Speaker, I cannot understand this feet dragging, this no action, plenty of reports, plenty of talk, plenty of discussions on the television, plenty of sensational reports on the radio, but no action; no industry; no industrial development.

Madam Speaker, we also have heard something in reference to electrical power, and I refer to the Nelson River in reference to industrial development in Manitoba. I am pleased that action is being taken in this direction because last year I was beginning to get somewhat

(MR. SMERCHANSKI cont'd).....concerned, because the longer we wait, we're likely to lose out to nuclear thermal power which can be developed at a cheaper rate as new improvements are developed in this type of generation of power.

However, Madam Speaker, how can this government - how can this forward-looking government of the Roblin administration justify development of industry in this province when our present rate is 20 percent higher than it is in the Province of Ontario? Every thousand dollars worth of electricity I use in the Province of Manitoba, I would only have to pay 800 for it in Ontario. Now why, Madam Speaker? If we have to throw some goodies to industry, surely this is the basis on which we should make a study, and say that at least we'll give industry an equal power rate as is given in other provinces. Madam, it is not enough for the Minister that is in charge of power and telephone lines to get up and tell us that on a per kilowatt basis it is cheaper, because this is not the answer. The answer is what base are we using? Are we using a 60 percentage of consumption or are we using an 80 percent figure on consumption? When you break all this down, the absolute facts show that we're paying 20 percent more for power in Manitoba than in Ontario.

The other thing I'd like to know, Madam Speaker, in reference to the Nelson development is: are we going to export power in wholesale blocks of utility power to other provinces at the expense of industry in the Province of Manitoba? This is the inference that I gather from this over-all glowing report. Madam Speaker, Heaven forbid us if this ever takes place, because I want to tell you that you are going to go back, in reverse, rather than go forward in the development and attracting of industry into the Province of Manitoba, because all you're doing is you're going to export power at the expense of existing industries in Manitoba, and this is not right.

Thirdly, again I make the statement, Madam Speaker, that if power is going to be developed so cheaply, then let us attract that type of industry into Manitoba that is a large user of electrical power. I mentioned last year that we could go and have the smelting of stainless steel furnaces, alloy steels, spring steels, stool steels. All these can be done by electrical smelting furnaces. All these are high users of power. All these produce a high quality steel which is an expensive item on a per pound basis as compared to standard steel. This is the kind of a product that can stand transportation. This is the kind of a product that can give us the advantage of a competition in the fields of European markets, American markets, Asiatic markets.

What is the sense of talking about exporting power? I would like to appoint some man that is capable and active and fire him that enthusiasm to go out and bring industry into the province, and if it is 250 million -- or 250,000 kilowatt hours that we have a surplus, utilize it, because if it's a surplus now, Madam Speaker, let industry utilize it; let this industry pay taxes to the government; and this is going to relieve and make a lesser tax load on the average individual that lives in Manitoba.

Now this is the kind of a forward-looking approach we should take on industrial development in this province, but here we are sitting, Madam Speaker, with the Grand Rapids coming into production, surplus power on our hands and we have done nothing - absolutely nothing to attract industry that would utilize this excess power. No matter what we sold that power at would still mean an income to the Manitoba Hydro, and yet the Minister of Industry and Commerce, Madam Speaker, has the gall to get up and tell us that we should look to the Federal Government for guidance so that we might have an over-all picture of the economy of Canada and try and give ourselves a slice of that favourable loaf of bread. I say, Madam Speaker, nobody is going to look out after Manitoba except the people of Manitoba. This is our function. This is what we're supposed to do for the Province of Manitoba, and we will contribute, all the taxpayers and all the people in Manitoba will contribute to the growth of Manitoba. To ask others to take care of us is of no consequence.

Madam Speaker, in March of 1964, I well remember the Minister of Agriculture saying that to build another sugar plant in this province was like counting your chickens before they were hatched, and he qualified that statement by saying it simply can not be done. Can you imagine the impact of that type of a phrase on me sitting in this chair? It can not be done. Madam Speaker, I again say there is no room for such pessimistic thinking. This is gloom and doom and I just absolutely refuse to have any part of it.

Studies should be made, research should be made, and then it should be brought to the attention of the proper people and let free enterprise develop a new sugar plant in this province and contribute to the industrial growth and industrial development of this province. It's as



(MR. SMERCHANSKI cont'd)..... simple as that, Madam Speaker. And if you did that, Madam Speaker, we in this province, I don't think, have got one single basis organic industrial chemical enterprise, and from sugar and its raw materials we can produce such things as alcohol derivatives, starches, dextrans, other related organic compounds, and I daresay into the polyethylene field which makes hoses, garden hoses and so forth, PBC, polyvinyl, fluorides. We could make the basic materials. This is made in other parts of Canada and then shipped across Canada, and because it's a high-priced article, it can stand this transportation. All of these chemicals, Madam Speaker, would in turn attract other related industries that would come into the manufacturing of synthetic yarns, fabrics, and other synthetic materials such as carpeting and imitation leather and so forth.

Now I simply use this as an example, as an example of what can be accomplished. Now, Madam Speaker, why isn't this being accomplished? This was started I think, in 1958 or 1959. We were on the horizon of a rising sunrise, everything looked beautiful, everything looked so glorious, and here we are after six or seven years and it's raining and the sky seems to be falling around our ears because our industrial development of the province is simple not there. It's simply not there.

Madam Speaker, this development of a sugar plant in the Province of Manitoba tax-wise would contribute more than the taxes that you're going to derive from the heating tax, the tax on the telephones, the taxes on the electricity used for lighting and heating, and even the taxes on the coloured gasoline of the farmers. We could move out of this playing in the backyard sort of tax problem and get on with something that is more lucrative, something that will pay bigger dividends into our tax coffers of the Province of Manitoba, but the Roblin government seems to be preaching on a high and straightforward plateau - something like you would find maybe in the upper reaches of the Ural Mountains - but when it comes to analyze what will be the proper approach on equity of taxation, we are dithering with something that would be better left alone because this is not equity taxation and it is not equitable as far as the smaller taxpayer or wage earner is concerned in the Province of Manitoba. I would be a happier man to put up a great big industrial complex that would contribute directly and indirectly millions of dollars as a source of taxation for this province. Now this is the proper way to go.

Madam Speaker, the other thing that I would like to point out in reference to the industrial development is that quite frankly I have tried to review some of these studies that have been made on the ARDA project, and unless I am unable to understand the English language, after getting one-third through these reports I become very very confused, and by the time I come to the conclusion, my mind is swimming in about five different directions. I don't know whether the honourable members in this House have read some of these reports, but some of them are very annoying to the mental make-up of the individual when you are trying to ascertain just what the over-all plan or purpose of that study of that report was in order to come to a final conclusion and naturally with some kind of a recommendation, and these are not there, Madam Speaker.

So, Madam Speaker, it is one of the things taking place here, either these reports are prepared by competent people in their field or these reports are prepared by incompetent people and who are there because of some political handout. If this is what is going on, Madam Speaker, this government of the day has to take that responsibility and make itself responsible to the people at our next provincial election because there has been too much of this going on, especially in areas like the Interlake area, and this is not fair. You can preach and talk all you want, but these are facts of analysis that you cannot get away from.

Again in reference to the industrial and development, Madam Speaker, in April, 1963, the then Minister of Agriculture - aided by the Minister of Industry again - made the statement that it was rather unfortunate that the previous government of this province had short-changed the people in an area like the Interlake area and that certainly the forward aggressive approach of the Roblin administration was not going to let this take place in the Interlake area again, and that now there would be new industries established - industries such as turkey and poultry processing operations, extensive packaging of honey products and so forth, and in addition there would be additional studies made by the University of Manitoba and the Extension Department of the Department of Agriculture at the University of Manitoba, all of which would enable new industry to be developed in the Interlake area.

Madam Speaker, I think if you examined this particular area you would come to the conclusion that there wasn't a single one industry developed in this area as a result of these studies. Now I'm not just making statements, Madam Speaker. This is factual; it's in Hansard, you

(MR. SMERCHANSKI cont'd).....can check it; you can go out into the area. You've got the present government preparing these resources conferences, discussions, productivity and everything else, but the fact still remains that you have to come to the conclusion that there was no action taken on it and some place, somewhere we lack a spark plug. We lack the ability to get this thing on the road.

I again say to you, Madam Speaker, that after having spent \$1 million on ARDA projects in the Interlake area - and nobody profited from this except those people directly involved in the study of this area - that this is a golden opportunity to bring industry into this area. There's nothing impossible. We can bring industry into this province and we can find the highest rate of employment in this province compared to any other province in the Dominion of Canada; but it seems that we are stuck in the mud -- would that be the proper definition for it? It seems that this economic development wagon is stuck in the mud and that we should.....

MADAM SPEAKER: I'd like to remind the honourable member that he has four minutes left of his time.

MR. SMERCHANSKI: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, I think that we should declare a moratorium on some of these studies and researches that have been conducted. I think we should take a hard look at what we have done for regional industrial development in the Province of Manitoba and I think we have to come to the conclusion that we have been doing the wrong thing, that the economic climate for the attraction of industry is not functioning as it should and therefore it should be changed. I think it needs to be changed, Madam Speaker, more than just the odd phrase from the Throne Speech, more than just by the description of the Minister of Industry and Commerce telling us that we are going to recommend to the Dominion Government that maybe they undertake an economic study of the future of Canada. I say, Madam Speaker, let these people take care of themselves in the other parts of Canada. Our responsibility is the Province of Manitoba. Let us study the problems that we have in the Province of Manitoba and let us develop the industrial growth of the province of Manitoba.

Madam Speaker, I want to close on this - this present approach to industrial development - and if I exceed a half a minute I hope you'll be patient to have me complete my little story. This little girl was going to market and she had a jug of milk on her head. She was balancing it very nicely and her mother told her that for that particular day she could sell the milk in the jug and buy herself whatever she wanted. She thought to herself, first of all I'll go to the market and I'm going to trade this milk for some eggs. I'll take these eggs home and they will hatch into chickens. These chickens will grow up and I'll have other eggs which I'll be able to sell to the market. I'll buy myself a pig and then I'll have more pigs, then I'll be able to go back to the market and I'll buy myself a cow and then I'll have milk and cheese and butter of my own. I'm really going to build up a wonderful farming operation, and with this she was so delighted and so filled with joy, she jumped up in the air, the jug of milk fell off her head onto the ground and the milk spilled all over the place and she said: my dreams were wonderful, my plans were wonderful, but everything has gone down the drain. I think this is the kind of approach that the Roblin administration has been using in reference to industrial development in this province. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

MR. GORDON W. BEARD (Churchill): Madam Speaker, I listened with interest to the Member for Burrows and jotted down a few things while he spent his 40 minutes spelling doom to Manitoba. Certainly if we considered listening to speeches like that very long it would be doom for Manitoba. I don't know whether I will accept the return ticket to Northern Manitoba or not. I wonder if I shouldn't go somewhere else, but the member didn't bother to tell us where to go. No, he just said this wasn't the place - this wasn't the place to live - he hasn't made any money in Manitoba - no sir, not one cent! Manitoba Hydro took it all, and if they didn't take it all, then Manitoba Telephones took the rest.

Madam Speaker, I just wonder whether this doom that the Liberal Party are trying to speak about today is really something that will add progress to our good province. Certainly we cannot walk down our streets today and say there's doom. I see happy people with happy faces. Certainly there must be something that is attracting people to Manitoba and certainly keeping people in Manitoba. Maybe I'm not slap-happy but somebody is in this House - somebody is. He said he wished that they would find a spark for Manitoba. Certainly a speech like that is no spark for Manitoba.

He said industry does not need any extra incentives, Madam Speaker. Industry doesn't need any extra incentives to allocate to a province to start up. I wonder if he would go to Saskatchewan and find out what extra incentives were necessary to attract pulpwood to the

(MR. BEARD cont'd).....Prince Albert area. He knows it as well as I do. Certainly they want extra incentives. Today all provinces are fighting, parrying for industry, and I think it is the time when we have to consider what is necessary to provide incentives to come to Manitoba, not to spell out doom as the past speaker has.

I would point out to him: is he not knowledgeable of what is going on in Manitoba? How about the Fox Lake development? Here is a development that is going to - and is now in fact - enlarging Lynn Lake to double the size. Consider this for a minute, a town that will be doubled in size, what it will require. It will require materials that would be double the investment of what is there now. This must add progress and it certainly will add prosperity for many people, not only in Lynn Lake area but in Winnipeg, because all materials go through Winnipeg. Winnipeg is a giant warehouse for the rest of Manitoba. Certainly all these things passing through cannot pass through without a little profit brushing off, not only in this warehouse in which we are located but also on all the intermediate points on the way to Lynn Lake.

This will add prosperity to all these towns. You can look at Swan River, The Pas, Portage - they are all growing. How about the development at Soab Creek? How about the development at Birch Tree? Doesn't he know anything about these? Hasn't he been reading his mining magazines? Certainly a development at Soab Creek must present something for the imagination of the member. Here is an area where they sunk a shaft, and what did they find? They're into more ore than they could possibly mine in that area. They had to move this shaft. The area was too rich. Certainly this is a wonderful kind of a mistake to make, but I don't think this spells doom. Certainly I don't think it does.

The new encouragement that our Department of Mines and Natural Resources have given to the fishing industry in northern Manitoba - this certainly does not spell doom to the fishermen and industry. They have opened up new lakes, as the member knows they have, that certainly have not been economical to open in the past. This is not doom. These are lakes and resources that have in the past laid idle. They're open. The fish industry is growing and expanding. Certainly there are problems but it is not the problem of lack of fish, and these lakes are being fished.

He speaks of rates in Manitoba. Coming from the north, I'm very happy to advise him that the Manitoba Telephone System has seen fit to lower our telephone rates so that they are comparative to the rest of Manitoba. This isn't accepted as doom in the north. No sir!

He talks about doom - about doing nothing about it. How about the extra education incentives that were announced today? This is planned progress - good progress. He talks about the human resource. How about Cranberry School? I'm very sorry that he didn't take hold of the opportunity to come to Cranberry School with us and just see what happened there. He didn't see the literally hundreds of children there that are going to receive secondary education which was never within their scope before. Certainly Manitoba is not doomed when this type of facilities are being opened and offered to people for the first time. Maybe it should have been done 50 years ago, but I don't think our first Premier was here to offer this at that time. But it is being done now, not 10 years from now.

I'm no authority on the Interlake area. I'll leave that to him. If he wants to live in doom there that's up to him, but I think he should go down to Ottawa and tell them about it. This is already classed, as I understand, as a doomed area. What are they doing about it? Certainly the incentive is there now. Why doesn't he go up and build a big plant? He gets a fair share of it back if he locates in that area.

How about our Roads to Resources program? Where is it? The money's all gone. Where are we going to look for more money? We haven't got a money tree around here; we've got to find it; and if the Federal Government aren't willing to "kick in" and help, then we've got to do it on our own. Up till now we've had a Roads to Resources program which has allowed us to build roads in the undeveloped areas of Manitoba and the Federal Government have allowed us 50 percent encouragement to build these roads.

Everybody likes to think that resources are the property of all Canadians, and so they should be. But how are we going to get in to look after this if all the Canadians don't help? Roads to Resources program unfortunately apparently was a Diefenbaker program and we're going to lose it. I would hope that our Federal Government will come up with something comparable so that we can get rolling. All you have to look at is your maps to compare what this did for Manitoba itself, what it is doing for Saskatchewan. Granted Saskatchewan took a little longer to build them, but they're getting at it; they're spending money like mad to make use of this resources money before the program is completed.

(MR. BEARD cont'd).....

And where are we now? We're stuck with the road to Lynn Lake 100 percent; we're stuck with the road from Gypsumville to Wabowden 100 percent. Madam Speaker, I think if the member would take his speech of doom down to the Prime Minister and express the position that Manitoba is in now, perhaps these roads will be made available -- this money will be made available so that we can have roads to these areas, so that these people will not be isolated and so that we can find more mines that will encourage everybody.

How about the J. R. Simplot plant at Brandon? Is this doom for Brandon? I don't think so. How about the potato plant at Carberry? Is this doom for the farmers - farmers that reap profits of many thousands of dollars? This isn't doom for them. I happened to live very close, or was born and raised very close to Carberry. There was a lot of that area that was doomed before the potato plant was there. I don't know whether it was me moving out of that area or the potato plant moving in, but certainly it is good now. I'd like him to go down and talk to some of those people.

How about the Inland Cement in Tuxedo? This isn't doom for that area. Manitoba Rolling Mills at Selkirk, whose operation opened this summer - certainly not doom for that area. Versatile Farm Implements in Fort Garry - I understand they're expanding - not doom to the Mayor of Fort Garry. On top of this I understand there are four other large companies manufacturing implements in Manitoba. This isn't doom to the farmer in Manitoba. I think, Madam Speaker, that every member in this Assembly should be going out to sell Manitoba. You're not going to do it by running it down.

I know that the member, a couple of years ago, spoke on the Nelson River Development. I sat and listened to him with much interest and I wondered about it. He preferred thermal power at that time. He spoke of large developments down in the New York area, I believe, where thermal power was the only thing, and now he says let's get ahead with Nelson River development.

MR. SMERCHANSKI: Madam Speaker, it wasn't thermal power at all; I was speaking about nuclear power. These are two different things and my honourable member I don't think knows the difference.

MR. BEARD: O.K. Let's have nuclear power -- nuclear thermal power if that is what it is -- I don't know. I don't think the honourable member knows more than I do about it. But anyway, he certainly knows nothing about the Nelson River development. I would suggest that he read over the blue book that we got the other day. I spent the weekend reading it. I was very encouraged, because, Madam Speaker, on a nuclear plant I don't see where it would allow for the development of many of the other things that the Nelson River allows. I can see where the Nelson River development will in effect provide ways and means to develop human resources where the human resources are available.

The Nelson River development apparently fits in to a program that the Federal Government are considering to provide a grid system for all of Canada. This is wonderful. We should go on and speak about the Nelson River development. I think a little imagination will show that the export of power is not going to discourage industry from coming to the province - not one bit, Madam Speaker. If you're going to start to look under every little stone for a problem, then you can find them, but I'm quite happy to go on record for the Manitoba Government and Manitoba Hydro to sell electricity, sell all we can find, develop all we can get. If we can sell enough of it, I'm sure we'll make a profit and a big profit.

This is a resource that we're developing. This resource is no different, Madam Speaker, than going down in the ground and finding nickel, copper, gold. What's the difference? What's the difference than the farmer going out and planting wheat and selling it? We're providing electricity and selling it for a profit. Is this wrong? I'm sure, Madam Speaker, if the member would think about it for a little while and consider the possibilities rather than preaching doom to embarrass the government and to embarrass Manitoba, and to discourage people from coming to Manitoba -- my goodness I thought we were here to sell Manitoba, to make Manitoba a better place to live in. We're not going to do it by degrading the province the way he has.

The Nelson River development allows not only development of a natural resource and a renewable resource, it goes on forever. It's gone on for a long time now and I don't see it drying up. This is progress. It allows us to add on, Madam Speaker, almost unlimited amounts of power, not only on the Nelson River development but on the Burntwood development in the South Indian area, development in the Split Lake area; development on the Winnipeg area. If we want to live in doom, Madam Speaker, it is to look under the rocks. Like the Minister of

(MR. BEARD cont'd). . . . . Agriculture said the other day, "Be an ostrich; run away and hide."

I think if you're going to go out and do something for Manitoba you've got to be constructive in your criticism rather than destructive. I don't think they're going to win any votes by being destructive. People are forward-looking in Manitoba and they are looking for forward-looking programming. This is what is going to win votes, not the destructive criticism of our government, but programs that you can offer, if they're sensible, programs that will allow us to go ahead, to progress along with the rest of the prairie provinces and along with the rest of Canada.

And so, Madam Speaker, I think we should take another look and see what has been done, what can be done in the future, and do it with an air of optimism rather than pessimism as we have heard today.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Carillon, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Ethelbert Plains. The Honourable the Member for Lac du Bonnet.

MR. OSCAR F. BJORNSON (Lac du Bonnet): May I have the indulgence of the House to have this matter stand, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for La Verendrye. The Honourable the Member for Souris-Lansdowne.

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce)(Fort Rouge): In the absence of the honourable member, could this be allowed to stand, Madam Speaker. I am sure that the honourable member would have no objection to anyone else speaking.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. JOHN P. TANCHAK (Emerson): Madam Speaker, it seems that in many speeches that I hear, I can compare it to this, that the fashion for ladies is very short skirts. It seems to be in vogue to blame Ottawa for all the ills that are befalling Manitoba, but I am not going to do that.

We have a resolution before us, and probably if the Honourable Member from Souris-Lansdowne would have spoken, he probably would have amended it. But I wonder what would have been the result or how productive this amendment would have been. We can think back a year and now we know how productive the other amendment was. But this resolution, if accepted, would reduce the cost of production to the farmer - the cost of his product. It would mean a great saving to him in pursuit of his occupation as a farmer.

But there is one more thing that's never been mentioned here, and this is the fact that the farmer by paying this gasoline tax on the gas that he consumes is actually being taxed twice. It is double taxation. For those people who understand farming operation, they will understand what I mean. When the farmer garnishes his grain, he has to use his truck and he has to burn up gasoline. This gasoline bears a tax, 17 cents on a gallon - I think I am right. He stores his grain in the bin on the field. He has already paid the 17 cents tax. Then when he wishes to sell his product - his grain or whatever it may be - he has to use the truck a second time and again burn up gasoline on which he is paying 17 cents on the gallon. That is double taxation and I don't go along with that. I should think that the farmer is entitled to use purple gas - in the pursuit of his business on the farm - in his truck.

We have some really unrealistic arguments against permitting the use of purple gas in farm trucks. Some of them are very unrealistic. It seems to me it's just a red herring, trying to silence the people - and the farmer is included in this - from arguing in favour of purple gas in trucks. One of the arguments that we hear is that we have no sales tax - and that comes from the First Minister - we have no sales tax. How ridiculous! I say that we have sales tax. This tax on gasoline, that's a form of the sales tax. What about the tax on heat, the tax on electricity and many other products? It is a partial sales tax - not a general tax I admit - but it is a sales tax.

Reference was made that the farmers of Saskatchewan and Alberta, although they are permitted to use tax-free gasoline in their trucks, have to pay a general sales tax. Which would they rather have? Well if they were to pay a sales tax on gasoline, say gasoline at 40 cents a gallon, five percent sales tax would amount to roughly about two cents a gallon, while the farmers in Manitoba are paying 17 cents a gallon. That's worse than a sales tax.

(MR. TANCHAK cont'd).....

Now, the Premier - and I'm not too sure I should say this - the Minister of Agriculture thought that the farmers would prefer the tax rebate to the use of purple gas in the truck. Why relate - I am not sure, I think the Minister.....

HON. GEORGE HUTTON (Minister of Agriculture)(Rockwood-Iberville): Madam Speaker, on a point of privilege, I think the member should not attribute sayings to other people in the House on which he is not sure.

MR. TANCHAK: I am sorry if I offended him - the Minister seems to take offence very easily - but the First Minister said that anyway. "Ask the farmer," he says, "and find out which he'd rather have, the tax rebate or purple gas." Why relate the tax rebate to agriculture? The benches here say that this is a school tax, to alleviate the school tax. They relate it to education - it's in education - it's included in the Estimates of Education so why mix it up and apply that to the farmer? I think it's a very unreasonable argument.

But the substitute, what a dilly that was last year. And I quote, and I think I can quote the Minister right this time - the Minister of Agriculture. First of all, I will read the amendment of last year by the Honourable Member from Springfield. It said: "Be it resolved that the government consider the advisability of extending such further recognition to bona fide farmers operating farm truck licence under The Highway Traffic Act by way of a reduction of farm truck licence fees." That was the amendment, and here is in part what the Honourable Minister of Agriculture had to say. He endorsed this, he thought it was fine. It's a very, very good thing because he said this: "That the Honourable Member from Springfield has advanced a very good proposition."

I am sure that the Honourable Member from Springfield must have been sincere. He believed that this was in the best interests of the farmers. I wasn't there but I'm sure that he must have caucused with the Minister of Agriculture or the Treasury Department or whatever he did, because he introduced this amendment. He must have done that and he must have been sincere. But was the government sincere in that? What happened to that amendment? I would say nothing has happened so far. The farmer still, as far as I know, quite a few have purchased their farm truck licences and there is no reduction. I say that the government was not sincere last year. After unanimously voting in favour of that amendment, they couldn't have been sincere. Sometimes one wonders where you find the word "sincerity". Maybe as far as the government is concerned, in the dictionary. I believe that the government used the Honourable Member from Springfield as far as this amendment was concerned because they fooled the Honourable Member from Springfield. The government fooled the farmers of Manitoba. The government fooled the members of this Legislature because nothing has been done.

MR. PETERS: No, they didn't fool us. We knew what was going to happen.

MR. TANCHAK: We couldn't say beforehand they wouldn't do anything but now we can say it. You have done nothing about it. You have fooled the farmers of Manitoba. You have fooled the members in this House, and I would like to say that this goes as far as contempt of Legislature if the government accepts to do something, votes for it and does not carry out the resolution. It is contempt of Legislature.

I would like to ask: why ignore the plea of the farmer of Manitoba? Other Western provinces, Saskatchewan and Alberta, do not ignore the farmer. They recognize his needs. Why not Manitoba? I just wonder what the government is going to do with this resolution. Probably amend it again and probably the amendment will get the same treatment as last year's amendment did. I hope not. I hope - - (Interjection) - - Yes, actually it was 50 cents raised this year, which is a different matter altogether. But it may be raised, who knows. If the government persists in such action, I do not see how the people of Manitoba could trust this government, how they could have faith in this government. The time will come when they'll tell the members opposite, you will not fool us again.

MADAM SPEAKER: Any other member wishing to speak? Agreed to stand in the name of the Honourable the Member for Souris-Lansdowne.

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

MR. PETERS: May I have the matter stand, Madam Speaker?

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution by the Honourable the Member for Carillon. The Honourable the Member for Gladstone.

MR. NELSON SHOEMAKER (Gladstone): Madam Speaker, if there is one resolution on the Order Paper that should receive the support of every member of the House, it's this one, because it doesn't cost any money and should actually result in a real saving to the Province of Manitoba and the taxpayers thereof. If I am not correct in my assumption, then I wish someone would get up and tell me where I am wrong in this regard. I have always maintained that in my capacity as a member of the House and as an ombudsman for Gladstone constituency, that one of the most frequent things that I have been asked to do in the last eight years is in respect to the welfare of the electors in one way or another. In 1965 I am satisfied that the greatest single, the greatest number of telephone calls and personal calls that I received was in respect to the rebate, the school tax rebate. You would think by the tone of the people that phoned me that it was my money and that I refused to pay it after having promised faithfully to give them this cheque for \$50.00 or \$100.00 or \$200.00, having promised to do that that I had refused to pay it. They said generally, "I sent my application in last June and I'm still waiting for my money." "I sent my application in for the rebate in August and I'm still waiting for my money." Madam Speaker, they're still phoning me - they're still phoning me; and this has prompted me, as you will know by Votes and Proceedings, to ask several questions in respect to the school tax rebate. There are five or six questions in the Votes and Proceedings in respect to this.

Now when we met last week, and I suppose the government did, with the Farmers Union - and incidentally, Madam Speaker, if you were present, you will note there was a much larger than usual delegation from the Farmers Union this year; in fact I think the number was at least triple what it usually is - and on Page 11 of the report that they not only read to us but left with us in the hope that the government would pay some attention to their recommendations, I want to read you one paragraph in respect to education tax rebates. It says, "The present policy requiring that the taxpayer pay his taxes in full and then apply for a rebate in lieu of education tax, does not appear to be too acceptable to the taxpayer inasmuch as it has raised a storm of criticism across Manitoba." Now I think that that is an understatement when they say that it has raised a storm of criticism. That's exactly what it does. And I notice my honourable friend the Minister of Agriculture sitting over there with the party Whip looking amazed as usual, and I'm not going to talk about the principle, Madam Speaker, I'm not going to talk about the principle of the rebate, whether it's right or wrong today, because I'm dealing with the resolution that is before us. I could spend an hour talking about the principle of it but I expect I'd get the same kind of an intelligent answer this year that I did last year from the Minister of Municipal Affairs when I said -- I just happened to mention that I had a friend who had 41 parcels of farm land and could conceivably get back \$2,150.00, and do you know the answer I got back? The answer? He said I was lucky to have a friend like that. Now what kind of an answer is that? He is a dashed good friend of mine too.

But to get on with the resolution before us. I notice that this past summer this government has attempted to pay some heed to the requests of the municipal mayors, and I enjoyed some of the sojourns through the province when the Honourable Member from Portage la Prairie and myself attended with that municipal committee and we went to Brandon and Swan River and so on, and it seemed to me that the government was quite willing to let the municipal - men propose all the future legislation. They were quite willing to go along with anything that the municipal men said. Now, Madam Speaker, if they are, they certainly should go along with this resolution, because the municipal men are the men that are making this request as set out in the resolution that is before us. This is exactly what the municipal men have asked for for a year, and to prove that, if my honourable friend the Minister of Municipal Affairs was in his seat I know that he has several letters from municipal men and corporations asking for exactly what we are asking for here. I know that he has.

The Municipal Affairs Minister sent out to all Secretary-Treasurers of every municipal corporation and town in the province, a circular letter on December 21, 1964, upon the introduction of the school tax rebate plan, setting out in some detail the procedure that the municipal men were to follow in respect to these rebates. Included in that letter was six pages of straight questions and answers, so that it would be a guide to the Secretary-Treasurer in particular, and helpful in filling out the forms. Question 22 - and incidentally, Madam Speaker, there were 25 questions and 25 answers - Question 22 said this: "Would it not be possible to have the Secretary-Treasurer of a municipality deduct the allowable rebate on school levies when taxes are paid before December 31st of the year of demand, so that the taxpayer would not have to pay this

(MR. SHOEMAKER, cont'd) . . . money out?"

That's a very reasonable and sensible question. You know what the answer is? I'm going to read it: "While it might have been possible to have handled the school tax rebate through a deduction at the source of imposition of the tax, the policy of the government in respect of the school tax rebate is set forth in the legislation relative thereto and prescribes the manner in which the school tax rebate is to be paid." So what? Doesn't that apply to every bill we've got here? And isn't it a fact that at every session that we attend there is amendments made to existing legislation? Now I propose and suggest, we suggest in this resolution that's before us, that it is such a simple thing that it should be done.

The municipal men requested that the rebate be handled at the source prior to the implementation of the rebate, because I have before me Winnipeg Free Press, December 18, 1964, and there was "a last ditch attempt" made by the municipal men to persuade the government to have the rebate made at the time the taxes were paid. But apparently the government of the day thought that they were going to gain a great deal more popularity by having each and every one of us receive a cheque directly from Duff, because that is the way it is suggested even when we do get our rebate. Incidentally, Madam Speaker, I was glad to learn yesterday that the Attorney-General has no intention of putting us fellows in jail who made application for our rebate last year, because I must confess I think I was the first one in this Assembly to make application for my tax rebate and I haven't been sleeping very well.

A MEMBER: On your 41 parcels - or 42?

MR. SHOEMAKER: On two parcels - on two parcels of land, and I got \$100.00 (Interjection) How long did it take, Madam Speaker? You know why it didn't take so long in my case? Because I was the first one that made application. I likely got about cheque No. 2. All right, Madam Speaker, my honourable friend over there is laughing away. I guess he paid his 1965 taxes in '62, and if he did, why he beat me to it.

But what I am saying is that it is not only practical, it is sensible; it would meet with the wishes of the municipal men; it would meet with the wishes of the Farmers Union; it would meet with the wishes of the Farm Bureau; it would meet with the wishes of 99.9 percent of the farmers; and why not? Why not make it possible for me and everyone else to walk into the municipal office and say (we'll have our tax notice with us): "My taxes are \$200.00 and I give a cheque for \$150.00." The Secretary-Treasurer will say, "We have \$50.00 to your credit," so I give them a cheque for \$150.00 and we call it a day and we're all happy. Now what is wrong or so complicated with that kind of a set-up? I can't understand it at all, why this government would prefer to do it the other way. Madam Speaker, it's too simple. I guess that's the trouble. I am told, in fact I think the propaganda sheet tells us that these forms that are supplied to the municipality on which you make rebate — it's quite a colorful form; I don't know what it cost the government but the government charges the municipalities 3-1/2 cents apiece for them - 3-1/2 cents apiece. I know that's small potatoes to my friends opposite who like to talk in terms of millions of dollars - 300 millions of them this year - but when you add all of these little things up, the stamps, the cost of the cheques, and incidentally Madam Speaker - I suppose I'll get mowed down for this one as I usually do, but it doesn't bother me much; I'm always able to make a comeback - but I had a fellow in to see me shortly before Christmas on this same subject matter and he said, "When in the blinkety-blank so and so can I expect to get my \$50.00 rebate?" He said, "We have to have it for Christmas." And he's one of the few people, and there are quite a few people in this province, that are finding the pinch. I know my honourable friends opposite would like to think that everything is rosy with everybody, but I said to him, "My guess is you will never get it by Christmas 1965. You may get it by Christmas 1966. I'm not going to argue that point." Well, he said, "I'm going into Winnipeg on Monday and I'm going to stay there until I get my cheque." "Well," I said, "You'd better take a tent with you then because I'll bet my bottom dollar you'll never get your \$50.00 cheque." He came in to see me the next day without the cheque and I said, "How did you make out?" He said, "Not very good. But," he said, "I found out one thing. I went over to the department in which they issue these cheques and I found 15 girls working in that office." He said, "I counted them."

Now if this is a fact it just points up what I have said all along, that it's a very, very expensive way of paying me my \$50.00, and I suggest, Madam Speaker, that if my honourable friends opposite profess to be Conservative in any stretch of the imagination, that they will go along with the resolution that is before us. I know that their actions in the last eight years that I have sat opposite - and I've sat opposite the exact number of days that they have sat opposite me - their actions in the last eight years have pointed out to me, and pretty clearly to the people



(MR. SHOEMAKER, cont'd) . . . of this province, that they are not Conservative at all, when it comes to conserving and saving the taxpayers' dollars, and I will be most interested to see and listen to the many objections that my honourable friends will likely put forward to the proposition that is before us.

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN Q. C. (Attorney-General) (Dauphin): Madam Speaker, the gracious reference by the last speaker to the fact that the Attorney-General was not going to prosecute him for receiving his school tax rebate the first in the Province of Manitoba, prompts me to participate briefly in this interesting debate.

I find it, of course, completely impossible to accept the argument or the idea that the members of the Official Opposition are at all concerned about the procedure that is followed or the cost, which is after all, very small, or the delays alleged, fictitious and otherwise, that they tell us about. They omit, to tell us about -- and indeed, as the Honourable Member for Gladstone rather nicely said, he got his within a few days, and of course he doesn't tell us about the many other thousands of people in Manitoba who received theirs within a few days. But as I say, they are really not concerned about that, nor is anyone else who stops to think about it.

I suppose one might be permitted to make a very political comment that, in any event, in 1965 the school tax rebates reached the taxpayers of Manitoba a good deal sooner than they used to when our friends were on the government side; but Madam Speaker, the members of the Official Opposition have very short memories, very short memories indeed. I think, if I remember correctly, that it was the first time that I was here, the first session that I was here, and if it wasn't the first it was certainly the second, when the substance of the motion calling for the defeat of the government was that? "It was because," they said, "you on the government side have done nothing to relieve the local taxpayer of his tax burden," and year after year, speaker after speaker, the same charge hurled across the aisle: "You are doing nothing for the local taxpayer - Nothing for the local taxpayer, and you should not be in office. This is wrong."

Well Madam Speaker, we did something for the local taxpayer. We did exactly what they had been advising us to do, and we undertook to pay the school tax rebate, the school tax rebate which - and all of the honourable members opposite will know this of their own knowledge - which covers one half the school tax cost, the actual school tax cost, to over 75% of the taxpayers of the province of Manitoba. Now that's what they thought ought to be done; that's what was done; and I say to them now that they are in rather unusual ground to be objecting, when the very thing that they were advising us to do has been carried out.

But Madam Speaker, there is one other point, and this is really what I rose to say, because as a result of the good use to which the Honourable the Member for Gladstone - Neepawa has always put the local press and his reports to us of things that he sees in the press, I started to read the newspapers since I've been a member and since I've been hearing him here, and I just happen to have in my hand today, Madam Speaker, an item from the last issue of what great public journal known as the Dauphin Herald and Press for Wednesday February 16, 1966, and I will not read the entire article - it's rather lengthy - but it's entitled "1965 Financial Report for town reflects healthy position," but I do want to direct the members' attention to a very important part of this report. This, by the way, is a report from the Secretary-Treasurer to the Council with respect to the 1965 financial affairs of the Town of Dauphin, and he points this out - and I now quote: "In 1964, with \$642,346 in taxes to be collected, the total current net revenue was 98.1 percent; in 1965 with \$758,393 this percentage was 105.1 percent," and I continue and note this: "The taxes on the roll outstanding as of December 31, 1965, are \$34,176 down from the previous year, the main reason of course being the school tax rebate. This legislation has encouraged the payment of taxes, as well as lightened the load of the ratepayers."

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Will the honourable gentleman permit a question?

MR. McLEAN: Yes, by all means.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: The honourable gentleman was the mayor of the town of Dauphin for some years. Does he recall having collected more than 100% of the taxes in any of those years without this incentive?

MR. McLEAN: I'd be glad to answer that question, Madam Speaker. No, we never collected -- we used to run about 95 - 96% per year, but the --

MR. SHOEMAKER: Another question. Will he kindly read the resolution, will he kindly read it -- at some time in his speech will he kindly read the resolution and stick to it? . . . read

(MR. SHOEMAKER, cont'd) . . . it some time during your speech. Any time; I don't care when.

MR. McLEAN: Madam Speaker, I really don't think I ought to do that because that would obviously spoil the debate and put me in an unfair advantage with the members of the Liberal Party who haven't read it either.

Madam Speaker, the point is quite obvious and of course can be repeated many hundreds of times throughout the province of Manitoba, that the incentive of the direct payment of the school tax rebate to the taxpayer has encouraged the early, prompt, full payment of local taxes, and every municipal corporation in this province can testify to that fact; and all I'm saying, Madam Speaker, is that the great concern of the members of the Liberal Party is really quite unnecessary. The system is working more than satisfactorily and ought to continue in that way.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I might say, as many speakers in this House, I had not intended to enter this debate, but the appeal of the Attorney-General, my neighbour up in the north central part of the province, prompts me to get to my feet. It is unfortunate that the Attorney-General had not read the resolution, most unfortunate he didn't read it, because he obviously doesn't know what the resolution is driving at. The resolution says that the tax rebate should be handled through the municipality. That's exactly what the resolution recommends, that instead of a cheque going back with the signature of his colleague, the First Minister, and a little slip of paper in with the cheque to each taxpayer in Manitoba who is entitled to the rebate, what we are saying here is very simple: Give the municipality the right to give the rebate back to the taxpayer at the time the taxpayer pays his taxes. Most elementary, Madam Speaker; most elementary. It may not have quite as much political appeal to my honourable friends. It may be a little short, a little short on that, because after all, you know, they couldn't say, "well here's a cheque from Duff." It would be a cheque going back, as it's intended to be, to be a rebate on the taxes paid by the taxpayer, to be a rebate of this municipal tax given to him at the time that he pays his municipal tax and including his school tax. Very straightforward but certainly not as politically appealing, this I must confess.

But let's look at the situation, Why is the present technique used? Is it cheaper? Is it by any means more economical to the Provincial Government and to the taxpayers of Manitoba to have the present method used where the taxpayer goes into the municipality, pays his taxes, gets an extra copy of the receipt, mails it to my honourable friends here in the Legislative Building at Winnipeg, waits two months, six weeks, ten weeks - I've heard of some being as long as twelve weeks - for the rebate to come back. My honourable friends process it here. A fair amount of difficulties in it because if there have been any transfers of title and all the rest of it, they are not as aware of it as they are at the municipal level. Eventually the cheque goes back to the taxpayer. Is that a cheaper method? Is that more economical than to simply have the municipal clerk at the time the taxpayer comes in to pay, say, "Well you are entitled to \$40, or entitled to \$50 or whatever it is that you are entitled to. Pay us your amount of taxes minus that amount, and we will make the application en bloc to the Provincial Government." Surely it would be much more economical to do it through the municipalities. The mechanism is there; the municipal clerk collects the taxes in any case; he could make the deduction at that time.

Secondly, is it more convenient to the taxpayer? Is the present method more convenient where the taxpayer has to go through all this performance of sending his receipt into the Provincial Government, waiting for some weeks before he gets it back? Surely not. The taxpayer himself would be much more satisfied if he could get it at once. It would be much simpler for him to simply go in and pay -- if he was owing \$200 and he was entitled to a \$50 rebate, he'd go in and pay \$150, and as far as he's concerned that's the end of it. Much more convenient from the taxpayer's standpoint. In fact, much cheaper from the taxpayer's standpoint; not involved in letter writing, not involved in sending these things in, and he gets his money right away. He gets the total amount of the rebate that he's entitled to at the very moment that he pays his taxes. Under the present system, in a number of cases, where the taxpayer borrows money from the bank to pay his taxes, he has to pay interest for that period of time, waiting for his cheque to come back from the Provincial Government.

So in whatever way you look at it, Madam Speaker; from the convenience standpoint to the taxpayer; from the convenience standpoint to the Provincial Government, I am sure: convenience standpoint to the municipality; from economy; from speed; there is every reason to accept the resolution that we are proposing. Every reason. There can only be one reason for not accepting it, one reason only for refusing it, and that's straight political reasons. Straight political

(MR. MOLGAT, cont'd) . . . reasons that my honourable friends want to send the cheque back to the taxpayer - his own money, might I add, to begin with. They want to send him a cheque with a little note saying "Here's a cheque from Duff." There's no other earthly reason for doing it.

Now, has anyone asked my honourable friends to do it the way they're doing it now? Not a soul. The Michener Commission to begin with did not recommend a school tax rebate of this type, so they went against their own Commission when they set it up. But since that time the public bodies in the province have been asking the government to make the change. The municipalities of this province has asked the government to make the change. The Urban Association, the Union of Manitoba Municipalities, have all passed resolutions asking the government to change the system and let it be handled through the municipalities. And now the Attorney-General gets up and persists in presenting this resolution as something that it isn't at all. He didn't get down to the point of the resolution at one single stage in his speech. The resolution is very simple, very simple: Just let's get down to a practical method of handling this; forget the politics of it. Now that may be too much to expect from my honourable friend. Maybe we're asking him for a sacrifice that he's not prepared to make, but that is certainly what this resolution requests - a more economical system, a more efficient system, a cheaper system, one that the taxpayers have asked for, one that the municipalities have asked for. The only people who don't want it are the government members sitting across.

MR. ARTHUR E. WRIGHT (Seven Oaks): Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Elmwood, that the debate be adjourned.

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

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

MR. WRIGHT: Madam Speaker, I beg leave of the House to have this resolution stand.

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

MR. ALBERT VIELFAURE (La Verendrye): Madam Speaker, may I have leave to have this matter stand please.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Logan. The Honourable the Member for Springfield.

MR. FRED T. KLYM (Springfield): I beg the indulgence of this House to have the resolution stand, Madam Speaker.

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

MR. WRIGHT: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Elmwood, WHEREAS it has been recorded many times that the oddity of human nature makes it difficult for our citizens to realize that tragedy can come to them or their loved ones; and WHEREAS even the morbid predictions on the number of highway deaths by the National Safety Council on the eve of every holiday weekend has failed to arouse public opinion on the care of accident victims; and WHEREAS highway accidents annually account for double the number of casualties as were suffered during the six years of World War Two; and WHEREAS it is the responsibility of good government to act on matters of emergency without public pressure; THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT, in the opinion of this House, the Government of Manitoba should give consideration to the advisability of establishing a Government-operated ambulance service.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. WRIGHT: Madam Speaker, I first raised the question of ambulance service in 1959, and I was able to find a clipping of June 28, 1959, and I would like to read it to the House because at that time, Madam Speaker - and I quote the Tribune of June 28, '59 - "Two undertakers, one Liberal and other Conservative, joined forces in the Legislature Friday to combat a CCF resolution urging the creation of a government-owned land ambulance service." They pointed out at the time the humane work that was being done in the province by the various volunteer groups and the undertakers of the province. No one said they couldn't afford this - they said that we didn't need it. They said that every time there was trouble that people rallied to the cause, and this is true, Madam Speaker. This is true of human beings; wherever we find people in trouble we always find other people that are only too willing to help.

But in 1963 the Honourable Member for St. Boniface was beginning to see the light, because he said in 1963 that he could see the sense to having a Metro Ambulance Service. He

(MR. WRIGHT, cont'd) . . . said, and I believe I still have the - the Honourable Member said the government should have an airplane ambulance service to serve on mercy flights and he felt "that private firms can handle the rest of the business at the present time because I hear they do some good work." But Madam Speaker, what do the people who know best think about it? Our doctors - I have a clipping of the Free Press where the Manitoba Medical Association presented a brief to the Winnipeg Police Commission, and I quote: "The Medical Association's brief said, 'The conveyance of patients or casualties is an aspect of public health and as such the responsibility for and the cost of the services should be borne by a single provincial ambulance agency. A government agency was universally recommended and all reports studied.' It goes on to say, 'It was proposed that all ambulances, rural and urban, should be controlled by a central provincial agency so that individual competitive companies could become united for their own betterment through general efficiency and economy of service.'"

And the brief broke down its recommendations into three categories - those for an ideal ambulance service, those for service covering Greater Winnipeg specifically, and those for rural Manitoba service. The brief said provincial and metropolitan ambulance services now were inadequate, inefficient, uneconomical, and subject to a constant cycle of change as each private service becomes bankrupt in turn and goes out of business. This is what the people who know best say about our ambulance service. The Police Commission had obtained the brief in the wake of charges and counter-charges made recently in connection with the operations of some private ambulance firms. It went on to say that present individual ambulance services "should be amalgamated under a central agency, private or governmental," the brief said. "A transitional structure such as a united private ambulance service may be necessary but it is undesirable, and by creating a more efficient service with central operational control, possibly by the police, the total number of units necessary would be reduced."

The brief also said that the institution of any free ambulance service would lead inevitably to a great increase in their use so it will become necessary to divide their duties into general and accident categories, each unit being equipped accordingly. With the per capita levy no charge would be made for emergency use of an ambulance and some general duties, such as the transport of the maimed and blind to treatment centres, could be taken over by a volunteer car pool which could be organized by hospital guilds. The organization of a unified service based on civil defence requirements might justify application to Ottawa for a grant to cover much of the cost, the brief said. And the cost of organizing and running a Greater Winnipeg Ambulance Service with 10 units, based on the costs of some existing companies, was estimated at a total of \$245,000. This would mean a levy of about 50 to 75 cents for each person in the Greater Winnipeg area. However, this would not cover depreciation, replacements, uniforms, training, and the installation of radio control. The operating cost of the units would be about \$20,000 while wages for the staff paid by the Central Authority would run up to \$200,000, the brief said.

In regard to rural service, the brief said a central agency should eventually own and operate all provincial ambulances, but that during the transitional period it would be preferable for local authorities to accept responsibility and take over all existing private and hospital ambulances. It went on to say that there were two publicly-owned ambulances operating in Greater Winnipeg. One was operated by the Winnipeg Police and the other by the Federal Department of Veterans Affairs. There were 14 privately-owned ambulances at the time the brief was drawn up. And with a central agency, the brief said the dispersal of ambulances to strategic areas could be arranged and under - competition with the resultant loss of efficiency would be reduced. All would-be competitors could be excluded by instituting control by licence, thus no new company would be allowed to operate unless the central agency considered another unit necessary. "And at present," the brief says, "ambulance operators have to insist on pre-payment of charges, which is a most unsatisfactory arrangement leading to delay and inefficiency and bad public relations between the ambulance service, the medical profession and the population in general. A small prepaid per capita charge is one way to cover the cost of an ambulance service," says the brief. "Other ways of financing such a plan could also be considered."

It went on to say that since fire stations were more strategically situated than the police stations, arrangements should be made to base ambulances at the fire stations. Although the ambulances and their personnel would be responsible to a central agency, operational control should be exercised by central police radio control.

This is what the people who know best say about our ambulance service, Madam Speaker.

(MR. WRIGHT, cont'd) . . . I think it's time now to take a new look at the situation as we have it in Manitoba, and I had a booklet here which I consider to be one of the best studies made on the question of emergency medical care. It was issued in May '65 from the Health and Welfare Association of Alleghany County in Pittsburgh, and I'd like to quote briefly from it, Madam Speaker.

"According to Dr. Robert H. Kennedy, Chairman of the Committee on Trauma of the American College of Surgeons, he said that one way to cut down the unnecessary slaughter on the nation's highways might be to improve the nation's ambulance services. Dr. Kennedy said the committee had just completed the first year of a similar study of the ambulance situation in the United States. 'In the past year,' he said, 'we have learned that the demand, the opportunity for good and the complexity of the ambulance situation far exceed the emergency department's problems.' "

It went on in the study to show the type of vehicle - it's very intensive study, but I'll just quote again briefly from a table here. It talks about the types of ambulance services, the equipment that is lacking. It went on to show the equipment which it lacked; a resuscitator -- 2% of the volunteer fire departments, 6.7% of the police departments, and 54.8% of the funeral directors that we heard so much about in 1959, lacked resuscitators. Splints - a simple thing like splints, Madam Speaker: 13.7 in fire departments, 26.7 in police departments, 45.2% funeral directors. Lacking even a first aid kit: fire departments were completely equipped but police departments - 13.3% of the police departments lacked a first aid kit, and 31% of the funeral directors had not even a first aid kit. When one looks at this you can understand why these studies are going on across North America today.

I used as an argument the first time I presented it, Madam Speaker, and I quoted from an article from the "Saturday Night" of June '59. The author of the article I thought at the time was probably one of the best authorities I could quote, because it was none other than Major General Worthington. His article was entitled "An Ambulance System to Cut Traffic Deaths." He went on to say that if the army looked after its casualties the way we provide for our civilians, there would be a hue and cry raised in Canada that could defeat a government.

He went on to take a look at the civilian record. He said in the cities there are commercial ambulance companies which are kept busy meeting their normal demands, and for the most part they are not anxious to go out on accident calls for too often they don't get paid, but they cannot afford to give free service and their contribution wouldn't solve the problem anyway for many highway accidents occur on provincial and county highways beyond a reasonable range of city firms.

He said that definite information on the ambulance situation across the country is obscure, but there is every indication that it is deplorably wanting. He went on farther to say that the St. John's Ambulance were a group that were well-qualified to assist in providing the voluntary help so badly needed. He said that they already have about 70 first aid posts across the province - and he's talking about Ontario - but have very few vehicles and don't usually operate 24 hours a day. He suggested if sufficient money were provided for equipment and communication, and legislation passed for authorization, they could do a job.

Madam Speaker, accidents today are - highways accidents in particular - are most severe. Head injuries today are more numerous than they were in the day of the horse and buggy. You could fall off a horse and buggy and break your collarbone, but today when you're involved in an accident at high speeds there is very often hemorrhage, and hemorrhage must have immediate attention. Head injuries, too, play a very important thing. We're beginning to read more and more in the papers of the demand on our car manufacturers to make cars that are much safer. Even farm accidents, Madam Speaker, are on the increase with the mechanization of our farms. This is something that we have to take another look at.

Now, the very fact that we have centralized our medical care, our experts seem to think that with modern transportation that we are able to bring people to the large centres for instance, it wouldn't be practical to have such things as cobalt bombs scattered all over Manitoba, and I understand that brain surgery in Manitoba is done at the Winnipeg General and St. Boniface Hospitals. I believe that's the only two places. This to me seems all the more need to have our ambulances situated out on the periphery so that we have them there and can readily bring them into these large centres. This to me seems a commonsense way of looking at it. In fact, civilian defence was organized along these lines in case of disaster, which could happen to our city, where we would have even our fire engines out on the edges of the community and could have them readily available, but because there hasn't been any

(MR. WRIGHT, cont'd) . . . public outcry and because many of our municipal officials too are apathetic to this, because too many of our elected representatives are only concerned when there is a public outcry, and I suggest that it is time that people who are able to get the information and who keep themselves informed should take the initiative in keeping up with the times. People tend to walk away from the ugly and the macabre. This peculiarity of human nature is no excuse for governments of any level to shirk its responsibilities.

One of the things that always struck me as being odd when we talk about the oddity of human nature, Madam Speaker, is the fact that we keep our fire departments 24 hours a day; you can get a fire engine to your house in three or four minutes if you happen to spill some grease on the electric stove, and yet we find it so difficult to be able to get an ambulance to a scene of a horrible tragedy where severe hemorrhage or brain injury is often prevalent. It seems to me that if we were as concerned as we should be, we would have ambulances in our fire halls. With the advent of natural gas, with the construction of our homes now to higher standards, it seems more sensible that every fire hall, at least in every community, one of its fire halls should have an ambulance. I have documented some cases. I don't want to recall them here because of the recent happenings and it may produce sorrowful memories to the people that I would mention so I will not refer to them, but they are easily reviewed and can be . . . .

We have improved our fire departments. We hear of things called fog nozzles and resuscitators these days, and we have gone to a lot of trouble to keep up with the times, but we simply haven't realized the need to have them on the spot. We have some of the finest medical facilities here in Manitoba I think that you could get anywhere in the North, American continent, but it isn't very much consolation to know that if you went to Winnipeg General or the St. Boniface and required a brain operation probably equal to any on the continent, it's not much good if you can't get there in time.

I think, Madam Speaker, it's the mark of a civilized people to be found not wanting in its concern for human life and suffering. We have heard a lot about our natural resources this last few days, Madam Speaker, and I was just wondering, is this not a good time to give some attention to our human resources?

I was going to recount far more material, Madam Speaker, but I have done this from time to time since 1959. I'm just pointing out that because of the oddity of human nature in not seeming to realize that things can happen to us and our loved ones that we are neglecting this very important thing. I would sincerely ask the House to take and support my resolution.

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Madam Speaker, I would like to say a few words in this debate, because I want to please my honourable friend who has just spoken. I would like to say first of all he needn't have taken so much pain to associate the now Minister of Highways and myself with people that have refused to have the control, a government-controlled ambulance, or an ambulance. My friend the Minister can speak for himself no doubt. Yesterday I said what I thought about certain practices of funeral homes but today, after this, there is something that I think I should do is to defend the funeral homes.

For my honourable friend's benefit or information I might tell him that I am not operating an ambulance. He wanted to try to get me involved in this apparently. I wasn't operating an ambulance in 1963, I wasn't operating in '61 or '59 when I was elected, and it was at least 10 years before that before I operated an ambulance and I can tell him there's not one year that I made one cent out of the ambulance work. I want to say this because he attached a lot of importance to the ambulances that are operated by funeral homes. I might say to him that in nearly every single instance that I know of, this is a service and I think that — gosh there's enough blame on the poor funeral directors; give them the credit when they do something good. This is something that the funeral directors have done as a service and it's not a money-making scheme at all, so I hope that the impression will not be left that the funeral directors -- that this is part of their racket anyway. They might have some other rackets but this is not one of them. So it is true probably that when he's quoting and he's giving numbers of funeral directors who haven't this and haven't that in the ambulance, I agree with him, because most of them have some kind of a makeshift station wagon that they use just as emergency, so please give these people credit; they are not the people that are really operating the ambulances here in Manitoba. But, after having made this correction — and I think it should be made, because my name or the name of funeral directors cropped up — not my name but I think I knew who he meant — cropped up a few times, but I won't be vindictive and I will please my honourable friend. I might say that I am agreeing with him a little more even than in 1963

(MR. DESJARDINS, cont'd) . . . . and I'll admit it. I think we should admit things when we are wrong.

Now I will not admit this, that I didn't think then that we needed ambulances. This is not -- everybody here, I'm sure, wanted to see a proper ambulance service for the people of Manitoba I'm sure, but I felt, I felt until 1963 and until not too long ago, that this could be handled by private enterprise. I don't think that I should be afraid because I believe in private enterprise, afraid to say sometimes the government has to take something over. I'm not admitting defeat on this at all. I think this is something unusual, I mean, if you are going to be in a free enterprise system, you have to at least pay the expenses. Now I'm not blaming all the operators of the ambulances at this time, if this is not going the way it should do, because they want to get paid, and if they let the patient get away from them too often they never get paid, so one of the first things unfortunately that they ask for is for their money, that's true. And this is bad, and this is one of the reasons why I'm inclined to agree a little more with my honourable friend.

I thought in 1963 - and in this discussion, as I say, I'll let my honourable friend from across speak for himself, if he wishes to, but any discussion that I had with him I thought that there had been a change. It wasn't just the local funeral director, and I can assure you, especially in the Metropolitan area, none of the funeral directors wanted to be mixed up with it, and I don't know of any funeral home in the Greater Winnipeg area that has an ambulance now, as soon as somebody else would take it over, so I would think that my honourable friend, if he wants to be fair, should make this correction and not leave the impression that the funeral directors are keeping this for themselves; and if I spoke, and if my honourable friend spoke, not because we were experts, certainly not because we were funeral directors, but because we had had some experience. Now I feel that, I felt at the time, as I say, that this could be handled by a pre-arranged -- a, I've got that on the brain now, you've got me going -- by a group of people, independent people, who - well it would have to be pre-arranged you'll have to admit, Madam Speaker.

Now, I thought that these people could operate and I felt that this was the best way to do it, but I have somewhat reversed my position. At the time I was all for an ambulance for a plane, to take care of the people in the rural district and so on, but I received an answer from the then Minister of Health, if I remember right, that they had no trouble, and he gave us proofs, cases, that they could get, in an emergency - it would be prohibitive to keep an ambulance, a plane, for this work - that they had no trouble at all getting an ambulance from either the Air Force or the Department of Transport and so on. But I am starting to feel now that maybe we don't need this plane, that this is something that would have to be considered, but I think -- I'm not sure if I'm ready to - I'd like to think about this a little bit more - ready to accept this exactly the way it is, but I'll certainly endorse the principle of my honourable friend, but I would like to see - and this is not just placing the blame on somebody else's shoulder or responsibility - I say I'll accept the principle because I think it has been demonstrated that a private ambulance here is not working too well. But before I'm ready to adopt this, because I was all set to go for that plane until I got the answers, I think, like he said, he repeated, he made a point to say after naming my honourable friend and myself, "Now let's hear from somebody that knows." I would like to have somebody that knows, apart from my honourable friend from across, the member who has just spoken, and myself, some people that would look at the conditions right now, bring in a quick report, not something that's going to drag on and so on, and as I say, if this report, if they feel -- the important thing is we have to, and I agree with him 100 percent on this, we have to provide ambulance service for the people of Manitoba, and if they feel, as I am inclined to think that they will, we need something better, and we have to co-operate this, or the government should take over the ambulance service, I certainly will back them 100 percent.

MR. WRIGHT: Madam Speaker, on a point of privilege, I didn't want to give the impression that the undertakers or the funeral directors were in the ambulance business. I said that in times of emergency the community rallies to the support of people who are injured and I classed them in this position. But I did want to show where their equipment is completely inadequate, and as far as mentioning the word "undertakers" I was simply quoting a clipping from the Tribune.

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

MR. PETERS: Yeas and nays, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the members. The question before the House: the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Member for Seven Oaks.

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

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

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

MR. CLERK: Yeas 17, Nays 27.

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

MR. PETERS: In the absence of the leader, may I ask that this matter stand?

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

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q. C. (St. John's): Madam Speaker, I ask your permission to let this matter stand.

MR. COWAN presented Bill No. 36, an Act to validate By-Law No. 1081 of the Town of Tuxedo, for second reading.

MADAM SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. COWAN: Madam Speaker, this bill carries on the business tax and the personal property tax in 1966 and in future years on the same basis that the taxes were levied in the Town of Tuxedo in 1965. This bill is being brought to the House because of the legal advice that there is some doubt about the validity of this by-law because of the varying rate of taxes on businesses and because it classified businesses in different classes. The rates in this by-law for business tax purposes are exactly the same as the rates in force in the City of Winnipeg.

MR. HRYHORCZUK: Madam Speaker, I don't think that explanation that the Honourable Member has given us is quite sufficient. There must be some more specific reason for this than to validate something that we're not too sure of is valid. I, for one, don't like these retroactive provisions in any bill, because if anything has been done under the by-law in the Town of Tuxedo that shouldn't have been done, I think it should be corrected in a different manner than this. I don't think that we should be asked to agree to, or to say, "Well, you've done something illegally. All you have to do is come to the Legislature and we'll correct it." And I would like to have some more specific answers as to why this by-law is asked for than the general statements that were made by the honourable member.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q. C. (Selkirk): Madam Speaker, I will have to take opposite sides to my colleague. A bill similar to this has been introduced in this House during the last three or four sessions by the City of West Kildonan, the City of St. James, and numerous other municipal corporations in the Greater Winnipeg area, and I think the fault lies in the fact that these corporations have not the same power under The Municipal Act or under the charter as is possessed by the City of Winnipeg and the City of St. Boniface. Both of these cities can bring in graduated taxes on business assessments based on amount of assessment, and under our Municipal Act a municipality in enacting a business tax can only fix a fixed amount regardless of assessment. And I think the fault lies with us, that we should change our Municipal Act, to give to ordinary municipal corporations the same power in respect of business taxes as it possessed by the City of Winnipeg and the City of St. Boniface under their respective charters.

MR. COWAN: Madam Speaker, this by-law is only retroactive to the extent that it comes into force on the 1st day of January 1966. You will notice that in the very last clause of the by-law, which makes up the schedule. This, as the Honourable Member for Selkirk has stated, is somewhat similar to the by-laws that have been validated by this Legislature for West Kildonan, St. Vital, and also Fort Garry - and the City of Winnipeg also, because each time the City of Winnipeg changes its business tax rates, its business tax schedule, it comes to this Legislature for validation.

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

MR. EVANS: I would suggest, Madam Speaker, we might call it 5:30?

MADAM SPEAKER: I call it 5:30 and leave the Chair until 8:00 o'clock.