

ELECTORAL DIVISION	NAME	ADDRESS
ARTHUR	J. D. Watt	Reston, Manitoba
ASSINIBOIA	Steve Patrick	189 Harris Blvd., Winnipeg 12
BIRTLE-RUSSELL	Hon. Robert G. Smellie, Q. C.	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
BRANDON	R. O. Lissaman	832 Eleventh St., Brandon, Man.
BROKENHEAD	E. R. Schreyer	2 - 1177 Henderson Hwy., Winnipeg 16
BURROWS	Mark G. Smerchanski	102 Handsart Blvd., Winnipeg 29
CARILLON	Leonard A. Barkman	Steinbach, Man.
CHURCHILL	Gordon W. Beard	Thompson, Man.
CYPRESS	Hon. Thelma Forbes	Rathwell, Man.
DAUPHIN	Hon. Stewart E. McLean, Q. C.	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
DUFFERIN	William Homer Hamilton	Sperling, Man.
ELMWOOD	S. Peters	225 Kimberly St., Winnipeg 15
EMERSON	John P. Tanchak	Ridgeville, Man.
ETHELBERT-PLAINS	M. N. Hryhorczuk, Q. C.	Ethelbert, Man.
FISHER	Emil Moeller	Teulon, Man.
FLIN FLON	Hon. Charles H. Witney	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
FORT GARRY	Hon. Sterling R. Lyon, Q. C.	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
FORT ROUGE	Hon. Gurney Evans	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
GIMLI	Hon. George Johnson	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
GLADSTONE	Nelson Shoemaker	Neepawa, Man.
HAMIOTA	B. P. Strickland	Hamiota, Man.
INKSTER	Morris A. Gray	406 - 365 Hargrave St., Winnipeg 2
KILDONAN	James T. Mills	142 Larchdale Crescent, Winnipeg 15
LAC DU BONNET	Oscar F. Bjornson	Lac du Bonnet, Man.
LAKESIDE	D. L. Campbell	326 Kelvin Blvd., Winnipeg 29
LA VERENDRYE	Albert Vielfaure	La Broquerie, Man.
LOGAN	Lemuel Harris	1109 Alexander Ave., Winnipeg 3
MINNEDOSA	Hon. Walter Weir	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
MORRIS	Harry P. Shewman	Morris, Man.
OSBORNE	Hon. Obie Baizley	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
PEMBINA	Mrs. Carolyne Morrison	Manitou, Man.
PORTAGE LA PRAIRIE	Gordon E. Johnston	7 Massey Drive, Portage la Prairie
RADISSON	Russell Paulley	435 Yale Ave. W., Transcona 25, Man.
RHINELAND	J. M. Froese	Winkler, Man.
RIVER HEIGHTS	Hon. Maitland B. Steinkopf, Q. C.	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
ROBLIN	Keith Alexander	Roblin, Man.
ROCK LAKE	Hon. Abram W. Harrison	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
ROCKWOOD-IBERVILLE	Hon. George Hutton	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
RUPERTSLAND	J. E. Jeannotte	Meadow Portage, Man.
ST. BONIFACE	Laurent Desjardins	138 Dollard Blvd., St. Boniface 6, Man.
ST. GEORGE	Elman Guttormson	Lundar, Man.
ST. JAMES	D. M. Stanes	381 Guildford St., St. James, Winnipeg 12
ST. JOHN'S	Saul Cherniack, Q. C.	333 St. John's Ave., Winnipeg 4
ST. MATTHEWS	W. G. Martin	924 Palmerston Ave., Winnipeg 10
ST. VITAL	Fred Groves	3 Kingston Row, St. Vital, Winnipeg 8
STE. ROSE	Gildas Molgat	Room 250, Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
SELKIRK	T. P. Hillhouse, Q. C.	Dominion Bank Bldg., Selkirk, Man.
SEVEN OAKS	Arthur E. Wright	168 Burrin Ave., Winnipeg 17
SOURIS-LANSDOWNE	M. E. McKellar	Nesbitt, Man.
SPRINGFIELD	Fred T. Klym	Beausejour, Man.
SWAN RIVER	James H. Bilton	Swan River, Man.
THE PAS	Hon. J. B. Carroll	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1
TURTLE MOUNTAIN	P. J. McDonald	Killarney, Man.
VIRDEN	Donald Morris McGregor	Kenton, Man.
WELLINGTON	Richard Seaborn	594 Arlington St., Winnipeg 10
WINNIPEG CENTRE	James Cowan, Q. C.	412 Paris Bldg., Winnipeg 2
WOLSELEY	Hon. Duff Roblin	Legislative Bldg., Winnipeg 1

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Thursday, March 19, 1964.

Opening Prayer by Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions

Reading and Receiving Petitions

Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees

HON. STERLING R. LYON, Q. C. (Minister of Mines and Natural Resources)(Fort Garry):

Madam Speaker, I beg to present the first report of the Standing Committee on Public Utilities and Natural Resources.

MR. CLERK: Your Standing Committee on Public Utilities and Natural Resources beg leave to present the following as their first report. Your Committee met for organization and appointed Honourable Mr. Lyon as Chairman. Your Committee recommends that for the remainder of this Session the quorum of this Committee shall consist of nine members. Your Committee met on Thursday, March 12th, 1964, and on Thursday, March 19, 1964. Your Committee has examined the 12th Annual Report of the Manitoba Hydro Electric Board for the year ended March 31, 1963; and the Annual Report of the Manitoba Telephone System for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1963, as published. Your committee received all information desired by any member from Heads of the Utilities above mentioned and their staffs with respect to matters pertaining to the reports and business of these Utilities. The fullest opportunity was accorded to all members of the Committee to seek any information desired. Your Committee has considered Bills No. 37, an Act to amend The Manitoba Telephone Act; No. 38, an Act to amend The Manitoba Hydro Act; and has agreed to report the same without amendment. All of which is respectfully submitted.

MR. LYON: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Agriculture, that the report of the Committee be received.

Madam Speaker presented the motion.

MR. GILDAS MOLGAT (Leader of the Opposition) (Ste. Rose): Madam Speaker, I'd like to make it very clear that insofar as the report of this Committee I do not agree with the two Bills. And one of the statements, if I remember correctly, although I do not have the written copy of the statement made -- none by the way was asked in the Committee -- no such report was passed by the committee. This is a report that has been made exclusively by the Chairman of that Committee, and I want to point that out most clearly, Madam Speaker, that he has made some statements there of an extended nature on his own. Insofar as the information obtained from the members of the commission who were there, certainly there was no attempt to hold back any information, this I agree; but I want to make it very clear, Madam Speaker, that because these gentlemen were present at that committee and because these gentlemen answered questions will in no way relieve the Minister, when we come along to the Public Utilities department, from being questioned and, I trust, answering questions from any member of this House.

MR. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Leader of the New Democratic Party) (Radisson): Madam Speaker, I think maybe I should make a brief statement on the committee and the conduct in the committee. I might say that as far as I was concerned as a member of the committee, and I'm sure that I'm speaking for my colleagues that were on the committee, we appreciated very much the fact that we had an opportunity at very close hand to ask any questions that we desired of the gentlemen who are charged with operating the Manitoba Hydro and also the Manitoba Telephone System. As a matter of fact I was moved this morning, Madam Speaker, to compliment particularly the management of the Manitoba Telephone System on the manner in which they're operating this great utility in the Province of Manitoba.

Many members of course of the House are not on that committee and they didn't have the opportunity as we had, being members of the committee, to see that insofar as telephone rates are concerned -- and I suggest that this is an area where we can make comparisons on a uniform basis across Canada, different from comparisons in Hydro rates. In telephone rates at least we can make comparisons of prices, and we were very very pleased to see that where the telephone system is operated as a public utility the rates are considerably lower than those in other jurisdictions that are operated under so-called free enterprise private management, and I think it's only proper for me, Madam Speaker, to point this out to the House.

(Mr. Paulley, cont'd) . . .

Now I don't agree also with everything that was said in the report of the committee, and I do wish we had of had an opportunity of hearing the report. Once again I rise to say that I support the bills with the amendments that will make this an annual set-up, where automatically the members of the two utilities will be appearing before the committee as to their conduct over the past year.

I only wish, Madam Speaker, quite frankly, that we would have the same opportunity in respect of natural gas in the Province of Manitoba. I think it would be a lovely thing and a forward-looking situation in the Province of Manitoba if we were able to call the management of a publicly-operated natural gas utility before the committee of this House, and I trust and hope that before too long that we of the New Democratic Party will be able to convince the government-- or become the government of Manitoba -- in order that the natural gas utility will come under public ownership in order that we may exploit fully the development of this great natural resource which we find so abundant in Canada, but unfortunately not too abundant as yet in the Province of Manitoba.

So I say, Madam Speaker, I'm glad to have this opportunity of speaking on our public utilities. I presume that there is no indication because of the receipt of the report from the committee that if any question arises during further deliberations in this House that it is necessary for the committee to reconvene to hear the experts of the utilities, I'm sure that -- at least I hope that this will be done.

MR. D. L. CAMPBELL (Lakeside): Madam Speaker, may I ask a question of the Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party? I would like to ask the Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party if he was suggesting a little while ago that this House does not have the right to call the natural gas people in front of a committee if they wish to. And I'd like to ask him further, if he's of the opinion that they should be called here, why has he not taken some action to ask this House to refer that matter to the committee and have them called?

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I am of the opinion, and possibly wrong, that because of the gas utility being operated as a private enterprise that the only people we could call properly without special directive before this committee would be members of the Public Utility Board, in answer to any questions of discussions that they've had with the natural gas utility. I may be wrong in this and if I am wrong, I'd be glad to be corrected. However, my main point, Madam Speaker, insofar as the gas utility is concerned and my remarks previously made, was to once again draw to the attention of this House the desirability, at least in our opinion in the New Democratic Party, of the gas utility being publicly owned. I don't know if these are the answers which will be satisfactory to my honourable friend, but this mainly was the reason for me mentioning the gas utility. Again I confess I do not know whether we as a Committee of the Legislature have the right to call the President and management of the Greater Winnipeg Gas Company to appear before a committee of the Legislature, but rather do it through the Utility Board insofar as setting of rates and the likes of that is concerned.

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker, I'm afraid to ask my honourable friend another question because I recognize only too well that some of that natural gas that is produced in the Province of Manitoba would be forthcoming in this Chamber. And so instead of asking another question, I would simply rise to inform my honourable friend that he should not forget that in the spheres that have been allocated to it, the Province of Manitoba is a sovereign body and they have the right to call any of these companies and any of their officials before it, public or private.

MR. PAULLEY: My impression, if I may, Madam Speaker, the answer would be "Yes", providing it was by special directive of the Legislature of Manitoba. I doubt, however, whether this falls into the ambit of just automatically calling them before the Public Utility Committee.

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker, the rules say that the only time that you can speak twice on the same subject is if your remarks were misunderstood or wrongly interpreted. My honourable friend certainly misunderstood what I was telling him, because I made it very plain to him that the fact was that it would be this House that would have to give the direction. And providing my honourable friend has learned that lesson today, here endeth the first lesson.

HON. DUFF ROBLIN (Premier) (Wolseley): Madam Speaker, it appears that the only people who can speak twice in the House are the Honourable Member for Lakeside and the Honourable Member for Transcona, because they're quite accustomed to doing that kind of thing. I don't wish to make any extended remarks on this occasion, merely to say that the government

(Mr. Roblin, cont'd)... will continue to discharge its full responsibility in connection with these utilities in Chamber and elsewhere as it has on previous occasions undertaken to do, and I wish there to be no misunderstanding on this point whatsoever.

May I say that I am personally well pleased with the work that the committee has done to date in examining the affairs of these two utilities and I'm happy to know that after the bills concerned receive Royal Assent, as I trust they will, that this will be an annual procedure and we will have this opportunity, by statute, every year to make sure this job is done.

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

MADAM SPEAKER: Notices of Motion

Introduction of Bills

Before the Orders of the Day, I would like to attract your attention to the gallery where there are 45 Grade 7 and 8 students from Stoney Mountain School under the direction of their teachers, Mr. Kerr and Mrs. Lee. This school is situated in the constituency of the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture. There are 38 Grade 6 students from West St. Paul School under the direction of their teachers, Mr. Battershill and Mr. Clark and this school is also situated in the constituency of the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture. We welcome you here this afternoon. We hope that all that you see and hear in this Legislative Assembly will be of help to you in your studies. May this visit be an inspiration to you and stimulate your interest in provincial affairs. Come back and visit us again.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, before you call the Orders of the Day, the House might wish me to give a short statement on my visit yesterday in Ottawa with the Prime Minister in connection with the TCA problem. If that is agreeable I will merely say that I had two purposes in mind in visiting the Prime Minister on this occasion and about this matter. The first was to clarify, if that could possibly be done, what the actual undertakings of the Federal Government were with respect to the TCA base and how those undertakings were being carried out. The second thing that I wanted to do was to try and find some new opening, some new approach to this problem to see whether we could not move forward in some constructive way to preparing for the future growth and development of that base.

It is of course inappropriate that I should give this House an account of my discussions with the Prime Minister but I want to say that they were very frank, very forthright and, I am bound to add, very friendly, and as a result of my conversations with him I posed three questions which I propose to read to the House, and they are in the following terms: (1) In terms of -- and these are questions addressed by me to the Prime Minister -- in terms of your statements in Parliament, what undertakings do you consider to have given about the maintenance of employment at the Winnipeg TCA overhaul base? (2) Have these undertakings of the Federal Government been reflected in TCA policy re employment and transfers at the Winnipeg overhaul base? And (3) In view of Federal Government policy to encourage development of regional air centres, will the Federal Government, in co-operation with the Province of Manitoba, direct a study into the decisions to transfer TCA facilities from Winnipeg including a consideration and evaluation of the Dixon-Speas Report and of proposals for the future development of the Winnipeg base?

I am glad to say that while I was not able -- in fact it would be unreasonable to expect that I should be -- not able to receive answers to these three questions at the time of our meeting, I have been informed by the Prime Minister that we may expect to hear his replies to these questions very shortly, and I believe that to be so. I am hopeful that from his answers we may be able to discern the next step, not only in dealing with the current problem at that base but what is much more important, getting down to brass tacks on our developmental plans for Winnipeg in this respect in the years that lie ahead.

HON. STEWART E. McLEAN Q. C. (Attorney-General) (Dauphin): Madam Speaker, I wish to table the Return to an Order of the House, No. 23, on the motion of the Honourable the Member for St. George made the 28th February, 1964.

Madam Speaker, I have received replies from the Chief Justices, which I would now like to read to the members of the House. The first is a reply from the Chief Justice of Manitoba addressed to myself as Attorney-General. It reads as follows: "Dear Mr. Attorney: Your letter of March 12th with enclosures received. I have perused the material forwarded. All the cases mentioned in your letter originated in the Court of Queen's Bench and the only one that came before us was the first More case. Chief Justice Tritschler advises me that he is replying

Mr. McLean, cont'd)... to your communication at some length. This seems to me more fitting as the proceedings being discussed were in the Queen's Bench. I will confine myself to generalities.

"I have read the comments of Mr. Guttormson, as reported in Debates and Proceedings on pages 882 to 886, 895 to 896, 899, 900 and 919. He does not specifically allege anything that would constitute a charge of secret, surreptitious or dishonest conduct, but the use of the word "deal" and similar references might imply that the member is of the opinion that the arrangements made were improper. I would say, both as a lawyer and as one of Her Majesty's judges, that since I have been practising law, and insofar as I know, every since criminal jurisprudence has assumed any semblance of system, there has been in the courts of this country, and I fancy in Great Britain also, incidents similar to the type of arrangement made in the instance raised in the complaint of Mr. Guttormson. There is nothing secret or furtive about these arrangements. There are made openly and aboveboard and I am quite sure with the interests of justice always uppermost in mind.

"The suggestion for a reduced plea originates with counsel, usually experienced counsel, and may emanate from either counsel for the defence or for the Crown. Each counsel has a duty to the public. Each has a duty to the accused and each has a duty to the Court. I doubt if the approval of the Court is required with respect to arrangements made, but certainly if the judge involved felt there was a miscarriage of justice in a proposed reduction of the charge, or that it was improper, the Court would in my opinion be justified in intervening.

"The Crown has not only a right but a duty to the accused, and in the interests of justice generally to reduce a serious charge to a less serious one if Crown Counsel becomes convinced that an accused should not be placed in jeopardy in respect of a more serious charge. In my opinion, from the institution of proceedings until the matter is placed in the hands of jury, the Crown Counsel, has a duty to give continuous thought to this important feature of our criminal trials and should not hesitate to take the initiative towards a reduction of the charge. The mere fact that a serious charge, say capital murder, has been preferred by the Crown and a preliminary hearing held, and even a jury trial commenced, does not relieve Crown Counsel from his responsibility to reduce the charge to a proper one if the evidence being adduced so indicates.

"It is not only the right of the Attorney-General's departmental officials but in most cases their responsibility and duty to decide what charge, or charges should be laid against an accused person initially and whether, during the various stages of the proceedings against the accused, any reduction in the charge should be made.

"The administration of justice, as we all know, lies in the hands of the Attorney-General and his officers. These men must act fairly and honestly, but they must be able to perform their duties as responsible officers of the Crown without being limited in the exercise of a reasonable and proper discretion as to what charges should be laid and as to what charges should be maintained and proceeded with; and, if necessary, when and on what charges pleas of guilty should be accepted.

"The assertion made by Mr. Guttormson that the Attorney-General and his officers are substituting their opinion and judgment for the verdict of a jury has no meaning. The jury can decide only what is submitted to them and it is the Attorney-General's duty and responsibility, acting usually through his Crown officials, to decide the conduct of the proceedings on behalf of the Crown, and it is within the range of the responsibilities of the Attorney-General's department to decide when and what pleas of guilty offered by an accused person should be accepted, unless of course the accused pleads guilty to the original charge laid by the Crown.

"To circumscribe the authority of the Crown in this field would not be, in my opinion, in the interests of justice. The Crown now has more latitude in homicide cases than formerly. If the Crown felt it could not satisfy the heavy onus of establishing that a murder was planned and deliberate, the essential ingredients of a capital murder charge, then it seems to me that the ends of justice would be normally served by accepting the plea of guilty of non-capital murder which carries a mandatory sentence of life imprisonment.

"The amended code, which creates two types of murder, makes it fairly difficult for the Crown to secure a conviction for capital murder, which carries the penalty of death, when the jury has the option of bringing in a verdict of not guilty of capital murder but guilty of non-capital murder or, alternatively, manslaughter. This is so because the Crown has the onus

(Mr. McLean, cont'd)... in a capital murder case of establishing a planned and deliberate murder. In the days prior to this legislation when the alternatives were murder and manslaughter only, the Crown would naturally be more reluctant to accept a reduced plea, but now there are two types of murder available for the Crown's consideration in addition to manslaughter. Yours truly, C.C. Miller, C. J. M."

I have received this second letter from the Chief Justice of Manitoba, also addressed to myself as Attorney-General, which reads as follows: "I sent over my letter yesterday afternoon. I noticed that the papers have suggested this was a judicial enquiry. I think that that is exaggerating the object of your letters to the Chief Justices. It seems to me it was more in the nature of a request for an opinion as to whether or not there had been improper practices in the courts insofar as Crown officers were concerned and particularly as regards certain specified cases.

"Your letter to me indicated I was to answer it as Chief Justice and you are not seeking an opinion from the Court of Appeal as such. That is the basis upon which I answered it. You gave me permission to consult with the other judges as I might desire. Mr. Justice Freedman is in Israel and Mr. Justice Guy is also away. Mr. Justice Monnin has perused the material and also my letter to you, and while expressing grave doubts as to the propriety of the matter, agreed, as you had made a request, that I should answer it in the manner in which I did. Mr. Justice Schultz from the outset took the position that it was wrong in principle for the Attorney-General to refer a matter of current political controversy to the Chief Justice of the Province for an expression of personal opinion and that you should have been so advised. I am writing this letter so that there will be no misunderstanding regarding the opinion I gave as I do not wish to give the impression that Mr. Justice Schultz was in accord with my replying to your letter or with what I said. Yours truly, C. C. Miller, C. J. M."

A letter from the Chief Justice of the Court of Queen's Bench, addressed to myself as Attorney-General: "Dear Mr. Attorney: Your letter of March 12th and its enclosures have been considered by the judges of this court. We feel that before we answer your particular enquiry, some general comments as to the matter of dropping or reducing charges would be helpful. Although the discussions revealed by the enclosures with your letter have centred on indictments for murder, the matter of dropping charges or reducing the gravity of charges with or without a plea of guilty to the reduced charge has always been present in, and, in our view, a proper part of the general administration of criminal justice.

"When a person suspected of having committed an offence is apprehended and first charged, the precise nature and quality of the evidence is often not known. The law being that a person may never be convicted of an offence greater than the one charged but may sometimes be convicted of an offence less than that charged, the result frequently is the initial selection of a charge of sufficient gravity which includes lesser offences or the laying of several different charges. As the time of trial approaches, and whether the case is to be tried by a magistrate or a judge alone or a judge and a jury, the quantity and quality of the evidence becomes more apparent and the strength and weaknesses of the case may be evaluated by counsel for the Crown and for the accused. A re-assessment of the charges is then possible and proper. The time for re-assessment may sometimes not be reached until the attorneys who are to present the case have themselves interviewed the witnesses.

"If Crown Counsel concludes that the evidence available does not support a count as grave as that charged but only a lesser count, he will cause the indictment to be reduced to a charge, or charges, which in his opinion might reasonably be supported by the expected evidence. On the same grounds, defence counsel will often request a reduction in the gravity of the offence or offences charged. Sometimes a judge, having considered the preliminary enquiry evidence, will raise with counsel, the question whether the expected evidence is likely to support the charge or charges laid.

"Crown Counsel should, and in our experience do, give proper consideration to the re-assessment of charges. Justice to the accused demands it. We think it fundamental that an accused has the right not to be put on trial for charges which, on a reasonable opinion, cannot be supported by the expected evidence. For example, a person who has caused the death of another in an unpremeditated brawl, or a chance encounter which cannot on the evidence amount to more than manslaughter, has the right not to be put on trial for capital murder, or even

(Mr. McLean, cont'd)... non-capital murder.

"There are suggestions in the material you sent that if in such a case a charge of murder was originally laid by the Crown, should not, on a re-assessment of the evidence reduce the charge, and that to do so would be to strike at the jury system and to deny a jury its supposed right to determine the fate of the accused. It is the accused who has rights. A judge or jury has duties. A jury has not the right to try an accused person, but a duty to try him if he comes to trial. A jury has no right in the matter of selection of charges to be preferred, but has a duty to consider such charges as may be preferred. It is the right of an accused to plead guilty to any offences except of course one punishable by death. This is why an accused has the right not to be faced with a charge more serious than is warranted by the expected evidence. Otherwise, he is put to the jeopardy, anguish and expense of defending himself against an unnecessarily grave charge, and is deprived of the right which he might wish to exercise of pleading guilty to a lesser charge of which he considers himself to be guilty.

"There are suggestions in the material you sent that some injustice may be done an accused if he is permitted to exercise his right to plead guilty to a lesser charge, because were he forced to trial through the Crown insisting on a charge of higher gravity, the jury might acquit him altogether. The answer to this is simply that an accused's right to elect to plead guilty to a proper charge may quite safely be left to him and his counsel to decide, and that to force an accused to trial by unreasonably refusing to reduce a charge denies a fundamental right. The accused has a right not to be tried by jury since he may plead guilty. Exercise of this right should not be deemed to strike a blow at the jury system.

"Of course there will frequently be room for a reasonable difference of opinion as to the nature of the charge which is justified by the anticipated evidence. In such a case, Crown Counsel will properly maintain the charges laid. Even then the jury does not have the duty of freely selecting the offence of which the accused is to be found guilty. If the evidence in the opinion of the judge cannot support a charge, he has the duty to direct the jury accordingly, and the jury has the duty to follow the judge's direction. The judge may withdraw a charge or even the whole case from the jury.

"I think it is important to emphasize that in considering the dropping or reducing charges, the nature of the evidence should be the criteria. Such matters as anticipated trouble and expense to the Crown of a protracted trial should not be a consideration. If, irrespective of the timely expense involved by a trial the expected evidence in the considered opinion of the Crown officers is sufficient to support the charges as laid, no reduction in charge should be made.

"I now deal with the cases where the Crown of its own motion or on the suggestion of the accused or of the Court concludes that the evidence warrants a dropping of a charge or a reduction in the charge either with or without a plea of guilty to a lesser charge. It is axiomatic that to exercise and give effect to the Crown's duty and the accused's right outlined above can have only one result, the dropping of or reduction in the charge. The use of such words as "deals" and "collusion" to categorize what are common and wholly proper acts of justice is unwarranted. Any suggestion that for the purpose of saving time and trouble or expense law officers of the Crown accept pleas of guilty to reduced charges is, in our experience, unwarranted. The law officers are, and under previous administrations have been, men of energy, enthusiasm and competence, and we have never seen any indication of a disinclination for hard work, nor has the question of expense entered into their thinking.

"As to the five cases mentioned in your letter: (a) Regina versus John Patton Thomas More. The accused was charged with capital murder. The jury found him guilty and recommended clemency. The Supreme Court of Canada directed a re-trial on the ground of a misdirection in the judge's charge to the jury. When the accused was re-arraigned, the Crown accepted a plea of not guilty of capital murder but guilty of non-capital murder, and the accused was sentenced to life imprisonment. Mr. Justice Nitikman presided at the first and second trials. In his opinion, and mine, the Crown's acceptance of the plea to the reduced charge was wholly proper and warranted by the evidence.

"At the first trial the accused elected to rely upon the defence automatism, claiming that his action was the involuntary response to exterior forces for which he was not responsible. He insisted on his counsel staking the whole defence on this unusual plea, and insisted on his counsel in the presence of the jury, waiving other matters of defence which might have served the accused in good stead but which would have been incompatible with the novel defence of

(Mr. McLean, cont'd)... automatism. Acceptance of the defence of automatism would have resulted in a verdict of not guilty and the accused would have gone entirely free. The jury would not accept this defence. The accused had staked all on it and lost. The result was a finding guilty coupled, as has been noted, with a recommendation for mercy.

"Before the re-trial, it became evident the accused would not a second time try the defence of automatism but this time would permit his counsel to properly put before the Court many matters which would justify the jury in finding this a case of diminished responsibility. The result would have been, in the opinion of Mr. Justice Nitikman and myself, counsel for the defence and for the Crown, a finding of guilty of non-capital murder. Consequently, it was the course of justice and common sense to permit the accused to plead guilty to non-capital murder, thus saving him the burden of a second trial.

"There is comment in the material you sent about the reasons for judgment of judges of the Supreme Court of Canada. Without going into detail as to the interpretations which have been placed on these reasons for judgment, nothing in these reasons, and in my view in any way, cast doubts upon the absolute propriety of Crown Counsel and Defence Counsel and the Court accepting a plea to the reduced charge in this case.

"(b): Regina versus Michael Sednyk. The accused was charged with capital murder. At the trial, a plea of not guilty to capital murder but guilty to non-capital murder was accepted. The accused was sentenced to life imprisonment. In the opinion of counsel for the Crown the verdict which would have been warranted by the evidence was one of guilty of non-capital murder. The accused was desirous of pleading guilty to that charge. Mr. Justice Nitikman who presided at the trial concurred in the view of counsel for the Crown and the defence, and in his opinion the correct course was followed in accepting the plea to the reduced charge.

"(c): Regina versus John Henry Wichikowski. The accused was charged with capital murder. He pleaded not guilty and was tried before a jury and found not guilty of capital murder but guilty of manslaughter. He was sentenced to ten years imprisonment. This was not a case of accepting a plea of guilty to a reduced charge. It illustrates points already made. Here Crown Counsel's evaluation of the evidence caused him to put the capital charge to the jury. The trial judge did not withdraw it. The jury in coming to its conclusion waived the pleas of accident, provocation, insanity, and particularly that the accused had the mental intelligence of an 8 year-old. This result, proper in itself, does not form basis for an argument that all homicides must go to juries and accuseds be deprived of their present legal rights to plead guilty to non-capital murder in appropriate cases.

"(d): Regina vs. Stephen Kozaruk. The accused was charged with capital murder. He pleaded not guilty at the February, 1964 assize. On the second day of the trial the accused indicated his wish to plead guilty to a reduced charge of non-capital murder. The plea was accepted and the accused was sentenced to life imprisonment. In the opinion of Mr. Justice Bastin, who presided at the trial, there was sufficient evidence of diminished responsibility of the accused, that the proper verdict would have been one of guilty of non-capital murder. Mr. Justice Bastin fully concurred in the decision of Crown Counsel and Defense Counsel on the matter of the plea to the reduced charge. There is reference in the material you sent to a misunderstanding about accepting a plea to a reduced charge which arose in this case between Crown Counsel and Defense Counsel and Defense Counsel before the October, 1963 assize. The question whether Crown Counsel or Defense Counsel was responsible for this misunderstanding is irrelevant to the problem under review by me.

"(e): Regina vs Mary Elizabeth Sutherland. The accused was charged with non-capital murder. At her trial she pleaded not guilty to non-capital murder and guilty of manslaughter and was sentenced to two years less one day in the Manitoba Jail for Women at Portage la Prairie. In the opinion of Mr. Justice Dickson, who presided at the trial, the acceptance of the plea on the reduced charge was wholly proper. He agreed with the view of Crown Counsel and Defence Counsel that the evidence could not have warranted a conviction for any charge higher than manslaughter. There were very extenuating circumstances which were reflected in the sentence imposed.

"Dealing with the two questions put on Page 2 of your letter, the Judges of this Court assure you without hesitation that there was no impropriety in the acceptance of the reduced pleas in the four cases mentioned above where charges were reduced. We are of the opinion that in these cases the decisions to reduce charges were based on an evaluation of anticipated

(Mr. McLean, cont'd) ... evidence and not on considerations of convenience or expense to the Crown. It is our view that the law officers of the Crown acted in all five cases in commendable and proper manner to ensure that justice was done.

"The question is raised in the material you sent as to why the more serious charges are laid in the first place. Those familiar with the administrators of criminal justice will understand why it is prudent and proper for the Crown in the first instance to set its sights reasonably high and why it is that later, on a careful study and re-assessment of the evidence, decisions may be taken to drop or to reduce charges or to accept pleas to lesser charges. In our view this practice is proper and should not be subject to criticism. It is not a practice peculiar to the present administration. I have myself been consulted by an Attorney-General under a previous administration who had requested to accept a plea of guilty to manslaughter where the indictment laid a capital charge. The plea to the reduced charge was accepted and, in my opinion, quite properly.

"In our view the Attorney-General for the Province of Manitoba under the present and former administration have been fortunate in having Deputy Attorney-Generals and Crown Counsels of competence and integrity. Those presently serving are men of high calibre and enjoy the respect of the Court. Many former law officers of the Crown under the present and previous administration, who received their training in the Attorney-General's Department, are now in private practice. They are ornaments to the legal profession.

"You asked for any recommendations you may consider to be in the interests of the administration of justice. The material you forwarded prompts this suggestion. From time to time a difference of opinion may develop between counsel for an indigent accused and Crown Counsel as to whether or not an expenditure is reasonable and ought to be undertaken by the Crown on behalf of the accused. While we have not found Crown Counsel's to be unreasonable in these matters, we suggest that where differences of opinion do arise, the judges of this court might be consulted by defence and Crown Counsel. This would probably result in a reasonable solution.

"We believe that as experience develops with the new law of capital murder, the capital charge will be less frequently laid. However, it will be very regrettable if in the selection of any charges Crown Counsel were to be influenced by fear of criticism for laying too severe a charge in the first instance. It would also be quite improper for Crown Counsel to refuse to drop or to reduce charges or to accept pleas of guilty to lesser charges because of fear of criticism by persons who were not aware why the more severe charge was laid in the first instance, and who might erroneously think that there was something damaging to the jury system in the dropping or reduction of charges or the acceptance of pleas of guilty to reduced charges.

"One hopes that the law officers of the Crown under the present and future administrations will not seek to avoid the responsibility involved in the difficult task of selecting charges which are sufficiently high to meet the requirements of the new administrators of justice but which are not so unreasonably severe that injustice to an accused results, and will never from fear of criticism refuse to drop or reduce charges or accept pleas to reduced charges. While these matters are not subject to the approval of the Court, judges have the duty to comment and may be counted on to do so if ever it seems that law officers of the Crown are not properly performing their public duty.

"We have given careful consideration to the desirability or otherwise of writing this frank expression of our views. We are aware that it is an unusual course which may be misunderstood and be the subject of comment. However, the material enclosed with your letter indicates a real uneasiness on the part of some that the practices referred to might be improper and impede the due administration of justice in this province, and we came to the conclusion that this expression of our views was necessary and appropriate. Yours truly, G. E. Tritschler, C. J. Q. B."

I lay these letters on the Table of the House.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I realize that the statement made by the Minister is not debatable and I do not rise to debate it. I reserve my position and that of my Party when he first introduced this idea in the House last week, and I wish to state at this time that I will be introducing a resolution in the House, Madam Speaker, to make sure that this issue gets full debate and recommending some positive courses of action insofar as the administration of

(Mr. Molgat, cont'd)... justice in this province. The two letters just read only point out to me all the more that there is a requirement for a thorough investigation.

HON. ROBERT G. SMELLIE, Q. C. (Minister of Municipal Affairs) (Birtle-Russell): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to lay on the Table of the House a Return to an Order of the House No.38, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Portage.

MR. CAMPBELL: Madam Speaker, the Honourable the Attorney-General has laid the letters on the table, but I assume that he would be willing -- I'm asking him would he be willing to have copies made so that all groups would have copies.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Labour. Could the Minister tell us what steps the conciliation department -- that his bureau is taking in bringing together the parties in the Grand Rapids labour dispute?

HON. OBIE BAIZLEY (Minister of Labour) (Osborne): Madam Speaker, I'm sure the honourable members will be happy to know that our conciliation services have been made available to the parties. Unfortunately, they were not successful and the strike began on Tuesday morning. Now our services are still available but they're only available upon request of either party, and at the moment there has been no such request.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, may I with supreme regret announce to the House that the former MP for the Province of Manitoba passed away in Dauphin this morning, namely Mr. Fred Zaplitny. I'm sure he was acquainted with many of the members of this House and that they will join with me in expressing regrets to Mr. Zaplitny's family. Funeral services have not been arranged as yet. It is contemplated possibly for Monday. The passing of my dear friend was quite sudden.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I'm sure we would all wish to join ourselves with the expression of condolence that has been offered by the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party in every respect.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, this is not one of normal condolence motions, but I want to add the thoughts of my group in this case. I knew Mr. Zaplitny very well. While he and I were not in the same party he was my federal representative for a number of years in his capacity as the federal member for Dauphin constituency. His home is originally in my own constituency. His father and his brothers are constituents of mine now. I know the family well and I share the loss to the Province of Manitoba of a man who was a devoted and interested public servant.

MR. McLEAN: Madam Speaker, I might just join with the others in saying that the late Mr. Zaplitny was a classmate of mine. We have been friends for a long time and I join with what has been said.

MADAM SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. GUTTORMSON: Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Public Utilities. Yesterday he tabled a Return to an Order of the House No.36. Question No.2 was what additional grouting work was awarded, and I have just a list of names but there is no money shown in the order. Would the Minister undertake to provide that information please?

HON. MAITLAND B. STEINKOPF, Q. C. (Minister of Public Utilities) (River Heights): Yes, I'll get that information.

MR. E. R. SCHREYER (Brokenhead): Madam Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Public Utilities. I submitted notice of the question to his office and it may not have had time to work up to him, in which case he could take it as notice again. Perhaps the Minister is aware that certain automobile owners who attached licence plates to their car in the wrong way so that the numerals appear on the front plate have been charged by police officers in various parts of the province. I would like to know under what specific authority, under what statute, or what section of The Highway Traffic Act or what regulation this is being done under.

MR. STEINKOPF: I'll accept that as notice.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the second reading of Bill No. 76. The Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I don't like doing this, but I would like this to stand.

MR. STEINKOPF presented Bill No. 89, an Act to provide for Relief from Certain Unconscionable Transactions, for second reading.

Madam Speaker presented the question.

MR. STEINKOPF: Madam Speaker, I think this Bill can be best explained by reading Paragraph 3 of the Bill which says: "Where in respect of money lent the court finds that, having regard to the risk and to all the circumstances, the cost of the loan is excessive and that the transaction is harsh and unconscionable, the court may . . ." and it sets out what the court may do. May I suggest, Madam Speaker, that this bill be referred to the Standing Committee on Rules, Orders and Regulations so that it may be considered along with the other bills that we have referred to this committee, with the intent that it not be brought back during this session.

MR. T. P. HILLHOUSE, Q. C. (Selkirk): Madam Speaker, I'd like to compliment the Minister is bringing this bill in. I think there has been a long need of such a bill in the Province of Manitoba and I want to congratulate you most sincerely for having done so.

MR. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q. C. (St. John's): Madam Speaker, I too am very pleased that this bill has come forward. It's an indication that the Honourable Minister, whom I did not have an opportunity to formally compliment and wish well because I did not speak on the Speech from the Throne, but whom I would now like to compliment in regard to not only this bill but others which he has been bringing forward to us, which indicate the benefits of debates which we had last year.

Nevertheless, knowing as he does that even he is not perfect, I would like to draw to his attention certain questions which arose in my mind as I read this bill and possibly he would care to answer these questions when he closes debate, or at least they will be recorded so that when the bill is discussed on other occasions these matters could be dealt with if the committee in its wisdom thinks there is some point in what I have to say.

Firstly, I had hoped that the Honourable Minister would have commented on the case involving the Ontario Act in which an Ontario Unconscionable Transactions Relief Bill was declared to be *intra vires*, to indicate to us whether that bill or that act was closely checked with this bill, to give us a feeling of assurance that this bill is within the jurisdictional powers of the province.

Secondly, Madam Speaker, I had hoped that this bill could have considered and contained relief against acceleration and relief against forfeiture, both of which are matters which would ease the burden of those who are caught in a transaction with which they cannot cope because of acceleration and forfeiture clauses.

Thirdly, I note that in spite of the name, the title of the bill and the enthusiasm with which I was first inclined to greet it, that it is limited to loans only, and in view of the debate and discussions we had last year on The Time Sales Act and the fact that time sales themselves create a burden and a problem relating to the cost of extended time for payment, I deplore -- that's a strong word -- I wonder at the omission in this bill of dealing with other matters relating to payment over period of time and the costs of financing time payments.

And fourthly, I wonder, Madam Speaker, whether the sixth section -- no, I know I shouldn't name the number of the section but I can refer to the principle involved -- in a saving clause for assignment for value as seeming to be a method whereby you could get out of the operation of this bill by arranging to assign the loan contract for value. It seems to me that the bill itself indicates a method whereby unscrupulous people may be able to avoid the effect of the act, and since it is aimed at unscrupulous people, we can rest assured that they will know this act very well in very short time after it is passed. So that I'm hoping that we could get clarification on these points that I have mentioned.

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

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I wonder if you would call the debate on ways and means, please?

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable the First Minister and the proposed amendment of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition and the proposed amendment to the amendment by the Honourable the Member for Brokenhead. The Honourable the Member for Roblin.

MR. KEITH ALEXANDER (Roblin): Madam Speaker, I'd just like to say a few words at this time to take advantage of the opportunity of commenting on the actions and some of the statements made by the Opposition on this debate because this is one of their opportunities for

(Mr. Alexander, cont'd)... showing reasons why the people of Manitoba should not have confidence in the present government, and from what I can see we have got nothing of substance from them whatsoever.

The Liberals are still battling with their split personality. Their main argument seems to be that the government has to do more and at the same time spend considerably less doing it. The Leader of the NDP commenting on this debate spent most of his time, I felt, doing an imitation of Jack Wells describing the actions of the member from Assiniboia, and I'd like to continue with that analogy.

I feel the honourable member is in the position now of finding himself deep in his own zone with the score about 45 to 0, and the quarterback of the team has fumbled the ball on the third down with the minute flag of the fourth quarter flying. As a matter of fact, the image I got was of a gentleman whistling as he walked past the graveyard where all dead political parties are buried.

I feel, Madam Speaker, that from the calibre of debate we have had from the opposition, the stands that have been taken by them, that the people of Manitoba have every good reason for casting them aside as alternatives to the present government and having oodles of confidence in this present administration.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. SCHREYER: Madam Speaker, could we get an interpretation of that last bit of harangue there?

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

MR. PAULLEY: Yeas and Nays please, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the members. The question before the House is the proposed amendment to the amendment by the Honourable the Member for Brokenhead.

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

YEAS: Messrs. Barkman, Campbell, Cherniack, Desjardins, Froese, Gray, Guttormson, Hillhouse, Hryhorczuk, Johnston, Molgat, Patrick, Paulley, Peters, Schreyer, Shoemaker, Smerchanski, Tanchak, Vielfaure, Wright.

NAYS: Messrs. Alexander, Baizley, Beard, Bilton, Bjornson, Carroll, Cowan, Evans, Groves, Harrison, Hutton, Jeannotte, Johnson (Gimli), Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McDonald, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Moeller, Roblin, Seaborn, Smellie, Stanes, Steinkopf, Strickland, Watt, Weir, Witney and Mrs. Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 20; Nays, 31.

MADAM SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost. The proposed motion in amendment by the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition. Are you ready for the question?

..... Continued on next page.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I think perhaps it would not be wrong for me to make a comment on the somewhat unsatisfactory character of this debate so far. It is unfortunate that for one reason or another it has been strung out over so many days, so much so that a good many of us perhaps have forgotten whatever the Leader of the Opposition for example might have said when he was producing his amendment to this motion on Ways and Means.

I suppose from some points of view that really is a good thing, because in my humble opinion, Madam, his address was so shallow and so superficial and so misleading as to constitute no real credit to himself, and certainly to shed very little light indeed upon the real state of the finances of the Province of Manitoba. I'm aware that those may sound as rather harsh comments on his presentation to us, and I understand my responsibility to lend some color of reason behind my feeling moved to speak this way about what he said to us when he introduced this motion of no confidence.

I think I may say that I can comment on Budget speeches and on Budget addresses as something of an expert in this sense, that I have delivered more Budgets and I have replied to more Budgets, both on this side of the House and on the other, than any member of the Legislature, except I believe the Honourable Member for Lakeside, whose experience in this connection certainly outranks us all. And on the basis of that experience, I can say that I know a half-baked Budget reply when I hear one. In fact I, somebody said, made one, and I'm going to go along and say that I can bolster my opinion in this respect by admitting that at least on one occasion I have made such a half-baked reply to a Budget speech, but not in the position occupied by my honourable friend. I know a clinker in Budget speeches when I hear one and that's what we got on February 17th. A muddle-headed classic is the description that I might like to ascribe to it.

Now what bothered me about that Budget was the apparent disregard for a closely researched examination of the facts with which it was presented to us. There is no Budget that cannot be improved upon and there's no Budget that is not the better for criticism, and I acknowledge that, but criticism it seems to me must be based on a careful respect for the facts upon which such criticism is based, and I feel that my honourable friend has not documented well the criticisms that he makes. In fact, I think that many of his allegations are almost completely unsupported by any reference to the facts. Certainly it does not, in my opinion, convey a real appreciation of Manitoba's financial position.

Now I say to any member who is not interested in this subject, and I think that seems to apply to most of the honourable gentlemen opposite though not to all, that it will not disturb me if they leave the Chamber at present because I am going to take some time to deal with the matters that are before us and it may not be universally appealing. We don't all take an interest in the same things. But I would, however, like to start with some of the allegations my honourable friend made in respect of what I call the subsidiary issues and then move on to those which struck him and perhaps will strike others as having been more important.

The first rather subsidiary comment that I have made a note of was his reference to the Department of Agriculture -- he never seems to like to give it its correct title, Agriculture and Conservation -- and his rather off-hand remark that we were trying to fool the people -- I got that impression -- in the size of the Budget allocated to the Department of Agriculture and Conservation, in that most of it was for water control rather than for agriculture. Well I really can't see any force in that criticism. He would have done better if he had examined the current agricultural share proper and compared it with what had been spent in previous years in that department if money is the measure, and it was in this case with him, and he would have found that it has risen from 2.1 million in 1958 to 3.8 million in 1964, an increase of 60 per cent. I think that increase and the emphasis given to agriculture refutes right away any expression of opinion that we are not doing what is right and proper in that department, having regard to our total responsibility.

No one ever suggested that the expenditures for Floodway purposes, for example, were expenditures for agriculture in the strict and proper sense. I never heard anyone suggest that. My honourable friend berates us because he alleges we did suggest it. Well having knocked down that strawman, he then proceeds to cast a wayward dart at the watershed and the water control and conservation matters, and says: "When do we stop studying and when do we start working?"

(Mr. Roblin, Cont'd.)

Well if he doesn't know the answer to that question I despair of him, because placed before this Legislature in this session was the largest single program in the history of Manitoba -- floodway and major control matters aside altogether -- the largest single proposal placed before this province for water control; works on the Norquay Floodway system, the Morris River, the Boyne River, \$400,000; the completion of the Grassmere Drain, \$240,000; Hespeler Floodway, another instalment of \$210,000; new structures for Fish Lake and for Dennis Lake, some \$328,000 being spent this year on that project; \$385,000 for a series of public drainage works in the Red River Valley such as the Aux Marais River drain, the reconstruction of the boundary drain in Rhineland, reconstruction of the King drain in McDonald and the reconstruction of many other drains in that area, and a whole list of other projects here.

I'm not going to read them all off but undoubtedly, factually, demonstratively, the biggest program of water control in the ordinary sense of that word, excluding altogether the Red River Floodway and the diversion and the Shellmouth and all the rest, that we've ever had in the history of our province. And yet he asks us: "When do we stop studying and start working?" I ask him, when does he start studying so that he will know the facts that we've placed before the House? How can a man with the responsible leadership post that he occupies as Leader of the Opposition make that statement in a budget speech when it is demonstratively open to the most direct contradiction. It seems to me that's not the kind of sensible criticism that we are entitled to expect from the Leader of the Opposition in dealing with budgetary matters in the Province of Manitoba. He heard them in the estimates. He has forgotten them, but I doubt if the people who are affected have forgotten them. I think they're pretty well aware of what's going on; the biggest conservation and control program in the history of the Province of Manitoba. So it's not such a big point. Let's pass on. Nothing much in that allegation.

Well, in this broadside approach of his he takes another whack at my friend the Minister of Agriculture and Conservation and criticizes the speech the Minister made in which he referred to the rate of growth in the physical volume of production in Manitoba, and the Minister frankly said, and I agree with what he said: "Let's do better." I don't see any reason for complacency in this field, either on the part of government or anybody else.

But I think the Minister of Agriculture and Conservation was far too kind to the Leader of the Opposition when he made that speech because he could have pointed out -- perhaps he should have, except there's a limit to this business of political "one-upmanship" -- he should have pointed out that in the first part of the period under review which he was talking about were eleven years of Liberal administration in Manitoba, and during that period Manitoba's average index of agricultural production declined. In that period of eleven years prior to our coming into office -- immediately prior -- Manitoba's average index of agricultural production declined by one percent.

Since that time, in the six years in which my friend the member for Rockwood-Iberville has mostly been responsible for agriculture's administration, the same index of agricultural production has risen 15 percent. So that if the Minister was looking at that whole period as he was in giving a figure for the progress and saying that it was unsatisfactory, and I think he's right -- It is -- Why should we be satisfied? -- I don't think it's very sensible for the Leader of the Opposition to use that as a stick to beat him with, because during the Liberal term of office that index was stationary, or went down. The subsequent six years it is up some 15 percent.

I don't see any reason why this government should expect anyone to accord it the full credit incidentally for that increase of 15 percent. There's no need for us to take that position; but I think that there is need to give those facts when we are being berated by my honourable friend when the situation is as I have described it. So here's another one of these criticisms of the present administration and its financial management, its general management which fizzles out when it's stacked up against the facts. That's the gravamen of my charge against my honourable friend in this speech of his. It fizzles out when stacked up against the facts, and I want to give some more facts dealing with all the major points that he made in his address. I want to suggest to him that he'd better be careful about using that kind of an argument in the farming communities of Manitoba because they know the facts as well as anybody else. I don't think they're going to be much more impressed than I am by the kind of argument that's being used in this connection.

(Mr. Roblin, Cont'd.)

Well, having taken a whack or two at my colleague that sits on the end of this row here, he then decided to have a word or two to say about my neighbor on my right here in the Department of Industry and Commerce. And with a great "to-do" about split personalities, so it seemed to me, in the Department of Industry and Commerce, how the Minister was marching bravely off in one direction when some of the important officials of the government were marching briskly off in another; that my honourable friend here was making speeches about the limitations of government investment and one of the important officials of the Crown was making speeches about the necessity for government investment.

We had this point being drawn to our attention that no wonder the Minister couldn't get on with his job, they couldn't even make up their minds which direction they were marching in in the same department, and it was a pretty poor piece of management all the way through. "Massive spending not the answer, says the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce." "Massive expenditure by government key to growth says Mr. Kristjanson, one of the important members of the government team." -- newspaper headlines.

The more I listen to my honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition the more it occurs to me to wonder whether he ever gets behind the newspaper headlines. I wonder when that Party over there are ever going to come to grips with real problems of administration and policy in Manitoba; when they're going to get tired of this continual pin-pricking which is the standard of conduct which they seem to set for themselves in dealing with their responsibilities here; and when they're going to present us with some alternative policies, because that's what the people are going to want to know when election time comes around.

But let's get back to these headlines that my honourable friend quoted with such devastating effect in respect of the split personality within the Department of Industry and Commerce. If my honourable friend had taken the trouble -- I almost said taken the trouble to read the rest of the newspaper story, but I haven't got it here so I'm not going to say that -- but if he'd taken the trouble to read the speech made by the gentleman he referred to, Mr. Kristjanson, he would have found out what the position taken by Mr. Kristjanson was, and it had no relationship whatsoever to the interpretation placed on it by my honourable friend. It simply doesn't jive; it simply doesn't fit. Another case of this superficial examination.

In his statement which was made in Brandon, I think, Mr. Kristjanson said, and I'm going to quote parts of his speech -- I'm going to quote all the parts I believe are relevant, that bear on this point, and I trust I shall not misrepresent Mr. Kristjanson or anybody else. And in his speech, he says on page 2: "While there are no surprises in these projections, there are some no doubt surprised by the limited role ascribed to government." He's referring there to the COMEF report. "To quote the report," and he quotes: "The responsibility of government will be primarily to provide guidance and the creation of the appropriate business climate. Massive expenditures by government are not the key to Manitoba's economic growth nor will they attain the goals that have been established."

Mr. Kristjanson comments: "I for one find it difficult to agree with this conclusion as I shall show later. I would agree, however, with the implications of this statement that the necessary jobs will not be found if primary reliance is placed on government. This is not a serious disagreement with the report. I quite understand what its authors wish to be perfectly clear, that in our scheme of things, primary alliance must be placed on the private sector for carrying out the development effort. They tried to avoid leaving the impression that the government should take over the development effort in any substantial degree. I have no wish to detract from this impression."

And then he goes on to say, as he said he would, the basis of his disagreement with the statements of COMEF, and after some discussion about the role of private enterprise, he says on page 4, "The other level at which corrective measures lie is in the operation of government. This is so not because of the extensive partnership between government and the individual that already exists, rather it is because the most important investment factor for growth has not been provided primarily by the private sector in the past and is not likely to be so provided in the future. I am referring to investment in knowledge, education and the training of individuals." He's making his point.

And then he goes on, and I think that the thought follows logically and that I'm not in any

(Mr. Roblin, Cont'd.) . . . way misrepresenting his statement. "This line of reasoning raises one particularly interesting question so far as planning for economic growth is concerned. It is this. Who will make the substantially increased investment in knowledge, education and training? Traditionally, the bulk of such investment has been made by government and public institutions and I can see no sign that this tradition will not be upheld. If this be so, then the government becomes an ever more important part of the investment picture and we will be investing larger amounts through public decision. It is in this respect that I take issue somewhat with the COMEF report as indicated earlier. This is not to minimize the importance of private investment decisions of the traditional type, but it does point to a growing need for full public understanding of the operations of government to assure skillful allocation of public funds. It makes better planning of public expenditures more necessary."

It's quite apparent from this that Mr. Kristjanson's concern is with the role of government in investment, in education, in training, in those areas of concern on which we too for a number of years have placed our primary emphasis. It's not at all a question of Mr. Kristjanson and the Minister disagreeing. Even if that matter were important in itself -- and I don't maintain that it is -- if my honourable friend were strictly and literally right in this, I would be tempted to say "So what?" Certainly there are divergence of views on these various matters and they exist within the government ranks as well as anywhere else. But the fact is that he was content, as far as I can see, to take some newspaper headline without any investigations, without a reading of the speech, and use that information as a criticism of what the Minister is doing.

Well, there are plenty of things the Minister does that are open to criticism. He'd be the first to admit that. But to choose this kind of approach to the province of criticism, I think reflects no credit on my honourable friend. It certainly does not point to any degree of research or understanding of what he is doing when he makes those statements, because a perusal of the speech made by Mr. Kristjanson, on which this allegation of split personality is based, completely destroys the charge. Mr. Kristjanson is talking about investment in education and associated facilities with which we all fully agree, and not with the kind of investment situation that my honourable friend believes he was talking about when he made the criticism of the government.

Well, never mind. He's completely off base in my opinion on this matter. It still isn't a matter of world-shaking importance in any case. I'm really rather surprised that it was brought into a budget speech, but seeing it was, I'm pretty well obliged to answer it. But my honourable friend says to himself no doubt, "Well never mind, whatever you may say about Mr. Kristjanson, the Department of Industry and Commerce only produced another 260 jobs in the last 10 years." And when you make that bald statement in those terms it doesn't look very good for the Department of Industry and Commerce, but that's just another one of these cases where you really contribute nothing to a public understanding of the situation unless you go behind those statements that look so conclusive and sweeping but which just skim over the surface of reality. And I say what contribution does a responsible public man make to the understanding of public issues, which God knows are serious and difficult enough, by contenting himself with that sort of an approach to the problems we face here.

I might comment, since when did the Liberal Party for example believe that it was the responsibility of government to create all the jobs in the economy? I really don't think that's his philosophy or the philosophy of his Party. It's certainly not mine. What he can say quite justifiably is, "Is government doing its part?", even though we recognize that the main responsibility under our system rests on the twin pillars of initiative and the enterprise of our people. But let's take a look at this 260 job proposition which sounds so good if you don't bother to dig down beneath it and see what's there; which sounds so good from the point of view of those who wish to condemn the work of a department. Dig below them and see what the real facts are if you want to find some kind of realistic assessment of what is going on.

In this province, from 1958 to the present time, we have lost 5,000 farm jobs it is estimated, and I think that's on the low side. We lost those because of increasing technology and because of increasing structure of the farm system. In the same period of 1958 to 1961, and it's probably been going on since then, there have been another 5,000 jobs lost in the railway agencies and services in this province and I'm sure the Leader of the New Democratic Party

(Mr. Roblin, Cont'd.) . . . will understand something of the tremendous loss of job opportunities taking place in that industry because of technological advances. How many jobs have been lost in the vicissitudes of fortune of the TCA base is perhaps open to some debate. I don't offer any opinion on that subject and I don't intend to go through all the other industrial undertakings in this province to indicate the job losses that we have suffered, because these two categories of 10,000 jobs in the short time that I have mentioned are sufficiently indicative of the nature of our problem to make us, I think, be wise if we avoid the temptation to over-simplify the question by saying only 260 jobs in the last so many years, or whatever it was.

The task of new job creation demands the best that we can do just to keep up with the progress of events in this field. We look for a partnership between enterprise and government as being the way to approach it, and that is the effective kind of partnership that we seek. If you say to me what jobs, if any, has this department produced; have all the jobs been produced to replace the 10,000 we have lost been produced by somebody else? I'm sure a lot of them have. I don't want to take too much credit for that, but I can point to the one institution we have in the province, the Manitoba Development Fund, which is a major tool in the production of jobs in Manitoba, and since that started to work, in 1960, I think they got into operation, they can claim the responsibility for 1200 new jobs.

Now my honourable friend the Minister of Industry and Commerce must be given credit for that operation if for nothing else, and to blandly say or to imply, and that's the implication of it, that we stood still or that nothing has happened or that progress hasn't been made or that people aren't doing things and nothing is resulting from this, is not a factual presentation of the situation. We have in this province lost jobs and we have created many new jobs, and the government can take some credit for having created a large number of new jobs, and to that extent we can regard that with satisfaction. We can never say that we are totally satisfied. We can never say that this job has been done to the last degree of perfection or that we are not constantly striving for new goals and new achievements.

My honourable friend would be a lot more useful in his function to the people of Manitoba if he would provide -- if he thinks he knows a better way of doing some of these things let him share that knowledge, because if he has good ideas we're not so proud that we won't take them up. But to be confronted with the statement 260 new jobs in so many years, the Minister and the department is a wash-out, is a very shallow and superficial interpretation of the task, and I say to the House that he does no service to the people to pretend otherwise.

Let us put the plain facts on the table as best we can. I hope that I am not departing in what I say today from the facts. If I do it's inadvertent and I apologize for it now -- and I will gladly be corrected -- but I think it does not help our understanding of the situation to glide smoothly over the surface of these difficult problems as my honourable friend the Honourable Leader of the Opposition has done. The Manitoba Development Fund has provided in its short term of life 1200 new jobs and a payroll of \$3.6 million. That is something, and I think it only right that I should mention it. Total employment in Manitoba from the period '58 to '63 has gone up by 6,000 jobs, in spite of the fact that we've lost 10 in those two industries of which I speak. We've not only made good on those 10 but we've got 6,000 more. Is that anything to throw your hat in the air about? No it is not, because we must do better than that. That is our continual effort and we'll welcome all the help we can get from whatever quarter. But take a look at the facts and just don't glide smoothly over the surface of things for the sake of a -- well, what shall I say -- if you want to think of what appears to be a quite unsatisfactory approach to the problem of public affairs. My honourable friend owes the people of Manitoba something better. We will diligently continue to work.

But, Madam Speaker, let me give you some of the facts about what has been going on in Manitoba as well as in this field of job creation. Let me tell you something about the advance of the economy of this province in the general nature of that conception in the last few years, and let me compare it with what Canada is doing. That offers us a reasonable standard of comparison, and I want to give you some figures which have been taken from the Dominion Bureau of Statistics and which I place on the record as being the figures of the change from 1958 to '63 in a number of interesting categories. Annual disposable income rose 31 percent. Remarkable isn't it, that from '58 to '63 it rose 31 percent in Canada -- remarkable increase in those few years. It rose just a little better than 31 percent for us here in Manitoba. Farm

(Mr. Roblin, Cont'd.) . . . cash income rose 13 percent for the nation, rose 25 percent for us. That's not unusual because we're still an agricultural based province. It went up twice the rise for the Dominion as a whole. In construction -- here's an interesting one -- the increase in construction in Canada from '58 to '63 was 7 percent; this province it went up 21 percent -- three times. Manufacturing output, and this is a significant figure, Canada went up 30 percent. I'll frankly say we didn't match it, we went up 28 percent -- we're 2 points behind. Mining went up 42 percent in the nation as a whole and 200 percent here; power went up 27 percent in the nation as a whole and 47 percent here.

Now we've got nothing to be ashamed about in those figures. They're heartening figures, they're encouraging, and they ought to stimulate us to do better if we possibly can, but they are figures that indicate that in this general sweep of our economic march forward, this province is not doing badly compared to the Canadian average, and I think we have no right to denigrate the effort of our people here in developing our economy. I trust that no one does that. While the government does not desire to take the full credit for these advances, it is entitled to its share.

The Leader of the Opposition says this government has failed to produce results from many of its programs. That will do on the hustings when no one is there to challenge you, I suppose. It isn't very precise. I thought it would have been better to take some of the programs of the government and see whether they have produced results -- many of its programs. Take the most important programs that the government has initiated, say in the field of agriculture. What about the crop insurance plan? That's produced results -- produced results in the great drought of 1961 -- the worst we ever had -- many farmers rescued with the crop insurance plan; produced results last year when we had bad water conditions, too much moisture in eastern Manitoba, the crop insurance plan was there. My honourable friends in days gone by were urged to bring it in and they never did. We did; we're gradually extending it; we'll extend it some more. That program has produced results. Take the Farm Credit Plan. There wasn't any provincial farm credit plan till we came in, now we have \$22 million lent out, half of it to young farmers to restore and re-establish the family farm. You ask them whether the programs of this government have not produced results. I think they'll tell you another story.

Take the question of our programs in education. Members must know these figures by heart now because they are mentioned so many times, but my honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition throws this in his grab bag of "failed to produce results from many of its programs." Our programs in education failed to produce results? What about the kids in high school, in the new high schools that have been built? A very large building program -- 64 to 65 million dollars worth of new schools since we came in. How many students in high schools that weren't there before because there was no high school for them to go to? Those figures have been given in this House many times. Is that another one of these programs that failed to produce results? What about the development of our university and the increase in students and in the increase in facilities there? Millions of dollars invested; the university support grants tripled, apart altogether from any capital support that the Honourable Member for Burrows talks about. Do those people think that our program doesn't produce any results? It isn't necessary, you know, just that we should be convinced in here. You've got to convince a few other people besides and make them see what's going on. Brandon College resurrected. I don't think that's too strong a term. Brandon College resurrected by our educational policy and made into a flourishing institution with a tremendous future before it for western Manitoba. That's another one of these policies that don't pay off -- one of these programs that we can't really see any results from.

In hospitals, debated here the other day -- \$25 million more or less in new hospital construction under our jurisdiction -- over, what is it, 1,000 or 1,500 new beds either built or about to be built in the near future? The number of beds per thousand actually increasing in this province. Ask the communities where new hospitals are built as to whether the policies of this administration bring results or not. Go through the communities of Manitoba and look at the elderly persons' housing organizations in all the smaller centres of Manitoba. "All" is too strong a word -- they're not in all the centres but so many have elderly persons' housing. Ask the old folks in those homes whether the policies of this government pay off or whether they don't.

(Mr. Roblin, Cont'd.)

Consider the question of mental illness. What was it -- six people engaged in out-patient mental service when we came in and now 125 or something to that effect? The mental hospitals being emptied because we are able to get people back into their homes with better methods. Is that another one of these programs that aren't paying off?

Take the roads of Manitoba. Get out the road map. Drive on them. Ask the driving public whether or not the policies of this administration in the field of roads have paid off or not. We have made great strides in improving our road system in this province and we have more yet to do, but to say that these policies don't pay off is something that the people of Manitoba will not believe, because they can see what has been done. To say that more should be done is a legitimate approach to take, but to say that these programs have failed to produce is nonsense, and we know it, all of us here, and I have quite a strong conviction that the people of Manitoba know it as well.

And you can go through other programs that this government has initiated. In the field of roadside parks, for example, and recreation facilities of all sorts. We've spent a lot of money on these. There's been 1,600 miles of new or rebuilt hardtop established. There's that wonderful highway to Flin Flon, the north-south backbone of this province. There's 233 access roads to 233 municipalities that didn't have access roads before we came into office. If the Leader of the Opposition doesn't know about these things I want to tell him the voters of Manitoba do.

What about cultural grants? Not an important matter in terms of money. Cultural grants were a grand total of 10,000 when we came into office; they're 97,000 today for that particular group of institutions. The people in the arts world know what the policies of this government mean if my honourable friend doesn't, and I doubt that they would subscribe to the theory that our policies have not paid off or materialized.

What about welfare? What about the old age pensioner who now can get social assistance when he wants it? He couldn't get that before. He couldn't get Medicare before. He couldn't get the facilities of that department to the degree that he can today. Ask him whether the policies of this government pay off? He may say, "You should do more." That's a human and natural thing to say, but I think he would do us the kindness to say that these policies have substantially improved the position in which he finds himself.

Slum clearance; urban renewal. These policies pay off. The bulldozers are at work. The builders are at work. The houses are going up; the people are in them. But those policies didn't exist before we came in, and these I suppose are more of these policies of the present administration which my honourable friend said in his resolution have failed to produce results.

Elderly persons' housing -- I mentioned that. Forty-two new elderly persons' housing projects since we came in. There's been a quiet revolution in the field of the treatment of the aged. I want to just read you if I may, Madam Speaker, a statement made by one of the gentlemen in this field: "A quiet revolution has taken place in the care of the aged, William Smith, executive director of the Middlechurch Home, said at the annual meeting Thursday. The improvement in Manitoba has been no less spectacular than in the field of housing. Due to assessment of individual needs and assistance where required, each person can plan and purchase in his own way, and according to his own pattern. Another area that has been completely overhauled is Medicare, noted Mr. Smith. He underlined that older people can now utilize the services of their own private physician in place of the endless waiting and impersonal use of hospital out-patient departments. As of January, the executive director said, this private physician care has been extended into the hospital." Quiet revolution in the care of the aged. The job done? No; much to do; but a quiet revolution has taken place and I say to my honourable friend that he cannot convince the people of this province that our policies in this field have failed to produce the results of which he speaks.

What about the Water Supply Board policy? Is that another one that's failed to pay off? Twenty-four communities in this province. A new policy that didn't exist before we came in -- that's one of ours. In his own community of Ste. Rose there is interest in this Water Supply Board. Modern conveniences for twenty-four localities that knew it not before this policy was initiated by us. Another one of these policies which has failed to pay off.

Number of people in our parks and camp grounds - 31,000 used them in '59, 109,000 in

(Mr. Roblin, Cont'd.) . . . 1963; number of camping areas up from 25 to 42; number of high-way wayside points from 10 to 66. More of these policies that don't pay off.

I say to my honourable friend that he may go through as many of the policies of this government as he wishes, and while I will not be one who will maintain any sense of complacency about them, I do say that the charge made in this resolution and this amendment that the policies of the government are not paying off in many particulars, has totally failed any substantiation whatsoever from my hit-and-run friend over there. That kind of criticism does not advance the public business because it is not related to the facts as we all know them. Until there is that effort made by my honourable friend to relate his criticism to the facts I'm afraid that he will not be rendering that service to the people of this province which I feel he should in his post of responsibility.

Well, so much for the odds and ends of my honourable friend's speech. I've probably given more emphasis to some than they deserve -- I'm sure I have; but I felt that it would be useful at some time in this session to get on the record a few of the things that have been going on, and to demonstrate, as can easily be done, the fatuity of the type of criticism that we are receiving from gentlemen opposite.

I now want to spend a minute or two upon the other points which I believe he would regard as his main charges, namely to do with the finances of the Government of Manitoba; and in this respect the first point that comes to my attention is the fact that the Post-War Fund was "used up." How can a man who can read and cipher make a statement like that? How can a man who obtends to criticize the finances of Manitoba make that statement? Because to test the truth of it, all he has to do is to turn to page 299 of the Public Accounts, and if he does so he will find the disposition of that moneys and what it is invested in, and he will find that it is not used up, it has been lent and is available on demand. And if he says, "Ah, but that's different from what it used to be," then I'd say, turn to the Public Accounts of 1958 and you will see that at that time the investments of that fund were in -- among other things -- in Canadian bonds and in Provincial Treasury bills and in Manitoba Hydro. They were invested then just as they are today. He made no charge that those funds were used up in '58 and that is why, because they weren't; they were there and available, and they're there and available now, and to say that that fund is used up and not available is just simply not the case; and how can you, with the Public Accounts before you to which all of us may refer, come to this House with a statement like that and expect to be taken seriously as a financial critic? Frankly, I can't see it.

Well then he says, and this is a reprise -- I think that's the word in theatrical circles, a reprise of an old argument, that they juggled the figures on the other side; they cooked the books just a little and all this talk about surplus is just for the birds. The government, he says shows a financial surplus for every year of the past six years but he says that's just so much malarkey -- my honourable friend says tommy-rot and I just don't know which word is more appropriate -- but he says that the government's claim to have a surplus in these connections is not accurate. He says there's a very substantial deficit every year, and in support of that allegation he produces the report of the Canadian Tax Foundation and according to the information contained in that report, which he is kind enough to give to us, with respect to Manitoba, the government's claim to have surpluses is knocked into a cocked hat because it is shown there beyond peradventure of a doubt that they have a deficit in all these years instead. Oh, the rascals and their surpluses, and all the proof and all the impartiality of the Canadian Tax Foundation, and oh the cleverness of the Leader of the Opposition to expose this fraud on the people of the Province of Manitoba; to have brought to the light of day this financial trickery in which the Provincial Treasurer stands convicted by the Canadian Tax Foundation in misleading and deceiving the people of Manitoba. Here is a real expose, and it certainly is a real expose because the Budget speeches made by me are written with two ends in mind, of course, one for the consideration of this House and the other for the consideration and study of every financial expert in Canada. All the banks and all the bond houses and all the financing agencies and all the insurance companies, both in Canada and the United States, read this statement of mine, and they think it's a statement that discloses a balanced budget and a fine and a sound order of finance in the province, but they've all been hoodwinked by Duff until the peerless Leader of the Opposition read the Canadian Tax Foundation report to expose this to the world.

Now, first of all, let me say that the Canadian Tax Foundation report is everything that

(Mr. Roblin, Cont'd.) . . . the Honourable Leader of the Opposition said about it. I wouldn't quarrel with him on that. It's an impartial document prepared by men of competence, and I don't quarrel with what they put in here; but I say to my honourable friend, did he not have the intellectual curiosity to ask himself why is it that this document doesn't agree with the Provincial Treasurer? Is it necessary to jump to the conclusion that "the Provincial Treasurer is a rascal" because his figures disagree with those in this Tax Foundation report? Did he not have the intellectual curiosity to ask himself, what is the reason for the difference? Or does he just seek any stick to beat the government with? Does he accept any aid in this connection without any examination of the validity of the figures that he chooses?

Well, frankly, I could hardly bring myself to accuse my honourable friend of not knowing the reasons for the difference in the figures, but I can wonder, that if he knew, why he did not take the trouble to tell the House, because if he asked us to accept his criticism, I think he is bound to give the facts that lie behind the criticism that he put before us. Because if you will look at this document on page 166, you will see the record of the Province of Manitoba as figured up by the Canadian Tax Foundation, and in the year 1963 we are shown as having a deficit of \$31,350,000 during the same period when we were claiming to have a surplus in our budgetary accounts. Well, why don't we take a look at the Province of Ontario, or did my honourable friend not have the curiosity to turn to the next page to see what they had. In 1963, the Province of Ontario is shown with a deficit of \$130,480,000 and yet the Provincial Treasurer of that Province declared a surplus of \$66 million in the legislature of the Province of Ontario.

Take a look at the figures for the Province of Quebec. The Province of Quebec for the same year showed a deficit according to the Canadian Tax Foundation of \$182,400,000, and yet the Treasurer of that province who is the Premier, Monsieur Jean Lesage, declared a surplus of \$17 million when he reported his budget to the treasury, to the legislature of that province. Or take a look at the Province of Alberta if you will, and you will find that according to the Canadian Tax Foundation in 1963 they had a deficit of \$4,890,000, and at the same time their treasurer was forecasting a surplus of \$52 million. Well, when you come across that kind of a situation where you find the treasurers of these other provinces, not the reprehensible gentleman that has the shop in Manitoba, but these other men reporting surpluses of the kind that I have mentioned, and the Canadian Tax Foundation showing a deficit, one must ask are all these men -- I won't use the word "liars" -- it's unparliamentary -- but are all these men misrepresenting the facts of their budgets to their people as I have been accused, I should think, of doing here? I don't think anyone would make that claim. The facts are that the Canadian Tax Foundation combined the current and capital accounts together. Thus they get their own figure. This province does not, and neither do the other provinces, with the exception of Saskatchewan which has its own system. It's not just Manitoba, but it's all the other provinces following the same system. But it seems to me criticism on this ground just falls to pieces when you analyze it, because when we declared a surplus, as we have done, we declared a proper surplus and we deceived no one, and it has been accepted by all the responsible financial people in the northern hemisphere that are interested in this thing, and we are doing exactly what the other provinces do and have done for many a long day. And yet to accuse us that we're misleading the people by means of false surpluses is I think a charge that simply can't be strictly justified on this basis.

The difference between the two approaches is this: The Canadian Tax Foundation says that if you buy a house on time you are to include it in the expenditures of one year. Well now, that's all right with me, if you want to look at finances on that basis; but to use that as a means of substantiating a charge of juggling, -- and that's the word -- against this government or indeed the governments of Ontario or Quebec or Alberta, is simply to be too ridiculous for words. Was the Leader of the Opposition too stupid to know about this? Was he too lazy to turn the pages and see what the other provinces were doing? I don't think so, because I believe that he is neither stupid nor lazy. I think he knew; but I say that if he did know -- and I believe he did -- that he should have told us when making this criticism what the basis of it was, because there has now been spread in our newspapers and in the length and breadth of Manitoba the allegation, which I have just now had the opportunity to reply to, that our books are juggled and that our surpluses are deficits, and that obviously the financial operations of the province are in very questionable shape indeed. Now, that kind of an attack is something

(Mr. Roblin, Cont'd.) . . . less than the public deserves in considering the importance of the matters we deal with. Once again, I think the attack fizzles when it is confronted with the facts of the situation. I think that the presentation that the government has given in connection with our financial situation is true and solid and sound, and that it is accepted as such by those who are the experts in this field from one end of this country to the other. Our financial status in the Dominion of Canada is the best proof that I can bring as to the soundness of the management of our public affairs; and to produce a statement based on this and give only the figures which seem to reflect unfavourably on Manitoba, without the explanation that ought to go with them, is again no service to a rational discussion of public finance in the Province of Manitoba. It's superficial. It's shallow. It won't do.

Now I want to talk about the other principal cross upon which my honourable friend has impaled himself. That has to do with the provincial debt. The provincial debt horrifies the Liberal Party -- it doesn't horrify the CCF; they're much too sensible for that. It horrifies the Honourable Member for Rhineland. -- (Interjection) -- I always feel it desirable to say something nice about the Honourable Member for Radisson when I can, because there are times that I am not able to, but in this case I think I can. And in introducing this question of debt, my honourable friend did me the considerable honour to read for perhaps the sixth or seventh time in six or seven years an extract from a speech which I must admit was my own, delivered in this House from the other side -- I think from the seat now occupied by the Honourable Member for Carillon. A very good seat, and I almost said, long may he occupy it, but I have some other ambitions in that respect for him, but however that may be, he's a member of the House that I certainly respect and he's in a good seat. Twelve years ago -- it's a long time, isn't it? -- I made a speech. I wasn't the Leader of the Opposition as I was charged with by someone. I was a backbencher in the Opposition, but I had been let loose for the first time as Opposition financial critic. I think it was my maiden effort in that important field, and I was a pretty junior member to be allowed to say anything about finance twelve years ago, and I rather felt it quite an honour. But in that speech, I made a statement which I'm going to read to the House, not because I don't think they know it by heart already, but just as wise to get the continuity of my remarks on the record. Here it does: "There's a funny thing about debt, Mr. Speaker, no matter what you call it you still have to pay it back, and I say that we regard the steady increase in the gross total of the debt of the province with some concern." The point in that sentence was later embodied in the resolution on the budget which was presented by me.

I suppose I could claim a number of excuses for that. I could talk about youth -- a little younger then. I could talk about inexperience in finance. I could talk about plain ignorance. But I must admit, and not for the first time, that it'll be a long parliamentary day before more certain immaturity of financial judgment will be contained in one sentence as was contained in that sentence which I delivered myself in this Chamber twelve years ago. Not to put too fine a point about it, I was wrong, completely wrong; and the interesting part is that the Grits didn't believe it then and they don't believe it now, because what did they do when I made my speech? Did they vote for it? Did they stand up to the man and say "Ah, here comes the Solomon of finance. He'll put his finger on the weakness of our policy. We have increased the debt. We've heard from him. By gad, we'll put a stop to it. He's told us what the rule ought to be." Did they do any of those things? No, they didn't. The people of Manitoba -- (Interjection) -- well, I doubt if it is. I think they had much better grounds for judgment than the speech I made twelve years ago in the back benches of the Opposition. Much better judgment than that. And I say this, that the Liberal Party voted against that sentiment as expressed in that sentence which has been quoted. They voted against it in 1952 and they voted against it in one form or another ever since. They don't believe the statement; they didn't believe it then. So what is the point of trotting it out now as if it were an article of their faith? -- (Interjection) -- Well, there's a point -- it provides me with something amusing to talk about. But that's about the only point I can see in the whole thing. They have made themselves, these gentlemen opposite, they have made themselves party to practically every dollar that has been added to the public debt, whether you call it direct debt or indirect debt or guaranteed debt from 1952 until the present time, because the debt is made by the votes of this House; and who voted for it? Well, among others, the Grits. And let me give you the record, because we are being damned, we

(Mr. Roblin, Cont'd.) ... are being condemned on this question of debt, and one can only presume that a man who criticizes the debt policy of the government must have some other idea in mind. He must have some other policy. He must oppose this policy and support another, and what evidence is there on the record that my honourable friends have done any of those things, although they stand up here quite ready to say on the occasion of a budget debate that it is wrong?

Well, here we are: Loan Act No. 2, 1958 -- \$33 million. Did my honourable friends vote against that? Not by a jugful! Loan Act 1959 -- \$59 million. Did my honourable friends vote against that? Not by a jugful! Loan Act 1960; there were two of them that year, one for \$48 million and one for ten. Did my honourable friends vote against either of those? Certainly not! It was a policy that they obviously approved of. Ah, but come along to 1961 and what did they do? There was a bill in there for \$39-1/2 million and they said, "We are not interested in voting for \$3-3/4 millions of it that belong to the Floodway," and they moved on concurrent and it's quite plain there that on account of the \$33-1/4 million they weren't going to vote for that one. So there's \$33-1/4 million that they can lay to their -- they can lay that flattering unction to their soul on the question of debt if they feel inclined to do so. In the same year there was another bill for \$55 million. What was their view on that? They were in favour of it. They voted for it. In 1962 there was a bill for \$43 million and that one they voted against because they didn't believe in the road policy the government was following at that time. Presumably they were not opposed to the other things involved in it which were telephones and colleges and buildings and what, but on account of the road policy they voted against that one -- 1962. Then the second Loan Act of 1962, they voted against that -- \$14-1/2 million, for agricultural credit and business development. That they didn't like. We come along to 1963 and nothing bothered them that year. They voted for \$32 million 6 in one capital bill and \$45 million in another capital bill, and then way back in 1960 they voted for \$150 million in another capital bill. So during that period in which this terrible debt on which my honourable friends have raised their hands so high, of some \$440 million of both direct and guaranteed debt, they actually voted, according to the record, against \$36-1/4 million of that total. So \$404 million they are just as much responsible for as anybody I suppose. If they didn't like it they could have voted against it. They never did. And I say to this House, Madam Speaker, that you have to accept the consequences of your actions. They are entitled to complain about \$36-1/4 million of the \$404 million increase but no more, because that's all that they declared themselves as being opposed to during that period. So it seems to me that it is, to put it in the mildest way, irresponsible, to stand up now and criticize the government for actions of which they were a party. I am prepared, however, Madam Speaker, and I want to make this clear, I am prepared to let my honourable friends be as irresponsible as they like, and I am prepared to defend the government's capital borrowing policy on its own merits as we were responsible for it and we proposed it. And however much of an accomplice my honourable friend may have been I am prepared to defend the government policy on its own merits.

Now in the Hansard in which my honourable friend's budget speech is recorded, he talks about the debt and says first of all, on page 250 up at the top of the page, he criticizes the way in which we are showing our debt, and doesn't think we are coming clean. He doesn't think we are being honest, if I want to put it in a rather blunt way, with the way in which we have referred to the public debt in the Province of Manitoba. He says that -- referring to the debt -- "it is mentioned, but do we find any clear cut statement, Madam Speaker, of the total debt, including the guaranteed?" That's what the argument was all about -- whether the guaranteed debt should be shown along with the direct provincial debt or not. And he says, no, it wasn't included in the total debt. There are two tables -- one on page 30 and one on page 32, and if you carefully combine the right figures, as the Comptroller-General did for us in the public accounts committee -- and this has to be done with some care and considerable juggling from page to page, if you do this carefully here and combine the right figures it is possible to get the total; but if you look at either table separately there is no clear picture, Madam Speaker. This was one of his important charges against us -- we weren't showing the debt. Well, I would like to direct the attention of the House to a budget. This budget is one that was presented in this Legislature, and if you care to look at page 18 of this budget -- and it was the one delivered in the spring of 1958 by the Honourable Charles E. Greenlay, Provincial

(Mr. Roblin, Cont'd.) . . . Treasurer of Manitoba -- the only reference that you will find to the provincial debt, either direct or guaranteed, in the budget statement as contained on page 18, "it is estimated that at the year end the dead weight debt of the province will amount to about \$29 million. Detailed information respecting the make-up and distribution of the provincial debt has been included in the table appearing in the index in this address." That's all. In my budget speech, it's included in the text on two different pages. In this budget speech -- the last one delivered before we had any responsibility -- not mentioned in the text of the budget speech itself. No mention of guaranteed. But he said it's in the charts. And here again my honourable friend says something about charts, again reading from his speech: "Similarly if you take the last page of this budget which shows this graph entitled "Province of Manitoba Public Debt," one could reasonably expect that this would be a true presentation of the total public debt of this province, but Madam Speaker, it does not." This chart does not include the guaranteed debt of the Province of Manitoba.

Well, let's turn to the chart that Mr. Greenlay had in his budget. Turn to page 42, that's where the charts are to be found in connection with the budget. Anything to be found in there about guaranteed debt or anything but the direct dead weight debt of the province? Not a . . . in the chart. Not so much of a scruple of that debt do you find -- except half way down the page -- in rather small type that my honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition would have trouble reading, judging from his experience with my budget -- a footnote. It got in. There was a footnote. In my budget: set out, documented, detailed, there. In this thing, not a mention in the budget proper, and the best you can do, search as you will, is to find a footnote among the charts. "Tricky financing?" I don't think I every accused Mr. Charles E. Greenlay of tricky financing. I thought he was an extremely straightforward and candid person. I still think so. And I think his budget was a straightforward and candid budget. It isn't as informative as mine to be sure on this question of debt, not as informative but I certainly wouldn't hold him up to public ridicule on that ground. I wonder why my honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition didn't tell us about the way they did things when they were in, when he criticizes us. -- (Interjection) -- No but you were sitting there. You were sitting there. -- (Interjection) -- Didn't he know? On this occasion I'm inclined to think he didn't know. He knew all right but he'd forgotten. It was some time ago. But I think that in making charges like this, which are serious, about the validity of information contained in a provincial budget statement one must not be shallow and superficial. And that's what my honourable friend is. He is shallow and superficial.

MR. MOLGAT: It was accurate.

MR. ROBLIN: He heard it in the 1959 budget, he heard it read, he read it himself. He knows it and he should have told us.

MR. MOLGAT: It's accurate.

MR. ROBLIN: Of course the reason for all this is perfectly obvious -- why Mr. Greenlay did not show this in his budget and why I treat it the way I do -- because whatever you say the guaranteed debt is not a direct liability of the province. There is not one single penny to be found in the public accounts or the estimates placed before this to pay for items which are listed under the guaranteed debt of this province. The Comptroller-General is no tool of the Treasury and that's the way he shows it in the public accounts; that's the way it shows in the balance sheet of this province; that's the way it shows in our estimates; and that's the truth. The guaranteed debt is not part of the direct obligations of this province, it is contingent, and there is not a cent in the public accounts charged up against that particular type of expense. And why, why is all this? Well, I'm going to give you another authority, and it's from another budget speech. This budget speech goes back a little further, it's 1951, and I can't expect the Honourable Member for Ste. Rose to know anything about this one. But I can expect the Honourable Member for Lakeside to know something about it and he has been particularly noisy on this particular point. And let me ask him to turn to page 20 of the budget of 1951 which he himself delivered in this House on the 21st day of March -- haven't got long to go before we get there. And listen to what he says about the way to treat guaranteed debt in the public accounts of this province, and I quote, "I think however that it is well to announce at this time a new policy with respect to our debt management which we plan to include at this session of the Legislature. The probable extent and scope of public power development from now on-makes it

(Mr. Roblin, Cont'd.) . . . desirable for us to deal with the future debt to be created for power generation as have the other great public ownership provinces of Ontario, Quebec and British Columbia. We plan to authorize the Hydro Electric Board to issue bonds in its own name with provision for guarantees by the province. This will mean that in future the direct debt of the province will be shown separately from the debt of this expanding new utility. Hydro Board public borrowings will be made separately from borrowings for other provincial purposes. It is desirable if we are to keep the Board's financial affairs completely separate from our own in such a way as to be readily seen by all people at all times. It is a new departure for Manitoba, but one for which the trail has long since been blazed by the three largest provinces of Canada in the same field of public power ownership." Now I ask you, where now does my honourable friend's criticism stand? He is criticizing us for following a sensible policy laid down in 1951, followed by all the treasurers from 1951 to '58 with respect to the treatment of the guaranteed debt; the way in which it should be considered; its relationship to the provincial budget; where it should appear in the statement of account and in the budgetary statements that are made, and its affect on the taxpayers of Manitoba. Well, balderdash is the most discreet term that comes to my lips at this moment, but it indicates again the superficial nature of the charges made by my honourable friend in this connection. All right! It is therefore realistic that we should separate this guarantee from the other debts of this province and it is also realistic to treat them as we do with respect to the tax position of the people of Manitoba. My honourable friend lumps them together. In spite of the clear statement by one of the preceding provincial treasurers of this province that that was not the way to do it, as I have just read from the budget speech of 1951, my honourable friend lumps them altogether and he gives figures for the gross debt guaranteed and other of the Province of Manitoba, which would scare the hide off of anybody who took it at its face value, and I see some newspapers did. A dreadful figure, if it were truly the debt that weighed upon the back of the taxpayers of the Province of Manitoba but it doesn't happen to be the case. The actual direct debt, the per capita net debt of this province is \$176.71 per capita, not that horrific figure that received such wide publicity as the result of my honourable friend's irrational and superficial statement. The figure that I'm using, I'm bound to point out, is not the same figure that appears for debt in the Canadian Tax Foundation report because our figure is calculated after the deduction of sinking funds and self-sustaining debt. Theirs is not. That's the reason. I'm bound to explain the reason. I do so. Manitoba is fifth in this list of provinces with respect to net per capita debt -- \$176.71 -- 4 percent, four cents on the dollar is what it takes us to pay for it in the Provincial Budget; well within our power to carry; right that we should have it in view of all the circumstances, and certainly nothing to do with this horrendous figure as given by my honourable friend when he spoke.

But, Madam Speaker, I suggest to you that for the purposes of this argument set aside all these refinements if you like, forget about it. It can be said somebody borrowed the money; somebody borrowed it, and let's look at it in that light. Let's look at the total figure of the debt of this province, whether it be guaranteed or direct, because it's a highly instructive exercise to do so. The meaningful question, I submit to you, the meaningful question to ask about debt is not how much but what for. That's the question to ask about debt. That's the question that anyone who is conducting a serious examination of the public finance of this province ought to ask. What for? And I commend that question to honourable gentlemen opposite. Is it debt to pay the grocery bills? That's one thing. Or is it debt to build a Hydro plant? That's another. One is non-productive debt, the other is a productive investment. My honourable friend, if I may just include him in this discussion I'm having here for a minute, the Member for Brokenhead, he was complaining about the fact that the province didn't invest enough money in capital works of this sort -- so I'm not sure which side of this question he's on -- but if he had read my budget speech of this year, or was it last, he would have noticed 35 percent of the capital put in place in this province is on government account -- 35 percent. Now, today, this minute, and it has been for the last five years, 35 percent of the capital investment being made is on government account; yet he tells me it isn't enough. I think it goes quite a long way. And most of that is for public utilities: Hydro's 329 million of these very large sums we're talking about, out of a total of 450 million -- Hydro, 329; Telephone's, 121. This kind of debt is an investment because a productive asset is created, and this is the

(Mr. Roblin, Cont'd.) . . . essential point.

A productive asset is created which is no burden on the provincial taxpayer, and just for the sake of developing a figure which would scare the pants off anyone who sees it without any explanation, his game isn't worth the candle to do that kind of thing because it misrepresents the facts of public finance. These guaranteed borrowings for utilities of this sort are no burden on the taxpayers of the Province of Manitoba -- speech of 1952 or no speech of 1952. They are no burden, and honourable gentlemen opposite know that just as well as I do. Just as well. And he shakes his head -- I'm lost in amazement to think that the point really hasn't penetrated yet. Of course, the fact is he's shaking his head for effect because he knows perfectly well that what I'm saying is nothing more nor less than the literal fact.

If you don't borrow for these things what happens? There are no lights. There are no telephones. There's no water supply. He stands up here and tells us to get out of the Water Supply Board. One of his things that he did say, that we were doing all right the other day -- he didn't quite like the way we were doing it but doesn't he realize that we borrow money for that? Isn't that part of the debt structure of this province? Does that cost the taxpayers of Manitoba as provincial taxpayers anything? No. Why don't you say so? Why don't you give us a candid appraisal of the facts? Does my honourable friend and the men behind him and beside him advocate no lights and no telephone and no water supply, because that's the logical conclusion of the argument that he put before us about too high a public debt. Well if that's what he believes -- and of course his votes indicate that he believes no such thing -- but if that's what he believes, let him have the intestinal fortitude and the candor to tell the people of Manitoba that -- to go around this province and talk about gross per capita debt in the terms in which he has done and yet not share with them the fact that if they want that stopped they've got to stop borrowing for utilities. Well it won't take long for the public to see through that kind of an argument. He's got to come clean with the voters, if he says one thing in this House and doesn't follow through with a logical conclusion of his reasonings in the other. Because, what did the people get for this debt? Just an obligation to pay somebody something? Not on your life! What the people of this province got for this debt are Hydro dams and power lines and a telephone system; but they got a little more than that because it was a public investment and free of taxation, free of taxation, they received on the basis of this investment, not only these physical assets -- which incidentally today are worth far more than they would cost them at the time -- physical assets which cost the taxpayer nothing to support, not a nickel. They got something else; they got the inestimable advantage of one of the cheapest telephone rate structures in the Dominion, and we looked at it this morning and they got something even better; they got the cheapest Hydro electric rate structure taken as a whole in the Dominion of Canada.

Well, my honourable friend says, no sir. He was handed this morning, I'm sure, the chart that indicates the facts on this. Who was saying, no sir? I missed that one. Oh well I don't know whether he saw this statement or not, but I'll read it to him. That we have the cheapest farm and domestic rate in the Dominion of Canada. We have the cheapest power or industrial service in the Dominion of Canada. In commercial service, as he pointed out at the committee, we are second in the Dominion of Canada, or is it third? But all services taken together -- that's the statement that I made a minute ago -- we are the cheapest in the Dominion of Canada. And even if we're not the cheapest, we are . . .

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I wish the First Minister would be accurate, seeing as he's so keen. The chart indicates that Quebec is the cheapest all services considered.

MR. ROBLIN: Thank you! I accept the correction. It escaped my notice.

MR. MOLGAT: It's interesting you know.

MR. ROBLIN: Well if my honourable friend will just have the same batting average on accuracy as I have, I'll have not so much to complain about the next time, because almost nothing he has said was accurate.

I was going on to say, before I was corrected -- and I accept the correction -- I was going on to say that even if it wasn't the cheapest in Canada, this investment, this capital debt, this horrible guaranteed debt which sets everyone's skin quivering and hair stand on end, not only supports itself but has given us -- and I'll say this time -- one of the cheapest power and telephone systems in this country. That's worth something. That's worth the effort that the people of this province have put into it. And I say that if you want to talk about the debt of this

(Mr. Roblin, Cont'd.) . . . province; and if you want to talk about the gross debt, no holds barred, everything thrown in, I'm your man. I'll talk about it, and I'll talk about it anywhere because it just makes the best good plain common sense that anyone ever heard of that we should support these investments and these utilities in the way in which I have spoken.

And yet the Liberal Party would have us believe by this amendment that that's all wrong; that it was wrong to accumulate this debt; that the government should be put out of office because they did it, in spite of the fact that the Grits had a big hand in voting for it at every turn and corner, and yet they haven't got the candor to say what they would do, and how they would change policy in this respect. The answer is they wouldn't change it a bit, and everybody knows it very well; so everybody knows that this whole resolution is nothing more than a cream puff without any cream in it.

We borrowed some money on our direct account you know as well. I've been talking about guaranteeing. We borrow money on direct account. We borrowed a lot of money for roads on direct account. I don't gloss over that. The next biggest item I think is for roads, many millions of dollars. The people can see and use the fruits of that investment in good roads and they have, I think, quite cheerfully accepted the gas taxes that are necessary to help pay for the cost of borrowing in this connection.

So there we have it. Allegations of inaccuracy knocked into a cocked hat in my opinion. Allegations of an expose of government finance; allegations about debt; the crushing character of the per capita debt of this province exposed in my opinion as unrealistic nonsense. And even if it were true, where does it leave the Liberal Party? On which particular horn of the dilemma do they wish to rant? Do they want to cut expenses? One would think so. Yet on the other side of the House, the other side of the mouth we hear the holler for more hospitals and more social allowances -- a resolution on the Order Paper now for more costs in education. It might be a good resolution but it's going to cost money. More education grants, more brain-
age. Do you want taxes to be raised to pay for this so that we don't have debt, otherwise we might have a debt. Perish the thought! He just wants services without the cost. Well I suppose that's an understandable ploy but it won't work. He knows it won't work. Does he want to reduce borrowing? Thinks we borrow too much. Well he'd better speak to some of his members, like the Member for Portage la Prairie that's got a six and a half million dollar highway resolution on the books; or the Member for Assiniboia who's got a half a million dollar resolution on the books; or the Honourable Member for Emerson who's got a three and a half million dollar resolution on the books. I'm afraid you'll find it's more than that before we get through. But supposing it's just one and a half as my honourable friend says -- (Interjection) -- I'll be as accurate as I can. What's he going to do about all this? Which one of these horns does he really want to hang himself on? No borrowing, or no services or -- I'll invent a third one for him -- more taxes?

Well I think my honourable friend is in the undignified position of trying to shuffle sideways with his back to the future and his face turned longingly to the past. -- (Interjection) -- Well, I've had about a month to think about it, and I really think I should have done something better than that in a month. I'm not very proud of that particular description of my honourable friend because I think that it's hardly sufficiently illustrative of his position to do him justice.

But I think I can say that in the presentation that he made here the other day, I'm afraid he didn't present a very deeply thought-out, or indeed a factual, critique of the financial affairs of the Province of Manitoba. This government isn't perfect. There are plenty of ways to criticize it legitimately, but to trot out this kind of superficial and shallow -- I was going to say . . . but I don't think I had better do that -- I withdraw that remark. It's not entirely courteous. -- (Interjection) -- Well, it might not be. I remember when I was once described as indicative of the manifestations of political immaturity. I think that was one expression used on me long ago by the Honourable Member for Lakeside. I think he was probably right at the time as a matter of fact and he's right occasionally. No, I wouldn't use any expression like that on my honourable friend, though it was used on me when I was in his position. I would merely say that what he has given us is shallow and it is muddleheaded and it is foolish, because not one of the criticisms which he has laid down in his speech would he pay any attention to if he had responsibility for the affairs of this province. He wouldn't stop borrowing. He wouldn't do any of the things he asks us do. He is just feeding us a little bit of political humbug.

(Mr. Roblin, Cont'd.) . . . Well a humbug is a little bit of a candy that you can suck and if my honourable friend's remarks had that to recommend them, perhaps I'd have something good to say about them. I don't think they have. I think it's just plain political humbug; that his facts are misconceived and the direction of his arguments totally mistaken; and he is asking us to do things that he would never do himself. And I would like to say that in my opinion that is not a satisfactory performance in the public interest for the criticism of a budget in this province of ours. You find something of substance to criticize us on, and we'll listen to you, but as long as we have this kind of inadequate performance offered, with no policy, no criticism of any substance and finickety finagling over the affairs of Manitoba, I can feel that it will be a long day before you can sell that to the people of the province.

MADAM SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Inkster, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I think probably that it might be useful to proceed with some of these important resolutions before we go into Supply. Perhaps the one on dental health, and then the one on shared services, then perhaps back to the Committee of Supply.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the Minister of Health. The Honourable the Member for Rhineland.

MR. J. M. FROESE (Rhineland): Madam Speaker, having listened for better than an hour to the First Minister, I've trouble in gathering my thoughts for the things that I had intended to say at this time. First of all let me say that I'm very interested in this matter that is being proposed here in this resolution, that of setting up a committee to study and investigate the whole matter of the denturists. I for one am very interested and I was interested at the time that we had a bill introduced in this House -- I think it was around 1960 -- in connection with the denturists. At that time we were going to authorize the denturists to operate in a legal manner in Manitoba, and the matter was very roundly debated. I checked in the journals the other day, and I think this is one case where just about every member in this House spoke, and I think a good number spoke very heartily in favour of endorsing that legislation. However, we found that the professional members of this House opposed it, and eventually were able to swing the tide and to vote the matter down.

Now we have a similar situation in the other provinces in connection with the denturists or dental mechanics as they are called in the other provinces, and where we have this opposition present to these people; and when I heard the Honourable Member for St. Vital in his remarks the other day I think he mentioned that there was confusion in other provinces about this very thing and that there was a need for this enquiry. He mentioned some of the conflicting reports that had come up to him from the other provinces in connection with the dental technicians, and while I don't know where he got his reports from, I have been in contact with some of the people responsible in other provinces where they have legalized and authorized the dental mechanics to operate, that apparently they are doing a very satisfactory job. Naturally, they are confined in their operations; their scope of operations has been determined by law, but yet they perform a very useful purpose. And I feel by bringing in this resolution and in asking for this study we're just delaying legislation in Manitoba to give these people a chance to operate here. This I feel is a very urgent matter. These people should be legalized to operate in Manitoba.

Apparently we are short of dentists, especially so in rural areas. People in the rural areas have to come in to the city if they want some dental work performed. And secondly, I feel that a lot of people find it too costly to go to the dentist today, and as a result some necessary work that should be done, especially on the children, is being left undone and is not taken care of; so that I feel that we should not waste any time in setting up long studies before we bring in any legislation and doing something about this matter. I maintain that we can't afford to wait any longer, or wait that long till we have the report of the committee and who knows, it might be another year then before action is taken. However, if this is the only way we can get action from the government on this matter, I will support the resolution, although under protest. I feel that this matter should be taken to hand at the present time and not be deferred any longer.

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

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, Yeas and Nays, please.

MADAM SPEAKER: Call in the members. The question before the House is the adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable Minister of Health.

A standing vote was taken the result being as follows:

YEAS: Messrs. Alexander, Baizley, Beard, Bilton, Bjornson, Carroll, Cowan, Evans, Froese, Groves, Hamilton, Harrison, Hutton, Jeannotte, Johnson, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McDonald, McKellar, McLean, Martin, Mills, Moeller, Paulley, Roblin, Schreyer, Seaborn, Smellie, Stanes, Steinkopf, Strickland, Watt, Weir, Witney, Wright and Mrs. Morrison.

NAYS: Messrs. Barkman, Campbell, Cherniack, Desjardins, Gray, Guttormson, Hillhouse, Hryhorczuk, Johnston, Molgat, Patrick, Shoemaker, Smerchanski, Tanchak, and Vielfaure.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 37; Nays, 15.

MADAM SPEAKER: I declare the motion carried.

The adjourned debate on the proposed resolution of the Honourable the First Minister. The Honourable the Member for Souris-Lansdowne.

MR. M. E. MCKELLAR (Souris-Lansdowne): Madam Speaker, I adjourned this for the First Minister.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable the First Minister.

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, I don't think this is proper. If I may, just on a point of order. The resolution is held in the name of the Honourable the First Minister. We were not aware of the fact that the Honourable Member was doing that. I question the propriety of doing this. . . . not to the holder.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, it's frequently done. But I want to say that he's not holding it for me to the exclusion of anyone else, because I'm quite prepared to hear any other member who wishes to speak. It appeared last night that the thing might be going to a vote, from what I am told, and it was kept open to make sure that that should not happen, but I invite any honourable member who wishes to speak to do so.

MADAM SPEAKER: Any member wishing to speak may do so.

MR. M. GRAY (Inkster): Yes, Madam Speaker.

MADAM SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GRAY: I wish to make a brief statement on a very important question. I'm sure it is not a new discovery for the members of this House when I tell them the school question has assumed the proportion of a major issue, which is embittered by the fact that the religious emphasis has entered into it. Yet I think that we have not yet reached the stage at which the basic question "for or against subsidizing the parochial schools" should be discussed. The government is aware of the way in which various groups in the community and in this House feel about the issue. In view of this situation the shared services plan has been submitted, which the government considers a workable compromise. I cannot say whether I agree with this proposition before I have studied it. I may come to the conclusion that it is entirely unworkable and unrealistic -- but then again, I may feel that it has merit. But how can I possibly come to a conclusion on the merits of the compromise if I commit myself in advance to one of the sides of the argument which this compromise is purported to settle.

What is before us now is a motion to set up a committee of the Legislature to study the merits of the shared services plan -- the plan which is supposed to settle a very touchy and potentially disrupted situation. In all fairness, I want to give this motion my support since by giving this support I do not in any way prejudice my future position, either on the merits of the shared services plan, or on any controversial issue to subsidize parochial schools. I simply want to get a chance to study the question as thoroughly as possible, and I think that the establishment of the committee will help me to gather the information which I need for an intelligent decision. In view of this important question, I wish to place myself on record with the few remarks I have made.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Member for Lakeside, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, may I ask you now to call the proposed resolution

(Mr. Roblin, Cont'd.) . . . standing in the name of the Member from Morris, on which we are expecting your ruling.

MADAM SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the

MR. PAULLEY: Madam Speaker, before you make your ruling, may I question the propriety of dealing with this particular resolution on Government Day. The resolution is proposed by a private member of this House, and I suggest that we should deal with -- if it is the intention of going into government business, namely the committee -- that we should do that before we start in on a private member's resolution which is in accordance with the Orders of the House, the government only having the right, as I understand the rules, on Government Day to deal with resolutions standing in the name of the government.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I don't wish to make an issue out of this, but I believe that when government orders are reached, or it is a Government Day, the government may call the business in the order that it determines, whether or not it's government business. I think that is the rule, and if Madam Speaker cares to rule on it, well fine and dandy. I don't wish to break the rule, but I believe it is the rule.

MR. PAULLEY: Well, Madam Speaker, may I request that you do this. We may not proceed with this today anyway. May I ask that this be done in order that we're sure of how we stand, because -- may I suggest a hypothetical situation that a private member's resolution may be called by the government if the suggestion of my honourable friend is correct at any time; whereas we have set aside in our rule book days and hours for private member's resolutions. I think this is the first time this has come up, at least since I've been in the House, and I would ask, Madam Speaker, that you'd give this your consideration.

MR. ROBLIN: Well, Madam Speaker, I would have no objection to you reserving this matter to rule on the point, because it is a nice point and if you'd like to get it clarified -- I personally don't think there's any substance in it, but I have occasionally been wrong on these matters of rules, so I'm quite willing to agree with my honourable friend that Madam Speaker should take it under consideration.

MADAM SPEAKER: I agree then to take it under consideration, and I will give my ruling on it at a later date.

MR. PAULLEY: . . . you might do that at the same time as you're giving your ruling as to whether or not the resolution is in Order that's being held by yourself.

MR. MOLGAT: Madam Speaker, on the point of Order, while I presume on Private Members Day it's impossible for the government to step in and take over precedence, surely on Government Day if the government does not want to proceed at that time with certain items of government business, it can or could conceivably go completely into Private Members Day. It seems to me that we do this at the -- mind you, the rules are suspended at that time, I agree, but surely it doesn't condemn the government to having to proceed, does it? At least this is not my interpretation of the rules, but if on a certain day they chose to go into Private Members rather than government business, they would be free to do so.

MR. PAULLEY: May I suggest though, Madam Speaker, if I may speak again on this. The Honourable the Leader of the Opposition may be right, if it was reached in the ordinary routine of arriving at the resolution, but in this particular case it is the jumping over of a resolution in the name of the government, namely the Committee of Supply. The intention would be to jump over that, and I'm sure that my honourable friend would not want to start on the resolutions and not come back to the Committee on Estimates this evening, and I think this is the difference, and this is my point.

MR. ROBLIN: Well, I hate to drag it out, but I think that my honourable friend's point is not right. He's misconstrued it. I think that the position is that on Private Members Days the private members have an undoubted precedence which the government can't interfere with; but that on Government Days the government calls the business in the order that it desires. I think it's as simple as that now. -- (Interjection) -- Madam Speaker can rule. But Madam, if you are going to rule on this I suppose it would then be in order for me to move the Supply motion.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Madam -- if I may interject here -- under our rules of Orders and Procedures, Rule 20, subsection 2, it says: "When government business has precedence, government orders may be called, government orders may be called in such sequence as the

(Mr. Hillhouse, Cont'd.) . . . government thinks fit, so I think that covers this situation.

MR. ROBLIN: Madam Speaker, I think that there might be some argument as to whether or not this motion is a private motion. After all, this motion was introduced as the report of a committee appointed by the House and I would rather fancy that -- but I'm not going to labour the point. Let Madam Speaker worry about this one. I'll simply move, Madam Speaker, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Health, that Madam Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee of Supply to consider of the supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

Madam Speaker presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried, and the House resolved into a Committee of Supply with the Honourable Member for St. Matthews in the Chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Health Services No. 7 -- Hospital Services passed . . .

HON. GURNEY EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce)(Fort Rouge): Mr. Chairman, I wonder in view of the fact there are just two or three minutes left if you would consider calling it 5:30 and we can take a fresh run at it after supper.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise to report. -- (Interjection) -- I call it 5:30 and leave the Chair until 8 o'clock.