

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
8:00 o'clock, Monday, April 19, 1971

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. TRUEMAN: Mr. Speaker, during this past week or so, it has been interesting for all of us to watch you developing your own style in the Speakership of this House, and your clear intentions to remain in charge are admired by us all. You've even put down that obstreperous group that sits on your right. You wear the gown and tricorne in déagé fashion and I suggest that speaker-watching is going to be an interesting pastime for the remainder of the Session.

The mover and seconder of the Speech from the Throne acquitted themselves well and deserve our congratulations. I wish I could say as much for the others who have spoken on the government side in their Throne Speech debate. The two new members of the Legislature who are putting in their time in the gallery, I know must be impatient to enter into the activities of the House. I congratulate them on their successful campaigns and their elections.

The Throne Speech in its generalities has told us very little about the government's real plans for the people of Manitoba. No doubt they will be revealed to us before very long. The proposed Statistics Act I trust will provide for the long desired Bureau of Social Statistics that was recommended by the social service audit. I trust this will be a service not just for government but that it will also be available to the community. Ideally, it should be a system for collecting and updating social data continuously, and also a means of evaluation of public and private programs and it should assist in the co-ordination of the work of all agencies. An integrated income security program is to be introduced. Lack of money is only one aspect of the complicated problem of poverty. So far there has been little evidence the government really realizes this. There has not been one general proposal to help the disadvantaged to achieve independence. Oh, certainly there's mention of efforts to reduce unemployment and we hear pious remarks from all quarters to that effect. We are told that unemployment has dropped, but the devious figures that are given are only a part of the relevant information that we need. Welfare and unemployment insurance data are also needed in order to complete the picture.

The facts are that the federal government deliberately set out to reduce inflation by taking advantage of the most vulnerable people in our society. They were forced out of work and on to a bare subsistence level of welfare. Many of the families involved will never recover from this crushing experience. There will be permanently broken homes for the stresses and strains of poverty damage the relationship between members of a family irreparably. The idiocy of such an economic policy is now apparent and efforts are being made to halt the effect of it, but the fallout I think will be with us for generations as new families accommodate themselves to living on welfare and bring up their children in this example.

Meanwhile in Manitoba the great giveaway goes on. We have witnessed the profligacy of the Department of Health and Social Development during the past year. We have watched the Welfare Advisory Committee setting policy and imposing it on the municipalities. We have watched feeble attempts by the Minister to straighten things out in almost daily news reports, especially regarding the use of needs tests and the consideration of parents' incomes before assistance is awarded. First he says, yes we do use the needs test, then he says, no we don't, yes we do. The Welfare Advisory Committee says, no we don't. There is an apparent inability to achieve agreement between the Minister and his advisors. Lady bountiful says well of course people on welfare should be able to drive cars and the government may even help them buy houses. There seems to be no consideration of a taxpayer who is paying for the welfare and doesn't have a down payment for a house himself and can't afford to run a car. The limitations on assistance cannot be written off as all evil. They are there to protect others.

Winnipeg has faced a massive increase of 50 percent in welfare cases in the last two years and we read even as of yesterday that there is no seasonal adjustment, that the welfare rolls are continuing to rise and that there are seven additional people on the welfare rolls every day. The recession in unemployment must certainly end soon and we should be developing job preparation programs. Training and retraining will be necessary as people move back into employment. We can't assume that they will simply get their old jobs back. A community can't afford to pour unlimited funds into dead-end welfare programs.

When the Member from Pembina suggested that the Department of Health and Social Development might be overspent by ten or eleven million dollars we noticed that no one

April 19, 1971

(MRS. TRUEMAN cont'd.) jumped up to deny this. We wonder is it \$13 million that they're overspent, \$15 million, who will deny it? Is it \$20 million, \$25 million, \$30 million? No one denies it.

A MEMBER: No, 30 million for welfare. One month. One year. One year.

MRS. TRUEMAN: I can't bear to raise the bidding any higher than that.

A MEMBER: Nice bookkeeping. Nice bookkeeping.

MRS. TRUEMAN: Spending has obviously been out of control in this Department to a point of irresponsibility. Authority has been fragmented between so many advisors and special consultants that it has been impossible for us to hear a reply from the Minister to a question. A couple of days ago when we asked whether the provision of welfare to strikers in the last 24 hours, whether there'd been a change, and his reply was, "not to my knowledge." Though in recent days we've heard a statement concerning changes regarding the welfare available to students living at home. Perhaps we may also expect then, if there are some new considerations being given, that we might have a policy statement regarding the provision of welfare for strikers. It has always been my understanding that unions had their own welfare fund which provided for the alleviation of any undue hardship that was caused by their strike action, but if the general public through taxation is going to provide this assistance then in effect government will be subsidizing strikes and the implications of this are so far-reaching that I feel we must have a clarification from this government.

In other areas of the Throne Speech there are forecasts for changes in corrections and an increase in the development of day care facilities; grants towards operating costs for such facilities are being made as of now. Hopefully, grants for capital costs will also be made available as they are in some other provinces. Personal care and nursing home facilities are to be increased in a dramatic way. I am told that 1,200 new beds were made available this year through private enterprise and that there is now a surplus of extended care beds in the hospitals. A psycho-geriatric centre will meet a serious need that has been apparent for years. At the time of the change in government Progressive Conservatives were considering using the old Grace Hospital for that purpose.

There is a suggestion that there will be a variety of family-oriented services. I wonder if it would be too much to hope that the government has seen the great need for credit counselling that exists in our community? The Credit Grantors Association before it disbanded provided such counselling. Some young people when they get their first job, get married, they optimistically go out and buy all the furnishings they need on credit and then suddenly find before all these debts are paid they have lost their jobs and they are in real trouble. Welfare does not generally include any help in paying off someone's debts. Their only resource, the Orderly Payment of Debts Court is running two months behind in its caseloads? If a person is fortunate enough to find another job his wages can be garnished and then the new employer may regard him as unreliable and fire him. It becomes a vicious circle and a serious problem which I feel urgently needs attention.

Now in the ship of state of this government there is one minister who I feel is resting a little on his oars, and that is the Minister of Labour. If he had studied the disadvantaged position of women in the labour force -- and I don't want to hear any more silly remarks about discrimination -- he would realize that he should be establishing within his department a Women's Bureau similar to those in Ottawa, Ontario and Alberta. Information is available from the Federal Government which says that in 1970 eighty-three percent of the women in the public service were in office support or administrative support jobs. They are placed in stenographic, typing and such like of roles, the low-paying jobs that men don't want. Similar figures from our province I think would disclose similar occupational segregation. In 1967 fifty-nine percent of men in the total labour force and 90 percent of women made less than \$6,000 a year. Among these are our working core. If one relates these figures to the problems of sole support mothers it is apparent that if they try to find work they cannot make enough money to pay for alternate care for their children and provide for their full maintenance without some supplementation of wages. If welfare is reduced dollar for dollar of earnings there is no incentive to go to all that work and trouble. Many of these women need training or retraining. A women's bureau could concentrate on arranging for such training and improving access to employment and advancement opportunities. Changes in the status of women are occurring to a significant degree but only where governments have realized that they have a responsibility to help women out of their disadvantaged positions. And I think I

(MRS. TRUEMAN cont'd.) could summarize these remarks by saying that I feel that the Minister of Labour must pay more attention to the people of this type and not simply be the Minister of Labour Unions.

In the last few days some information has been given through the press about plans for community health clinics. There is still a great deal of mystery about the government's intentions and we need a fuller explanation of proposed financing as well as a clearer statement as to whether the patient will still be free to go to the doctor of his choice. The pattern established in the auto insurance industry of not consulting with the experts in the field seems to be being repeated. It is unfortunate that the government does not avail itself of the services of people with experience in Manitoba but instead bring in someone from elsewhere over their heads. And I'd like to say, Mr. Speaker, that I resent very much the practice of this government of overlooking Manitobans and not giving them the opportunities for advancement which they have earned, and bringing in Tommy Dopson's son-in-law overseeing any area of the Medical profession, I think that's just the absolute end. Perhaps the Minister of Health and Social Development, and I'm sorry he's not here, would explain to us some time, too, the role of Mr. Crawford, who has positions on three committees, the Hunt Commission, the Health Services Commission, and the Medical Review Committee and appears to have a real conflict of interests. He can sit on the committee that reviews the Commission that he sits on and then when it reports to the third committee, he has an opportunity, if he disagrees with the report, to have another kick at the cat and he has a real advantage in being able again to promote his ideas which might very well conflict with the majority opinion. His position is a joke and I think he can only be regarded as some sort of ministerial spy.

At the last session I observed in a speech in this House that great power was being gathered and resting in the office of the Minister of Finance. In several pieces of legislation, I noted that any surpluses in other government agencies were to be returned to the Finance Minister for his investment. Then there was also the 25 to 30 million dollars gained from the auto insurance agencies under the guise of great social reform. I didn't realize then that it would also be so easy for him to assume absolute authority over other elected bodies. Apparently by Order-in-Council or something, he can attain without even reference to the Legislature veto power over the cities and municipalities in the Metro area. He can postpone elections indefinitely - and to me this is undemocratic to say the least. I didn't think such a thing was possible. I thought our government had safeguards to prevent the frustration of the will of the people. After reorganization of the area he will be Minister of Urban Affairs and will still have the whole area under his thumb. Such centralization of power that we witness in my opinion can only be justified in a case of civil strife or an attack from outside our boundary. Certainly I didn't think it could be done because of the bickering of a couple of politicians and the sensationalizing of that matter by the Press. And he sits now as a virtual czar of the Metropolitan area.

Mr. Speaker, I hope you don't get the impression that I am simply dissatisfied with this government's handling of public affairs. If you have, then I have indeed understated my case and perhaps I will be able to develop it further on another occasion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Flin Flon.

MR. THOMAS BARROW (Flin Flon): Mr. Speaker, I regret you having to leave our side of the House mostly because of the helpful advice which you gave so freely and so often to us as rookie MLA's, but congratulate you on your new role and wish you well. I believe my colleagues did very well in moving and seconding the Throne Speech. I congratulate them both. Also my seat mate on his new appointment. I also welcome my new colleagues from St. Vital and Ste. Rose and I know they will enjoy their role on this side of the House.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to say just a few words stressing the need of a second national park in Manitoba. Hopefully in Northern Manitoba. And with the help of H. E. Walsh, President of the Zoological Society for Manitoba a recent event has focused attention on the question of a national park in Manitoba. This was the speech to the Selkirk Chamber of Commerce by Ronald P. . . . in which he reported the willingness of the Federal Government to establish a second national park in Manitoba, if and when the land is available by the provincial government. There are two potential sites, one near the Cranberry Portage area in northern Manitoba. It's an area twenty by twenty miles bounded on the south by the Thompson-Snow Lake Highway and the west by Highway Number Ten, an ideal location which has already been surveyed. The second site is on the east side of Lake Winnipeg.

What is a national park? It's an area set aside as a national heritage to be preserved

(MR. BARROW cont'd.) unimpaired for the benefit, education and enjoyment of future generations. The Cranberry Portage country would be an excellent choice for its fine area of boreal forest. . . Do we need a second national park? Yes is the answer to the question. Riding Mountain National Park provides all the answers. Riding Mountain identifies Manitoba as much as Portage and Main. Its elk and bison herds represent wildlife conservation. Its forests, lakes and vistas attract countless tourists and most Manitobans.

Riding Mountain National Park was established in 1929 when Manitoba's population was just over 600,000. With our present population the need for a second national park is very critical. The government's hesitation in providing land may stem from the lack and expressed demand and from the possible loss of potential mineral and forest potential. The former can be rectified by the members of both societies writing to the government. The latter could be readily determined and if worthwhile then adjustments probably made in the park boundaries. To set against possible losses are the concrete gains of environmental conservation and of a sound investment for the present and future enjoyment of all Canadians. I'd like to emphasize the two groups from the north under the capable leadership of Tommy Dobson have been fighting for this park for 20 to 25 years, and Mr. Speaker, they won't give up easily.

Now as a MLA for Flin Flon, it's only proper for me to say a few words about the strike situation in that city, which is well on its way to the third month. I believe the 26th of April will make it three months. In my opinion the strike was unnecessary. The demands of the trades union were not out of line and the financial costs were very low. The bargain methods left a lot to be desired. It's not easy - it's not easy to bargain when the people who have the power are in New York, Toronto, Africa and obviously not too concerned about the conditions in Flin Flon. We also have the problem of the steel union trade bargaining separately with the trades in the minority group. I would agree that combined they would have more bargaining power and quite possible more success in the bargaining. I also see the trades have a desire to bargain separately if they feel deeply about this. I would like to compliment the citizens for remaining so calm during the length of this strike. As the result of the peculiar boundaries between company and town properties, many of the facilities are located just over town lines and on company property. These facilities, including the medical clinic, sport arenas and half the fire station are on company property and as a result of the location of the picket lines it is necessary to cross these picket lines in order to reach these areas. Due to the understanding of this situation, no major incidents have taken place. This illustrates the responsible attitude of the citizens who are under the impression they had free access to these facilities over the years. Approaches made by the local council to management to allow the pickets to move a short distance so that citizens could enter the buildings without crossing these lines. The company would not agree, which was most unusual and made things very awkward. I'd like to commend the members of the unions, especially the steel workers; their co-operation has been excellent despite the fact that they have been placed in a very awkward position; they have shown great restraint. The attitude of the company has been most strange. They are apparently determined to break the allied trade unions. Efforts at mediation by federal and provincial labour departments have been unsuccessful thus far. At present it appears that the federal Department of Labour are going to become more actively involved, and we trust the strike will soon be over.

Apart from the economic problems involved, it is very evident steps will have to be taken to ensure that the town or province take over ownership of all streets, roads and other amenities which over the years have by common usage, have been presumed to belong to the citizens and I appeal to the government to take the necessary action.

I also wish to thank my colleagues, the Honourable Minister of Labour, the Honourable Minister of Transportation, who at a very crucial time came to Flin Flon on short notice, were at the scene in a matter of hours, in fact, and not only met with management, unions, Chamber of Commerce, etcetera, but also contacted the people and received firsthand knowledge of the problems that beset our northern city.

Mr. Speaker, just a few comments that I think will avert future situations of this nature. First, a better bargaining system whereby the company would have a spokesman who had power and authority; a better relationship between the two unions, trade and steel, that would increase their bargaining power and bring these matters to a head quicker; the Provincial Government have jurisdiction in these situations. Mr. Speaker, this is important as our Federal Minister of Labour seems unconcerned. He's too far away from the action and our government, however eager to end the situation, is severely handicapped.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I would like to answer a few questions frequently asked. There are between 16 and 1700 steel workers; they receive Unemployment Insurance;

April 19, 1971

(MR. BARROW cont'd.) . . . they are not on strike. There are 650 trades; of these 650 I understand 50 draw welfare and those of these 50 who have property assets, etcetera, they are expected to repay this back. I can't see for one minute, Mr. Speaker, where of 2300 employees, and having 50 on welfare, where the government are in any way subsidizing this strike. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Before I enter into the content of the remarks that I intend to make tonight, I should like to make an inquiry of the Minister. I think we've all been wondering what the score is with regards to who owes apologies to whom, when just before the Session began there was some difficulty in the Cabinet and if I kept score correctly, there are still a few apologies coming to the Minister of Transportation or the Minister of Highways or the Minister of Highways owes a few apologies, and I wonder if the Cabinet would put us straight on just who owes who. -- (Interjection) -- Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I'm going to be permitted to continue my remarks or if my honourable friends opposite are going to continue to carry on with their raucous interjections. Well, now, if there's anyone else that has a speech to make - because that's about all that we've heard up to this point - then I would suggest that they get on their feet. Apparently, Sir, honourable gentlemen opposite haven't learned the purpose of this institution as yet. They haven't learned that the purpose of the Legislature is debate and that in order to participate in debate one has to get up on his feet and be recognized by the Speaker and I hope that honourable friends opposite will accord the kind of attention that has been given to most members of the Chamber when they have risen in their place to speak.

I don't mind dealing with interjections Sir, but it's going to detract from the remarks that I propose to make and I think that it would be tragic if I should be sidetracked in the remarks that I hope I shall be able to make.

May I first of all, Sir, and I do this in no perfunctory manner, I do this very sincerely because in the demonstration of your capabilities in maintaining the rules of this place, you have already given members, at least on this side of the House, the assurance that impartiality in the application of the rules is going to be the criteria with which you will administer the rules and that even the sometimes overly energetic Minister of Labour, who has been so many years in this Chamber that it is always a challenge for him to see how far he can circumvent and how far he can bend the rules, and I noted, Sir, that you are going to take away from him one of his greatest sports, because on more than one occasion already you have demonstrated that the rules are going to be applied, and for that, Sir, we are deeply appreciative and we can assure you that you shall get the support of the members of this side of the House in what we know to be an onerous and a difficult task.

Some honourable gentlemen opposite seem to regard that the Legislature of the Province of Manitoba is the 29th Congress of the Socialist Republic of Manitoba, rather than the 29th Session of the Manitoba Legislature, and you will recall the one that was just concluded in Moscow where the entire purpose of that Congress was for the self-glorification and congratulations on the part of Politburo. It seems gentlemen opposite when confronted with criticism respond by raucous interjections and trying to shout anyone down who happens to have the floor. I assure you, Sir, that makes no difference to me; they can do that as much as they like and I know, Sir, that with your fairness of mind, that any time that was spent in interjections will be added to the time that I will be permitted to speak during the course of this debate.

The Legislature, Sir, is a place where the spending intentions and the legislative intentions of the government are subject to scrutiny. It is our responsibility to examine that legislation and to examine it fully. We had experience during the last session where a hurried examination of legislation produced because of the volume of the legislation that was placed before honourable members, produced bad legislation, and there are going to be a number of amendments brought to that legislation because of the hurry and speed with which they were rushed through Parliament, or through the Legislature. I don't think that it is the wisest course to attempt to rush legislation through this House without making sure that there is an opportunity for full examination.

I regard, Sir, the process here very much as I regard a court of law. It makes no difference to a defence attorney whether his client is innocent or guilty. His job is to make sure that the Crown Attorney does a competent job of bringing evidence before the court, and if he doesn't do that under our system of justice, the accused is given the benefit of the doubt.

(MR. JORGENSEN cont'd.) In this Legislature, perhaps not to the same degree, but nonetheless, the general principle applies. Our job is not so much to judge the legislation on its merits or how many votes it will get or anything of that nature; our job is to examine the legislation that is placed, and the spending intentions, that are placed before us with a critical eye, and if there are weaknesses in the drafting of that legislation, and if there are moneys that are asked for are being spent unwisely, then they will show up, then they will show up under that criticism. This, Sir, is the intention of that kind of an examination in a Legislature. -- (Interjection) -- Well, Sir, if my honourable friends will make sure that these interjections are not going to be a part of the time that is allocated to me during the course of my remarks then I'll be happy to answer questions. I'm always happy to enlighten my honourable friends opposite.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I would suggest if the honourable gentleman wishes to yield the floor he should indicate to the Speaker that he does. I should also like to caution the other members who are going to question, that it has been our practice to ask questions of clarification, not to open a further debate by a question. The Honourable Attorney-General, if the gentleman wishes to yield the floor.

MR. CHERNIACK: I'm sorry. With all this introduction, all I wanted to do was ask the honourable member if he would mind standing closer to his microphone so I could hear him better.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: Well, Sir, if my honourable friend is unable to hear me, then I'm sure I don't know what else I can do about it. You know, honestly Sir, I didn't think that I required a microphone. However, be that as it may.

Sir, there have been a number of suggestions made during the course of this debate, and in other debates, that cause me to wonder about the understanding of an institution such as the Legislature or the Parliament of Canada and how well the people of our country understand this institution. I'd like to quote from R. Bassett in his "Essentials of Parliamentary Democracy". Mr. Bassett said this: "It is this inadequate comprehension of the working of our political system which is responsible for the excessive demands upon it and for the resulting of disillusionment." And in his book on Legislatures, K. C. Weir points this out: "For the large part of the time of these bodies (meaning Parliaments, Congresses, Assemblies, etc.) is not devoted to the law making at all. One of their most important functions is to criticize the executive. They debate the great issues of public concern; they constitute a grand inquest of the nation; they act, as what John Stuart Mills called a Committee of Grievances and a Congress of Opinions."

Sir, it is on this point that I would like to direct a few of my remarks because in the Speech from the Throne the First Minister, through the Lieutenant-Governor, had this to say: "We meet at a time when citizens from all walks of life are questioning the traditions and practices that have been with us for so many years. We see these questions most in the young people in our society but a basic re-examination is now in process among all our citizens. We meet at a time when policies of the Federal Government of Canada have caused the citizens of all provinces to live with an economy in recession and for many serious economic readjustments, and what is at stake today is the faith of our citizens in the ability of our traditional institutions to rise to the occasion and solve the problems of tomorrow. Through our deliberations here we have the opportunity to demonstrate to our citizens that government can and must be responsive, open and humane." And the danger, Sir, in that statement is that it implies either the failure or the success of people of this country to achieve that measure of the good life, rests with what governments do or do not do; rests with how well this institution functions and I reject that theory because I don't think it's so much how well this institution operates as much as it is the principles upon which our political philosophies are based and how well we pursue them.

The Leader of the Liberal Party, for example, in one of his -- (Interjection) -- Well, the present leader, in one of his frequent press releases prior to the opening of the session stated that he felt that the debate on Bill 56, for example, was a useless exercise, useless because everybody knew how the vote was going to go beforehand, so why debate if you know how the vote's going to go. Well, Sir, if that is going to be the principle upon which a Legislature is based, hardly any point in coming here at all. We just count noses and then go home.

The debate in this place is designed to inform; if correctly interpreted and correctly

(MR. JORGENSON cont'd.) reported by the press, people of this province have an idea of the kind of legislation that is being processed through this body and the reactions of the different people who speak on that legislation. They then have an opportunity to compare and to judge, they then have an opportunity to determine what kind of legislation and what kind of performance the government is putting on.

I say that there seems to be a deliberate attempt - we've noticed it from some honourable gentlemen opposite - one that is going to follow me just shortly, I notice he was on his feet, the Member for Crescentwood, who I believe is contemptuous of the Legislature. There seems to be a tendency to downgrade and to create an air of mistrust in our established institutions, our law enforcement agencies, our courts and the legislative bodies themselves. The intention seems to be to blame the Legislature instead of themselves if something goes wrong. We have, for example, the abuse and the misconceptions of what Cabinet solidarity and responsible government is all about. Under our system of government, the First Minister, or the Prime Minister, has to take the responsibility -- (Interjection) -- Well you know, my honourable friend the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs is performing no better in his capacity as the Minister than he was as the Speaker of this House. It might behoove him to do a little more listening and a little less talking. If he wants to participate in the debate in this Chamber, then let him rise when his turn comes and speak all he wants; he has that opportunity. He obviously hasn't learned anything from the short while, and thankfully the short while, that he was the Speaker of this Legislature.

What happens, Sir, is that we have a situation where one Minister makes a statement that in no way embodies government policy, such as the Minister of Highways, and then on the other hand we have another Minister making a statement that takes the opposite direction and the First Minister does not take the responsibility for either one of them. Sir, if we're to have the kind of government that the people understand and the kind of government that people trust, then somebody has got to be making the decisions, and the decisions are to be made by the Cabinet as a whole, and if one Minister cannot agree with those decisions, then it is his responsibility to resign. That is the essence of responsible government.

But what do they do here? The First Minister in his attempt to create the knight in shining armour image, takes the responsibility for nothing. He is the Lester B. Pearson of the Provincial Legislature, trying to be everything to everybody. If the Minister of Highways utters a statement that does not embody government policy, it is the responsibility of the First Minister to say so, that it is not government policy, but instead of that we have a situation where there are a series of Cabinet meetings when they should be taking up their time discussing the matters that concern them as a government, instead of figuring out who is going to apologize to who. And then we have a statement made on the other side by the Minister of Mines and Resources or the Member for Crescentwood, none of which embody government policy; but, Sir, if a statement made by one of those Ministers happens to be something that meets with the approval then the First Minister says, Oh, that's fine, then I embrace it. Now, that statement, Sir, goes over about as well as an expectant mother doing the pole vault. I wonder, Sir, who writes his material.

Sir, as I was saying, if the statement meets and looks as though it might be popular on the By-Line -- these gentlemen opposite spend all their time listening to the By-Lines; if they're not listening to them, they're on them -- and if it looks like it's popular well then it becomes government policy; and if it doesn't look like it's popular, then the honourable gentleman is speaking for himself. Well, you know, that's the kind of government we have today: government by By-Line. I know, Sir, that it wouldn't be difficult to draw the Minister of Highways out in one of his comments.

Sir, the stage was set the other day though by the Minister of Mines and Resources when he injected himself into this debate in which he suggested that the only party that has ever went to the people with an election platform and then carried that platform forward, has been the NDP Party. My honourable friends applaud that statement in spite of the fact that on the record this afternoon there was read so many contradictions and we haven't even begun to look the contradictions up. There'll be more put on the record as the days go by. But the interesting thing about the Minister of Mines and Resources, however, was the way he referred to the Leader of the Opposition when he suggested that oh, he wasn't going to take the time, it was beneath his dignity to reply to the Leader of the Opposition; he was going to leave that for his Leader. He referred to the Leader of the Opposition's speech as a "low level debate". Well, I want to caution the Minister that when he replies he better think and better be reminded of

(MR. JORGENSON cont'd.) the kind of debate that he engaged upon during the course of that by-election - "disgusting little shyster" - language of that nature, unbecoming a First Minister, and I would suggest that he might do himself some good if he reviewed some of the statements that he made during the course of the by-election.

Well now, what did the people say and if -- (Interjection) -- well you know, if we all had the opportunity of playing in that kind of poker game my honourable friend, perhaps the results might have been a little bit different, but -- (Interjection) -- You know, Sir, just after the war in Holland, at that time there was a great deal of inflation in that country and I recall getting involved in a few poker games and it was a funny thing, you know money was so easy to come by, cigarettes you could sell for \$2.00 apiece and the bets ran into the millions of guilders, the winner walked away with a wheelbarrow full of money and if you were a loser it didn't really matter, you just went out and got some more. That seems to be the way that the honourable gentlemen treat the currency of this country. They have no consideration at all for the fact that that money comes from the taxpayer, that it certainly is not theirs to give away in the way that they tried to give it away during the course of those by-elections.

But then when the Minister of Mines and Resources came to his punch line and he suggested that the members of the Conservative party and the members of the Liberal party should coalesce, as he said, what he was attempting to do was to create in the minds of a lot of people that there is a similarity. Well, Sir, let's look at the similarities. You know, I hate to say this about my honourable friends in the Liberal Party but it doesn't appear as though anybody wants them. The Member for Winnipeg Centre, in a gracious gesture, invited the Liberals to come over there and join them and the Minister of Highways says no, no you go that way. They don't want to -- anybody wants to be associated with the Federal Liberals. Well, I'm wondering if my honourable friends are assuming that there is any difference. -- (Interjections) -- Well, my honourable friends want to know, and since I haven't got too many moments left perhaps I can point out the similarity between my honourable friends opposite and the Liberal Party, and the Federal Liberal Party.

Now then, Sir, let's just examine the agricultural policies of the two parties. Sir, there have been many suggestions made in this Legislature, and outside of it, as to what should be done insofar as agriculture is concerned and everybody talks about agricultural policy and what is needed. Let's examine what is really wrong with agriculture. Sir, in 1951 the total gross income of agriculture during that year was \$299,500,000, and out of that gross income of \$299 million the farmers realized net income - and I'm going to use the realized net income figures rather than the net income because I think they more accurately reflect the farmers' cash position - the realized net income that same year was \$170,539,000 -- (Interjection) -- 1951. In 1970 the gross income, that is the total value of goods and services sold by farmers, amounted to \$370 million and out of that the realized net income given to farmers was but \$81 million, one half of the 1951 figure. In spite of the fact that the gross income was \$80 million more, the net income was \$80 million less.

And it's very easy to figure out where this comes about. The taxes, farm taxes in 1951 was just under \$9 million. In 1970 it was over \$19 million, and included in the list of expenses are those taxes, but in 1951 the total expenses of the farmer was \$129 million. In 1970 the expenses had risen to \$289 million. Well, I think most people were aware of this, but what perhaps my honourable friends opposite may not be aware of - and I'm confident that they don't - is the reason why this happened. Well my honourable friends opposite have a tendency to blame big business, to blame the businessman, as was pointed out by the Member for Roblin here the other night. You know when the Russian revolution started, it was the bourgeoisie that got the blame. When Hitler got to power in Germany, it was the Jews that took the blame. Here it's the businessmen, and wherever you go you hear cries of how the businessmen are rooking the consumers. Well, Sir, I don't think it's the businessmen as much as it is bad government.

Let's have a look at the expenditures, let's have a look at the expenditures of government. -- (Interjection) -- I wish my honourable friends would be just patient enough to sit down and be quiet. In 1961-62 -- here's the former speaker again, Sir. I wonder what the honourable gentleman had for dinner tonight that he is so garrulous. In 1961-62 the total estimates, the total expenditures of the government in that year was \$6 billion. In 1971-72 the estimates for the next fiscal year is \$14 billion, gone up in the space of ten years, gone up 8 billion dollars, and the three top spending departments, Sir, of the Federal Government were Finance, Defence and Health and Welfare.

(MR. JORGENSON cont'd)

In 1956-57 the defence budget was \$1,750,000,000; today it is \$1,819,000,000 and that's not much of an increase. They have held the line there. Health and welfare has gone up from \$539,000,000 to \$2,592,000,000; and Finance - and here is the one, Sir, here is the department where we begin to find out what is really happening - 1956-57 the Department of Finance, the total estimates for that department was \$931,000,000; today it is \$3,391,000,000. Now where is that money going? Why the increase in the Department of Finance? Well, very simple, Sir, the gross debt of this country has gone up from 20 million to, I presume - the latest figures I have are 1968 when they were \$32 million - they have probably gone up to close to 40 million -- 40 billion now. The net debt, the latest figures I have are 1969 when they were 17 billion and they have probably gone up another two billion since then.

In 1969 the net debt per capita of the Federal government, every man, woman and child in this country owed, as his share of the national debt, \$825.00. Every child that is born, the moment he is born he owes \$825.00. No wonder they squawk. And his share of the interest rate, his share of the interest rate on that debt is \$92.70 per year. Now that's a rise of from \$35.00 in 1959 to \$92.70 this year. Well, Sir -- (Interjection) -- no it doesn't sound like Major Douglas. There's another gentleman over there who has a great capacity to make his most intelligent statements when he's sitting on the seat of his pants. And for the record, since it isn't going to appear on the record, it's the Minister without Portfolio - and he's without a lot of other things too.

But, Sir, I have illustrated what I believe to be the real problem with the economy of the country today. Inflation is created by over-spending on the part of governments, and where I draw the parallel, Sir, is that this government endorses and this government supports the same philosophy as the Federal Liberals in Ottawa, a policy of ruination. They are the people who support the principle, so far as agriculture is concerned, of supply management, and supply management is going to be the ruination of agriculture in this country. It doesn't matter - you can talk all you like about raising prices to farmers, injecting cash flows, whatever you will, those short term temporary advantages will be very shortly offset by an increase in prices brought about by high government spending, by the kind of inflationary policies that are being pursued by this government in conjunction with the government at Ottawa. And I suggest to you, Sir . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member has five minutes.

MR. JORGENSON: Well, Sir, I suggest to you that if this government continues to pursue that kind of policy, if this government continues to adopt the policies of the government at Ottawa and thinks that they can spend their way into prosperity and thinks that the answer to the problems of today is greater government spending, then they had better think again. -- (Interjection) -- More unemployment, my honourable friend says. There's another classic interjection from the Minister without Portfolio. It was he who when my friend from Roblin was talking about the plight of the businessmen that interjected the other night with these classic words "hear hear", as if he was happy, happy with what was happening to the businessmen in this country today. Here is the difficulty, Sir, and here is the problem, and I think the sooner that my honourable friends opposite recognize that they are not going to be able to spend their way into prosperity and that what they are going to do is create greater difficulties for the farmers of this country and for the producers of this country, the sooner we are going to reach that level of prosperity that we want for all of our citizens.

And I close, Sir, by reminding the House of a statement that was made by the First Minister when he introduced his Cabinet. He said this in a press release issued on July 15th: "Selecting the group of men who will become the Cabinet was no easy task. It never is, I expect, but in my case it was probably more difficult than usual because I have the privilege to lead one of the most talented caucuses this province has ever seen." We haven't seen any evidence of that, Sir. "My problem was not finding able men to fill the posts but rather deciding which of many able men I would include - an exercise in subtraction, if you will, rather than the usual one of addition. Since talent really wasn't a problem I was able to devote most of my efforts to meeting the other criteria which must be met in forming a Cabinet. In short, I am in the fortunate position of being able to present to the people of Manitoba a Cabinet exceptional for its talent, vigor, imagination, and for its representative nature." Sir, for a man who claims to have so much talent, he's done a dismally inept job at picking it or a very clever job of hiding it. The only apparent talent that I see from honourable gentlemen opposite is their ability to keep dipping their hands into the pockets of the taxpayer.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I am overjoyed at being in a position to congratulate you on your elevation to the high office you hold. As a New Democrat we honour you, we respect the integrity of your high office as it's been abundantly demonstrated so far this session.

We also congratulate the official Leader of the Opposition who again is absent, and we also give our condolences to the erstwhile Leader of the Liberal Party who remains absent as usual. We have a continuing sympathy for the Leader of the Liberal Party, because after all he does have a very hard seat to maintain. I have tested the comfort of the galleries and I can assure you that we can have very great sympathy for the Honourable Leader of the Liberal Party. -- (Interjection) -- It's very safe, thank you very much.

I would like also to congratulate the two newly elected MLA's from Ste. Rose and St. Vital. The saints did come marching in. If honourable members will reflect on the list of the seats in the Legislative Assembly, there are seven seats, lucky seven seats that are saints - St. Boniface, St. George, St. James, St. Johns, St. Matthews, St. Vital, Ste. Rose. All the saints have come in. Now St. Boniface is not too far away, as a matter of fact as early as this afternoon he indicated that he was disinclined to vote for the motion of non-confidence because he still had confidence in this government, and I for one, I for one still have a feeling of warmth for the Member for St. Boniface and recognize the differences that he sees are really not that great, because within our caucus - and the honourable members across the opposite side are quick to recognize - there is a diversity within our caucus that reflects the splendor of the Manitoba mosaic.

We have differences of opinion and shades of criteria and importance within our caucus and they are reflected in the discussions that take place within our caucus. We also have a leader, we also have a leader who demonstrates democracy, tolerance and reasonableness. He doesn't lead with an iron hand, he doesn't have to wield a mailed fist to lead a party of strong-willed, strong-opinioned men. The people of Manitoba on April 5th acknowledged a confidence, not only in a Cabinet with real diversity of ability but a leader, a leader who has been able to weld his Cabinet and this caucus into an instrument to introduce the most imaginative legislation in the last twenty years in this province.

On April 5th the people of this province voted confidence not only in this government but in the able leadership of our Premier. I would like, Mr. Speaker.....

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. MACKLING: I would like, Mr. Speaker, to draw the attention of the members of this House.....

MR. SPEAKER: I am having a bit of difficulty with the exuberance expressed by the members. The hot vapors are irritating my audio assist that I have and creating nothing but static and I can't hear the speaker, so I do wish the members would kind of contain themselves. The Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I was about to indicate that I believe that on April 5th the people of Manitoba indicated not only their confidence in this government but also their satisfaction with the able leadership of our Premier.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to reflect but briefly on the contributions to the Throne Speech of certain members of the opposition, the official opposition party. I felt rather dissatisfaction with the lead-off in respect to the debate on the Speech from the Throne because of the very rather hollow and unimaginative and ill-willed presentation that the Leader of the Opposition made, and I think it set the tone for the entire Opposition's contribution to the debate thus far. In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, it was low, flat, reedy and discordant. With but few exceptions the opposition speeches have been low comedy with an introduction followed by -- I should say the Leader of the Opposition's speech was low comedy as an introduction, followed by a regurgitation of re-hashed previous effort. One would think, Mr. Speaker, that a former Minister of a former administration would be better advised and equipped for the high office of the Leader of the Official Opposition. Obviously he is not and he had better watch out because, as I understand it, there are still members in his caucus who have leadership ambitions.

For example, the Leader of the Opposition, the official opposition, has been making speeches for some time about redundancy of boards and commissions of the former administration in which he was a Minister, as well as the present administration, and he

(MR. MACKLING cont'd) continues to indict unspecified boards and commissions as being redundant. He carried off this same attack during the by-election campaigns, but lo and behold I think one of his caucus members said, "say, we'd better do something about this because we are going to be asked to name the specific boards and commissions that are redundant," so obviously he accepted the sound advice and not one but two Orders for Return were filed asking for the information on which obviously the Leader of the Opposition lacks the information.

Just so that none of the honourable members of the official opposition will be taken by surprise however, as has been indicated in earlier comments of members of this government, the composition of boards and commissions and their functions has been under review for some time by the present administration and I am sure that there will be constructive criticism presented in due course from both the opposite side of this House and from this side of this House, and good constructive criticism is welcome. But what about the type of criticism that has emanated from the Honourable Member from Fort Garry? He never fails, Mr. Speaker, to endeavour to amuse through his wondrously strange use of allegory. Frankly, Mr. Speaker, his latest effort sounded like the ravings of a sun-racked, ship-wrecked wretch on a desert isle trying vainly to blot out the recollection of the destruction of his own rotten ship by denigrating that of his sworn enemy. Can't you hear that poor fellow - can't you hear that poor fellow on that wretched sand strip agonizing, if only we hadn't been too greedy for more power - if only we hadn't been too greedy for more power; if only we had had a better captain and a better ship ourselves; if only we hadn't threatened to mutiny; if only that Hardy sailor hadn't abandoned our ship; if only - if only - if only - and so it goes on.

And the honourable member, the honourable member's allegory is weak as apparently is his eyesight, because although he was admonished on numerous occasions when he waved the booklet, the Civil Service Commission Administration of the Civil Service Act 53rd Annual Report, he was admonished: Read the footnote, the explanatory notes - and they are not in the legal size print, these you can actually read and they explain what otherwise seems to be a substantial increase in the Civil Service staff as regularizations of past policy of previous administrations. And so, Mr. Speaker, when the document is read and analysed correctly, it indicates a normal growth in a normal pattern in the expansion of the Civil Service, but the Honourable Member for Fort Garry is weak in eyesight as well as allegory.

Mr. Speaker, the pith and substance of the opposition's attack on the Throne Speech is really not too much worthy of comment. Honourable members on this side have indicated very well in their replies a constructive analysis of what little substance there was in the contributions made from the other side. However, I don't want to be completely negative on them. I thought that the Honourable Member from Pembina continued in his same solid form and I was particularly impressed by the Honourable Member from Rock Lake who I thought was in much better form than he had in the past. He is improving and I think that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition better watch out from those two gentlemen whose capabilities have certainly been denigrated.

But, Mr. Speaker, rather than continue the rather negative contribution in respect to the Throne Speech that has been demonstrated from across the side, I as an MLA now, as an MLA from the constituency of St. James, would like to bring to the attention of the House a matter which I think is of some very serious concern. We have, Mr. Speaker, elsewhere in other debates, considered the ramifications of the effects of pollution of our environment, pollution of the air and pollution of the waters in particular. I, Mr. Speaker, wish to emphasize the danger, and it's a very real danger, of the continuation and the escalation of another form of pollution which has been sadly overlooked in our society and I'm talking specifically about noise pollution - and it's not noise pollution in this Chamber, although, Mr. Speaker, I do have great difficulty in being able to continue with the continual chatter that goes on across the way.

But, Mr. Speaker, I would like briefly to refer honourable members to the very serious concern that I have for the high rate of noise pollution resultant to constituents in my area by virtue of the fact that in my constituency there are two major glide paths into the Winnipeg International Airport, and on these glide paths there are hundreds of homes located. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that the residents who own these homes are seriously affected by noise pollution from aircraft taking off and landing at the Winnipeg International

(MR. MACKLING cont'd),....Airport. The noise pollution is excessive. In other areas of North America, Mr. Speaker, there have been efforts made to change the aircraft flight patterns to minimize noise pollution. There have been new concepts of airport development, steps taken either to remove the airport from the built-up area of the city or steps taken to minimize the interruption and the very serious consequences of noise pollution occasioned by modern aircraft. Mr. Speaker, I can assure you that members of the opposition who now sneer and carouse, if they were to ask constituents of mine in the glide path whether or not there was a very real disruption of their quiet enjoyment of their property - as you are indicating interruption of my quiet enjoyment of this moment - Mr. Speaker, they would assure you that it is a very real and effective nuisance.

Mr. Speaker, experts have indicated that noise levels of 85 decibels and over are dangerous to the human anatomy, and Mr. Speaker, currently there have been studies indicated of noise levels from aircraft in my constituency that very much exceed 85 decibels. I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that there is a very grave concern on the part of some with the effect of noise pollution on the interruption of sleep patterns for example. There are innumerable landings and take-offs throughout the years and the incidence of aircraft involvement is increasing substantially. We are now facing the era of the Jumbo Jet. We have seen in other areas where concerned citizens have stopped the development of super-sonic transports because of the threatened damage to our environment, not only by the exhaust pollutions but the destruction of the sound emanating from these aircraft.

Mr. Speaker, one gentleman in Greater Winnipeg, almost alone, has indicated a concern, a very real concern for the effect of noise pollution and the exhaust emissions as it reflected the quiet enjoyment of his property. As some of you may know, this gentleman, who happens to live in the constituency of the Leader of the Official Opposition who continues to be absent, has waged a battle in respect to the assessment authority asking for reconsideration of assessment since it was seriously affected by the noise pollution of aircraft. Unfortunately, the assessors in this area have not recognized the validity of his argument. His argument is manifold many times when the situation of my constituents is considered. My mother happens to have a home directly in the glide path and I can assure you that it would be impossible for you and I to have a conversation even five feet apart during some times when aircraft are passing overhead.

So, gentlemen, this is a very serious problem. It is a very serious problem inasmuch as -- yes, the medical authorities now are considering the very serious health consequences to sound on the human anatomy. There have been reported cases of very serious illness, protracted illness through the manifestations of continued periods of noise. Mr. Speaker, it's not the noise from aircraft alone, you recall that my honourable colleague the Minister of Transportation has indicated a concern for the noise from snowmobiles; improved muffling devices are necessary in respect to transport vehicles of all kinds. I for example, as a resident of my constituency, lived in an apartment block and again, living in that apartment block it was impossible to engage in reasonable conversation for many periods of time because of the high incidence of noise from large transport trucks travelling along the No. 1 highway. Mr. Speaker, this is a growing and serious problem. I understand that one of my colleagues, one of the members of the caucus has drafted and will be presenting a resolution calling upon this Assembly to give serious concern to the whole question of noise pollution as a factor in the destruction of our quiet enjoyment and a real serious problem in our environment.

Mr. Speaker, I know that by tradition the Premier generally exercises a precedent long established in endeavouring to speak before the vote is taken on the vote of non-confidence, but as most honourable members have earlier been advised, the Premier is ill at home, otherwise he would have been here to contribute to the debate. Mr. Speaker, I have much more that I would have preferred to say in respect to the whole question of the destruction of our environment by new types of pollution but I'm prepared to recognize that you are about to call the hour at 9:30 and I will take my place.

MR. SPEAKER: I thank the Honourable Minister. It is true our Rule 33 (3) indicates that I must put the amendment before the honourable members now. The proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Logan and the amendment thereto by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. Are you ready for the question? All in favour please say Aye.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye

MR. SPEAKER: Against say Nay.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Nay

MR. ENNS: Ayes and Nays please, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder if the honourable gentleman would contain himself until I made a decision. In my opinion the Nays have it and I declare the amendment lost. Call in the members.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. The proposed motion before the Assembly is the amendment by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition to the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Logan.

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

YEAS: Messrs. Barkman, Bilton, Craik, Einarson, Enns, Ferguson, Girard, Graham, Henderson, Johnston (Portage la Prairie), Johnston (Sturgeon Creek), Jorgenson, McGill, McGregor, McKellar, Moug, Sherman, Spivak, Watt, Weir and Mrs. Trueman.

NAYS: Messrs. Allard, Barrow, Beard, Borowski, Boyce, Burtiak, Cherniack, Doern, Evans, Gonick, Gottfried, Hanuschak, Jenkins, Johansson, McBryde, Mackling, Malinowski, Miller, Paulley, Pawley, Petursson, Shafransky, Turnbull, Uskiw, Uruski.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 21; Nays, 25.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the Nays have it and declare the amendment lost. On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Logan. Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. BARKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I think there's enough time to say what little I intend to say. I would like to join the many others in congratulating you in taking your rightful place. I'm sure that as the days go by the hours might get very tedious at times, but I think you've already shown at the outset that you will be able to control this House, at least to a great extent I hope. I do sincerely wish you well in this high office that you've undertaken to serve. I do wish to say also to you, Mr. Speaker, that I hope in the coming session, and for that matter in the coming years, that we can strive as members to try to raise our standards as far as decorum and language is concerned. I think it will be up to a lot of us members who have not really fulfilled our duties often when things get a little bit disturbed.

I would like to join in congratulating the mover and the seconder, the Member for Logan and the Member for Gimli. I was very glad to hear both of them speak, and especially the Member for Gimli who so forcefully brought out his intention of what he thought should be done with our private school problem. I think it took some strong desire on his part to come out as boldly as he did and I congratulate him for doing so.

I thought it was very fitting that the Speech from the Throne made mention of the Honourable Richard Bowles, their span of time that they served. I think most of the members down here know that it isn't really a money-making affair for these people. I'm sure that most of us are aware that you better have a few dollars perhaps if you wish to serve, but in the meantime they did a very honourable job and I'm sure all Manitobans are proud of the performance they gave the people of Manitoba.

I would like to also say that I was very happy to see congratulations mentioned to the former Mr. Maitland Steinkopf. I had the honour of serving under him for approximately 4 1/2 years and I wish to say to the youth of this province, if ever I've seen a man, and especially of his age although he wasn't old, but youth was always upon his mind, leave alone the imaginative mind, the constructive mind that he had, that he used so forcefully and helped both the 1967 Centennial and also our 1970 Centennial be so successful, and I'm sure that Miss Bayer and the Rev. Honourable McLean had a lot to do with it, but with the type of leader they had this must have been a very challenging job for both of them.

I would like to, since we are celebrating, or perhaps I should say not we, necessarily, but we with them, make mention of the fact as was mentioned in the Throne Speech that the signing of the Indian Treaties No. 1 and 2 will commemorate their 100th anniversary this year. I think it is in order that we join in making 1971 a memorable one for them.

Now I think also it's quite in order, and I don't want to make this congratulatory part too long because I should perhaps be sitting on the other side of the House by now, which is not my intention at all, but I would like to say that I would like to congratulate the many community projects that took place since 1967, especially our Centennial year and so many of them completed in 1970.

(MR. BARKMAN cont'd).....

Now, Mr. Speaker, one could go on and on as far as congratulating some of the good things that have happened, and of course there are also so many things that are not in the same vein or same line of thought, and I think perhaps our duty on this side of the House is more to bring up a few of the other matters rather than what I've just done.

I was very interested in the Throne Speech when the Speech mentioned that this government's intention - I just forget how it was worded - but that a government must be responsive, must be an open government and a humane government, and I wonder, with the attitude that we've seen so far since the opening of this session, I'm not too sure that after the winning of the two elections - and I wish to congratulate them - but for this government to take an attitude that nearly everything now goes or is in their power to suggest, as seems to be the case with quite a few individual members, is not good for the citizens of Manitoba, even if they had won by 100 percent total vote leave alone with perhaps a little less than a 40 percent vote. I was very interested to listen to the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources the other day when he got all steamed up and was really tearing into some of the members on this side and he pointed out quite a few things - I don't think I have to repeat them, most of us heard what he said - but when he came to a certain point and nearly went over his desk and he says: "Yes, coalesce." -- (Interjection) -- Yes, that's exactly what he said and I'm so happy that he also understands that word, and I'm glad, very glad, and I hope he takes it back to his executive and lets some of the members in his own Cabinet, also give them the same preachings, shall I say, because I think it will do some of those members good also.

Mr. Speaker, I think it has been brought up several times that possibly this Speech from the Throne would go on record as one that said very little, but I think in fairness to the party across, I believe there wasn't really too much to say because most of it had already been said in the by-election of April 5th.

I don't want to take up too much time in discussing the agricultural program at this time. The honourable gentleman sitting in the Premier's chair does not quite look as good as the Golden Boy on top, but perhaps if he sits there long enough he will become better looking than our present Premier or more so. In the meantime, Mr. Speaker, I know that many of us on this side are very concerned with the problems of agriculture. I don't want to say that at the time Mr. John Diefenbaker was the Prime Minister of Canada that the \$2.00 that he gave to the people of Canada at that time did not influence a lot of people to vote that way. I don't want to say that the \$1.00 an acre in the case of this government did any damage to any votes in this election. I'm sure they hope they did not. I'm sure that some of the farmers forget to think that perhaps well, I'm getting \$1.00 an acre; I may only have to pay back about 75 cents of it so 25 cents is better than nothing.

But in the meantime, in all seriousness, I do hope that as we go along in this session that we take a very serious look at some of our agricultural problems. I'm very much aware when the Honourable Member for Morris spoke of some of our agricultural problems, I'm very much aware that a lot of the responsibility as far as agriculture is concerned lies with the senior government at Ottawa, but I do hope that as far as us having to join the NDP Party to get along in Ottawa, I don't think, at least I for one am not quite ready to do that.

Now, I don't know what they think about it in Ottawa but I'm not really that concerned what they are doing in Ottawa; I am very much concerned that we do our part, especially in agriculture in Manitoba, and I've wondered over these last past days, I'm sure that quite a few of us are thinking of things that ought to be done. We know the farmer needs more protection. He's probably honourably and boldly till now said, I don't want any kind of protection; I don't want that kind of protection. Maybe he's come to the point where he will have to accept some kind of a protection if it's available.

I think some people are of the opinion that as far as credit is concerned, far too much is given. I can't say that this is my thinking unless we have odd cases where it has been misused, yes, but I am rather concerned about some of those farmers who have had big loans and are not able to pay back their payments the way they ought to, and I understand that the Federal Government and quite a few of our mortgage companies now give this farmer an opportunity of paying it back on a one-third basis of what his crop brought in and perhaps this government could also consider that in case his payment is not large enough, Perhaps if he gives up a third, the other two-thirds he needs for himself, or needs for his family or needs for his operation.

(MR. BARKMAN cont'd).....

I know that as a member on the Agricultural Committee that ways and means are being looked for to find more protection as far as machinery sales and parts sales for our farmers and also for our small dealers. I was rather discouraged when I read the Royal Commission Report, I believe it was 1936 or 1938 - I know it's a long time ago - I was rather surprised that some of the large companies did not show a bigger profit than they did, and I'm very much afraid the improvements that we are going to try and make, that these companies will not have an opportunity to price these improvements that will be asked for, to price them right back and the farmer will still have to pay for them. So I think we will have to be careful in what we're demanding but I certainly agree that there must be changes.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that the Honourable Member for Morden brought up a very interesting point as far as police brutality -- (Interjection) -- Morden. Sorry, Pembina, the Honourable Member for Pembina, sorry - as far as police brutality is concerned, and I'm sure that him as the former mayor of the Town of Manitou has experienced often how hard it is to hire a policeman in a small town or a small village and I think he meant exactly what he said: the time has come when we'd better try and get more protection for these policemen.

I was encouraged in the note in the Speech from the Throne that police training and police education and relations were being considered and I certainly hope - and not to bring up an old subject, but I think it's something that's of great importance - I certainly hope that a way can be found that certain villages with population of over 500 can also be helped. I think they need to be helped. The time has come -- I hope when the bills come out, when the suggestions come out there's something along that line. And while we're speaking along this line, there was also some mention made that our courts, or perhaps some procedure along that line would be streamlined. I do hope that this government considers increasing the amount of \$100.00 that is going to the Small Debts Court to at least 500 as some other provinces have; I don't think it's too high in this day and age and I do hope that they will consider an amount of at least \$500.00 as far as the Small Debts Court is concerned.

Mr. Speaker, I have one very grave concern and that is over our overall road - I might say road maintenance picture. I think the situation has come to a point, and I believe the Honourable Minister of Transportation is aware that perhaps no body of men are more co-operative than our municipal people when it comes to planning and when it comes to helping with the Provincial Government. I think we've run into trouble; we can perhaps blame a lot of our problems on our weather conditions, Manitoba's heavy frost. We can perhaps blame a lot of the damage on our roads on trucks carrying overloads - and I understand part of this is being checked which I think is necessary. We can perhaps blame part of our roads on past governments. At least at one time, not too many years ago, I heard most of the fault went right back to the Liberal regime time, so maybe some of it is on that, but I do maintain that unless we are going to spend more money and more seriously keep on repairing our roads and keep them up to a higher standard, we will be spending much more money than we are even at this time. I'm sure that the Minister is aware of this and I hope that the Minister of Finance also hears this because moneys will be needed to keep these roads in condition.

I don't think I want to spend very much - I'm just not sure if I should - I'd like to go into a problem that I think is also getting quite acute and quite severe as far as this government is concerned and perhaps as far as any government is concerned, and I've come to the conclusion that unless somebody, somebody takes a responsible attitude, then this thing is going to run away on us, and I'm talking of our great bureaucracy in various departments. I'm not just referring to the Department of Health and Welfare, I'm referring to many departments of this government. I dare say that as was suggested the other day in this House, that when we are starting to appoint government boards, permit boards, license boards, tribunals, enquiring bodies and nearly any kind of a regulatory agency and many more, I think the time has come when perhaps there has to be a halt, and I dare say that as was mentioned the other day in this House, over the last - somebody has suggested over the last 25 years - there has been an increase of only 23 percent population but an increase of over 1,000 percent as far as our increase in boards and agencies is concerned and I think this has to stop.

So, Mr. Speaker, the people of Manitoba do not need an extension in bureaucracy and

(MR. BARKMAN cont'd).....I don't think they want an extension in all these boards and all these tribunals, enquiring bodies and what have you, and I would like to suggest that this type of bureaucracy is something that will have to be checked and there's no use saying to the other fellow, "You have to do it." This government, if they want to be the government they sometimes say they are, which I'm not too sure they are, will have to do something about bureaucracy for sure.

MR. SPEAKER: It is now 10:00 p.m. The question is still open in the Honourable Member who spoke. Does he wish to have it in his name?

MR. BARKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I think I need not continue.

MR. SPEAKER: The Member has concluded? -- (Interjection) -- I realize it's 10:00 o'clock; I've already said it's 10:00 o'clock. I will put the question -- the Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. BILTON: by the Honourable Member for Fort Garry, that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: It is now 10:00 p.m. The House is adjourned until 2:30 p.m. Tuesday afternoon.