

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
8:00 o'clock, Tuesday, May 22, 1973

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions; Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees. The Honourable Member for Logan.

REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

MR. WILLIAM JENKINS (Logan): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the Second Report of the Standing Committee on Law Amendments.

MR. CLERK: Your Committee has considered Bills:

- (No. 6) - An Act to amend The Sale of Goods Act.
- (No. 7) - An Act to amend The Bills of Sale Act.
- (No. 8) - An Act to amend The Assignments of Book Debts Act.
- (No. 9) - An Act to amend and repeal The Lien Notes Act.
- (No. 13) - An Act to amend The Local Authorities Elections Act.
- (No. 18) - An Act to amend The Employment Safety Act.
- (No. 24) - An Act to amend The Crop Insurance Act.
- (No. 39) - An Act to amend The Manitoba Water Services Board Act.
- (No. 53) - An Act to amend An Act to amend The School Tax Reduction Act.

And has agreed to report the same without amendment.

Your Committee has also considered Bills:

- (No. 5) - The Personal Property Security Act.
- (No. 35) - An Act to amend The Criminal Injuries Compensation Act.
- (No. 36) - An Act to incorporate the Certified General Accountants Association of Manitoba.

(No. 44) - The Prescription Drugs Cost Assistance Act.

And has agreed to report the same with certain amendments. All of which is respectfully submitted.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. JENKINS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for St. Vital, that the report of the Committee be received.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: Ministerial Statements; Tabling of Reports; Notices of Motion; Introduction of Bills. The Honourable Minister of Labour.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour) (Transcona), on behalf of the Honourable First Minister, introduced Bill No. 67, an Act to validate an Agreement dated the 10th day of May, A. D., 1973, and made between The Brandon Centennial Auditorium Corporation Incorporated and the Government of Manitoba, Brandon University and the City of Brandon.

MATTER OF URGENCY

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for La Verendrye,

WHEREAS the Chairman of the Manitoba Farm Credit Corporation who is also the Chairman of the Manitoba Hog Marketing Board has actively campaigned for the government as guest speaker at an NDP nominating convention; and

WHEREAS the same person has seen fit to launch a political attack on members of the Legislature who sit on the opposite side; and

WHEREAS the remarks by the Chairman as reported in the Swan River Star and Times on May 17th, 1973 indicate that he has had access to information which could only be supplied by the Department of Health and Social Development, and he used such information which is normally considered confidential to try to denigrate certain members of the opposition in a political manner;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the regular business of the House be now adjourned in order to debate a matter of urgent public importance, namely the matter of heads of Crown

MATTER OF URGENCY

(MR. G. JOHNSTON cont'd) corporation actively campaigning for the NDP government while still holding office.

MR. SPEAKER: According to our procedure before I accept the motion we have the opportunity of each of the parties having five minutes in which to explain their matter of urgency. The honourable member will have first opportunity.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, during this past session which is rapidly drawing to a close there has not been one emergency debate allowed this year, and as my memory serves me I don't think there was one last year. And I refer mainly to your rulings on the various questions which were raised, first and mainly on the grounds that the questions under consideration could be discussed under some of the following terms: (a) under the Estimates, which are now passed; (b) under grievance which - and I question that, Mr. Speaker, because under grievance a member can only rise once and usually on matters to do with his constituency; (c) under bills that may within some broad measure be able to bring in the subject matter. And when I examine the bills before us, Mr. Speaker, I see no way that this important subject can be debated. Then finally, it has been suggested by the Chair that a matter that has been raised can be discussed under Order for Return.

So I say, Mr. . . .

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Minister state his point of order.

MR. PAULLEY: May I have a copy of the motion proposed by my honourable friend the Member for Portage la Prairie so that I might assess, as the present Leader, Deputy Premier, the contents thereof.

MR. SPEAKER: That point of order has been in order. Order please. Let me also caution the honourable member that I hope his debate on urgency will not impinge on past rulings of the Chair. The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: So finally, Sir, I say to you that it cannot possibly be discussed under an Order for Return because the government has control and by past practice, and I don't say this government but any government, gives government business precedence so it's no way this matter can be discussed.

Finally I say again, when one peruses the bills that are before us there is an Act however, Bill 55, to amend The Civil Service Act, and I submit to you this matter cannot be discussed under that item because we're speaking now about the head of a Crown corporation which is not in the Civil Service.

So I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, and I tried to stay away from the subject matter while I await your ruling, but I suggest to you that if the Chairman of the Manitoba Hydro or the Chairman of the Manitoba Telephone System campaigned against the government the following day his resignation would be asked for. I leave it at that.

MR. SPEAKER: Any other further urgent debate? Five minutes.

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q.C. (Leader of the Opposition) (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, there have been several emergency debates that have been requested in this House, none of them more serious than the one that's been suggested now.

Mr. Speaker, the reasons for the emergency debate relates to the fact that a person placed in responsibility in a sensitive area to serve all the people of Manitoba has seen fit to serve the political party that placed him in that position. Mr. Speaker, the question of the morality of the New Democratic Party is at stake. As well, Mr. Speaker, it comes at a time when we are witnessing in the United States the agony which is taking place where political appointees in high places have exercised their loyalty to the party rather than their loyalty to the people of the United States. Mr. Speaker, this emergency debate is warranted, because we have in the course of conduct that has taken place a severe breakdown in the proper and appropriate action by those who have been given responsibility by government to exercise it on behalf of all the people who now deem it more important to try and elect a party than to carry on with the independence that they must show in exhibiting and in carrying out their responsibility, particularly one which deals with almost every farmer in Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, this debate, this emergency debate is warranted. (Applause)

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman or Mr. Speaker, I apologize, Sir, the question before the House is one of urgency and within the rules of the House. I can well imagine that the

MATTER OF URGENCY

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) sponsor of this resolution, the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie and the Honourable Member from River Heights would be most desirable of imputing motives and attempted . . . --(Interjection)-- Mr. Speaker, I hope you deduct from my time the interjections from either one of them.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. PAULLEY: I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that with this proposition the net effects would be to deny any member of any corporation to expressing an opinion. I draw to your attention . . . --(Interjection)--

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. PAULLEY: Oh let the rabble from Swan River shut up. Mr. Speaker, I draw to your attention that the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs is the Chairman of the Manitoba Housing Corporation. He is also very much involved in the Autopac operation, Manitoba insurance, the Chairman of Autopac and if the proposition of an emergent debate as proposed by the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie was accepted by this House, my colleague, the Minister of Municipal Affairs, would be deprived of taking --(Interjection)-- Oh you wouldn't understand because you're so damned stupid -- my honourable friend the Minister of Municipal Affairs would be deprived . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. PAULLEY: Nobody can smear more than the Honourable Member from Swan River. But anyway, Mr. Speaker, let us take a look at the resolution of the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

Whereas the Chairman of the Manitoba Farm Credit Corporation who is also Chairman of the Manitoba Hog Marketing Board has actively campaigned for the government as a guest speaker at an NDP nominating convention. Mr. Speaker, we live, I hope, despite the suggestions of the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie and from Swan River, I hope that we live in a democracy when anybody can have the right of free expression.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: I thought our rules called upon us to discuss in the five minutes allotted to us for each party the merits of the resolution, not the contents of the resolution.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Not the merits of the -- Order, please -- Not the merits of the resolution but the merits of urgency only. The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, you're so right, the matter of urgency. And I can understand where my honourable friend . . .

A MEMBER: Your urgency.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Would everyone kindly keep quiet. I think that it behooves us all to act like ladies and gentlemen and to be courteous and to keep quiet when another member has the floor. The members that can't contain themselves there are places where we can wet our whistle or do something else but not shout in this Chamber. Now I have to add that time that I have taken up and that other members have taken up to the Honourable Minister of Labour's time. I think that we can get the five minutes over with. The Honourable Minister has two and a half minutes left. The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): On that particular point, I agree that other members should remain quiet while an honourable member has the floor. The Minister of Labour is one that could really follow that advice. But at the same time, Sir, our rules provide that the matter of urgency is the only thing that can be debated. The Minister was far astray from that particular point at the time that he was interrupted. I ask you, Sir, to deal in that particular point and that particular point only.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I do not fault the Honourable Member for Morris because of his unintelligibility to be able to consider the matter before us. If, Mr. Speaker, the matter of urgency was the prime motivation tonight - and I want to draw to the attention of this House, Mr. Speaker, that there is a bill before this House dealing with the involvement of the Civil Service in matters political, and I also want to draw to the attention of this Assembly that in the resolution proposed by the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie, that he is referring to a report which was contained in the Swan River Star which is the organ of the Member for Swan River.

A MEMBER: Point of order.

MATTER OF URGENCY

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable Member for Portage state his point of order.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: My point of order, Mr. Speaker, is, and I thought I made it clear, but my honourable friend is still hard of hearing I see; that this matter cannot be discussed under Bill 55, an Act to amend The Civil Service Act. We're talking about the chairman of a Crown corporation, we're not talking about a civil servant. I hope my honourable member takes the correction in a kind manner.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: I also want to point out, Mr. Speaker, insofar as the matter of urgency is concerned that the remarks of the Chairman of the Hog Marketing Board were contained in an editorial of the Conservative organ of the Swan River Times or News on May 17th which was over a week ago; and insofar as urgency is concerned, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. PAULLEY: . . . had ample time to introduce this at that time.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable Member for Swan River state his point of order.

MR. JAMES H. BILTON (Swan River): Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. What a babe in the wilderness! I was being fair to the NDP Party by having the report of their meeting placed on the front page of this paper and it was . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please. Order, please. ORDER PLEASE. ORDER PLEASE. That is not a point of order. Would everyone kindly contain themselves. And I mean everyone. The Honourable Minister of Labour has one minute left.

MR. PAULLEY: Ah, but, Mr. Speaker, there's been so many interjections I only want to -- (Interjection)-- Mr. Speaker, I don't care a continental whether it was an editorial or not. --(Interjection)-- I wonder if my honourable friend from Swan River who is the proprietor of this paper would only desist just for a moment in order for me to indicate to you, Mr. Speaker, that there is no urgency because the article referred to by the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie was contained in the Swan River Times on May 17th, a week ago. If there was urgency, Mr. Speaker, and I suggest that there was not, that the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie, who apparently is a subscriber to that paper that comes out from Swan River, has had an opportunity on the basis of urgency to raise it before. And in addition to that . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please. Order, please. Order, please. The honourable gentleman's time is up. The Honourable Member for Portage have a further point of order?

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, and I raise the question seriously, the newspaper is a weekly and it's the first time it's been in our hands. There has been a long weekend and it's not a daily paper.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please. This is not a point of order. It's a matter of opinion. Order, please. The Honourable Member for Swan River have another point of order?

MR. BILTON: On the point of order for the edification of the House, may I explain to you, Sir, and to the honourable members that the newspaper is published on Thursday and it takes the post office four days to get it to Winnipeg.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. That too is not a point of order. Order, please. That includes the Member for Lakeside. He's out of order too. I do hope I'll get the co-operation of the honourable members tonight. Let me indicate that in the opinion of -- first of all, let me thank the honourable members for their contributions to urgency. In my opinion, I can only say that in respect to urgency it must relate to something that is so pressing that the public is demanding it according to Beauchesne citation 100 subsection (2). I have no evidence of that either in the resolution or in the speeches that were made by the honourable members. Secondly, it's got to fall within the ambit of administrative responsibility. The marketing board is an autonomous body, it's members are an autonomous group of people, therefore it does not fall within the ambit of administrative responsibility. I must rule the question out of order. Oral questions. The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, with regret I challenge your ruling.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please. Call in the members. Call in the members. The Minister of Labour.

MATTER OF URGENCY

MR. PAULLEY: That's right, because I know the rules of the House. I want to know whether, Mr. Speaker, the vote has been called. Somebody over there said ayes and nays, Mr. Speaker. You did not present the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Minister is on a point of order. He is entitled to be heard. I would like to hear him.

MR. PAULLEY: Okay, Mr. Speaker, I accept --(Interjection)-- you know Jim you had one too many tonight.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Motion before the House is shall the ruling of the Chair be sustained.

A STANDING VOTE was taken, the result being as follows:

YEAS

Messrs: Adam	Johannson
Barrow	McBryde
Boyce	Mackling
Burtniak	Malinowski
Desjardins	Paulley (Trans)
Doern	Pawley (Selkirk)
Evans	Petursson
Gottfried	Shafransky
Green	Toupin
Hanuschak	Turnbull
Jenkins	Uskiw
	Walding

NAYS

Messrs. Allard	Johnston (P. la P.)
Barkman	Jorgenson
Bilton	McGill
Blake	McKellar
Borowski	McKenzie
Einarson	Moug
Enns	Patrick
Ferguson	Sherman
Froese	Spivak
Girard	Watt
Henderson	Mrs. Trueman

MR. CLERK: Yeas 23; Nays 22.

MR. SPEAKER: In my opinion the Ayes have it, declare the motion carried. Order, please. Order, please. We are still under the Oral Questions. The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask a question of the Honourable the House Leader. Will it be the policy of this government to allow the chairmen of the various boards such as the Manitoba Hydro, Manitoba Agricultural . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please. Order, please. Order! I should like to indicate that Beauchesne citation 171 says questions of policy shall not be asked.

The Honourable Member for Lakeside, rephrase the question.

MR. ENNS: I have no intention of asking a policy question. I'm asking whether or not the Chairman of the Manitoba Agricultural Corporation will be actively campaigning in this election for the NDP Party?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, the answer for that is, under certain rules of procedure, if the particular individual wants to, under certain circumstances, we believe in a free society.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the honourable deputy premier of this province and ask the question of whether or not the chairman of the Manitoba Telephone System

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. ENNS cont'd) will be actively campaigning for the New Democratic Party in this election?

MR. PAULLEY: I do not know, Mr. Speaker, but if that is his inclination, then I too believe in a free democracy apparently that the Honourable Member for Lakeside does not agree with.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please. Let me indicate again Beauchesne citation in respect to oral questions. I wish to have no debate started during the question period. Order, please. I haven't suggested that anyone has debated. I'm just indicating that we will not have it during the question period. Let us carry on, citation 171, I'll read it first so we will all be aware of it: "In putting a question a member must confine himself to the narrowest limit. In making a question, observations which might lead to debate cannot be regarded as coming within the proper limits of a question. The purpose of a question is to obtain information and not to supply it to the House." And there are about 40 other additional sub rules to that citation; so therefore I wish the honourable members would take their time, make their questions brief, to the point and terse. And the same thing applies to the answers. Thank you very much. The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, in accordance with your rulings I think that I have been making my questions abundantly brief and not argumentative. But I ask only for a yes or no, or in fact no answer.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member is discussing the point now, will he come to the question. Question please.

MR. ENNS: My next question, Mr. Speaker, is to the Deputy Premier of this province. Will the Chairman of Manitoba Hydro be actively campaigning for the New Democratic Party during the course of the forthcoming election?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, in my capacity as the Deputy Premier of the Province of Manitoba, if it is the inclination of the Chairman of Hydro, the Telephones or any other corporation, that they want to campaign actively on behalf of the New Democratic Party, the Conservative Party, the Liberal Party or the Social Credit Party, we believe in democracy to the extent that they have that right.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin. The honourable member has had three questions on the same subject. The Honourable Member for Roblin. The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Tourism and Recreation. Can he tell me whether or not his Deputy Minister will be actively campaigning on behalf of the New Democratic Party in the forthcoming provincial election?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable Minister of Tourism and Recreation.

HON. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS (Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs) (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, I'm standing up on a point of order, not to answer that frivolous question from him. Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister state his point of order.

MR. DESJARDINS: My point of order is this, that there are about 38 other boards to go. My honourable friend can start --(Interjection)-- on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. On a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please. I shall name the Honourable Member for Lakeside. Would the Honourable Minister please sit down. Would the Honourable Minister please sit down. --(Interjection)-- Order, please, and that includes the gallery behind me.

I am going to ask the honourable members again for their co-operation. I have no intention to preside over a House that will not abide by its own rules. If the house does not wish to proceed, all they have to do is suggest and we can adjourn. I do wish to have the co-operation of the members, I'm willing to co-operate with them, but I'm suggesting that when I ask for order that the members do adhere to their rules.

I shall suggest again that if any member in the future insists on remaining on the floor when I have asked for the order three times I shall name him, I won't even give him a warning. This is the only way this House will proceed in an orderly manner. That's fair warning, I am stating it once more. If a member does not come to order when I ask him three times out loud, I shall name him.

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. SPEAKER cont'd)

Now may we proceed with the question period. The Honourable Member for Thompson,

MR. JOSEPH P. BOROWSKI (Thompson): Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of House Privilege regarding the question raised of Mr. Hoffer campaigning on behalf of the government. There is a bill before the Legislature which will allow civil servants to be involved in elections if it's passed, and I'm asking you to consider and perhaps rule now whether it's proper for the government to allow civil servants or other appointed people, while the bill is . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The honourable member does not have a matter of privilege. The question in respect to the urgency of debate was already adjudicated by this House, therefore there can be no further discussion on that particular matter. The Honourable Member for Roblin,

MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE (Roblin): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Honourable House Leader. I wonder can the Honourable House Leader advise the house if he's going to permit the Chairman of the Hog Marketing Commission to take my letters out of the Department of Health and read them into the record at political meetings such as he did in Swan River?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines and Resources.

HON. SIDNEY GREEN, Q.C. (Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management)(Inkster): Mr. Speaker, that is not a question that really relates to my obligations or duties as House Leader. I can advise the honourable member that if what he thinks has occurred is so outrageous he will have an opportunity of going to the people with what he considers to be an outrageous position. And I assume, Mr. Speaker, that that's what will happen, and if the position is as outrageous as the honourable member suggests it is -- apparently it wasn't outrageous in 1969 when the President of the Conservative Party, Mr. Cam McLean was the Chairman of the Fair Wage Board and actively participated in politics on behalf of the Progressive Conservative Party -- but if that now is an outrageous position, then I suggest that the outrage can be clearly and thoroughly canvassed in due course.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to restate the question to the Honourable House Leader because, Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please. ORDER, PLEASE. One of the cardinal rules of Beauchesne's Citation 171 is that a question whether reworded or otherwise if it's repetitive must be ruled out of order. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition,

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I rise on a point of order because I believe that the Honourable House Leader in his intention to answer the question, intention to answer the question answered only part . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Would the honourable member state his point of order not debate.

MR. SPIVAK: I am going to, if I may, direct a question to the House Leader. Is it to be the government's intention to allow members of the commission or chairmen of the various boards and commissions to have access to government files which they can use during the election campaign?

A MEMBER: Good point.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines and Resources.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I hesitate to answer a question which is based on a hypothetical proposition. Certain allegations have been made, and my understanding relative to those allegations is that the thing complained of is a letter that had been made public and previously quoted that a member -- the chairman of a board used a letter which was quoted. The honourable member says that something improper was done vis-a-vis a confidential letter being obtained by a chairman of a corporation; I assumed that he would have his remedy for that. I couldn't answer a policy question on a basis of hypothesis except that confidential information remains confidential as far as the government is concerned.

MR. SPIVAK: Yes. To the House Leader. I wonder if he can give an undertaking to the House that no documents or confidential letters in the possession of government will be handed over to any member or chairman of any board or commission to be used for political purposes?

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, it's so very difficult to give that type of undertaking because members of the Opposition have produced here confidential documents which came from government files, which got to them in a way which I have no knowledge of. So I couldn't possibly give that kind of undertaking. I mean where did the document that Mr. Craik, the

ORAL QUESTIONS

(MR. GREEN cont'd) Member for Riel, get; where did the other documents that have been revealed from the Department of Health, where were they obtained?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I address my question to the Honourable the Minister of Health and Social Development. Could he inform the House as to how Mr. Hofford, when he made reference to the 28 references, which were made by the Member for Roblin, asking for welfare, can he inform the House as to how Mr. Hofford got this information?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health and Social Development.

HON. RENE E. TOUPIN (Minister of Health and Social Development)(Springfield): Mr. Speaker, I believe the House Leader answered that question very thoroughly. There is no way that I could inform the House where Mr. Hofford, or anybody else, got copies of letter. Where did Mrs. Trueman or the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge, get copies of confidential letters from my office to my Assistant Deputy Minister? I have no knowledge of that, and the honourable member well knows it.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I have another question unrelated, and I address it to the Acting Premier of the Province of Manitoba. It refers to the letter by the Premier of this province with respect to the non-payment of medicare premiums for the future, and my question is, in view of the fact that this is a political document with an election coming up, is it the intention of members opposite to reimburse the taxpayers for the \$70,000 cost of this propaganda?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, in my opinion it is not a political document. It is informational, it is information that is relayed to the people of Manitoba to indicate to them what we are doing as the Government of Manitoba on their behalf.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. BILTON: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the House Leader, or at least the Deputy Premier. Has the Chairman of the Hog Marketing Board authority to come to my office and state that he is prepared to bring files from Winnipeg to substantiate a letter to the editor explaining himself, to vindicate the problem that's before the House? Has he the authority to bring those files to vindicate himself, private files of the government?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: As Acting Premier, Mr. Speaker, I say to my honourable friend the Member for Swan River, we don't accept, we do not accept the propriety of any chairman of any commission to give to the honourable member factual information. I think, Sir, the contrary would be the result, and the Member for Swan River would declaim the Government of Manitoba if one of its agents did not give him information as to what we were doing on behalf of the people of Manitoba.

MR. BILTON: A supplementary question. I wonder if the government had given authority to the Chairman of the Hog Marketing Board, the authority to use material to destroy me in the oncoming election?

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I may say to the Honourable Member for Swan River, he is destroying himself. All that the Chairman of the Hog Marketing Board is empowered to do is to give information as to the directives of the Province of Manitoba in that particular degree. And if in the process it defeats the involvement of the Honourable Member for Swan River let him take his choice, not us.

MR. BILTON: Mr. Speaker, my final supplementary. I take it from the Minister's remarks that the honourable -- at least the --(Interjection)--

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. BILTON: . . . has carte blanche authority to use records against me in this election, and I am prepared to fight him all the way, and your government.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, all I can say to my honourable friend the Member for Swan River, that if in the process of the activities of the Government of Manitoba my honourable friend from Swan River is defeated, then he will have to allow the chips to fall where they are.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON (Rock Lake): Mr. Speaker, I direct this question to the Minister of Agriculture. Can the Minister indicate whether any loans have been made through the MACC to farmers without any security in the Province of Manitoba?

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Minister of Agriculture)(Lac du Bonnet): Mr. Speaker, I think the best way to handle that kind of a thing is in the normal way. I have no knowledge as to the pertinent facts of all loans that are made by the MACC. They do not appear on my desk for approval. The management makes the decision in most of the cases; where they have no authority the board makes a decision.

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Speaker, I direct another question to the Minister of Agriculture. Has any directive from his office gone out to any officials of his department stating that they're prepared to buy up lands from farmers who are ready to retire in the Province of Manitoba?

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I think the honourable member should recall that during the introduction of my Estimates in the House some time ago we indicated that the MACC will be involved in assisting those people that wish to retire as well as assisting those young people who wish to enter the industry, and that we would opt for, or provide a new option, and that is the land-lease option for those that don't have a basis on which to borrow.

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Speaker, I thank the Minister for his answer and having given this information. If a young person who is engaged in renting property, will he have the option to . . . My question is, Mr. Speaker, will the then young farmer who has been renting will have the option to buy that same piece of property?

MR. USKIW: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture dealing with the Farm Machinery Act. I wonder can the Minister explain to the House, is a country blacksmith in the same slot as a farm machinery dealer?

MR. USKIW: I really don't know what the honourable member is trying to suggest.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, for clarification. Does the local blacksmith in the Village of Inglis have to pay the same bond fees as the implement dealer?

MR. USKIW: I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that my honourable friend look at the act and define for himself whether a blacksmith is a farm implement dealer or not?

MR. McKENZIE: A final supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Can the Minister advise the House if the blacksmiths of this province have got letters advising them that they must buy this liability bond?

MR. USKIW: No, Mr. Speaker, the Farm Machinery Board is charged with the responsibility of licensing and all of the matters pertaining to the new act. I would suggest that he should consult the Board.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin has had two questions on the same subject.

MR. J. DOUGLAS WATT (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture relating to the question just asked by the Member for Rock Lake. Have any farm-lands reverting to the Crown through lack of payment, or default of payment, and reverting to the Crown to the Province of Manitoba, been offered for sale?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. USKIW: To my knowledge, no, but I'm not sure as of this date.

MR. WATT: A supplementary question then. His answer was then correct to the member for Lakeside that land was being offered or would be offered for sale?

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, the Member for Arthur has the whole thing confused. The question asked of me earlier was whether or not there would be an option to buy for young people who would now enter into a lease program with MACC, and I said yes to that question.

MR. WATT: There has been no land offered for sale, land reverting to the Crown?

MR. USKIW: Again I said a moment ago I am not sure as of this date. To my knowledge there hasn't been any sold.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. JAMES R. FERGUSON (Gladstone): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question would be to the Minister of Agriculture. Under the present setup, and I'm having quite a number of complaints, in that there are several dealerships . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Question please.

MR. FERGUSON: Very well. I'll come to the question, Mr. Speaker, thank you. All right. As it stands, a farm machine dealer is obligated to have a \$5,000 bond, under the farm - I'm coming to that. --(Interjection)--

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please.

MR. FERGUSON: A farm machine dealer is obligated to have a \$10,000 bond.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. The Honourable Member.

MR. FERGUSON: My question is this, would one bond cover both the farm dealership, plus an automobile dealership, under the same name in the Province of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: That's asking for a legal opinion, out of order. The Honourable Member for Roblin,

MR. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, I regret to take issue with the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Would the honourable member state his point.

MR. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to table a letter addressed to my village blacksmith, which the Minister apparently doesn't understand, for the record, to prove that he doesn't know what's going on.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. It's not - order please. The letter is not necessary to proceedings under the Oral Questions. The honourable member wishes to confide something to the Honourable Minister, he can do it privately not during the Question period. Oral Questions. The Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney.

MR. EARL MCKELLAR (Souris-Killarney): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Attorney-General. Is it necessary for all lawyers to take out \$100,000 bond from now on?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. A. H. MACKLING, Q. C. (Attorney-General)(St. James): Mr. Speaker, I am aware of the fact that the Law Society through discussions among its members has been concerned about implementing a plan for a compulsory insurance and I think, if my memory serves me right, at the last session we made amendments to the Law Society Act which will permit the Law Society to make this sort of plan possible, so that it will protect individual clients from the errors or omissions, or failures, of individual practitioners, and I think it's a very desirable thing. I don't know whether you could call it a - I don't know whether the amount is as indicated by the honourable member, but there certainly is in the work a system to more effectively protect individual clients from the mistakes of their hired solicitor.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney.

MR. MCKELLAR: Mr. Speaker, I'd direct a question to the Minister of Health. Could he announce the name of the corporation who has made an offer to purchase Ninette Sanatorium.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. TOUPIN: Well Mr. Speaker, I did indicate to the House, I believe a few days ago, that I had made a commitment to both parties that I would not reveal the name in question and I still haven't directed that the deal has been completed. One of the parties have decided to make this public, but that doesn't oblige me to refer to it in this House, or publicly.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if you would please call Bill No. 42, standing in the name of the Honourable Member for Rhineland.

GOVERNMENT BILLS - BILL NO. 42

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, Bill 42 is an Act to amend the Child Welfare Act and I hadn't gone through it this morning when the bill was under discussion. I have since checked it, and checked the amendments with the original act, and I have a few questions and some comments.

I notice that under the Bill we are providing for day care centers in which three or more children receive care and that there will be a time of 18 hours a day. Mr. Speaker, this seems rather a costly business if you're going to set up day care centres for three children and then have it run for 18 hours a day. This means that you'll have to have three shifts, so that this can be a very expensive affair. I notice the Minister is not in his seat at the moment, but I certainly would like to get some answers to this. Mostly likely in many cases the centres will have more children than that but nevertheless when we legislate that the day care centres will be open with three or more children, and for that length of period of time a day, it seems a very long time in a given day that the centre will be open. Is it necessary to have day care centres open for 18 hours? I am questioning this, and I certainly would like to have some explanation

BILL NO. 42

(MR. FROESE cont'd) from the Minister when he closes debate on this particular bill. I know the day care centres have received discussion for many years. I can recall way back in '65 - '66 when we had discussions on this matter, and now we are having a bill before us to amend the Child Welfare Act to bring about this type of facility.

There are also numerous other amendments to the Act calling for a detention home and children's boarding home as they are defined, and I feel that we're really going all out on many of our social services. In fact I'm just wondering whether we're not going too fast at once and that we're spending too much money in this direction. I certainly feel that many of these services will not be provided to the rural area, that they will be mainly located in the large cities and that the services that we are providing through legislation of this type will not apply equally to all people.

We've been hearing a lot about equal opportunity in our educational system. Well here again equal opportunity will not exist by bringing in legislation of this type. And again I would like to hear from the Minister how many of these day care centres do they envision? How much are provided for under the Estimates and how many are they prepared to staff in the coming year? Certainly I think these are questions that need answering and that we should have answers to. There's also nursery schools, and here again I would also like the Minister to give us probably a little more detail than what is being proposed for the province as a whole.

With those few words, Mr. Speaker, I don't intend to oppose it on second reading. I hope that we have some representation from outside the committee to hear from them. I would certainly like to see some of the associations that are involved in this type of work to appear before the committee so that we can question them and get firsthand information on the legislation that we are proposing for this province.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister shall be closing debate. The Honourable Minister.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, very briefly I'd like to reply to at least some of the questions posed of me by the Member for Fort Rouge and just now by the Member for Rhineland.

The Member for Fort Rouge was asking the question pertaining to the responsibility of the City of Winnipeg or Unicity pertaining to their regulations in regard to day care centres versus the provincial standards and regulations. If the City of Winnipeg is financing day care centres they can set their own regulations and the province will not object. If the province is financing day care centres or home care or family day care facilities, they will fall under the provincial regulations and standards.

The honourable member was asking questions pertaining to the Review Board and felt sort of sorry that this was still a fact. I would like to mention to the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge that the functions and the responsibility of the Child Review Board has been amended to some great extent, they are no longer capable within the provisions of the Act, to alter the decisions of the court, and that they are especially there to be an advisory body to the Minister made responsible by Order-in-Council for the administration of the Act in regards to the treatment to be given to the given child. This will not, Mr. Speaker, hinder the cost-sharing arrangements that may be had pertaining to day care facilities between the Province of Manitoba and the Federal Government, but the function itself of the Review Board is a condition under CAP for cost-sharing of certain facilities with the Federal Government. So we do have to have the Review Board as set by the Act itself. The function as I mentioned a few minutes ago will be as an advisory committee to the Minister. And to specify the section I know this is not the time to make reference to sections of the bill itself, but the honourable member could look at the section, Section 22(5) of the bill and make reference to the Act itself, and will find that the function of the Review Board itself has been amended drastically.

The bill before us, Mr. Speaker, will allow the Department of Health and Social Development to license and regulate day care facility, and this is one of the main features of the bill.

The honourable member made reference to one of my statements in Hansard that touches on different meetings that I've had with different groups in the Province of Manitoba to discuss to discuss the day care program that is envisaged by the government for 1973. I've met with several groups, one of the groups that the honourable member herself has met with just prior to my meeting with them. I met with such a group again yesterday and one today. I meet with several groups that do deal with the provisions of child care, and we're trying to have a system of day care facilities that will answer the needs of all children in the

BILL NO. 42

(MR. TOUPIN cont'd) Province of Manitoba. I did say within the Estimates itself that we had approximately half a million dollars over and above the amount that was spent in 1973-74, which was approximately \$900,000 spent through my Estimates for those children considered to be in need, for those children falling under the category of either social allowance itself, on full social allowance, or those working who are being supplemented by the Department of Health and Social Development. But over and beyond that amount there is an amount of \$500,000 within the Estimates, which is ten times more than the amount that was in the Estimates for 1973-74. We don't foresee the possibility of meeting all the needs of child care in 1974, 1973-74 with that amount, but we'll make a good headway into meeting more of the needs of these children. And the program itself will be available to all, based on the ability to pay. We're not anticipating covering all the cost of day care facility itself; it will be a meaningful partnership between hopefully many, those that are able to pay employers by different levels of government and by the Department of Health and Social Development.

The Honourable Member for Rhineland asked the question, how many day care centres or family home care for children do we anticipate in the province? Being a service to all those children in need is very difficult to spell out how many we anticipate. We'll go as far as we can financially to meet all the needs of the children in the Province of Manitoba based on the ability to pay and based on the potential of manpower that we have in the field itself and those individual parents that have a desire to have their children cared for by others, but there's no way that we can anticipate the amount of applications that we'll have. I know that we have a certain amount of applications now that we are considering and, once the guidelines have been determined, we'll start negotiating with these different groups, accepting and refusing some, the funds that we have in our Estimates I've just related to being half a million dollars more than we had last year, more than the fifty thousand and more than the amount that was spent on the social allowance. So it is a step forward.

Mr. Speaker, I am quite sure that a lot of the questions that other members of the House may have here today could be answered in Law Amendments or in committee when this bill is considered section by section, or on third reading in the House. Thank you.

MR. FROESE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, would the Honourable Minister permit a question? I put the question to him earlier - he wasn't in the House at the time. For what period of time are these day care centres open in a day? There is provision for 18 hours. What length of time are they open generally?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. TOUPIN: Well, Mr. Speaker, we do hope to have the regulations quite flexible to allow for facilities that will care for children, say on an eight-hour basis, on a twelve-hour basis, during the lunch hour, after 4:00 and so on. We intend to have it quite flexible to meet the needs of the parents and the children concerned. So we haven't got a set amount of hours per day that we actually determine as being the maximum amount that we will allow under regulations. This will be quite flexible.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

BILL NO. 49

MR. GREEN: Would you call Bill No. 49, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Labour. The Honourable Member for Riel. The Honourable Member for Emerson. Order please. I'd like to ask direction from the House. Does that mean that the Honourable Member for Riel is forfeiting his right to carry the bill? The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. GABRIEL GIRARD (Emerson): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have been in conversation with the Member for Riel and because of an accident he was unable to come here tonight, not that an accident happened to him but it had to take him away and therefore he asked me to take the responsibility of debating very briefly this bill. So we exchanged some views on it and he wished me good luck as he parted.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you. --(Interjection)--

MR. GIRARD: Yes, and I accept this with gratitude when it comes from the Minister of Labour.

Bill 49 is An Act to amend the Civil Service Superannuation Act, and although I had a

BILL NO. 49

(MR. GIRARD cont'd) very brief view of the bill, I don't wish at this time to raise any very controversial issues, but I would like to make a few observations.

I would like to, first of all, say that I agree in principle with the bill wholeheartedly which permits earlier retirement for the civil servants of Manitoba. I think that it would be timely to chastise the Federal Government for not looking at possibilities of the same kind, in fact old age retirement, at this time as well. It seems rather ironical, Mr. Speaker, that we have governments in the Province of Manitoba as well as at the federal scene, who are busy throughout the year, especially during the times of higher unemployment, thinking up make-work programs such as LIP and PEP, who advise their Civil Service that they must take on more employees than the Civil Service supervision in some cases suggest that they need. We relax on welfare payment and then we become concerned about the able-bodied welfare recipients, and all this time while we are doing those things, Mr. Speaker, we are compelling the 64-year-old man to carry his lunch kit to work, telling him that he's got one more year before retirement, but we are nevertheless willing to pay Unemployment Insurance to pay money to PEP and LIP, to pay money through added welfare or through in fact a boosted Civil Service. And, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that it is timely for the government to introduce this kind of legislation.

I'd like to make another comment as well, Mr. Speaker, with regard to pensions as a whole. It seems to me that if we look at the pension plans that have been instituted in the past, that because of inflationary pressures on our monetary system, that frequently we find our pension schemes becoming outdated, and I think that it will soon be that government will realize that what they ought to do is find an equitable kind of pension plan and then attach the amounts receivable to the cost of living or a cost of living figure, so that pension plans and pensions will by and large grow with the inflationary trends. I think it is unsatisfactory for the people of Manitoba and in fact for the people of Canada to find that somewhere in the pension plans of someone there is the forgotten individual. There are people on pensions, for instance the Workmen's Compensation pensions, who recently last year got an increase--which I add is not all that significant--but there are people in that category and especially the widows in that particular case, which have been forgotten for many years, which suffered a tremendous increase in cost of living but enjoyed no increase in their pension plan. And this to me is a lack of flexibility and foresight on behalf of the legislators in legislating pension plans.

Mr. Speaker, we'll be very interested in hearing the presentations before the Law Amendments Committee--I understand this bill is going to Law Amendments--and I am sure that there will be very valuable suggestions made by representative of the Civil Service and maybe other people in regards to this bill. However, there's one last point I would like to bring out before we let the bill through, and I think that this again reflects the kind of short-sightedness that governments can be accused of, at least in the past and up to the present, and I refer to the fact that pension plans by and large lack portability. And when I suggest they lack portability I mean that one who had paid into a pension plan in the Civil Service in Manitoba who happens to change his occupation, he becomes a school teacher in Manitoba instead of a civil servant, or he becomes a civil servant in Alberta instead of Manitoba or whatever, he is unable to take with him the benefit that he has accrued when paid for in his pension plan. I know that this area presents some difficulty because it means a whole lot of negotiations by a lot of people involved, but certainly some efforts ought to be made by governments to ensure that there be portability in pension plans, and I would go as far as saying that option should be provided to include those who wish from the private sector to be participating in a pension plan that is basically public.

With those few remarks, Mr. Speaker, may I suggest again that we have no opposition to the bill at this time and we'd be very happy to hear the debate that will occur in committee. May I suggest to the Minister of Labour that it's a pleasure being able to speak on his bill without being critical.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I rise to support Bill 49, an Act to amend the Civil Service Superannuation Act. I did speak on it at some length at the Estimates of the Minister of Labour when they were before the House, and I believe I did as well when we were on Estimates of the Civil Service on his department. So, many of the provisions in the bill I can accept and agree. I know that, which I think is a good principle, the

BILL NO. 49

(MR. PATRICK cont'd) act allows for retirement at age 60 and removing the penalty, at least 3 percent per year penalty, for early retirement. Also the compulsory age of retirement will stay at 65 and not 60, which I agree. I think it's a good principle because if people wish to stay in employment until 65, I think it should be their right and this is what one of the principles in this bill contains.

The bill will permit civil servants with ten years of service who die before retiring, will pass 60 percent of the normal pension benefits to their dependents, surviving spouses, and would receive lifetime benefits. And, Mr. Speaker, I think this is a very important principle because most of the commercial pensions do not contain these provisions, which in my opinion are very inadequate, and I feel that this is a very good provision, Mr. Speaker. I know that dependents would only receive pensions for ten years, while the spouses would receive a lifetime pension.

The bill would also reduce the number of years for determination of income as a basis for pension to the best seven years instead of ten, which is reducing it and I agree with the principle. However, I wish to point out to the Minister that, and a couple of other provinces that I'm aware of, even as far back as in 1970 they would average it out over the best five years instead of the best seven years. So I don't know the reason why the Minister used seven years, but perhaps he can give some indication why when he closes the bill, because in a couple of the other provinces as far back as three years ago, the five-year averaging was used.

Mr. Speaker, the other point I wish to touch on is the portability. This bill will allow portability of pensions within certain areas, that's within the government, different governments of the provinces of Canada, with the Government of Canada, any agency of the government, municipalities, certain school divisions or educational institutions, to me it shows that it's quite wide, and either hospital or health facilities in Canada, so these boards and governments, it would be portable within these boards or governments, provincial and federal. But, Mr. Speaker, I hope it would also be portable within the municipalities, and I'm not sure if it is or not. Perhaps the Minister can give us some indication, because I think it should be portable within municipal agencies as well.

But the thing that we haven't done anything about, Mr. Speaker, is what about fully portable pensions? In this province, in industry and in the private sector, I think this should be made available and we have not made a move in this area at all, and I feel if somebody leaves the government service and goes to private industry, I cannot see why his pension should not be portable.

Now the other point I wish to touch on, I have, Mr. Speaker--I wonder what is, how many years of service would a person have to have full disability pension under this scheme - and this is an area that the Minister has not touched on and I wish that he would. Is there a full disability pension after, say, 10 years or 15 years of service, or is he allowed 70 percent or any pension? My other concern, and I did have an opportunity to talk to the Minister privately, I did have comparisons at least with the western provinces, but it's outdated and I was trying to get comparisons as of this date and I was unable to. It's coming to me but I haven't got it with me today and I did not want to adjourn the bill, I didn't want to hold it up, so I wish to proceed on it today. But the comparables that I had are several years old, 1970, and even at that time as comparing to the present amendments there are some benefits that seemed to be better under the scheme or some of the other provinces had. One that I would like to bring to the Minister's attention, Refunds for Contribution. In Alberta they do pay 4 percent and ours are still 3 percent; Mr. Speaker, so perhaps there's an area that the Minister may have overlooked but he probably had given it consideration.

The other point that I wish to make, and again my comparison somewhat may be out of date, but the monthly average pension cheques were considerably, considerably lower than the other two provinces, Saskatchewan and Alberta--(Interjection)-- three years ago, that's correct. So there may be some explanation because there was an updating a couple of years ago, but again, it was a significant difference, Mr. Speaker.

So these are some of the points that I wish to bring to the attention of the Minister and perhaps he can give us some explanation and I do hope that he will really give full portability his real serious attention, that we will be getting to the area where we'll have really true

BILL NO. 49

(MR. PATRICK cont'd) pensions as far as the province is concerned. These are the points that I wish to make at this time, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Bill No. 49. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, I think most of the items have been covered by speakers who have already spoken to the bill. I don't intend to cover the same ground. I notice that we are taking out some of the language in the previous bill which refers to the German Reich, and we're replacing those words with new phrases.

Still, I want to come to one point and that is the matter of compulsory retirement. I'm not sure whether we're doing the right thing by having compulsory retirement at 65. I think many people would like to carry on working and be employed, and I think that opportunity should be given to them. I don't think we should make it mandatory that they retire at 65. We know of other experiences. Even our Senate in the federal House, they made it compulsory at 75 and that is 10 years older, ten years more than what they're asking for in this bill. I wonder, has the government found out from the Civil Service and asked them personally through a questionnaire or some survey as to whether they want this and how many of them want it? I certainly would be interested in knowing because I'm sure that many people, while they may not want to work as full a day, but why not have them work part-time if they so desire? And I think this one option should remain open to them and I would like to hear the Minister's comments on that.

Other than that, Mr. Speaker, at this time I don't want to delay the bill any longer either, and I do hope that we have representation at the Law Amendments Committee from him.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. ARTHUR MOUG (Charleswood): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Member for Pembina, that the debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented, and carried.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: I wonder, Mr. Speaker, now whether we could call the other retirement bill which the government objects to, namely the Retirement of the Teachers' Pension Act--I mean the Opposition objects to, or they haven't any guts at all.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please. On the proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Education. The Honourable Member for Riel. The Honourable Member for Emerson.

BILL 50

MR. GABRIEL GIRARD (Emerson): Well, Mr. Speaker, I had a chance to look at Bill 50 --(Interjections)--

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. GIRARD: . . . and I want to applaud Bill 50 in the hope that teachers will be given a chance to retire early before they--if I might be facetious for a moment--show signs of deterioration before their responsibilities are terminated --(Interjections)--

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. GIRARD: Mr. Speaker, I have much the same comments to make in regards to Bill 50 as I made on the previous bill. However, I would like to raise one or two other points that might be a little different in this particular bill, and might yet not. The way our retirement schemes are now being proposed in this bill--and I accept that this is an improvement over the previous bills--I find that a teacher may retire at 60 years old with full pension under this particular proposition. Such a teacher, however, will be in receipt of a full pension for five years and at the end of five years, as things now stand, will get full pension that she has been receiving or he has been receiving for those five years, plus an increase because of the old age pension at 65. I think that it would serve us well, Mr. Speaker, to have probably more communication with the Federal Government, if that is possible, in order to achieve a pension plan so that a teacher retiring or a civil servant retiring at 60 obtains a fixed kind of retirement plan or income so that he doesn't go five years and then enjoys an increase, but rather that he enjoys the value of that increase, amortized if necessary, right

BILL NO. 50

(MR. GIRARD cont'd) from the time of retirement right at 60 years old.

I would like to suggest that the disadvantage, Mr. Speaker, is that in my view people wish to enjoy themselves from the date of retirement, and if added finances will help at all they should have it at the time of retirement rather than go five years before the increase in that particular pension plan. I think again it's a matter of communication and negotiations between government.

I would like to know, Mr. Speaker, and I might ask this of the Minister, if he had had requests to have included in the Teachers Retirement Bill the years of service provided by some of the teachers who are seeking retirement that were wartime service, and that those people might suffer a handicap because of their absence during a particular period of time. I think there again, Mr. Speaker, that this points to the kind of portability, if they were not granted a pension plan at that time, that concession or consideration should be given to that kind of service which is beyond one's control.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I think that people very much more qualified than I, representing the teachers, will be able to make presentations at the committee hearings and I'll be very eager to hear them at that time. I would like to emphasize, however, that with this bill as well as with the Superannuation of the Civil Service, that some consideration be given, that some consideration be given, Mr. Speaker, to somehow relate cost of living to pension plans. I wish to differ with the Minister of Labour and suggest to him that I'm in favour of this bill, as I was in the previous one.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

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

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, --(Interjections)--

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: ORDER PLEASE!

MR. GREEN: . . . just to tell the honourable members that we'll call these bills again tomorrow and we urgently hope that the two members who hold the adjournment will speak on them. Bill No. 55, Mr. Speaker.

BILL NO. 55

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Proposed motion of the honourable Minister of Labour. The Honourable Member for Swan River.

MR. BILTON: Mr. Speaker, in making my contribution to this bill, may I say that in my opinion, as a civil servant for a good many years, we were always content to stay outside of the orbit of politics, and, Mr. Speaker, I believe it's been the practice of the members of the Civil Service of the Province of Manitoba to stay aloof from the political arena.

Mr. Speaker, I would be the first, or at least one of the first, to suggest that I believe in human rights, the human rights approach; that everyone should have the equal opportunity in an endeavour to do what they can for the good of this nation, and Mr. Speaker, I hold high also at the same time the rights of the people in their business. And I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that the Civil Service as such hold that trust, hold the trust of the people of Manitoba within their grasp. And I believe that she or he have access to material that is beyond the reaches of the average individual, even a member of this Legislature, Mr. Speaker, and this is the way it should be, and all these things are beyond the reach of the average individual.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you this is a sacred trust, a very sacred trust, and it must not be aborted by that particular section in this bill. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that if this bill becomes law we are placing a tremendous onus on every civil servant in the employ of this province, which is uncalled for. We are asking him, Mr. Speaker, if he runs for private office, to ignore his private knowledge of what he has of the economy and the ability and the future of this province over and above those people he may be opposing in that election. Here I say it's unfair. It has been suggested that a member of the Civil Service could take leave of absence and express his will insofar as the party that he favours. There's nothing wrong with this, Mr. Speaker. But he must take the chances with the rest of us. All of us.

Mr. Speaker, if this legislation or this particular section of this bill goes through, in my humble opinion it will have the effect of breaking down the Civil Service and creating chaos

BILL NO. 55

(MR. BILTON cont'd) amongst them, all of which has taken generations to develop, and this government must not be allowed in my humble opinion, to disturb that that's gone before. It's very simple to say, Mr. Speaker, that every man has a right to do this or that or the other, but, you know, in life today a certain amount of discipline must prevail or otherwise we have chaos. And we must have discipline. We must have discipline in the Civil Service from the Minister right down to the lowest clerk of each department. You won't have it, you won't have it if this particular section goes through. --(Interjection)-- The Minister of Labour is saying, "right!", and yet he's been a party of placing it before the House. Have you changed your mind? --(Interjection)--

Mr. Speaker, I don't know what the Honourable Minister of Labour has to say. I know he's ignoring the fact that I come from England, the great exponents of freedom that provided the democracy and the part of government that we're living under today. But you're despoiling it by this bill. You're despoiling it by this bill. My colleague from Emerson, Mr. Speaker, covered a wide range of items, many of them of which I agree with in this bill. I believe the adoption of the bill in the part that I'm referring to, Mr. Speaker, will be a tragedy, and in time will develop into a situation where it could ruin our system of government. Mr. Speaker, can you imagine it? It's conceivable that a junior clerk in a department of the government can throw his hat in the ring and run for office and be elected, Sir. And tomorrow, Mr. Speaker, he could be the Minister of that department. Can you imagine what a situation would develop?

A MEMBER: Democracy.

MR. BILTON: Democracy, my foot! Let's not carry this word "democracy" too far. Let's keep it on a level, let's keep it on a level that we can all live with. --(Interjection)-- You know, Mr. Speaker, these gentlemen don't realize what they've done to this province in the last four years. The chickens will come home to roost but please, please don't go forward with this section. This is one thing that is wrong. I agree, Mr. Speaker, that everything being fair, I agree with the Member for Emerson that the Civil Service should have a right by referendum to give their opinion as to whether or not they want this privilege, and I have no doubt, I have no doubt for one moment what their answer will be. On the other side of the coin, Mr. Speaker, we don't have to tell the civil servants. They know. They have the trust of the people of Manitoba in their hands. And with the change of government from time to time they are the link with the past and the hope for the future, and they, by this sort of resolution or this sort of section, are destroying that matter which is so important to the province.

I wonder, Sir, what the rank and file of the Civil Service feel about this. I wonder if they've asked for this privilege. Or is it the request of CUPE without any reference to the rank and file of the civil servants? Has the executive of the organization asked for this? And I want the Minister to tell us in his reply if that's where he got the request? Mr. Speaker, I have no knowledge as to whether or not the --(Interjection)-- you've got a lot to learn in this ad libbing. Just take your time and learn. You're using the wrong moments to bring it in. You'll learn them.

I have no knowledge, Mr. Speaker, as to whether or not this type of legislation is in effect in other jurisdictions, but I want the Minister when he's closing the debate to tell us as to whether or not there is such legislation in our sister provinces. And if there is such legislation, has he enquired as to the outcome of it or how it is working out in order to justify that such a recommendation should be in this bill? Or are they going to tell us, Mr. Speaker, that it's a first for Canada, as they've told us so many times on so many other subjects throughout this session.

You know, Mr. Speaker, I don't have to tell you. You went through the agony of it tonight, of what can happen if this sort of legislation is adopted. We had an exhibition tonight of a person in the employ of the government, the chairman of a very important Crown corporation, and he was sitting in the gallery listening to what was being said. What a shady-- what a shoddy and shady exhibition. Mr. Speaker, we had a forerunner tonight of what this legislation is going to produce in the future, and I predict it will come about. And why should this Legislative Assembly be placed in that position when it's not called for? --(Interjection)-- The Minister of Labour asks me to give him an opportunity to reply, Mr. Speaker. You'll do that. But in the meantime, he will use words and words and words to make me believe that black is white, to justify what he's going to say, but it doesn't take away anything from the truth, that if you take away the fact that the Civil Service must stay outside of this Legislative

BILL NO. 55

(MR. BILTON cont'd) Assembly and carry out the orders of this Legislature, and do what is right and proper in the name of the people of the Province of Manitoba, we will be making a grave mistake.

The Minister of Labour tonight, Mr. Speaker, attempted to defend the action of a friend.

Who is to say that future Ministers and future members, regardless of government, under circumstances similar as they were brought out tonight, will not do the same thing in Legislatures of the future. Mr. Speaker, is it worthwhile? Is it necessary? --(Interjection)-- You're nuts! "Yes," you say. You go and pin your diapers. This hasn't happened in a hundred years in this province and there's no reason for it to happen now. The civil servants of this province have carried on beautifully, honourably and sincerely. Don't disturb it. Let it stay that way for another hundred years to come and don't you be suggesting to me that I am defending something that's wrong. I'm defending something that's right; and I believe that the Civil Service in themselves would want to stay out of the orbit of this Legislative Assembly. --(Interjection)--

This man, Mr. Speaker, chose to stand before an NDP nominating meeting in Swan River and I have no, I have no regrets in mentioning it. I'm just taking the hide off him. But he's in the employ of this government and he's responsible for the spending of \$4 million of the people's money. I say to you, Mr. Speaker, he has no right to condemn a member of this Legislature on the public platform at a public meeting and particularly a political meeting. This is wrong. But you're aiding and abetting it if you bring in this Act.

Mr. Speaker, the quote from the Star and Times--and it's not an editorial, it's a news story, Mr. Minister of Labour--it was Mr. Alford's opinion, it was Mr. Alford's opinion, an employee of this government, a public servant, there's no way out of it, in Mr. Alford's opinion the present day opposition to the government lacks all sense of honesty and integrity. Can you imagine that, Sir? --(Interjection)-- He said that they accuse the NDP government of handing out easy money but welfare records show that no references were made, no references for welfare were made by the NDP members--and Pete you'll love this--from Ste. Rose or Dauphin, while 28 were made by the PC member representing Roblin, and many many cases in which the Member for Swan River put on pressure even if they were ineligible.

Mr. Speaker, that's the avenue we're going into if we adopt this section in this, and I ask for serious thought being given to it. I'm not pleading my own case; never mind me. I'll live forever. --(Interjections)-- But, Mr. Speaker, in the interests of the people of Manitoba I ask you, Sir, and I ask the government in all sincerity, to please consider the impact of this section, and I ask them to call upon the Civil Service by way of referendum and let them say whether they want to become involved in politics or not. I have faith in them and I know what they will do. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, with some eager anticipation I have prepared some rather lengthy notes . . . --(Interjection)-- I've prepared some rather lengthy notes . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. ORDER! The Honourable Member for Lakeside spoke already on this question.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker . . . deference to your ruling, the people of Manitoba will be...

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion? The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Lakeside, that the debate be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to advise the honourable member that I'll be intending to call this resolution again tomorrow and I hope that he'll be in a position to proceed at that time. --(Interjection)-- I didn't hear that.

A MEMBER: . . . have enough guts to go ahead with it?

BILL NO. 59

MR. GREEN: Call Bill No. 59, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Health. The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

BILL NO. 59

MRS. INEZ TRUEMAN (FORT ROUGE): Mr. Speaker, may I have this bill stand please?

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed? (Agreed). The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to advise the honourable member that we'll be calling this bill again tomorrow morning at which time I hope she'll be prepared to proceed. Bill No. 61, Mr. Speaker.

BILL 61

MR. SPEAKER: Proposed motion of the Honourable Minister of Finance. The Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney.

MR. McKELLAR: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable the Minister of Labour I see is anxious today but I wished I heard -- I don't think I heard the Honourable Minister properly when the word he just used because it's very unparliamentary.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

A MEMBER: Order. Order.

MR. McKELLAR: Mr. Speaker, I'm just going to say a few words on Bill 61. If the Honourable Minister would keep quiet for a few minutes I'd be glad to get on with the job. And looking over this Bill No. 61 I find . . . --(Interjection)--

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney.

MR. McKELLAR: I thought maybe the Minister of Labour was going to take the floor; he was making a speech from his seat. Mr. Speaker. I'd like to say a few words on Bill 61, changes in the tax credit, property tax credit, of change in policy from a year ago, changing it -- doubling the limit, the minimum of \$50.00 to \$100.00 and a maximum of \$140 to \$200, applying practically the same rules as before, I understand, with the exception of one major change. The major change is, instead of having it deducted off our income tax we're going to collect part of it from the municipal office and part of it through income tax. That's the major change.

Mr. Speaker, there's been three years we've had three different property tax credit plans. The first one was \$50.00 deducted from source, off our municipal taxes. This past year we had the one the minimum of \$50.00, maximum of \$140.00 deducted from our income tax. Now, Mr. Speaker, in the year 1974 -- 1973, 1973 municipal taxes, in the year 1974 we'll have part of it taken off our municipal taxes and part off our income tax. So there's a complete change in policy again. Now I just wonder how long the people can -- if they'd only leave things for a year or two alone, just leave it alone, I think the public would appreciate it. But every year the government comes along with a new idea of how they can serve the people, thinking that they're going to help the people. Mr. Speaker, with all due respect to the government of the day, the only difference between a millionaire and the person on welfare is the difference between \$100.00 and \$200.00, and the millionaires are going to get \$100.00 and the people on welfare are going to get \$200.00; that's the only difference. That's the only difference; they're sharing the wealth. Well if they're interested in the people who need help, then give the whole thing to the people that do need it, in my opinion, instead of helping the millionaires in the Province of Manitoba.

I'm not one of those that believes in helping millionaires. They don't need any help. And I think the Member for Morris mentioned today, the millionaires are getting richer in the Province of Manitoba under the Socialist government; but the people, the poor people who need help, are getting poorer because they can't keep up with inflation. It doesn't matter how you put it, the government are increasing the cost of everyone's living every day of the year through high taxes and through other costs of government operations. There's no way you can keep up with the thing. So what happens, as I mentioned, the millionaires get richer, everybody else gets poorer, 'cause the rich people look after themselves, they don't need government to look after them; they can look after themselves. And this is not right. It's not right in principle to give \$100.00 to millionaires. It's not right. If you got that much money, why not give everybody a little more, give them a little more if you got that much money? That's not the way to divide it; all you're doing, as I mentioned before, is dividing people, dividing the public farther and farther away, and that's not the kind of society I want to live in in the Province of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, the one catch in this whole bill, the one catch that isn't in the act, that's in this here paper that was brought out here, it's brought out, and it's kind of a catchy thing

BILL 61

(MR. McKELLAR cont'd). . . . too. It's the one little short paragraph at the bottom. And it says: "All examples assume sufficient property taxes or rental equivalent to qualify for these benefit levels. That, in that short statement, it means the same that if you don't have the property taxes, the rental equivalent, you don't get the money; you get only a portion of what you pay in, you can't get any more than the amount that you paid in property taxes. It's right in there; it's right printed on. So the Minister of Finance gave it and he said it. So it means that an elderly person in the Province of Manitoba living in a town like I live in, who pays at least \$50.00 to \$60.00 taxes will only get \$50.00 or \$60.00 in rebate; they won't get the \$200.00 so it's false advertising to go on radio and television and tell everybody that they qualify, if they're earning less than \$3,000 they qualify for the maximum. It's not right; it's not right; they don't get that, because on every page it's got that paragraph, every page in this piece of paper that the Minister of Finance handles, and it pretty well explains it.

So, Mr. Speaker, the act doesn't come out clearly and state the facts. That paragraph should have been qualified right in the act here, in the bill which we are dealing with, in Bill 61. It should have been put in there for various reasons, to qualify the payment of the property tax credit plan.

Mr. Speaker, we've had debates on rebates, we've had lots of debates on rebates and they didn't start yesterday either. The first tax on rebates that we had was in the year 1964, a year which I will never forget. 1964. The Honourable Minister of Labour was here and the Honourable Minister of Finance was here and the Premier was here, and that's all on that side of the House. Three members on that side of the House were here in 1964 --(Interjection)-- They didn't bring about my defeat because I'm still here. I'm still here, and I'll be here, and I'll be here after the next election --(Interjection)-- I'll be here, I'll be here. 1964, a rebate plan was brought in, was brought in by the Minister of Finance at that time. The Premier of the province, Mr. Roblin -- Mr. Roblin, the Minister of Finance in his budget. He brought that plan in based on the commission report; not entirely on the commission report because the mill rates on schools financing are 13 mills across the province --(Interjection)-- and that wasn't adopted by the government of the day; it was felt that there should be a larger amount with the tax rebate. And what happened that year, Mr. Speaker? I'll tell you what happened. The opposition of the day practically laughed the government out of the province -- they tried to laugh the government out of the province, because they're bribing the people with their own money, bribing the people with their own money, and just to make matters worse the Minister of Finance that year sent cheques out under his own name.

Now this government of the day, they tried the same too. They tried the same; they tried it everywhere; they tried sending cheques out. One way they tried to send them out from the Federal Government through the income tax; they tried it on the municipal tax; this year they're trying it on both, through income tax and property tax. This is the new plan coming up. And every year they change the plan. I guess if we lived long enough for the Socialists to be in power for ten years they'd come up with ten different plans. It's pretty hard to criticize because every year they juggle it a bit, juggle it a bit just to confuse the man on the street.

But the one thing I must admire of this government, they're the best advertisers that we've ever saw; they're the best advertisers. When it comes to Autopac they advertise; when it comes to property taxes or credit plans, migosh you can't go to the television or radio without more about the property tax credit plan. You don't have to advertise, Mr. Speaker, when you're giving out money. As the Member for Portage la Prairie says, you don't have to advertise when you got a weak case. Well, I don't know whether it's a weak . . . maybe if you got any ideas to interpret; when you have a weak case you advertise it -- pardon me.

But I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, I want to tell you, I want to tell you, with all those ladies that were on -- those old ladies down there, they were practically in their graves, I don't know where you got them from, but they were hobbling around trying to prove a point on television. Well, I don't know what that did for me. It didn't generate much enthusiasm in me. --(Interjection)-- I don't know what it did to the government side, I don't think it generated much enthusiasm for the people of the Province of Manitoba. But I tell you, I tell you, there's a lot of my money gone down the drain. There was a lot of my money gone down the drain, and that's what counts. I don't mind if you give it to me, I'll pay all the taxes, but when you put it on and advertise on radio and television and newspapers, every day and every hour of the week, there's something wrong with the government of the day as far as I'm concerned.

BILL 61

(MR. McKELLAR cont'd)

And they'll likely come back and say, oh, when the Conservatives were the government, they did something too. The Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, he's got a famous mind. The only trouble there is that when I'm talking about 1964 he was on Metro Council about that time; he was having all the troubles he had with Metro, trying to solve their problems, so I don't think he remembers too much, and I don't think the Minister of Labour remembers that much either. I know that he voted against the property tax credit plan in 1964. He voted against a plan -- sure it was maybe not that much, it wasn't that much. It permitted -- each parcel of land in the Province of Manitoba that was owned by an individual, and you got \$50.00, a maximum of \$50.00 on each quarter section. It didn't look much, it didn't look much, it didn't look much. I happened to get over \$200.00; it wasn't very much in those days, 1964, but I tell you it was appreciated.

But I tell you, I tell you what, we figured in the long run there must be a better way of distributing wealth, distributing wealth, and it lasted two years; that's as long as we kept that plan. Because I tell you there wasn't one good comment that I had over that plan. So we all realized that as members of the government of the day, get rid of it. Distribute the wealth in other ways; by lowering the tax mill rate on education; lowering the mill rate; trying to reduce the cost of education to the man on the street. Now that didn't solve the problem either, because we got a problem worse than that now -- the division between the general mill rate on residential and farms, and the general mill rate on the businessman. And it's becoming really apparent today, after listening to the Mayor of Brandon mention increase in the mill rate, it was going to happen in Brandon. I imagine they've over 120 mills on the mercantile in Brandon; over 90 on the residential and farms in the City of Brandon. And there are some farms in the City of Brandon, too. This is the kind of mill rate that they're talking about in Brandon. And I'd like to say to the people in Winnipeg, you're not that bad yet that you have to pay that kind of taxes.

Mr. Speaker, I want to read a little bit, just a little bit here, I think because it states 1964, just what we offered the people of the Province of Manitoba that year; just one little short paragraph, because I think it should be put on record again nine years later, August 17, 1964, a special session of the Legislature that year, and this is Mr. Roblin -- I'm quoting Mr. Roblin: "The system we propose is a 50 percent rebate of school taxes paid to a maximum of \$100 of tax, a maximum of \$50 payment on each tax bill of any year. Our estimate of this cost is between 8.5 and 10 million dollars as against the \$10.2 million the Royal Commission proposed. By this -- and Madam Speaker, this is a most interesting statistic -- by this something over 60 percent of all school taxpayers will have their taxes cut in half, while others will enjoy substantial benefits." That's Mr. Roblin in 1964.

Well, nine years later we're still back in the rebate system back trying to share the wealth, as I call it. Trying to, I guess maybe we did the same thing, trying to help the millionaires out as well as the poor people who own a home. I don't know whether this is the right way to approach the problem or not. My way, Mr. Speaker, is to help those that need help. Everybody else doesn't need help, as far as I am concerned, in society. If they got enough gumption and enough git in them, they'll go out and make a living. If the people are handicapped and the people are disabled, those are the people that need help in our society. And the elderly. They're the ones that need help. I don't think our society can afford a cradle to the grave welfare program that we're trying to provide for them. My honest opinion is, I don't think we can afford it, and if we could afford it I'm all in favour of it, but I don't think we can afford it in the Province of Manitoba. We haven't got that kind of wealth. Sweden tried it; Sweden tried it. It hasn't been a really success in Sweden; they've had such success they're paying about 52 percent tax on every dollar that they earn. That's not the kind of society I want. I want a society that when I finish a day's work I got something left; and I don't want every government coming to me saying they'll help me out with the LIP program or with this two-price wheat system that we're getting from the Federal Government, or the \$58.00 I got this year, \$58.00 that I got from the Provincial Government this year. I don't think that's necessary. I think we got to provide a climate, a climate that will meet -- to try to encourage people to do something for themselves, to provide for their families, to provide for all their necessities of life. And everybody doesn't have to live up to the highest standards. I think that's one of the mistakes we got, that we think that everybody should have a bull, that everybody should have a trailer, that everybody should have a cottage at the lake. I don't think that's necessary. If we're working in a -- migosh we appreciate

BILL 61

(MR. McKELLAR cont'd) our own family on the weekend at home rather than try to have to go to the lake every weekend to enjoy the fresh air there. I think that we gotta look after the elderly, the handicapped, and the other people who might need help in our society, who through some unfortunate instance cannot provide for themselves. But let's try to avoid looking after them, as I mentioned before, from the cradle to the grave.

Mr. Speaker, there's nothing much more I have to say. I found out through government that governments don't get any pats on the back for paying out to people a little donation. They don't get it . . . The public won't -- in fact if you want help won't thank you one little bit. They'll take the money, sure. I'm sure that you won't get one cheque returned to you as a government. But I tell you in the long run it just won't make any difference to the people, to the average man on the street. They'll say, "Thanks again," but it just won't help.

Mr. Speaker, for those of us who are farming, for those of us who are farming, if you look at the \$58.00 that I got, it's \$58.00 that I would -- actually I end up with about \$30.00 net return because I would have been paying, I would have used that \$58.00 as an expense through property taxes, through reduction of property tax. So I end up with about \$30.00 net by the time I pay my accountant another \$5.00 or \$10.00 for making out my income tax. So this is the amount I get left over, \$30.00. That won't really make that much difference to me. I suppose to some people it will.

This is, Mr. Speaker, this is my feelings on the subject matter. It's not that great if we're going to help anybody, and to the millionaires I suppose they'll enjoy it for a half an hour -- that's about as long as it'll last them. And actually my feelings on it, I feel that the government could use that \$40 million, \$40 million to build more roads or do something else -- maybe encourage them, I don't know. Something that would generate more economy, or generate the economy in the Province of Manitoba some way -- yeah, more jobs, that's what we're asking for, not just part-time jobs during the winter. I think this is what we need, is something that would accomplish that. But seeing that's the government policy, I guess we can't do anything about it. It's a kind of a piecemeal deal, and I always considered our deal as a piecemeal deal. It wasn't going anywhere -- all we were doing was pouring 10 million out.

Mr. Speaker, in those days our budget was less than 200 million, so we poured 10 million out of 200 million; 5 percent of our budget went to rebate. --(Interjection)-- I told my leader -- we caucused in those days and we still caucus. But that's one of the difference I find is that I don't think the backbenchers on the government side really hit their government hard enough. I tell you, my Leader here and the Member for Lakeside, and the Member for Riel, the cabinet ministers, they knew that they were in a caucus meeting after the backbenchers got finished with them. I'll tell you that right now. I'll tell you that right now. This is the way you should operate as a government. This is the way it should -- it's got to be that way; it's got to be that way, but I don't think the backbenchers do their job; I don't honestly think. I never saw a bill come into the Legislature, it was the wrong bill before us. That's an experience. It took me 15 years in this place before I saw a bill get first reading, three weeks later it was pulled out. That would never have happened if that bill was in caucus; it never would have happened, I can tell you that now, Mr. Minister. It's not the way to do it.

So, Mr. Speaker, I'll just sit down. I know there's other speeches to be made here and I'll just say once again, in my opinion I don't think that the rebate system is the right way of sharing the wealth of our province. And if you're going to share it, look after those that need it, look after them in such a way that they won't be embarrassed to live in the Province of Manitoba. They'll be proud to be Manitobans, proud to be Canadians, and that's all I think they're asking for.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. BEN HANUSCHAK (Minister of Education)(Burrows): Yes, Mr. Speaker, would the honourable member permit a question? I believe on two or three occasions the honourable member did hint that he favoured a more equitable form of distribution of wealth, but he never did get around to describing a method that he thinks would work. He described one that in his opinion failed. Would the honourable member take a couple of minutes or so to describe a method that he thinks may work.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney.

MR. McKELLAR: Yes, I'd be glad to answer that. In 1961 we brought in a Social Allowance Act, 1960-61. That was one of the first things that we did as the government, to equal opportunities. And if you read the Act, the Social Allowance Act in those days, it provided for

BILL 61

(MR. McKELLAR cont'd) . . . necessities of those people that were unfortunate enough to make a living on their own. It provided for private Medicare cards, it looked after drugs, hospital, Medicare and everything else, and also made it possible that they could go to a nursing home if they needed that kind of care. This is one of the things that we did. Now I'm not saying that -- maybe that isn't enough but it was a start, a start in those days, because we only had a \$100 million budget. We didn't have that much money. Now I think there's 50,000 or 60,000 people who have a free Medicare card, and I tell you they appreciate that free Medicare card. You can talk about the Pharmacare bill we got in right now. The Pharmacare bill does a lot of things but it isn't as good as the one that they paid fifty or sixty thousand people that over the age of 65 have, because they get everything paid, and this government still adopts that policy. Now that's a start. You've got \$700 million, \$700 million that you're spending in the current Estimates this year. We had \$342 million the last year we left office. You are spending over twice as much. Now I don't know whether you're spending it wisely or not. I can have that argument, I'll likely say at election time whether I think you are or whether you aren't. But you have \$360 million that you could help those people that need help, and that's all our society is asking for. But they don't want you to help the millionaires. I don't think . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order, please. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I move . . . --(Interjection)--

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Well let him adjourn. I never saw such an outfit in all of my political career who were so wont to adjourn when we're in the middle of a very important discussion, and I can understand and I've seen two or three instances of that this evening, and now I can understand why it is that the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition is running out, because I want to criticize him, I want to criticize his party and their approach to the whole question of income tax in the Province of Manitoba. I realize that the Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney raved this afternoon or this evening on the matter of income tax. I can well imagine, Mr. Speaker, why the Member for River Heights wants to get out of this Chamber because he has an aversion from hearing the facts of life, politically, he has an aversion of hearing what really are the considerations of the people of Manitoba in the field of income tax. He did have the opportunity, Mr. Speaker, at one stage in the game, of being the Minister of Industry and Commerce. I heard him this afternoon raise questions as to the cost factor involved in industry and commerce. And I think, Mr. Speaker, all members of the House would agree with me that when there is a cost factor involved in the operation of government, that somebody has to pay for it, and insofar as the Province of Manitoba invariably it is the taxpayer of the Province of Manitoba has to pay for it, albeit that some contribution may come from federal sources as well as internally here in the Province of Manitoba.

But how typical, Mr. Speaker, is it of the Leader of the Opposition Party to run out of the Assembly when some member of this side of the House is in a position to criticize. I have noted today, Mr. Speaker, the total absence of the Leader of the Liberal Party. I hope my honourable friend the Member for Wolseley is not ill --(Interjection)-- Oh, I'm sorry to hear that he is ill and I'm suggesting -- no I won't suggest, I trust then, Mr. Speaker, that he will so recover that he can take part in the deliberations in this House, in this Chamber, so that he is better educated and, in being better educated, better enabled to carry through his functions as the Leader of the third party in this House.

Some people, Mr. Speaker, suggest that it may not be too long before the people of Manitoba will have an opportunity of assessing the capabilities of the three major parties in the Province of Manitoba, namely the New Democratic Party who happens to be the government of today, the Conservative Party who, for the time being, happens to be in Opposition, and the Liberal Party who are aspiring to come back into the political spectrum of the Province of Manitoba. --(Interjection)-- pardon? When will the election be? I suggest, Mr. Speaker, the election will be when it is called.

But after having listened to the tirade and the utter nonsense of the Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney, who attempted to go over the past few years dealing with the matter of income tax and its application to the citizens of Manitoba, I wonder really, Mr. Speaker, whether my honourable friend for Souris-Killarney -- and I guess this is the reason that the

BILL 61

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) Leader of the Opposition slunked out of this Chamber -- I wonder if my honourable friend from Souris-Killarney really and seriously has considered the past performance and policies of the Conservative Party in Manitoba.

I recall, Mr. Speaker, not so many years ago, before I would suggest that half of the members in the present House had the opportunity of taking parts in the debates in this House, that the Conservative Party of Manitoba, in order to raise revenues for the policies and the programs that they thought were necessary, imposed a 5 percent sales tax upon the citizens of Manitoba. Now, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney and his absent leader at the present time are objecting to an income tax proposal that will place upon Manitobans a policy of the extraction of their wealth based on the ability to pay. The Conservative Party and at that particular time, or just prior to that, the Leader of the Conservative Party, Mr. Speaker, in Manitoba, the Honourable Duff Roblin -- and I can say Honourable Duff Roblin because of the fact that in 1967 by edict of Her Majesty the Queen, Duff Roblin as a Premier of Manitoba was given the honour of being a Privy Councillor -- at that particular time, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Duff Roblin just before that said that the sales tax was as dead as a dodo. Having said that, about two years ago -- two years after, the Conservative Party of Manitoba brought before this Assembly a proposition to impose a sales tax on the people of Manitoba. The Honourable the Leader of the Conservative Party, Mr. Speaker, during this session condemned the New Democratic Party, of which I have the honour to be a Cabinet Minister, condemned this party, condemned this government, because we imposed an income tax based on the ability to pay. And, Mr. Speaker, what did in effect

A MEMBER: What did he do with the sales tax?

MR. PAULLEY: What? He didn't do a damn thing. But, Mr. Speaker, what did the Leader of the Conservative Party in his comments on the income tax in our budget, what did he say? What we should do in this province of Manitoba is to reduce the personal income tax of the citizens of Manitoba and the taxpayers of Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, what would have been the net result of that? Would it have been the matter of alleviating on the lower income group their requirements of payment under the income tax? I suggest, Mr. Speaker, the answer to that would be, no. Who would have been the big benefactors? I say that the big benefactors would have been the people like the Leader of the Opposition Party, who doesn't have to worry about where his nickels are coming from. The Leader of the Liberal Party who doesn't have to worry about it either. --(Interjection)-- Well, maybe the Minister of Finance, maybe the Minister of Labour, but Mr. Speaker, the difference is, the difference is that the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Labour because of their peculiar income, or the amount of their income, are prepared to pay, that the crocodile tears that emanate from the Leader of the Opposition and the Leader of the Liberal Party insofar as the collection of the required finances to operate this government is a horse of a different colour. Yes, my honourable friend the Member for Portage la Prairie says it's a lot of nickels, and I agree with my honourable friend, and I would suggest to my friend from Portage la Prairie that if he's got the nickels, then let him pay. And this is the whole basis of the philosophy of Bill 61 that we have before us. And what does it do? It is an endeavour to re-distribute, Mr. Speaker, the wealth of this province so that those who have not do not have to make the same contribution as those who have insofar as the operation of the functions of government at the school board level and other areas.

The Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne admitted apparently that in ten years there were ten different plans insofar as the re-distribution of wealth is concerned. I suggest to him, Mr. Speaker, that this is quite within the realm of possibility. It may be, Mr. Speaker, that the propositions that this government are putting forward in this Assembly will have to be changed from time to time. On the other hand, Mr. Speaker, I suggest --(Interjection)-- yes from election to election and in-between elections as well, the Honourable Member for Arthur has suggested. Again I want to go back to what his former leader said --(Interjection)-- as soon as I'm finished. I want to go back, Mr. Speaker, to the point that my honourable friend the Member for Arthur has raised, election from election, that the Honourable Dufferin Roblin, who just prior to an election, Mr. Speaker, said that the sales tax was as dead as a dodo --(Interjection)-- yes you heard me, but I want to re-emphasize, my honourable friend, that just shortly after that election he introduced a measure into this House imposing a sales tax on the people of Manitoba. So I can say to my honourable friend --(Interjection)-- Well, I don't give a continental what you call it, it was still a five percent tax on the people of Manitoba on their

BILL 61

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) sales purchases that was as dead as a dodo prior to an election that the Conservative Party of Manitoba imposed shortly after receiving the support of the people.

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to you that we are being a little more honest in our approachment. We are not bringing these measures in because there may be an election. We have fought for the principle of the ability to pay ever since there was an involvement of the old CCF and the New Democratic Party in this government. And if the Member for Souris-Killarney wants to take exception to this, I give him that right. All I want to say, Mr. Speaker, --(Interjection)-- no it's not a God-given right but it's a God-given directive to all of us that we should look after those who haven't the ability to pay as much as the Leader of the Conservative Party or the Leader of the Liberal Party. This is our approach and this is the direction that we are travelling in.

Mr. Speaker, it's perfectly true that not before too long the politicians in this province may be facing the electorate face to face.

A MEMBER: How soon?

MR. PAULLEY: Sooner than you will want because then your stipend, your emolument will finish. Because I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that insofar as the Member for Swan River is concerned, he is going to have the opportunity of getting his pension that was enacted by the Conservative Party on his withdrawal from the Legislature of Manitoba, and I predict, I predict that that will happen. My honourable friend, who is not even in his own seat, Mr. Speaker, won the last election by 52 votes and I suggest and I predict that my honourable friend the Member for Swan River will lose his deposit at the next election, but I'm not a prophet. --(Interjection)-- There's no deposit, that's right, I'm sorry. We abolished the deposit to save the Honourable Member for Swan River his hard-earned money as the operator of the Swan River Times, and we will allow him, for a little while at least, to continue with the profits he gets from the workers that are involved in his printing plant at Swan River, who are just about, as I understand, Mr. Speaker, just barely above the minimum wage in Manitoba. On my return I want to say as Minister of Labour, and I'm sure that I will be, I want to say to the Honourable Member for Swan River that while he won't be a member of this Assembly, I am going to make sure that there is different treatment insofar as his employees are concerned.

But apart from all of this, Mr. Speaker, --(Interjection)-- rats? I don't know whether I'm a rat or not but I'm a realist and I don't fault my honourable friend if he did call me a rat. --(Interjection)-- threat? Oh. Of course not. You're too much of a gentleman. Yes, with all your dignity and all this that and the other, Mr. Speaker, I can imagine that my honourable friend wouldn't say that I'm a rat because he knows that I may have some rebuttal.

But, Mr. Speaker, I want to say just one or two other little words to the Honourable the Minister of Souris-Killarney, and I don't know whether he, like his leader, has folded his tent and left the Assembly. I do want to make reference to the attitude of the Conservative Party to these little old ladies who appeared on TV. The Member for Souris-Killarney made reference to these little old ladies who appeared on TV, and he was very disparaging in his remarks to these little old ladies and what they had to say, because of the fact that this government, unlike the previous government, took into consideration the matter of abolition of Medicare and hospital premiums, which as of June 1st, I think everyone knows, will be abolished. But, Mr. Speaker, it was that government --(Interjection)-- right. That government who refused to allow these little old ladies who appeared on TV to use their prepaid funeral benefits of \$150.00 as a deduction from their welfare benefits. The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge who stands up here and gives vent to her concern for the old aged, those who are on welfare. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, whether she has ever taken into consideration the callous attitude of the Conservative Party of Manitoba, when they refused, when they refused to allow persons who prepaid a funeral plan from having that as a deduction from their income. What's happened recently? Even the City of Winnipeg, even the City of Winnipeg, Mr. Speaker, have agreed that the amount of refund that the welfare recipients are going to receive as a result of the activities of this government will not be considered as income. We have done that insofar as the recipients of provincial welfare recipients. But that government, that government who are now endeavouring to be re-elected, refused to allow as a deduction, Mr. Speaker, a prepaid funeral contract to bury a widow or a widower who may be a recipient of welfare. And this, Mr. Speaker, is the government, this, Mr. Speaker, is the Opposition, who today is saying to the electorate of

BILL 61

MR. PAULLEY cont'd) Manitoba, "Give us a chance to turn the clock back to where it was before this damn New Democratic government with this humanitarian approach." This Conservative Opposition, Mr. Speaker, oh they're fine fellows with a heart of stone, fine fellows with a heart of stone and a mentality that would go back to the Spartan age when they threw people over the abyss. But this, Mr. Speaker, is a type of approach. --(Interjection)-- Yes, that's right. I say to the Honourable Member for Minnedosa, the bank manager, and he ought to know, he ought to know because of his association with the poor people in Minnedosa - he says, "Over the hills and into the valley." And I'll bet you, I'll bet you a dollar, Mr. Speaker, that he, like so many other Conservatives, have that in their mind today.

MR. DAVID R. BLAKE (Minnedosa): Mr. Speaker, it's probably a point of privilege rather than a point of order. The Honourable Minister is ranting on about prepaid funeral plans that the Conservative Party would not allow. I happen to know something of prepaid funeral plans, and it's a blessing that the Conservative government had some investigation into prepaid funeral plans because many of them were discontinued after the government investigated them. And they became known as some . . . of rackateer programs rather than prepaid plans, and I would like him to clarify just what he was referring to when he referred to what our government had . . .

MR. PAULLEY: . . . my honourable friend that after a few years of Conservative government in Manitoba in respect of prepaid funeral plans, people were afraid to die lest they had their prepaid funds confiscated by the Conservative government of Manitoba. This is a fact Mr. Chairman, and if my honourable friend and his former leader, who had an association possibly up in Minnedosa, carried themselves on this way then I can understand it. But, Mr. Speaker, my whole point is, my whole point is that here is this ineffective opposition, the Conservative Party of Manitoba, trying by buffoonery to make an appeal to the people of Manitoba to return them to office. Bill No. 61, Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you is an approach to a realization by this government that the operations of the government of Manitoba should be based on the ability to pay principle, a principle that is absolutely foreign to the Conservative Party as evidenced by the statements of their leader, the Member for River Heights, in this House.

But how phoney, Mr. Speaker, are they really? The Member for Souris-Killarney objects to Bill 61. The Honourable Leader of the Conservative Party, in his Budget address in this House, condemned the approach of this government --(Interjection)-- A fine fellow yes, but how incapable and how incompetent. A fine fellow is right, Mr. Speaker, but the Honourable Member for River Heights, after condemning this government, after condemning our budgetary approach to the financial consideration for the well-being of the citizens of Manitoba, didn't have the intestinal fortitude to carry through their criticisms but the House for the first time, as I understand it, Mr. Speaker, in the history of the Province of Manitoba, voted in favour of the budgetary propositions of this government. I say to you, Mr. Speaker --(Interjection)-- It's not true? The record shows it, Mr. Speaker. The record shows that the Conservative Party --(Interjection)--

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, please. I am trying to intently listen to what the Minister is saying. If the honourable member, the Member for Lakeside wishes to take part in the debate, I'm sure that he'll have ample opportunity. The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, the fact is, on the day of the taking of the vote insofar as the budget motion was concerned, there was a mumble from the Conservative Party when Mr. Speaker presented the motion: those in favour say aye: we say "aye", those opposed, there was a rumble of nay on the Opposition side of the House, Mr. Speaker, but when my friend and colleague the Honourable the Leader of the House called for a recorded vote, every single man and woman of the Conservative Party, the Liberal Party, the Independents and the Social Credit member stood up, if they were in their seats, and said, Mr. Speaker, we are in favour, we are in favour of the program. My honourable friend from Lakeside is now saying, "Get back to the stealing of the insurance policies of the little old widow who had a prepaid funeral plan." I think possibly that would be more important to my honourable friend from Lakeside. He would like to focus the activities of his party on that rather than to agree with the proposition that this government has taken, to take from those that have and to provide for those who have not, and I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, that the Honourable Member for Lakeside is among that very very few who have so damn much that they don't want to give it to those who have so damn little.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, on . . . not on a point of privilege, let me, Mr. Speaker,

BILL 61

(MR. ENNS cont'd) accept the challenge of the last few remarks of the Honourable Minister of Labour in dealing with the bill, Mr. Speaker, precisely in dealing with the bill on the basis of which he spoke on the bill. --(Interjection)-- Well, Mr. Speaker, I will . . . of course, through a scrutiny by the Clerk and yourself, Sir, whether or not I have spoken on the bill. It seems to me that I have already been in this difficulty earlier this session, but inadvertently, in my eager desire -- that I may . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I can assure the honourable member that on Bill 61 he has spoken. Order, please. Friday the 18th.

A MEMBER: Was that Good Friday?

MR. SPEAKER: In the evening. It'll be in Votes and Proceedings No. 60. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion? The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. INEZ TRUEMAN (Fort Rouge): I move, seconded by the Member for Morris that debatè be adjourned.

MOTION presented and carried.

BILL 63

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable House Leader.

MR. GREEN: Bill No. 63, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge. Bill No. 63.

MRS. TRUEMAN: I'd like this bill to stand please, Mr. Speaker. It just had second reading this afternoon.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, it's quite all right. We'll now move to the concurrence motion, Mr. Speaker.

. Continued on next page.

CONCURRENCE - INDUSTRY AND COMMERCE

MR. SPEAKER: We are on the Department of Industry and Commerce. The Honourable Member for Assiniboia had 16 minutes on the topic.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I believe I will have sufficient time. I will not be able to, or require the full 16 minutes but I was trying to bring to the Minister's attention that he must take a very aggressive action to bring jobs into rural Manitoba very quickly because some of the towns will be disappearing, Mr. Speaker. I know that, in my opinion, the government in this respect has failed to produce a real proper rural development strategy, Mr. Speaker. The people from the small towns have to leave to seek job opportunities in the cities and some of our smaller towns within a number of years will disappear. I believe, it is my opinion that the Manitoba Development Corporation, which is a government loaning agency, have not taken an aggressive action in respect to assisting rural communities designating growth centres and trying to establish industry in the rural parts of the province. I hope that the Minister will be able to give us some indication what is the policy of the government, because the First Minister has indicated on every occasion he's had that this will be the government's policy, but the actions of the government certainly do not indicate that because as far as the rural part of the province there's been very little action as far as economic development is concerned. In fact the reverse is true.

Mr. Speaker, I know that I mentioned before the supper hour to the members my concern about the housing development and the housing starts in the City of Winnipeg and in the Province of Manitoba, and my source of information was the statistics from the Central Mortgage and Housing, which indicated in the first three months that the housing starts and completions were down considerably. I also have a report here from the Manitoba Association of Architects, which also indicates, Mr. Speaker, that the total construction planned by architects have decreased from last year to a six-months period this year, or indications are for a six-months period this year that it will decrease by some \$18 million or by 20 percent. And this is for total construction handled by architect offices.

It also indicates that the amount of government work at all levels will as well increase. I don't know how accurate the statistics are proving to be but surely the Minister of Municipal Affairs would be interested in this area and so will the Minister of Economic Development, or Minister of Industry and Commerce, that there's another indication that amount of government work will decrease by somewhere in the neighbourhood of \$21 million or a reduction in government construction this year as compared to the last year for the six-months period by some 40 percent, which is really --(Interjection)-- It is. I feel that the Minister of Labour should be concerned, should be concerned very much. --(Interjection)-- That's right, but last year he must appreciate we only produced 6,000 jobs; that's what we produced last year, and to --(Interjection)-- That's right, but to provide opportunities for our people in this province you have to create 15,000 jobs, you have to create much more than 6,000. So what happens? He says it's the lowest unemployment rate in Canada. What happens, the people don't stay here; they go somewhere else and that's, you know, that's the statistics right out of the Minister's document of the labour reports. So, well I wouldn't repeat this but the Minister is prompting me and I can't help but repeat that. --(Interjection)-- Well I am. The labour growth last year was 6,000 employees. 1.3 percent, the growth in this province, of the labour force. And the fact that I am trying to make is that we require at least double that amount of jobs or more, so what happens of the people that come on the labour market? They cannot find opportunities in here, and I'm sure the Minister knows that and I'm sure that he's concerned about it and he realizes that--they leave the province and go somewhere else. --(Interjection)-- Well I believe they go to Ontario or they go to British Columbia. You know, they must leave the province because they're not here. So, Mr. Speaker, I know that the solution is not that simple. We are in an area that we have transportation disadvantages. Goods produced here cost much more money to export them to the markets and --(Interjection)-- Well, I believe it's long overdue; the government should have taken a strong action as far as transportation. Sure, the Federal Government's responsible but I say that the government of the Province of Manitoba, the government here, should decide what it wants to do and have a course of action that it wants to take. It hasn't shown, this House.

A MEMBER: It has.

MR. PATRICK: It has not. So I feel that we must convince the Federal Government that there is such a thing as a regional--that we require a regional transport policy so that we

CONCURRENCE

(MR. PATRICK cont'd) would not be in a disadvantaged position. --(Interjection)-- Well, somebody from his seat is saying, "We sure try," but I wish the government would have tabled its position; that would have been of much assistance, I believe, to the members of this House and perhaps would have had a much stronger point if the position paper would have been tabled in this House. I know that--the Minister keeps repeating that, you know, the lowest unemployment rate in Canada, but again I'm sure that the Minister knows real well that to have the lowest unemployment rate and have the people come on the employment market and not be able to get jobs here, they have to leave the province and go somewhere else. So we do have a real brain drain as far as this province is concerned and I'm sure that he knows that real well. And it's a concern that it's not an easy solution, but I'm sure that the Minister of Industry and Commerce has to take his job much more serious and try to do something about it.

As far as regional development is concerned in this province, I believe that we have to work a little more . . . regional corporations and see what can be done. I know that I've mentioned this before, that we have to establish a trade commissioner's office in Ottawa. I know to some members this may sound like you're building a bureaucracy. I don't think so. I had an opportunity to meet with at least a dozen people from the External Affairs Department that are scattered throughout the world when they were traveling or when they were in Winnipeg here on a conference a couple of years ago. I asked the specific question, if this would be of any assistance or of any help, and every single one said they thought it would. Not a large office with a large staff, but they figured you must have somebody that when trade commissioners travel from other countries, when they stop in Ottawa they would like to drop into a Manitoba office and see what Manitoba has to offer. I'd say this type of approach would cost very little but the Minister will not get anywhere if he doesn't try, and this is the point that I'd like to say to him: he must take a very aggressive attitude, very aggressive attitude as far as industrial development is concerned in this province, if he wants to pursue and stimulate development. He will not be able to do that with the kind of attitude that some of the members of the backbenchers of the government have taken some while back, and I know this was brought to my attention. I know some businesses that I have discussed this with. I know that the Minister said the other day how many businesses have left. I know from my own experience, and all you have to do is take a look in the City of St. James-Assiniboia where we had at one time at least 15 to 20 small builders. Today I don't think you have more than one or two. And this is probably what's happening in the other parts of the city as well.

Now the other area which doesn't concern directly the Minister of Industry and Commerce but it does concern the Minister of Municipal Affairs, I think that he should call a meeting with the municipal governments in this city with the City of Winnipeg, in respect to a serious situation of shortage of lots for housing, and see if we really have a serious problem as far as housing is concerned. --(Interjection)-- No, I would disagree completely. I would say that this is not the type of operation that most real estate agents operate. Perhaps the land developers do and he may be right on that point.

So, Mr. Speaker, I feel that the Minister's responsibility is to take a much more aggressive attitude, and I'm not being too critical because it is a difficult job to try and bring in a . . . to the province but my attitude is that MDC should be used strictly to develop industry in the rural parts of Manitoba so we can bring opportunities to the people in the local areas where they can get job opportunities and they can keep some of the more able and capable skilled people in the regional areas. --(Interjection)-- No, but I do suggest that there are some large centers that the Minister can name as growth centers. There's Dauphin; there's Morris, there's Brandon, there's Arborg, there's quite a few cities or quite a few towns that can be declared as growth centers because the Minister must appreciate if Dauphin will grow, the towns around Dauphin within a radius of 25 miles they'll all grow and survive, and perhaps have a much better opportunity than if you haven't got any growth center, then the surrounding towns will not survive as well. So I think this is the responsibility that he has to undertake.

Now I will not be critical of some of the government Crown corporations but I believe that we must, we should be critical and examine it very closely, and we did not have the opportunity to do this in our Economic Development Committee meetings, but maybe we're spending some money not in a proper way and maybe we're wasting some money. I have never been critical of Saunders Aircraft to this time, but I think the time has come that we have given it perhaps sufficient time and sufficient opportunity to either start showing some progress, and

CONCURRENCE

(MR. PATRICK cont'd) if they're not going to show any progress I think it's time for the government to say, "Well look. We have to cut off the funds because we have given you sufficient and it appears that much of this money will not be returned and will not be recovered at all by the government." So I think it's sort of a wasteful type of operation.

If the Minister can give us some indication that he still feels that he's confident that there's a future, I would still give him another chance because, as I've said, I've never been critical of the operation but a time has come that we have to question it; the time has come we have to question it. We're told that there's no way or hope of recovering the investment in it unless we produce 600 planes, or similar in that area, and I believe it's almost as many as perhaps the United States manufactured for the war in Korea--I've made that statement. So really, I don't know if there's any chances of exporting or selling or marketing that many planes that can be produced in that operation, so I don't know what our chances are for recovery. And I know the Minister will say that you have to take a chance; if you don't take a chance there's no opportunity. Perhaps the Minister can take a chance at some smaller industries, much smaller, the type that Manitoba is known in manufacturing and companies and corporations of 25, that employ 50, 25 and 30 people. This is the type of companies that we have in this province that provide the majority of jobs for the people. That's the size, and small manufacturing companies that have been successful through many years and are still successful, instead of putting all your money in one pot and then finding out that it doesn't succeed. So I hope that the Minister will pay heed to some of the comments that I have to make and I think that we have to take a more serious look as far as centralization is concerned, as far as pouring the money into one type of operation which is so expensive.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise somewhat hesitantly having had some difficulty earlier this evening in speaking, and of course hoping that perhaps the Honourable the Minister would rise to make some explanations about some of the questions that have been put to him in the course of the Concurrence debate motion, and I would really like to return, if I may, to the Polish connection if I can, because it is by chance, his reaction to the relatively sedate and studied manner which is his norm, and I'm referring to my colleague the Member from Brandon, when he raised the matter about some comments or some speech that the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce had made in his travels in the international sphere of encouraging industrial development in this province, that seemed to bring about this rather quick response from the Minister as to what was said and what was not said. Now, Mr. Speaker, if the Honourable Minister is not prepared to respond, I noticed a little while ago the Member from Point Douglas, who accompanied the Minister on this particular trip, and in my understanding represented the provinces as the Deputy Premier on that occasion in the country of Poland, could well be in a position to make a full and a lucid support by leave, Mr. Speaker, of course, which we in the Opposition would be most favourable to grant. Because, Mr. Speaker, I believe it does bear some further scrutiny.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am the first one to recognize how utterly irresponsible the Press and the journalists of this day are, that they are beyond all comprehension and contempt of us. I should know, ever since the South Indian Lake days, although I have some of them, personally taken them to task. So I think there, Mr. Speaker, there's a responsibility upon us as legislators to, when the occasion arises that we think that we are being wilfully misquoted, misquoted in an irresponsible manner, that we should at all times take that occasion to correct the media, particularly when offered the occasion to do so as my colleague the Member from Brandon did in fact offer the Minister of Industry and Commerce to do so this afternoon.

And I think, Mr. Speaker, we should read into the record just precisely what it was that the Minister of Industry and Commerce wished to correct, and where he charged the Press with this gross bit of irresponsible journalism. And I'm referring, of course, to the reports that one of these irresponsible journalists here in this fair City of Winnipeg made about the Minister's trip to that fair country of Poland. And he said, "Amid the news releases relaying Mr. Evans' glorious speeches, extolling the virtues of Manitoba as a great place to locate your industry, came a report of another Evans' speech."

Now, Mr. Speaker, before the Minister rises on any point of privilege or anything else, I want to assure you, Mr. Speaker, and the Minister, that I am not attributing these words, I'm not attributing these words to the Minister, I'm attributing these words to the author of the

CONCURRENCE

(MR. ENNS cont'd) person who wrote this particular piece of journalism, and I would think that in defense, that at least we should have, you know, some firm denial on the part of the Minister, perhaps a copy of the speech that he actually made, Mr. Speaker. --(Interjection) -- Well, Polish or otherwise, but perhaps, perhaps a verbatim repeat of the speech that he made. Knowing the nature of the Minister, I would suspect that he could make the same speech in this Chamber without so much as tripping over a word. However, this was the impression that one particular journalist had about the Minister's activities in that distant land. But apparently Mr. Evans, carried away by his high success, an apparent feeling of isolation by distance from the old homeland, made a grand speech in Poland drawing all, drawing all sorts of parallels between their kind of government and ours. You know the sort of thing. "Listen, comrades, we're not really dirty money-grabbing capitalists in Manitoba; we're Social Democrats just like you." Well now, Mr. Speaker, if for a moment we believed that those were the Minister's words then we of course will have the first definition of what precisely a Social Democrat is. Or, as my colleague from Roblin says, what a comrade is. And if you're thinking of moving into the North American market . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister state his matter of privilege.

HON. LEONARD S. EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce) (Brandon East): On a matter of privilege, if my good friend the Honourable Member from Lakeside would tell us, tell the members of the House, the author of the article, whether or not it was an editorial, the date and the name of the publication, and to tell members of the House that he is not quoting me but that he is quoting an impression that some editorialist had of something that I said that he had no copy thereof.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, then let me welcome the interjection on the part of the Minister because I had attempted really to make that abundantly clear, that I am quoting one Mr. Egon Frech of the Winnipeg Free Press, September 23rd, 1972, and I'm not attributing these remarks to the Honourable Minister but I am suggesting, Mr. Speaker, the responsibility to the Minister and the responsibility that we all have, that when the Fourth Estate so abuses their privileges and acts so irresponsible, that we must rise, Mr. Speaker, in this Chamber and give them the benefit of a lecture of some basic fundamentals and truths, and take every opportunity that we have given to us in the public forum that we now have, to correct them where they err in their ways. And I just want to, Mr. Speaker, at least allow the Minister the ample platform to chastise the author, this one Egon Frech, properly by reading into the record precisely how he misquoted or how he misinterpreted the Minister in his forays into Poland.

Now to get on with my impressions that were relative to the Minister of Industry and Commerce during his trip to Poland by one Egon Frech of the Winnipeg Free Press. Well now, Mr. Speaker, I'm hoping that we can have at least that co-operation of what I am saying, because I understand that the Member from Point Douglas, the one time or at least for that short period of time the Deputy Premier of the Province of Manitoba during his visits to Poland, will corroborate and will give us ample evidence of precisely what did take place during this supposedly --(Interjection)-- well, revolutionary speeches as was suggested to me by none other than our Minister of Industry and Commerce. But he went on to say, Mr. Speaker, let me go; you know the sort of thing, "Listen comrades, we're not really dirty money-grabbing capitalists in Manitoba, we're Social Democrats just like you. And if you're thinking of moving into the North American market, maybe we've got just the place for you." Manitoba, the Cuba of North America, as has been suggested by somebody else, you know; in Brandon I believe it was, in other circles. "Why, the last thing on our minds is imperialism and exploitation. See, we even struck it to the auto insurance companies and foreclosed on those Yankee imperialist pulp mills."

Well now that shows you the difficulty that my honourable friend the Minister has, if he's even being quoted correctly here, because of course it wasn't a Yankee imperialist pulp mill, it happened to be one of those European Swiss Imperialist pulp mills that we foreclosed on. However, that's just a small little fact.

The operative, the operative phrase comes of course, the operative phrase comes of course, Mr. Speaker, with: "We're Red just like you." Well now, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that that calls for, you know, a complete and utter denial on the part of the Minister, not just arising on the point of privilege, particularly, Mr. Speaker, when there's sufficient reason to believe as to the . . . of authenticity to this report when it is rumoured in the Ottawa circles

CONCURRENCE

(MR. ENNS cont'd) of the Foreign Affairs Department that there was a degree of embarrassment about a certain Minister of Industry and Commerce making these kind of speeches among the Warsaw Pact of Nations and not the NATO Pact of Nations, and where there has been a report that copies, that all subsequent copies of that speech have in fact been disposed of and have been burned, and in fact, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that there is no copy available of that particular speech made by the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce, although one would suspect that when he's addressing a speech in a foreign country, I would assume in a foreign tongue, that there would be copies of that speech somewhere in existence although none appear to be present, none appeared to be present. So that's why we rely on the member the Deputy Premier of this province, the Member for Point Douglas, to add some light, shed some further light as to the full and true facts as to just how that particular speech was received and how it was made under the circumstances I described.

Well now, Mr. Speaker, I am suggesting to you, Mr. Speaker, that for the Minister of Industry and Commerce to suggest that this is all the fabrication in the mind of one Egon Frech, an enterprising journalist, would be of course to do the simple and straightforward thing and to do what really the people of Manitoba have a right to expect of him, because Mr. Speaker, when the province of Manitoba sends its Ministers abroad--no, at public expense--these aren't just trips I would like to believe, you know, into his old constituency where he may be expected to be making speeches off the cuff and so forth. But, Mr. Speaker, it's like when we sent that grand deputation off to Sweden, we did finally get a report of some kind or other of their activities in that country. And, Mr. Speaker, when we sent the Minister of Industry and Commerce and the Deputy Premier of this province to Poland, to lure Polish businessmen to taking - or being cognizant and aware of the tremendous business opportunities available to him in this province of Manitoba, then it is not just another little fishing expedition on the part of a particular Minister, it is indeed a far more official trip, and surely, surely, Mr. Speaker, without attempting to be niggling in the way of asking, you know, what did the trip cost, how many people went on the trip, I think it happened to be a legitimate trip and he should have gone.

But surely, Mr. Speaker, for those kind of trips that kind of expense of public money deserves, for the public record, a full and a complete accounting of the activities of that representative of Manitoba that was there. That includes the formal speeches that were made, the formal representations that were made to that government, and that we should know precisely what our embassy or what our emissary--and Mr. Speaker, I have no difficulty in representing or acknowledging the fact that he is my Minister of Industry and Commerce, and he is my Deputy Premier, the Member from Point Douglas. And then if they choose, if they in their wisdom believe that in order to induce industrial activity in Manitoba that they should travel to Poland to talk about the possibilities in this particular direction, then I would be the last one to criticize them. But, Mr. Speaker, when they for some reason or other, and I really don't know the reason, Mr. Speaker, other than the fact that the Honourable Member from Brandon seemed to just touch on the tip of an iceberg and there he seemed to strike a rather sensitive nerve, because the Minister of Industry and Commerce immediately jumped up on a point of privilege, and, Mr. Speaker, while I have no, you know, no particular personal affection for one Egon Frech, but Mr. Speaker, I have, I have, Mr. Speaker, a deep and abiding interest in keeping our journalists honest. Mr. Speaker, that, Mr. Speaker, is a privilege that affects all of us from time to time and I think, Mr. Speaker, as has sometimes been mentioned, that it is our responsibility to rise as individual members at any time that we think our privileges, our House privileges, are indeed being transgressed upon or threatened, and we should bring that to the attention of you, Sir, Mr. Speaker, as chief magistrate and arbitrator of the affairs of this House.

Mr. Speaker, that is precisely what I am doing this evening. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that a journalist of this fair city has taken upon himself a great deal of license in writing this kind of an article, and I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that there is one very straightforward and simple way for the government of the day and for the particular Minister involved, to simply, Mr. Speaker, as they have done on so many occasions, as they have offered on so many occasions in their interests of open government, to simply table the necessary document, table the speech. Give us the benefits.

Mr. Speaker, in fact on another point of order, if I may, why should the citizens of Poland have a particular right to particular words of wisdom that we are not privy to? And if

CONCURRENCE

(MR. ENNS cont'd) the words of the Minister of Industry and Commerce were that important, then surely we should benefit, we should derive the wisdom of the knowledge of that speech that he made. I'm suggesting, Mr. Speaker, without getting into any kind of name calling as to who is right or who is wrong, if the Minister of Industry and Commerce, if the Minister of Industry and Commerce would simply table his speech that he made, surely Mr. Speaker, there must be copies of that speech around. There must be. Well no, Mr. Speaker, I am only reporting, I am only reporting, Mr. Speaker, that there is a possibility that those speeches have all been, or copies of those speeches have all been destroyed or that they've all been burned because of the embarrassing nature of those speeches. But I don't even want to believe that; I don't want to believe that, Mr. Speaker. I don't want to believe that the Minister of Industry and Commerce in this province actually put down in words, "We're Red, just like you!" I really don't want to believe, Mr. Speaker, that he would put that down into a speech that had to be translated into Polish because he is not proficient in Polish. I don't think he would put that down in his speech. --(Interjection)-- I don't think he did. But, Mr. Speaker, all I'm suggesting, Mr. Speaker, all I'm suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that he could destroy or completely wipe out any lingering doubts that those of us in the opposition may have. And he could disparage, he could disparage this bit of irresponsible journalism on the part of Mr. Egon Frech of the Free Press, if he would simply produce a copy of his speech. --(Interjection)-- Oh, I'm sorry, a point of order?

MR. SPEAKER: Point of order. The Honourable Member for Point Douglas state his point of order.

MR. DONALD MALINOWSKI (Point Douglas): Mr. Speaker, for the point of clarification, I was down there with the Minister of Industry and Commerce in Poland and I was listening, and he never said something like it, as you are pointing out, that we are red as you are. I never heard something like that. As a point of clarification, Mr. Speaker, as I said, I was down there, I was listening and he said many things. If you want to know what he said, I may say here in this Chamber, but don't twist and don't use something like that, because if somebody put in the paper it's not because I . . . true.

MR. ENNS: I am reassured, in fact I am doubly sure that the Minister of Industry and Commerce never said that he's as red as I am. And I am convinced of that. I am totally convinced of that, and the Member from Point Douglas just reassured me on that particular point of view. The fact of the matter is that's not what I said. He's reported to have said that he's as red as they are, and that was the gist of my comments.

Now, Mr. Speaker, all this can be hastily and summarily dismissed if only, if only the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce will produce a draft copy or a copy of his speech that he made, which I assume that on these kind of visits, which after all involve, you know, several thousands of dollars of public money--it is an official kind of a trip--I would suspect that when a group like this, a delegation like that moves, that they're well equipped with stenographic help, that copies of their itinerary, I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, I'm sure, Mr. Speaker, if I asked for an Order for Return, if I asked for an Order for Return asking for which hotel did he stay in, what fights did he take on, how many meals he had and what was the total cost of the trip, I would get it, and it would all be there, it will be honest. There would be no--you know, it would be supplied because this is official government business.

Well, Mr. Speaker, by the same basis I am sure that a Minister of the Crown speaking in a language foreign to him, would have his remarks, his speeches put forward for him formally in some form or other, even a rough draft form that we could, that we could be sort of privy to, that we would be able to say and concur, and concur with the Honourable Minister that this was irresponsible journalism and that we could dismiss it, dismiss it from our minds. Now I would like the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce to do just that for us, because of course, Mr. Speaker, if he doesn't, and if he doesn't produce a copy of that speech, then of course that suspicion will linger in my mind.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolution passed? The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, I really was going to have the Minister speak first; however, since he's waiting till we have spoken, I guess I'll make a few comments in connection with the Department of Industry and Commerce, which plans on spending something like 4.895 million dollars--almost \$5 million, although the figure is very much the same as the previous year so that it's not that big an increase.

CONCURRENCE

(MR. FROESE cont'd)

There are a few points that I wish to raise under this department and I'm not just certain which things I should come up with first, but I received a couple of clippings this morning in the mail on what the B. C. government does, and there seems to be a certain likening between the two governments, ours and that of British Columbia, in the program of legislation that they have brought forward especially at this last session and there is a headline here "Barrett Concedes Government Bill Taking Very Great Power" and apparently they are embarking on the same type of program that we have in Manitoba under the Development Corporation part 2, except that they instead of having a separate bill, that they have authorized their Minister of Finance to make investments on behalf of the government and the province. I would like to read a couple of paragraphs from this article which shows it up pretty well, and this is from the Vancouver Sun of Saturday, April 7th, 1973, and it comes from Victoria, and I'm quoting: "Premier Dave Barrett conceded Friday that the government is taking very, very great power with legislation which would allow the Finance Minister to invest public money in any company, but he insisted it is only accepting its responsibilities to government." Then a little further down it refers to the Bill: "The bill was read a second time just before the House adjourned at about 6 p. m. The legislature normally sits only until 1 p. m. on Fridays. Bill 74 would give Barrett the power to invest money from the government surplus funds in the stocks of any corporation. Previously funds could only be invested in Chartered Banks."

Then I notice from this very article it says that the surplus this year will amount to about 180 million and that without limits on how it could be used the government would have a blank cheque. This is very substantial, \$180 million, and this is what they hand over to one particular minister to invest in any kind of company whatever. Speaking for the Official Opposition, James Cabot, Social Credit, Columbia River, said, that Bill 74 is an incredible piece of legislation, that could be described as the Waffle Act, 1973. He said it is wrong for the government to turn over the power of investment to one man and described Barrett as a man whose only business experience is selling bananas. Barrett has said that as a child he helped his father operate a food stand in Vancouver. That is asking too much, said Cabot. He called on the government to spell out the objectives for financial participation under the bill which he said was big club legislation by left wing government. He, Barrett, could get up some morning after a bad dream and decide we should invest in a particular business, Cabot said.

Then there is also reference made here to Pat McGeer, what he said. I don't know whether the members of the Liberal Party would like to hear what he had to say. Well Liberal Pat McGeer, Vancouver Point Grey, suggested that the B.C. Telephone Company will be the first company affected by the legislation. I suggest that B.C. Tel will be the first target for purchase of shares by the government, he said. The buying of shares in the company, he said, could prove a sly means of moving toward takeover. This is what the paper quotes as what Pat McGeer said.

Then further on in that same article, there is comments made by Newall Morrison, Social Credit, Victoria --(Interjection)-- yeah, and he said, he never suspected that Barrett was a frustrated monopoly player and that he would play monopoly with the public's money, and then it has a caption "Boggles Mind" and it's apparently that description came over from Manitoba to B.C. so that this is not something - an expression used in our House only. He questioned the Premier . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Point of Order.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I am aware that my honourable friend appears not to have lost his inclination to quote from the doings of the Province of British Columbia which apparently by inertia he continues to do despite the fact that there's been a change in government, but he has spent the last seven minutes or so discussing the Department of Finance of the Province of British Columbia under the Estimates of the Department of Industry and Commerce. Now if he is going to relate it then I think he should do so fairly quickly.

MR. SPEAKER: I think the point is well taken. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: I have heard other speakers in this House, and we heard one tonight that certainly didn't stick to the principles of the bill that he was discussing. However, I will relate it because the Department of Industry is one that is expanding and trying to encourage industry in this province, and here we have another province setting aside 180 million for investing in companies, and I'd like to read a few more paragraphs which certainly will relate

CONCURRENCE

(MR. FROESE cont'd) what is said in the article, and what we are doing in Manitoba, and I continue. He questioned the Premier on whether the government has any intention to sit on the board of a company it might buy into and whether it would attempt to change the directions of the company. It boggles the mind, he said of the Bill. Bob McLellan, Langley, warned against the power given the Finance Minister because the government, this government, has shown it doesn't know how to be prudent. Like other opposition MLA's McLellan feared the government would invest in financial aid troubled companies like Crown Zellerbach and Columbia Cellulose, and suggested the bill might be called "bail out legislation". It sounds very familiar, Mr. Speaker, very familiar, to what the experiences that we have had in this province and when the House Leader gets up and tries to curtail debate here on certain things, it was just a guilty conscience actually that got him up on his feet because he knows too well what has happened here in Manitoba, and that we have bail-out legislation in the statutes covering the MDC. We have bailed out a number of companies here in Manitoba and this is what is happening in B. C. now as well - only I think it will be on a much bigger scale out there because they have much more money available for that very purpose.

A MEMBER: What about Alberta?

MR. FROESE: Oh yes, Alberta - there was another article that I can refer to later, and I really had intended saving that one until the time that we will be dealing with Mines and Resources because that really discussed the Province of Alberta as well and how industry was leaving Saskatchewan.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I would like the honourable member to come back from his Trans Canada travels to the Province of Manitoba please.

MR. FROESE: Well, Mr. Speaker, we can't have it both ways or different ways.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. FROESE: I was asked by the Minister, what about Alberta, so I make a comment and here I am being reprimanded. The Minister of Agriculture said, talk about bananas. Well we had a reference made here that Barrett was apparently, oh yeah, "a man whose only business experience is selling bananas." That was the quote. --(Interjection)-- Yeah, here's another reference, if I may, "In answering the criticism Barrett said" - now we'll be hearing what Barrett has to say - "Barrett said the government will not be giving handouts to industry or bolstering up sagging companies." So I would have rather thought that they would applaud, but I don't hear any. "We will not be investing in corporations that need handouts such as private enterprise parties have done," Barrett said. "We are not going to invest in areas that will be risky or dangerous." So if that is the case that would be quite a change from what we have seen here in Manitoba. And if the Minister of Mines is so interested in getting it related to our home situation I would like to briefly dwell on Churchill Forest Industries because this is covered by the Estimates of the Department of Industry and Commerce. We are going to spend another \$174,000 on the Churchill Forest Industry Inquiry Commission, and last year we allocated 329,000 --(Interjection)-- Oh, I sure would love it, I sure would love it. But the other day the Leader of the Opposition started discussing the matter of CFI, but it didn't go very far and he quit, and I just wondered why - why can't we have a discussion on this very matter so that other members of this House will be getting some information as well, because it seems to me as though there is certain collusion going on between the Government and the Official Opposition because both parties, both parties are knowledgeable about what happened, what transpired. We on this side here, especially in this corner, we haven't had the experience; we don't know what happened and the detail as such as the other two parties certainly know about. Is there any intention here of covering up? The matter was raised even tonight about whether Churchill Forest was an American based company, an American based firm this was the statement made in the press the other day. The Member for Lakeside says, it's a European firm.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I would hope that the honourable member who's got some mechanical gadget going would take it out of the House. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would certainly like to know from the Minister how long more will the inquiry take? Will the final report be written this year? I hope I get the attention of the Minister so that we get some answers. Will we get an interim report of the inquiry commission, or will there just be one final report on the old inquiry?

The Member for Portage says that there will be an interim report sometime during

CONCURRENCE

(MR. FROESE cont'd) the election. Well I really had figured that before the election would be called, there would be some kind of report available. I am still hoping for one regardless of what the outcome is going to be. Then also will this present allocation that we have on the books, will that suffice, will that bring the inquiry to an end, or how long does the Minister expect that the Inquiry Commission will continue? --(Interjection)-- I don't know. Was the Minister of Labour asking me a question or not?

Mr. Speaker, I had some more items that I really wanted to bring to the attention of the Minister of Industry and Commerce in connection with what other provinces are doing, and especially other NDP governments are doing in this country, and I think the Minister of Labour was just waking up so I can probably tell him a thing or two about how labour is faring in the Province of British Columbia, which is closely associated with industry because B. C. has very strong labour unions, and I have an article here, "Left turn for B. C. at the gallop." And it's quite an article, but I'll just raise the point dealing with labour, and it says, and I'm quoting now: "Very wisely the government postponed the revision of the province's labour laws demanded by its organized labour supporters. The NDP had hung itself up on promises to repeal, but after a good look at the practical issues of industrial life in this province it has done well to take further time to consider its course." How much haven't we heard from the very people on the government here on B. C. labour legislation. My goodness, they held it up to ridicule time and again. Now we find that they are in government and they don't take it off the books, they leave it there. Now they like it. What a change it makes when they change and come into power. And I am quoting now: "It is unfortunate that the government did not also take further time to consider what effects its incursion into the private business sector might have on the province's economy." There is bound to be an adverse effect on investment for no matter what the government may believe about the need of outsiders for our rich natural resources, the investor in New York, or London, or Toronto, is going to think hard before risking his money in a socialist milieu."

Well, that is what we see happening now. We are taking - seeing this same thing happening that once the Socialists come into a province, and are in there for any length of time, then private business is hesitant about developing and I know the money that was available to B. C. before for investment purposes --(Interjection)-- no this was long before the election took place. There was more money available than they could use and they had a terrific rate of expansion. Now we find that there is a certain hesitancy already taking place, and I wouldn't be surprised if a lot of this money would not be made available to them after some time.

I certainly would like to see more development in this province, and while the government certainly has made efforts--I'm sure the Minister of Industry and Commerce has made efforts in getting development going in this province--but it seems to me that a lot of the development that is taking place is very small in nature. That we are not getting the bigger corporations to come in and set up plants here, or branches, or so on, and I think this is probably what is needed to get in on the ground floor and get larger --(Interjection)-- the member for, the Minister for Tourism said it's the federal policy that is holding us back. Well I think it's that, and the freight rates is another; I think banking is another one, that certainly we are at the mercy of the head office of the big banks, and they only allow so much money in for development as they see fit. So I know some of the reasons for it too. At the same time we cannot just sit down and hold our hands in our laps, and let things go by. I think we have to make every effort to see that we get development in this province, and I've mentioned on different occasions some of the things that I felt should happen in the way of our port at Churchill. The other day I mentioned on our exports of wheat. Why cannot we do more milling and ship our wheat in the finished product in the form of flour to other countries. --(Interjection)-- The gentleman can read Hansard later. --(Interjection)-- Okay.

Well I don't want to burden the committee at this hour any longer than necessary, but I'd like to really ask the Minister in connection with Churchill Forest Industry to give us the latest on it and to give us a little more details about the situation as it is today. Is there any hope that we will not have deficits and perpetuity as far as that industry is concerned up north if we leave the capitalization as it is? In my opinion the capitalization will have to be brought down before we can show any black figures, and if I'm wrong I certainly would like to be corrected by the Minister.

So, Mr. Speaker, with those few words I would like to hear from the Minister concerned on the Estimates of his department.

CONCURRENCE

MR. SPEAKER: Resolution passed. The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I notice there is no one in the press gallery but I understand the P. A. system works well into the press room, and I trust while they're enjoying that Polish czubruka that they are listening to my remarks, and I challenge them to come back into the House and do their job that they're being paid for even though it is five after twelve a. m.

I appreciate the concern of the Honourable Member for Rhineland about CFI. He has the same concern that the members on this side have. We've inherited a terrible situation (ah, we've got one back here) we've inherited a situation, we've inherited a situation, which "situation", we've inherited a situation which we have tried to make the very best of. And I don't know . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable Member for Arthur state his point of order.

MR. J. DOUGLAS WATT (Arthur): On my point of order I don't think any member of the House should imitate the interpretation of the English language. If you want to talk in Polish okay, but I don't.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. EVANS: At any rate, Mr. Speaker, we are very concerned, as the Member from Rhineland is, about the viability of CFI. We inherited a situation, a situation where we were told categorically - this was years before I became interested in politics - where we were told categorically that Manitoba had found a great group of investors, Swiss financiers. In fact it was on the front page of the Manitoba Business Journal. Front page and there was Duff Roblin shaking hands with Dr. Kasser, Dr. Reiser, said, "One hundred million dollar handshake". Boy, they weren't kidding. One hundred million dollar handshake. The only trouble is, Mr. Speaker, the article didn't go on to say which way the money was going. It didn't indicate that the money was going from the taxpayers of Manitoba into the pockets of so-called international financiers which my good friend, who has long gone to bed, I am sure, the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Spivak, I'm sorry, the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, Minister for River Heights. It's 12:08 a. m., Wednesday morning. He's long in bed so he won't hear my remarks but the fact is that he was Minister of Industry for two and a half years and surely he knew something about this great glorious CFI deal that Duff Roblin announced to the people of Manitoba that was going to develop the great resources of the north and give employment to our people. Great international investment that was coming into the Province of Manitoba and there it was on the front page of the Manitoba Business Journal, Duff Roblin shaking hands with the Swiss financiers, and as my friend from Wellington says, it was more of a shakedown than a handshake.

You know, and again unfortunately my friend, good friend, the Member from Lakeside is out enjoying himself in the corridor someplace, so he's not here to listen to my rebuttal of his innuendo based on innuendo, based on an editorial which was based on no facts whatsoever, you know, and this my friends in the Legislature I say, is a travesty (ah, here they're coming, here they're coming, I'm glad, they're here, they're here.) I say, you know, that a member of this Legislature can get up and make a speech, and make allegations about, and assertions of what I was supposed to have stated in a country in Europe, based upon an editorial which was based upon, not fact but upon some trivial hearsay. And that is the basis of an entire speech. And you know, Mr. Speaker, if that is the level of debate, and the level of intelligence, and the level of conscientious concern of the members of the Manitoba Legislative Assembly of Manitoba, then God help the voters, God help the citizens of Manitoba, if that is what the thoughts of the Members of the Opposition are with regard to the Estimates, or with regard to the spending of the Department of Industry and Commerce.

You know, let me say something. The editor or the writer of that particular article, he has been mentioned by the Member for Lakeside, Mr. Egon Frech, I spoke to him after he wrote the article and I asked him, what was the basis of his article? And he wouldn't reveal it, so that's fine. But I suspect the basis is this. That some innocuous member of my department wrote a very lengthy speech for me to give in Poland, which I never gave, and in that now --(Interjection)-- Well just listen Member from Swan River, just listen, listen to the truth, listen to the truth. Because why should I tell you otherwise. You know I've devoted my life to the truth; I've devoted my life to providing information to enlighten people, and not to confusing or not to muddying the waters. I've devoted my life to that, and I am not going to

CONCURRENCE

(MR. EVANS cont'd) change now. And the fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that a member of my department--and this is comical indeed; it belongs on the comic pages of the papers - that a member of my department in all innocence made reference to a certain provincial-federal diversity of opinion. And the Department of External Affairs in Ottawa felt that it would not be wise for a member of any government, any provincial government, to go abroad and make reference to provincial-federal differences of view. But it was some innocuous difference of view that was made reference to by some staff member, and I was told as I was boarding the plane that Ottawa was upset. I said, "Fine, Ottawa's upset." I took a glance at the speech for the first time and said, "As far as I'm concerned, I'm not going to give that speech anyway because it is not really what I want to say," so, so much for the civil service of my department. They are a very good bunch but this particular speech, the way it was written, was not the kind of speech that I wanted to deliver. And you know and the Honourable Member for Lakeside, who's not here - I trust he's enjoying himself somewhere in the building - but you know he makes a great to-do about an article which was based upon somebody's gossip, somebody's impression based on a little bit of gossip about someone in the Department of External Affairs being concerned about one phrase that was made, it was written by some technical person in the Department of Industry and Commerce, you know. And this is blown up out of all proportion and here my friend is coming, so he can now hear the truth, and it was blown up out of all proportion, and now he stands there and makes a great speech. Now I will agree with him --(Interjection)-- Well he makes a long speech, he makes a long speech anyway. And, you know, he said, this is an example of irresponsible reporting. I thought he said that, and I agree with him 100 percent on that, because it is an example of irresponsible reporting.

And I regret to say that because I have a great respect for this particular writer but in this case --(Interjection)-- Well, okay you don't, but I do - but in this case he wrote an article which was based not on the truth, not on the truth but on gossip, on hearsay. --(Interjection)-- Well, you know, and the member says, you know, he'd like a copy of the speech. Well the fact is I have a copy of the speech like the Honourable Member of Lakeside has a copy of the speech he gave tonight about 45 minutes ago. Because the fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that I decided to tell the people of Poland about the economic opportunities here in Manitoba and about how we were glad the Polish people bought the wheat, bought the wheat and the rapeseed grown in the Swan River Valley, bought the grain and the barley in Lakeside constituency, and bought the grain products of Manitoba. I wanted the --(Interjection)-- All right, well you can have a copy of my speech which is exactly that. It's a number of points about the opportunities of doing business with the Province of Manitoba, and it was well received by the Polish people. And I'm sorry the honourable member gave me credit, the honourable member gave me credit for giving a speech in the Polish language. I'm sorry, I am unilingual; I apologize for that; I wish I could speak two or three or four languages. I'm lucky if I can get by in English. However, although my parents spoke Welsh. --(Interjection)--

You know, Mr. Speaker, the group that I delivered the speech to was a group who specialized in North American affairs, and all of them spoke and understood English, and my speech was in English, and the Canadian Ambassador was with me. If you want to phone up the Canadian Ambassador, ask him what I said, be my guest.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me get on to more serious matters. You know I listened today, and my friend from River Heights, who I have great respect for as he has respect for me, but he tells me, you know, I'm a good guy but I'm incompetent. So I say in turn, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Leader of the Opposition is a good guy but he's incompetent. The Leader of the Opposition is incompetent; he doesn't really know what the process of economic development is all about. In fact he has a great lack of understanding of the economic process. You know he makes a great to-do about us being concerned about inflation, and as a citizen I am concerned about inflation; as a professional economist I am concerned about inflation, but somehow in all the questions that have been raised by the Member for River Heights there's some implication that the Province of Manitoba, or any province in Canada, has the great authority, the great power, to control the forces of inflation. And you can't seem to get it through his head that the phenomena of inflation is not a provincial phenomenon, it's not even a Canadian phenomenon, Mr. Speaker. Any idiot, I'm sorry, any first year student of economics knows that inflation in our economy, that inflation --(Interjection)-- No, I said

CONCURRENCE

(MR. EVANS cont'd) any first year student of economics, and I'm not sure whether the Honourable Leader of the Opposition passed the first year of economics course, but any first year student of economics can tell you that inflation is not a provincial phenomenon, it's not even a Canadian phenomenon, it's a North American, and indeed a worldwide phenomenon, because this is a world of trade, Mr. Speaker, this is a world of trade, and don't talk to me this idiot nonsense that I don't understand the business processes. Of course I know what the business processes are more than the Honourable Member of River Heights will ever dream about. The Province of Manitoba is not an island unto itself, you know.

I would like him to get up some day in this House and suggest what we should do about inflation. Would the Leader of the Conservative Opposition suggest what we should do about inflation. What should the Government of Manitoba do about inflation? What should we do? What should--you know what the Conservatives in Ottawa say we should do. They say we should put on price controls. The Conservatives in Ottawa, the Leader of the Opposition in Manitoba is repeating, he's parodying what Mr. Stanfield has stated in Ottawa, we should put on price controls. My goodness, Mr. Speaker, talk about anti-free enterprise; talk about controlling the private enterprise system. You know Stanfield's got to be the most radical person in Canadian parliament and if the Leader of the Conservative Opposition is suggesting that we put on price controls on Manitoba industry, let him explain that to his free enterprise friends, let him explain that to his private entrepreneurs, because he can't explain it. Because what he is suggesting if the Conservative Party of Canada is suggesting price control, they are suggesting an anti-capitalist measure. They're suggesting an anti-free enterprise--Well laugh, go ahead and laugh, because you've got no answer to it. You've got--well he never said that but he is parodying what the Leader of the Conservative Party of Canada stated.

Well, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Leader of the Opposition, I will give him full marks for being a salesman, but he seems to think that the qualifications for being a Minister of Industry are pure and simple. One qualification only, you've got to be a salesman, and if you're not a salesman then you can't be a Minister of Industry and Commerce. The fact of the matter is, to use his expression, Mr. Speaker, is that salesmanship, unfortunately--I wish it were true but it is not true--salesmanship in itself does not bring about economic development of the Province of Manitoba. The Honourable former Minister of Industry, the Honourable now Leader of the Opposition has been very good. He is very good at holding pep rallies - and God knows what this is supposed to accomplish - but he's exceedingly good at holding pep rallies. You know, Mr. Speaker, the former Minister of Industry --(Interjection)-- Well listen to the truth, now listen to the facts Lakeside, and listen my friends across the way, including Transcona, listen to the facts. The former Minister of Industry and Commerce, the now Leader of the Opposition, issued a nine page strategy for development paper. One and a half pages of that paper was entitled, "The Need for Enthusiasm", and he said . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for Swan River state his point of order?

MR. BILTON: I wonder if the Honourable Minister would advise the House as to the document he's quoting from and the essence of it.

MR. EVANS: Well I am. Well if the honourable member was listening he would have heard. It's the publication of the Department of Industry and Commerce and it was entitled "The Strategy for Development". It was a paper, it was nine pages in length, and there is one and a half pages, a chapter, called "The Need for Enthusiasm". It was published by the Minister of Industry and Commerce, Mr. Sidney Spivak. Now I haven't--Now he says, you know, they were prepared preparing - this is of course in 1969 before they realized that the people of Manitoba were going to wake up and kick them out of office - but they were going to prepare for 1970. And in an effort to create an excitement, atmosphere of excitement about economic development, they launched on their Spirit of '70 program. They launched it in January of 1968 at a Business Summit Conference, Mr. Speaker, at a Business Summit Conference which I attended, which was held, among other places, in the Marlborough Hotel and the Metropolitan Theatre, and I was dragged from the University of Brandon; I was told I had to go to this conference, or else, and at that time the Toronto Telegram noted this about the--and this is the Toronto Telegram speaking--about the Spirit of '70 Program that was held here in Winnipeg. It says: "But the question that came up most frequently during the recent Manitoba Business Summit Conference in Winnipeg was whether it was possible to turn on an

CONCURRENCE

(MR. EVANS cont'd) entire business community with something of the atmosphere of the modern political slogan" - Mr. Chairman, this was in '68 just the year before the election - "with something of the atmosphere of the modern political convention they also heard a song called The Spirit of '70, and a slogan, Manitoba Growing to Beat '70. They heard the youthful Spirit of '70 drummers" - and the Honourable Leader of the Opposition must forgive me if I refer to him as the drummer boy because he had his Spirit of '70 drummers there, and they shared the biggest - and this is a quotation from the Toronto Telegram - "They shared the biggest sit-down dinner in the history of Manitoba. They saw what must have been the biggest --(Interjection)-- . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. ORDER.

MR. EVANS: "They saw what must have been the biggest head table in the history of banquetry." Approximately 150, Mr. Speaker, at the head table, including much of Manitoba's political brass and Canada's corporate brass, and whether or not Spivak and his Industry and Commerce whiz kids turned on enough business to beat '70, history should give credit to them with the massive and imaginative experiment in group therapy.

A MEMBER: Now tell us what you did. Tell us what you did.

MR. EVANS: Now, Mr. Speaker, that's the great effort that the former Minister of Industry expects us to carry on. Salesmanship, salesmanship, salesmanship, and nothing but salesmanship. And that little episode which brought about - I don't know 1, 500, maybe 1, 600 people, businessmen in Winnipeg, Manitoba, that cost the taxpayers \$30, 000.00. Thirty thousand dollars to hear Lord Rothschild from London, and another 149 people at a head table. One hundred and fifty people, Mr. Speaker, at a head table and that's the Summit Conference, that's the epitome, that's the height, that's the ultimate, that's the ultimate in the thrust of the former Conservative Government towards industrial development in the Province of Manitoba.

A MEMBER: Tell us what you did, Len. Tell us what you did. You went to Poland, eh?

MR. EVANS: You know and, Mr. Speaker--let me get to that, I'll get to that--Mr. Speaker, there is other documentary evidence which shows that the Conservative administration and the former Minister wanted to have a breakthrough on industrial development by financing large corporations, by financing large corporations. And this was referred to in the COMEF Report. In Manitoba's development we had to have big growth, and of course, Mr. Speaker, what this meant, what this amounted to - and I'd like the press to listen to this - because what this amounted to, what this amounted to - well you said they were irresponsible, I didn't say they were, they're quite responsible, and please note that. The fact is . . . --(Interjection)-- Mr. Speaker, on most occasions that honourable gentleman is responsible, on that one occasion he was not.

But the fact is you can read a little book by Philip Mathias and the name of that book, Philip Mathias of the Financial Post of Canada, was entitled "Forced Growth" and it referred to the CFI fiasco, and a couple of other things around Manitoba under the Conservatives, as "disguised socialism", disguised socialism where you had huge investments which about 85 to 90 percent were financed by the Manitoba Development Fund and the balance given as cash grants by the Federal Government in Ottawa. And that was private enterprise, Mr. Speaker. That's private enterprise on the Conservatives. That, Mr. Speaker, is so-called disguised socialism, and the Minister, the former Minister of Industry and Commerce, if he has any record he has the record of being the Minister of disguised socialism. And I make no apology, Mr. Speaker, I make no apology. If you want a question I'll answer it later, Jake. No apology, Mr. Speaker, for not taking a Teddy Boy approach. I make no apology for not lining up a group of Teddy Boy drummers; I make no apology for spending \$30, 000 of the taxpayers' money, for dragging in 1, 600 to 1, 700 businessmen from all over Manitoba to mesmerize them into God knows what. I make no apology for a head in the clouds salesmanship. What we will do, and what we have done is taken a rational intelligent approach to economic development.

Now let's face it. Now listen gentlemen and lady of the Opposition. Manitoba has been historically affected by some very fundamental factors. Now let's be honest with ourselves and let's recognize this. Now let's recognize this. Now let's not laugh it off. Let's recognize this. The fact of the matter is there has been a population shift in western Canada, and that was before the Member from Lakeside was born, before the Member from River Heights was born, and before I was born. There's been a structural population shift that has taken place throughout the west which has caused the City of Winnipeg to diminish as a major

CONCURRENCE

(MR. EVANS cont'd) wholesale and distribution centre for western Canada. And that is a historical fact, and that's got nothing to do with you, it's got nothing to do with me. But the fact is that that has happened and that is a structural change.

There is another very basic change that has taken place and that is that through changing technology we can produce more farm produce with fewer hands than we were able to than you and I when we were children. When I was a child, when I was a child on my uncle's farm he had to have 20 to . . .

MR. SPEAKER: ORDER. ORDER. Order please. I am getting a little disappointed about the behaviour of some of the members. I must indicate that interruptions will be dealt with. The Honourable Minister.

MR. EVANS: When I was a child we needed 25 people to harvest, harvest--well you know the Member from Swan River can be insulting if he wishes but I will not insult him in turn because I am not a child. The fact of the matter is they don't want to listen to the truth of what has happened to the Manitoba economy.

The fact is that . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. EVANS: The fact of the matter is that changing technology has meant that we need fewer people to man our farms so therefore there has been a loss of farm population. This is not common to Manitoba, it's common to North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Saskatchewan, it's even common to agricultural Ontario. There has been slow growth in areas surrounding Manitoba. There's been slow growth in Saskatchewan for 40 to 50 years; there's been slow growth in northern Ontario. Kenora, the Town of Kenora has not grown by one person, I believe, in the last 10 years. Even Thunder Bay and all these areas have not grown rapidly. So the economic zone around Manitoba has not grown.

Another fact, Mr. Speaker, is that the changing industrial structure, the changing structure of our industry caused--well, Mr. Speaker, I cannot go on unless there is some quiet in this House and the Leader of the Opposition, or other members that are making too much noise.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. Would the Honourable Member for Radisson keep quiet please.

MR. EVANS: The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that because of our changing industrial structure there is concentration going on in industry all over North America, all over the world, and you know that was typified in what happened in Morden. You know, as I explained to the Member from Pembina before, the President of Morden--the President of Canadian Cannery Limited said we're making money at Morden but we can make even more money by concentrating in Hamilton. We've been bought out by an American concern and we've been told, cut out all the little plants, concentrate on the big ones where you make a greater percentage of profit, and I don't fault the president of that company. I don't fault him. He's done, he's doing what he--he is trying to maximize the profit for his company, and I'm not going to fault him for that. But what's good for that corporation is not necessarily good for Manitoba. Now that is an economic fact, and the fact is - the fact I'm trying to drive home, Mr. Speaker, is, that changing technology is making for increasing concentration of industry. This is a historic fact in the automobile industry. In 1919 how many automobile companies were there? Twenty-five, 35, 50? Names that have long since passed into history. Today we've got three or four major companies - and this is a historical trend.

The other factor that's mitigating against growth in Manitoba is the freight rate structure, and that's a long story in itself. The attitude of the Federal Government is also mitigating against growth in Manitoba, whether you're talking about the industrial development corporation or, I'm sorry, the export development corporation, the industrial development bank, the national energy board, the banking system, or whether you're talking about the Federal Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce. Ninety-two percent of the program money of the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce is spent in Ontario and Quebec, and as long as that department continues to favour the central provinces of Canada, how on earth can other provinces climb up by their bootstraps to try to equal the standard of living, the level of income of Ontario, of southern Ontario, and certain parts of Quebec. And those are some of the historical facts.

What I'm suggesting, Mr. Speaker, is that we have to have a rational approach, it's not a salesman approach that's needed. We don't need another Metropolitan Theatre Summit

CONCURRENCE

(MR. EVANS cont'd) Conference; we don't need the Teddy Boy approach, - we need some new thrusts, and I'm suggesting we've had those new thrusts in the Department of Industry and Commerce. We've helped existing industry as never before. If anything, Mr. Speaker, the money of the Department of Industry and Commerce is going towards helping existing Manitoba industries.

We've got management training programs throughout all of Manitoba. Virden, Minnedosa, Neepawa, Dauphin, Selkirk, Steinbach, Beausejour, and go on and on and on, all over Manitoba. We've had management training programs to help existing Manitoba industry. We've had productivity audits by industry and by region. We have put new life into the Manitoba Export Corporation. When I became Minister, when we became government the Export Corporation was just about dead on its feet. They had no life in it, and they were going nowhere. We revitalized the board and it's doing a magnificent job now. Likewise with the Manitoba Design Institute. Likewise with the Regional Analysis Program, Mr. Speaker, where we involved thousands of people throughout Manitoba to assist us in analyzing the problems of their communities. We involved 75 to 85 communities; we've got their reports; we're examining them; they're not sitting on shelves gathering dust; we're utilizing their suggestions, and we're working on them, and some concrete results have already come to light. We are putting emphasis on Manitoba applied science. We are saying through the Manitoba Research Council, here is money to develop a technique for growing tomatoes in Manitoba all year round, or cucumbers in Manitoba all year round. In regional development corporations they're saying we're allowing them - not allowing them to have freedom. Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is they've got more money from us than they ever had under the previous administration. They've got a bigger budget today than they've ever had.

So how do we cope? And I say, Mr. Speaker, we cope with an intelligent approach, with an approach based on economic research, with an approach that's based on helping Manitoba industry first and foremost. Well, Mr. Speaker, I could go on.

The honourable members were making some reference to a trip that we made to Europe. Well for the information of honourable members their former Minister of Industry engaged in many such trips, and the evidence is available, and there's all kinds of headlines, "Spivak Says Manitoba Out to Woo the World." "Britain Sees Manitoba on the Move." Here's all stories about Mr. Spivak, or the Honourable Member from River Heights, now the Leader of the Opposition, former Minister of Industry making trips hither and yon. I'd like him to explain to us all of his accomplishments from his trips, and how much it cost him to make those trips.

The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that we visited last fall for example five countries and someone said, well what good does it do? Well let me give you one little example, and it's not so little. The Czechoslovakian Government after we visited them and made contact with them, sent their buyer to Manitoba to tell us that they needed oil seed and they placed an order --(Interjection)-- Well now listen to this. This is a fact.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. EVANS: And you can check it.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: ORDER. If the Honourable Member from Minnedosa wishes to make a contribution I'll recognize him, but in the meantime I wish that he would keep quiet in deference if not to the gentleman that is speaking, but to the Chair so I can hear what's going on.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: ORDER PLEASE.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, the Czechoslovakian trade mission to Canada paid us the courtesy of sending their chief buyer of oilseeds to Winnipeg to inform us personally that they place an order of between 5 and 6 million dollars for oilseed grown and raised in the Province of Manitoba. It's a small amount, five to six million dollars. The Province of Manitoba made contact with the Czech Trade Commission a year and a half ago, a year and a half ago, a year and a half ago, and, Mr. Speaker, today we have Manitoba companies at this very moment doing business in Prague, and I'm not going to go into the detail because I don't want to interfere with their negotiations, but there's some very well known Manitoba companies today who are doing, who are making, who are negotiating for sales of Manitoba manufactured products in Prague, and I am not going to go into any detail because I am not going to jeopardize those negotiations. In the case of the visit to the U. K., we had a, within a matter of weeks we had

CONCURRENCE

(MR. EVANS cont'd) a follow-up visit in connection with our contacts and we reported it at the time, and I haven't got all the information with me but they reported a sales value of \$1 1/2 million based on their particular mission which was related to the contacts made by our own initial mission to the U.K. But I'm not going to go into that in any further detail because we're running out of time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make this point clear. Our policy is not to go about the world chasing CFIs. Certainly we are going to interest foreign investment in Manitoba. We have got two Japanese companies, one building bicycles in Rivers, another one building prefabricated homes in Gimli, Manitoba, but the fact is--you know, I don't know what the former Minister--you know, the honourable members can speak from their seats and be out of order . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Order. Order please. Order please. ORDER! Sergeant-at-Arms, will you escort that gentleman from the gallery.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, the policy of this government is not to go looking for CFIs. The Honourable former Minister of Industry and Commerce told us in public statements and in this House that he looked for 100 companies to build a pulp mill up in The Pas, and I should say, perhaps I was going to say, he finally found one; perhaps I should say they finally found him. And I don't know what part he took in this. He was Minister of Industry for 2 1/2 to 3 years. He was Minister of Industry for 2 1/2 to 3 years . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. Point of privilege. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: The Minister has suggested that I as Minister of Industry and Commerce made a statement. The statement was that I had looked for 100 companies. Mr. Speaker, as a matter of record, I had never looked for any companies at all in connection with CFI. The transaction with CFI was completed before I became a Minister. I think it fair to say that in speeches I presented the information supplied to me, that the government of the day did look for and did examine and went to a number of companies including a list of about 100, to try and sell a paper project for the north, but I as Minister was never involved. The transaction was completed before I was Minister.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, just on the point of privilege, I think that the honourable member is correct in pointing out that he did not seek one hundred companies, but I think that, for the record, that the transaction in terms of the contract continued on during the administration when he was Minister.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order please, order please. There is no point of order or point of privilege before the House. It's a matter of explanation that the honourable member can make as a point at some other time. The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

MR. SPIVAK: The Minister has made representation of what I am reported to have said. That information is not correct and I would hope that he would correct it here in the House and on the hustings as well.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister.

MR. EVANS: Well, Mr. Speaker, perhaps I didn't understand previous public statements made by the Honourable Minister. I'll have to check Hansard and the newspapers, so if he didn't say it, he didn't say it, but it seems to me that while he was minister, somebody for whom he was responsible for, I understand nobody, no one for whom he was responsible for looked for a pulp and paper company to build up at The Pas, nobody looked for it while you were the Minister of Industry and also responsible for the MDF; while you were Minister nobody looked for a . . . Well okay, so you didn't look for it. Well, my understanding was that the Honourable Minister had, or his staff, the staff who were responsible to him, had made a vast search and they finally found Dr. Kasser and Dr. Reiser, but I'm wrong.

SOME MEMBERS: Wrong.

MR. EVANS: So I'm wrong. If the honourable member says that that is not the fact, all right. It was the Minister before him then, Mr. Gurney Evans, who is no relation of mine, not that I'm concerned about that, he's no relation of mine, but the former Minister under the Conservative administration then went out and found CFI, or was found by Dr. Kasser and company. Nevertheless, the point I'm making, Mr. Speaker, is that we are not going to use the taxpayers' money in any hundred million dollar handshakes, as was demonstrated on the front page of the Manitoba Business Journal. We are not going to engage in a so-called disguised socialism that was engaged in under Rex Grose's management of the MDF. There is lots of

CONCURRENCE

(MR. EVANS cont'd) documentation on that and we can give you facts and figures--lots of documentation on that. What do I mean by disguised socialism? I mean by giving away a great percentage of the people's wealth to get an industry started. So much so, so much so that the private entrepreneur so-called takes virtually no risk.

In the case of Saunders Aircraft, the Crown, the people are taking the risk and it's 87 percent, and it's 87 percent owned by the people - it's not owned by a Dr. Kasser or a Dr. Reiser. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, our policy is not to use Manitoba taxpayers' money to bring in cheap labour. And I've got figures to show the hundreds of thousands of dollars that were committed while the former--and you cannot deny this--he was Minister of Industry and he made commitments to spend hundreds of thousands of dollars, legal commitments in a program to bring in cheap labour into Manitoba, to bring in cheap labour into Manitoba, and I've got the numbers: in 1967, 106 persons were brought in from Italy; in the spring and in the fall 159. I have nothing against bringing in people from Italy but these are people at the minimum wage.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker on a point of privilege. I have no objection to the Honourable Minister continuing with respect to debate. The reference to cheap labour can be interpreted in several ways. If, in fact, he is suggesting that cheap labour is below the minimum wage, if in fact he's suggesting that it's below what the union . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Order please. That is not a point of privilege. That's a difference of opinion. It's not a matter of privilege. The Honourable Minister has thirty seconds to close the debate.

MR. EVANS: Thirty seconds. Well, Mr. Speaker, I didn't realize time was - and I'm sure I won't get any leave from the opposition to conclude. I just want to say this: that it stated that there is a great outflow of people from Manitoba. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, in 1966 17,000 people left Manitoba. In 1969, the year we took office, there was 10,000 people left Manitoba, and today there are much less - there's still an outflow of people but much less than there was at that time and, Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Leader of the Opposition can make all the sarcastic remarks he likes about myself personally, but I do understand how our economy works, I do know the problems we are faced with, and I'm proud of the economic progress that the Province of Manitoba has made while I have been Minister of Industry and Commerce.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable member's time is up. The only way a question will be answered is by unanimous leave. The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, following the Minister of Industry and Commerce in irrationality, is like following a burning fuse in search of an explosive. You never have long to wait. And we certainly didn't have long to wait tonight for him to compile a record of irrational statements, contradictions and sheer stupidity, the like of which this House hasn't seen for a long time. It started out by attempting to make an attempt . . . Polish speech and I don't want to comment too much on that, other than to say that the members of this government are noted for the frequency at which they are being misinterpreted. Never in the history of governments throughout this country have we known a group of ministers to be so misinterpreted by the press as honourable gentlemen opposite are. The Minister can solve that particular problem very easily by simply tabling the document in question and then there would be no doubt as to what he said, but . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Will the Honourable Minister state his matter of privilege.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, on a matter of privilege, perhaps the honourable member was asleep, but I stated explicitly and clearly and concisely and truthfully that I spoke from rough notes and there is no copy of any documented speech, so now he keeps on insisting that I should table, and therefore, Mr. Speaker, he is assuming, he is implying that I have made some mysterious speech for which I have a copy thereof and that I am not prepared to table it, because there is simply no notes to table, and therefore the honourable member should do me the courtesy of recognizing that and stop this innuendo which is common of that particular member.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Industry and Commerce started out by saying that the notes that he used were prepared by some innocuous member of his department,

CONCURRENCE

(MR. JORGENSON cont'd) and I'm sure that the honourable gentleman in his department will be happy to know that--will be happy to know that he is as innocuous as the Minister claims he is.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Minister.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, on a matter of privilege, I stated quite clearly, concisely and the honourable member must have been asleep, that I did not use those set of notes.

MR. SPEAKER: The Member from Morris.

MR. JORGENSON: The Minister said that they were prepared, that there were some notes prepared for him by an innocuous member of his department, and as I was about to say, I'm sure that that member of his department, whoever he is, will be happy to learn the description that has been attached to him by his own Minister. Then he went on a little further in his remarks and said that the notes that were prepared contained some innocuous differences of opinion, and I suppose that it was those innocuous differences of opinion that the Minister was misquoted on. Well, Sir, it is interesting to listen to him in describing his search for Polish investment into this country, and I find this rather a contradiction. What has Polish investment got that American investment hasn't got? What is so attractive about Polish investment in Manitoba that American investment couldn't do just as well? But honourable gentlemen opposite rail away because Americans are prepared to invest money in this country, and yet they'll go out of their way to search out other countries than the United States to invest into Canada, and I've always found this somewhat of a contradiction.

Well, Sir, the Minister started out his remarks by making some references to CFI, and there were occasions when his comments became pretty caustic, as he can get, as honourable gentlemen opposite can get when they are discussing CFI. But one thing that they have never pointed out, or seem to want to choose to ignore on this whole question of CFI, and that is the fact that a relatively small amount of the total amount of money that was passed out through that consortium or complex or whatever you want to call it, was distributed by the previous administration, something like \$14 million. The remainder was passed out by honourable gentlemen opposite, and if they thought that the investment in the project was such a bad one under the terms of the Development Corporation Act, and I suppose that it would be necessary to--no, I don't think it is necessary to remind honourable gentlemen opposite, the section of that particular act which gave them the authority, notwithstanding any arrangement or any agreement that had been reached, that gave them the right to stop payment at any time that they felt that there was something that was wrong, and only my friends opposite are in a position to say why they never stopped payment if they thought the project was such a bad one.

But then we hear from the First Minister and in a news report, which I presume now they will want to discredit or they will want to deny, a Tribune report of January 12, 1973, in an article in that paper the Premier said that he would have started CFI, and so they condemn it on the one hand, thinking that perhaps there is a possibility that they might be able to attach some wrong-doing to the project, to the previous administration, and then when the price of lumber started to go up and there appeared to be an excellent chance of that project making money and becoming a viable project, they decided that they couldn't very well condemn it if it was going to be successful, so the Premier says that he would have started CFI. The Premier, Ed Schreyer, today said that if the previous Progressive Conservative administration hadn't developed pulp and paper facilities at The Pas, he would have undertaken a similar project - and now they can't have it both ways.

But honourable gentlemen opposite are pretty adept at straddling the fence on many issues, pretty adept at attaching blame to everybody else and attaching credit to themselves for all those things that they wanted to take credit for. It's rather interesting to listen to the Minister talk about what he described as the biggest dinner that was ever held in the Province of Manitoba, at which there were some promotional activities taking place for manufacturing investment in this country. It is rather significant that as a result of that event, or as a result of the efforts of the previous Minister of Industry and Commerce, manufacturing investment went up by 21.3 percent in 1970.

The following year when my honourable friends opposite took over, manufacturing investment dropped by 39 percent. The following year it dropped by one percent, and the following year, 1972, it dropped by 1.8 percent. So all the talk of the Minister in his efforts to attract industry to this province seems not to have produced the kind of result that he so gushingly

CONCURRENCE

(MR. JORGENSEN cont'd) refers to every time he arises in his place. He, I note, notwithstanding his admonition to the press that they must come in here and listen to him, and notwithstanding his admonition to members on all sides of the House that they must sit quietly and listen to him, I note that he has disappeared. He delivered himself of his speech and then flew the coop.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister has made a great deal of talk about how the government intend to, and I'm referring to an article that appeared in the Winnipeg Free Press, the 28th of December, 1972, entitled, "The Government will lure Industry into the Rural Areas, says Evans." Mr. Speaker, I don't intend to read the article other than to point out that the Minister in glowing terms describes how his government are going to establish industries in rural areas across this province. I happen to come from Morris, Sir, and when the Minister was talking about all those areas that his government had developed, or had assisted in developing, he very pointedly and significantly omitted to mention the name of Morris and for a very very good reason.

A MEMBER: Why was that?

MR. JORGENSEN: And I don't think that I want to re-enter that debate because the facts are well known, and been well documented. No wonder that the members of this House, on this side of the House at least, take with somewhat a grain of salt the Minister's gushing remarks about how he is developing the rural areas of this province. Because we know that insofar as activity is concerned there is a great deal of movement but very few results.

Now, Sir, when the Minister first took over as Minister of Industry and Commerce one of the remarks that we heard from him on frequent occasions was that his government were not going to have any part of this crude growth stuff. Somehow or another - they had some economist friend I presume that gave them that terminology - they were going to develop selective growth. Jobs that were going to be high paid, jobs that were going to contain a high degree of proficiency and education, but what do we find, Sir? We find this last year the government are patting themselves on the back and extolling their own virtues over the fact that they're able to put people to work cutting willows, and that is really selective growth; picking up paper under the snow and bending nails. Now that you must admit, Sir, requires all the selective skills that you could possibly imagine. This government has come full circle, and I wonder where the selective growth has gone to.

Another rather interesting comment that the Minister made while he was speaking was to say that in modern technology today it was possible for very very few farmers to produce all of the food that is required for a hungry world. It's rather interesting to hear him make that statement, while on the other hand the Minister of Agriculture and the First Minister, and other Ministers of the Cabinet, are talking about how they're going to maintain the family farm, how they are going to insure that there are going to be thousands and thousands of farmers left on the farms. What a contradiction, Sir, when you have on the one hand the Minister who can say that with modern technology we don't need any more farmers because very few farmers can carry on the work that needs to be done. On the other hand they say they're going to keep on the farm, and I find that a little bit difficult to reconcile those opposing views.

Well, Sir, one could go on. One could continue to find contradiction after contradiction in the statements made by the Minister, promises unfulfilled, hopes unfulfilled, and a level of performance on the part of the Minister that has produced the slowest rate of growth that the economy of this province has ever seen. The results are here for all of us to see. They're borne out not by the statistics but borne out by the need for the government to continue to find makeshift employment opportunities in order to prevent the manpower of this province from going on the welfare rolls and the unemployment insurance rolls. Sir, the fact is the measure of the performance of this government in my view leaves a great deal to be desired.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I have some comments I'd like to draw to the attention of the House regarding the Minister's resolution of concurrence. After listening to the eulogy of the Honourable the Minister tonight I am forced to rise to my feet and ask him only one barefaced question about all these glowing things he talks about Manitoba, and I'll just ask him to name me one thing that he's done in Roblin constituency. Just one, one thing, and if that gives him some problems and he happens to choke up on that one, Mr. Speaker, I'll ask him what about my neighbouring constituency to the south - Birtle-Russell. Can he name me one

CONCURRENCE

(MR. McKENZIE cont'd) thing he's done in Birtle-Russell? Let's move north - Swan River. Can the Minister of Industry and Commerce stand up in this Legislature and give me one example of something that's happened in Swan River? No he can't, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, instead of that we find examples as we see from his annual report is the first, the number one picture that you'll find when you open this great document is Flyer Coach, and that is in the record, Mr. Speaker, that type of industry is well known.

Picture No. 2, Mr. Speaker, is Saunders Aircraft Corporation at Gimli, and we well know the history of that experiment, Mr. Speaker.

And then comes the Regional Analysis Program, and I certainly was one of the people in rural Manitoba, Mr. Speaker, that was most interested in this Regional Analysis Program especially as it affected my constituency. And I don't know, Mr. Speaker, maybe something has happened in yours but nothing has happened in mine. We have seen no records, we have seen no people bringing the feedback of what they have planned for us, what they have in mind for the constituency, what did the program show? As I stand here today, Mr. Speaker, they're still waiting for the results of the Regional Analysis Program in my constituency.

Mr. Speaker, it just makes one wonder as you leaf through this document and listen to all the glowing philosophy and the glowing economic terminology that the Minister can so ably put together in this brief document. The Manitoba economy of 1971/72 is a most interesting column to read, for he says, "The highly diversified industrial and commercial sector of Manitoba's economy which allowed a great stability in the economic life of this province under anti-inflationary pressures." I wish he'd explain me that one. What anti-inflationary pressure that this government has exerted during their four years of office. And he goes on to say, "It clearly provides an even stronger base in the expansionary phase which is evolving at the present." Now, Mr. Speaker, that's quite a statement for a Minister of Industry and Commerce to make in this province, and I can't back him up no way because nothing has happened in Roblin constituency. I can't even talk about inflation, the inflationary factor in my constituency, because basically I can't see that Industry and Commerce has done anything to stimulate the economy one way or the other.

Mr. Speaker, and it moves over and he in glowing terms talks about agriculture and he makes some great statements about agriculture. "Agriculture is Manitoba's most important primary resource base." Well we all know that, Mr. Speaker. It's also the second largest producer of growth producing industry with regard to value of - both value of production and employment. And I support that philosophy.

But I wonder, Mr. Speaker, what happened to the development that got off the ground in my constituency where the local people put up 20,000 bucks of their own hard-earned money to try and develop a rapeseed crushing plant in the Town of Grandview, and I'm sure the Treasury members over there well know what happened to that one. When they got their finger in the pie, and when they got monkeying around with it, and the Minister tried to get it into Brandon, by that time my friends in Roblin constituency, who devoted \$20,000 of their own hard-earned cash, got so scared and found out that there was no way they could co-operate with this Minister of Industry and Commerce, no way that they could co-operate with this government, so the whole thing went down the drain. Down the drain; \$20,000 of local people's money. All we asked was the co-operation of the government, and that plant is still needed in this province today. And I'm sure it's going to be built some place someday.

So, Mr. Speaker, how can the Minister of Industry and Commerce stand up in this Chamber tonight and make charges, and make allegations of all the glowing things that's happening in this province, when he can't give me examples of one thing that's happened in Roblin constituency. Not one.

Mr. Speaker, and again we'll not go into some of the trips that are mentioned here, but I wonder if the Honourable Minister could give us some information of how the RAP Program is completed, the studies, and how the program is working? The Phase 2 part of it, I believe, is well under way. Oh, the Minister has spoke, that's right.

Mr. Speaker, with those few remarks I'd just like to put it into the record that I was very disappointed in the Minister of Industry and Commerce, very disappointed that nothing has happened in my constituency; not one solitary thing has the Minister of Industry and Commerce done in Roblin constituency during his four years in office. It is a regretful situation to stand up in this House and make a statement like he made about all the glowing things

CONCURRENCE

(MR. McKENZIE cont'd) that's happening in this province when unfortunately nothing happened in Roblin constituency.

MR. SPEAKER: Resolution passed.

Resolved there be granted to Her Majesty a sum not exceeding \$2, 011, 800 for Labour.

Resolution passed?

SOME MEMBERS: No.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I am taking the floor not to speak on the motion, I'm taking the floor to move . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Well may I first of all determine whether Labour passed.

SOME MEMBERS: No, no.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the department has not been voted on. That is correct. And I move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture, that the House do now adjourn.

MOTION presented and passed.

MR. SPEAKER: The House is now adjourned and stands adjourned until 10 a. m. this morning. (Wednesday)