

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Tuesday, April 27, 1971

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

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

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed I should like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the gallery where we have 125 students Grade 7 Standing of the John Henderson Junior High. They are under the direction of Mr. Starr, Mrs. McDonald and Miss McTavish. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable the Premier and also the Speaker of the Legislative Assembly. On behalf of all the honourable members of the Legislature I welcome you here today.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q. C. (Leader of the Opposition) (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the First Minister. I wonder whether the First Minister would indicate whether he is prepared to take leadership and meet with Premier Davis and Premier Bourassa on the possibility of import restrictions by one or other of the provinces against the goods of the other being brought into the province.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. EDWARD SCHREYER (Premier) (Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, I realize that it's an important matter which the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition is referring to, but I must point out simply to remind him that the position taken by the Government of Manitoba is well known, it's been repeated a number of times. The Honourable the Minister of Agriculture and the Attorney-General have made submissions, both written and verbal, to the governments of Quebec, the Government of Canada. We are following that up with appropriate constitutional legal action to bring the matter before the courts and I really wonder whether anything would be gained by following the suggestion of the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. I wonder if he could indicate to the House whether the government has arrived at a decision to provide cash compensation to the fishermen who cannot fish because of mercury pollution?

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

HON. SIDNEY GREEN, Q. C. (Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management) (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, representations were made to the Minister of Fisheries, Mr. Davis, in Ottawa Thursday last. Mr. Davis has indicated that his department will absolutely reject any form of cash compensation that does not involve a program such as has been presented by the Province of Manitoba. The Province of Manitoba program which would provide a full income maintenance program for fishermen is in the hands of the Federal Government and we are awaiting their approval of it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: A supplementary question. Is the Minister suggesting that if the Federal Government does not come through with a partial or whole payment towards this compensation that the provincial government will not offer compensation on its own?

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

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the fact that the Federal Government which is responsible for fisheries in this country would not come through with an income maintenance program such as they have indicated they would in the past year is to me an unthinkable thought.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Agriculture. I wonder whether he could indicate whether the Federal Government has offered a contribution to the cash acreage payment to be made by the provincial government?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Minister of Agriculture) (Lac du Bonnet): I think that my answer

(MR. USKIW cont'd.) to that has to be a reference to the statement made by Mr. Lang some month or so ago wherein he stated that he was going to offer a cash payment of some \$1.40 to \$1.50 an acre.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: A supplementary question to the Minister of Agriculture. At the time that the acreage payment was proposed by the government and passed by the Cabinet was the plight of the fishermen considered at that time or not?

MR. USKIW: The plight of all people in need in Manitoba are considered at all times, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs. -- (Interjection) -- Order please. Order please.

HON. HOWARD R. PAWLEY (Minister of Municipal Affairs) (Selkirk): Mr. Speaker, further to my . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I would suggest if the members are interested in making a statement they take their proper turn. The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, further to my undertaking last night I would like to table and to distribute to the members of the House the Manitoba Housing and Renewal Corporation Housing Program for the 1970-71 period.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. GORDON W. BEARD (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the First Minister. Has he received an answer in respect to his request to freeze the sale on the naval base at Churchill?

MR. SCHREYER: Not yet, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOUGLAS WATT (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I address a question to the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. I wonder if he could indicate to the House how many persons were licensed to proceed with fish farming last year who were unable to receive a supply of fingerlings?

MR. SPEAKER: You're asking for statistics. I think that's a question for an Order for Return. The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. ARTHUR MOUG (Charleswood): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Minister of Urban Affairs. Now that the government has the budgets of Greater Winnipeg municipalities, based on the 1971 budgets how many municipalities would show an increase and how many would show a decrease under the proposal of urban reorganization?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q. C. (Minister of Finance) (St. John's): Mr. Speaker, the last budget was received this morning and I'm not in a position to reply to the question asked except that I haven't really checked any in particular and I haven't really looked at Charleswood so I can't say. But I would say that there is some indication that there have been some attempted or proposed changes which may well come as a result of all the discussions we've had up to now.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. MOUG: A supplementary question. How many municipalities that are governed by the Act missed the April 15th deadline to submit their budgets to the Department?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: I'm speaking now from memory. I think that only about three complied with the legal deadline of April 15th, maybe four but a smaller number. I should say that Winnipeg and Metro which were not by law required to do so were the first two to come in and showed the greatest cooperation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. MOUG: Would the budget that you received . . .

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary?

MR. MOUG: A supplementary. Was the budget you received this morning governed by The Municipal Act or was it a city charter?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: I'm glad that question was asked because he's quite right. The one received this morning was not covered by The Municipal Act. The last one received was received I think on Friday but I was out of the city from Wednesday night on and I knew there were three or four due at that time so they may have all -- those required by law to file with

(MR. CHERNIACK cont'd.) the Minister of Municipal Affairs who should be answering the questions because incidentally, Mr. Speaker, not one as far as I have been able to ascertain, not one of the municipalities other than Winnipeg and Metro complied with my request that the budgets be sent to me for review. What they did was to comply with the law and send them to the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

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

MR. EARL McKELLAR (Souris-Killarney): Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Is the Minister aware that Canadian General Insurance Company Branch Office in Winnipeg with a total of 32 employees and an annual payroll of over \$250,000 . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Would the member state his question.

MR. McKELLAR: I am asking a question.

MR. SPEAKER: I haven't heard it yet.

MR. McKELLAR: Is the Minister aware the Canadian General Insurance Company Branch Office in Winnipeg with a total of 32 employees and an annual payroll of over \$250,000 have announced . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Order. The honourable member is reading a statement after saying "Is he aware". I don't know whether it's of concern to this House whether the Minister is aware or not. Would he please state his question if he has one.

MR. McKELLAR: Is the Minister aware they have announced yesterday that they are ceasing to do business in Manitoba?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs and it's in respect to the Canadian General Insurance Company employees. Will these employees be offered positions with Government Insurance Corporations because I understand this is one of the many companies that are pulling out and I want to know if these employees will have an opportunity to apply for the jobs with the government insurance.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. PAWLEY: They'll be in the same position as others in that they will be in a position to apply for positions. To the present time to my knowledge very few of the employees for that company have actually applied for positions but certainly they will be in the same position as any other person when it comes to the filing of applications for the positions.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs.

HON. BEN HANUSCHAK (Minister of Consumer, Corporate & Internal Services) (Burrows): Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the Public Utilities Board Annual Report for the year ending December 31st, 1970.

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

MR. McKELLAR: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct another question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Has the government decided who will be writing re-insurance for the Manitoba Automobile Insurance Corporation?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. PAWLEY: I think the honourable member -- I had difficulty . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order. I didn't introduce the Minister yet. I wish he would wait. And I don't know whether I can introduce him until he stands up. The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. PAWLEY: I think the honourable member's question was re-insurance and who is going to be writing the re-insurance? No decision has been arrived at.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Matthews.

MR. WALLY JOHANNSON (St. Matthews): Mr. Speaker, I have a question to direct to the First Minister. In view of the fact that a Mr. J. Don Grant apparently President of the Manitoba Chambers of Commerce has stated that this government has a . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Would the member state his question. Order please. I should like to remind the members that I am quite aware when a question is being placed and when it isn't. Those who enjoy stating questions maybe may get more enjoyment out of writing the question out a hundred times or so then they could see it. Order. The Honourable Member for St. Matthews.

MR. JOHANNSON: Mr. Speaker, in view of the statement made by the gentleman I

(MR. JOHANNSON cont'd.) referred to does this government have a list of industries which it plans to nationalize after it's completed the takeover of the auto insurance industry and is the International Inn one of those companies?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, to answer the honourable member's question I can say that I am aware of the statement made by the past president of the Chamber of Commerce and take this opportunity to say that no such statement exists, that in fact I have to regard that person's statement as being completely inaccurate, a wild exaggeration and quite stupid actually.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: My question is for the First Minister. I wonder whether he could indicate the nature of compensation to be offered to those agents who will have had their living taken away from them as a result of the government going into the monopoly Auto Insurance Corporation?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I've indicated on a number of occasions in the past and my colleagues have as well that this question is one that will be put before the Transitional Assistance Board when it commences operations in, hopefully, a short period of time from now.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: A supplementary question. I take it that the Transitional Adjustment Board has not met.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, the Transitional Assistance Board would have had no actual cases to deal with as yet.

MR. SPIVAK: A supplementary question to the First Minister. Was it not an undertaking by the First Minister that such a board would in fact be in operation and meeting prior to this session coming into force?

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, it's a matter of timing. The fact remains however, that there would be no actual cases for the board to treat as yet.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. BEARD: Well if the Leader of the Opposition has a subsequent question I was going to . . .

I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. In looking at the list that's placed before us I don't see anything for the small areas of the north such as Ilford or Wabowden, those places. Will there be housing in that area for Metis, Sir?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. We'll have the answer after this interlude.

ROYAL ASSENT

MR. SPEAKER: We, Her Majesty's most dutiful and faithful subjects, the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba in Session assembled, approach the Honourable the Administrator with sentiments of unfeigned devotion and loyalty to Her Majesty's person and government and beg for the Honourable the Administrator the acceptance of this Bill: (No. 11) an Act to authorize the expenditure of moneys for capital purposes and authorize the borrowing of the same (1).

MR. CLERK: The Honourable the Administrator of the Government of the Province of Manitoba doth thank Her Majesty's dutiful and loyal subjects, accepts their benevolence and assents to this Bill in Her Majesty's name.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD (Cont'd.)

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, I would have to take the honourable member's question as notice, so that I can provide him specifically with the information requested.

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

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the First Minister. With respect to the hearings which are to open soon on the Churchill Forest Industries receivership, could the Minister tell us when the hearings will begin and, secondly, will he consider broadening the terms of reference so that the Board can hear all sides of the question up until the date of the receivership. In other words, the previous government and this government's actions with respect to the receivership action.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, to answer the second part of the question first,

(MR. SCHREYER Cont'd.) it's my understanding that the terms of reference are very broad and certainly broad enough so as not to preclude the study of the very matter that the honourable member is referring to. With respect to the date by which the enquiry commission can commence its full and formal hearings, I will have to take that part as notice.

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: A supplementary question by way of clarification, Mr. Speaker. It is my understanding that the terms of reference do not allow what I have requested and if they do not, will the Minister insure that they will?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I'll undertake to look at the terms of reference again but certainly the intent was to make the terms of reference quite broad and I believe we have. However, I will have a very close reading of it again.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. J. R. FERGUSON (Gladstone): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to direct my question to the Minister of Agriculture and ask him how many Veterinary Clinics are at the present time in operation in Manitoba?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I think my best approach would be to take that as notice other than to guesstimate if that is sufficient for my honourable friend opposite. There are somewhere in the order of twenty in process at the moment.

MR. FERGUSON: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Are there sufficient vets available to fill the operating clinics?

MR. USKIW: As far as I am aware, at the present time there are. I can indicate that there has been a recruitment program which resulted in some five new ones coming into the province in the last month or so and we are very active in that particular area, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the First Minister, and I should like to ask him - my question is based on the statement by the Supreme Court that the Manitoba Egg Marketing case will be brought before the Supreme Court on May 31st and I would like to ask him if he can assure the House that Manitoba will be properly represented at that hearing on May 31st.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, it goes without saying that the Province of Manitoba will be properly represented.

MR. JORGENSEN: I wonder if the First Minister could indicate who will be representing the Province of Manitoba?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. A. H. MACKLING, Q.C. (Attorney-General) (St. James): Mr. Speaker, as the honourable member may know, we were forced to the position of taking, because of the adversary position that is recognized in the Courts, of proposing the legislation to be vires of this government and therefore before the Supreme Court; we are charged with a conduct of upholding or appealing the decision of the Court of Appeal and that is the responsibility of this government to see that that is placed before the Court. We are satisfied, however, that arrangements have been made for an attack to be made on our position; in other words, that there will be people there ably represented, upholding the decision of the Court of Appeal.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: Another supplementary question. I would like to direct this to the First Minister. I would like to ask him if in order to make sure that Manitoba's legal position is properly placed before the Supreme Court, that he would insure that the Minister of Highways would go along with the Attorney-General?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. LEONARD A. BARKMAN (La Verendrye): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Minister of Youth and Education. Apparently legislation has been passed in Saskatchewan whereby students who will be employed as farmers during the summer months, will get half of their salaries paid by the government. Is any such legislation contemplated with this government?

MR. SPEAKER: The Minister of Youth and Education.

HON. SAUL A. MILLER (Minister of Youth & Education) (Seven Oaks): Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of the program referred to by the honourable member. I will investigate and find out what is being done elsewhere.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm not sure whether I should address my question to the First Minister or the Minister of Agriculture. The question is - is the Federal Government through its Crown agency the Canadian Wheat Board, prohibited from selling wheat to countries that are party to the Bretton Woods agreement, for currency other than U.S. or American dollars?

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, I'll take that question as notice.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Honourable the Attorney-General. It relates to the distribution of addictive and unauthorized drugs in Manitoba. Has the Minister through his department been able to establish any clear connection between organized crime and the distribution of such drugs in the province?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, in answer to the question, the prosecution of narcotics in Canada is a Federal matter in accordance with the constitutional arrangements entered into some time ago. However, in connection with the administration of justice generally, the RCMP whom this government employs, as had the previous administrations in the past, are very watchful of the connections that possibly develop from time to time in connection with certain types of crime, of which narcotics sale is one, and I have assurances and have received assurances from time to time, that although crime in this area is organized in the sense that there is purpose and planning associated with it, there have been no direct linkages found to such organizations as are usually associated with that term "organized crime".

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question. Has the Minister initiated through his department any studies or research specifically directed to the establishment of whether or not organized crime is in fact involved in the distribution of drugs in Manitoba?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, in answer to the question. We have not initiated any course of police activity, other than the continuation of the efforts of the police who maintain a continuing concern in this field, to determine any linkages with organized crime; that is, organized groups of criminals in this particular field.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. BEARD: I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Labour. Do you have any agents in government that would be able to indicate whether there are jobs available for students at Manibridge in the Wabowden area or Ruttan Lake?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, the applications are received by the Department of Education. The Department of Labour has not any specific agents at the points mentioned by my honourable friend, but if he would contact either myself or the Minister of Education we would be more than pleased to process any individuals that he may have desirous of work in the general area.

MR. BEARD: Then a subsequent question. I wonder if the Minister of Youth and Education could indicate whether there are jobs available in these two areas for students?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Youth and Education.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I am unable to say specifically whether there are jobs in any of these two locations. If the honourable member will discuss this with me, I'll be glad to convey to the department his interest in the matter, and if there are vacancies or jobs I'm sure they will be looked into.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce. I wonder if he is aware that there will be further layoffs of employees at CAE aircraft industries in Winnipeg. And I have a two part question: Is he negotiating with anyone at the present time to contract some work to keep this base viable and when is his delegation going to Ottawa to meet with the Minister of Transport?

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

HON. LEONARD S. EVANS (Minister of Industry & Commerce) (Brandon East): Mr. Speaker, in answer to the question I should say that we are being kept fully informed of the situation with respect to this company and their employment program. My department has been in continuous touch with Ottawa and as I indicated yesterday, the Minister of Labour and myself will be in Ottawa on Friday coming, to discuss this with the appropriate officials of the Federal Government.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. R. (BUD) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Youth and Education and ask him whether the reams of "situations wanted" ads by jobless university students appearing in the daily newspapers these evenings are related to the work being undertaken by the government student employment service and office?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Youth and Education.

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, the student placement office is busily at work. We have hundreds and hundreds of applications that are being processed as rapidly as possible. We are also waiting word of the Federal government's program in this area of employment and hope that by the end of the month we will know from Ottawa what programs are acceptable in Manitoba.

MR. SHERMAN: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Would the Minister undertake as soon as possible to advise the House as to how the program undertaken by the government this year in that sphere compares with the success or relative success it enjoyed last year?

MR. MILLER: I hate looking into crystal balls, but I can say with certainty we'll be ahead of last year.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the Honourable the Minister of Education. How soon can we expect the report on the Public School Finance Board?

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, I'm told that the report should be with us within the next week.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, before Orders of the Day, I wish to place on the table, the annual report of the Department of Agriculture for the year 1969-1970.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. WATT: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to rephrase through you, my question to the Honourable the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, in such a manner that statistics will not be involved. My question to the Minister: Would he consider those persons who purchased licenses last year to fish farms and were unable to get a supply of fingerlings, to allow them to proceed this year on last year's license?

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

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'll consider the question.

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Attorney-General. In view of the fact that at the NDP leadership convention in Ottawa, four out of five candidates, including the successful candidate, have publicly stated that they are for the legalization of marijuana, will the Attorney-General be relaxing the vigor of enforcing the present laws with respect to the use of marijuana?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I take it that the honourable member is suggesting that as a policy on his part. That is a question of policy that will be decided. There has been no change in policy.

ORDERS OF THE DAY - MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

MR. SPEAKER: Orders for Return. The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. INEZ TRUEMAN (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, in March 1970, an Order for Return worded in the same way as this one was accepted by the Minister and replied to during that session. It is my hope that by assembling similar data now concerning the past year's family planning programs it will be possible to determine whether an adequate effort was being made to bring family planning services to all citizens and whether the Legislature could then give expression to its support for the Minister in the expansion of such programs. If the data did not reflect serious efforts in this request, then members would have had an opportunity to debate this during that department's estimates.

Many members of this House have spoken with great concern for the stress that is being placed on our environment and the too rapid expenditure of our natural resources. It should hardly need to be pointed out that the size of the population is an important factor in the demands that are being made on the ecology, and the attitude of these members towards family planning would indicate their sincerity regarding the whole problem of our environment.

(MRS. TRUEMAN cont'd.)

There have also been many expressions of concern with the skyrocketing costs of education. These costs are related to the number of children in the educational system and the numbers of taxpayers covering the costs of that education. With our present high standards of living generally and of education particularly, it is quite obvious that the community cannot afford to have as many children per family as it had in the past. I've often thought how helpful it would be to calculate the cost to a family to bring up a child to the age where he would become a contributing member of the economy and also a parallel study of the cost per child of the services now provided by the state such as Medicare, hospitalization and education; these to be balanced off against the actual contribution by the parents by way of their taxes. I think we would all like to see the children brought up in a situation which would give them an even break with everyone else. It would be easier for a couple to judge how many children they should properly bring into the world if they had such information.

Within the past year I believe that all members of the Legislature have received a list of recommendations from the last Indian and Metis Conference, and in case the Minister of Health and Social Development has misplaced his I have a copy which I would be glad to provide for him. It is because of these recommendations that the last item on the Order for Return was written in and this is the question of whether any action has been taken on the Indian and Metis Federation's recommendation (that should have been "Conference") recommendation that the province implement a community health work program and that family planning be intensified and expanded. I realize that this is a subject of some debate and difference of opinions even within the Indian and Metis community. However, at any time when such a list of recommendations is provided for me, I take them seriously and I believe that all members of government should.

Family planning, by definition, means planning births so that every child is a wanted child by a father and mother who are willing and able to take the responsibility for caring for him. It also means the spacing of births in such a way as to safeguard the health of both mother and child. In other areas of Canada governments have been active in providing for family planning education and services to a greater extent than we have in Manitoba. In 1967, the City of Montreal had provided for a dozen family planning clinics within that city; Ontario had encouraged its 43 local health boards to open clinics within the public health units. The encouragement for providing such services within the health units of course means that the necessary finances have to be made available. It's impossible to secure the extra staff and the special equipment that's needed unless the funds are forthcoming.

Family planning, Mr. Speaker, is a most important weapon in combatting poverty and it's the best way of relieving society of much of the burden of its chronic problems. Low income and large families lead to the probability of that family having to resort to some form of public assistance. The pressures and frustrations in such families often result in family breakdowns, physical abuse, child beating, alcoholism, illegal abortions and desertion of families. Among the poorer people in our community, particularly those on welfare, the birth rate, according to figures determined within the City of Winnipeg Health Department, was 1 1/2 times that of the population generally. It is necessary to ensure by way of educational programs and availability of facilities that these people are given the opportunity to control their families as do others. It has been indicated that for every one dollar spent on family planning centres, we would save \$25.00 in welfare.

Another important reason to expand knowledge and family planning is to help people who are passing on a genetic or hereditary disease. They may have a real fear of producing another child if they have produced one who has an incurable condition. Now, only a generation ago it first became possible to operate successfully on blue babies. These first babies are now at a reproductive age and time will tell whether they are going to pass on their congenital defects to their children in turn. I think we have to consider seriously the plight of a family that has one or two children with cystic fibrosis and their tremendous fear of producing more children with the same condition, and the fear that their children if they do not have the disease will in turn pass it on to the second generation regardless.

There are many good reasons to expand knowledge and facilities so that they are available to all of our population, not just to those who on their own initiative go to their family doctor. Unless the necessary funds are put forward by our own government then this would not be possible.

(MRS. TRUEMAN cont'd.)

It's been said that good family planning programs could save a million and a quarter dollars to the taxpayers of Manitoba per year. I feel it is an obligation on the Minister to provide the members of the House and through them the citizens of Manitoba with the information that has been requested in this Order for Return.

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

HON. RENE E. TOUPIN (Minister of Health & Social Development) (Springfield): Mr. Speaker, when this Order for Return was presented the indication was that it was not acceptable for the following reasons: On the first question, "What provincial funds are being applied to family planning programs in 1971?" This will be presented during the estimates of the Department of Health and Social Development very shortly. "How much money is involved?" This will be part of the budget, equally, of the estimates of the Department to be presented to this House. "In what type of programs is the money being spent?" This will equally be spelled out during the estimates if the honourable member so desires. "What requests for family planning activities have been received by the Provincial Government?" That will be revealed during the estimates. There are still some to come for 1971, I've been told. Not all . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Unfortunately, it was an oversight on my part. The Honourable Minister has already spoken on the motion indicating that he was refusing the Order for Return. -- (Interjection) -- Last Monday, the 12th, I'm sorry for not calling this to the attention of the Minister sooner.

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members. Order. The question before the House, on the proposed Order for Return by the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

A STANDING VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

YEAS: Messrs. Beard, Bilton, Craik, Einarson, Enns, Ferguson, Froese, Girard, Graham, Henderson, G. Johnston, F. Johnston, Jorgenson, McGill, McGregor, McKellar, McKenzie, Moug, Patrick, Sherman, Spivak, Watt, Weir and Mrs. Trueman.

NAYS: Messrs. Adam, Allard, Barkman, Borowski, Boyce, Burtniak, Cherniack, Gonick, Gottfried, Green, Hanuschak, Jenkins, Johannson, Desjardins, McBryde, Mackling, Malinowski, Miller, Paulley, Pawley, Petursson, Schreyer, Shafransky, Toupin, Turnbull, Uskiw, Uruski, Walding.

MR. CLERK: Yeas 24; Nays 28.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. In my opinion the nays have it. I declare the motion lost. I would suggest to honourable members the rule states there is no one to move or to speak when a vote is being taken.

The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. BARKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I was paired with the Honourable Minister Without Portfolio. Had I voted I would have voted for the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: Order for Return on the Honourable Member for Charleswood. The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. MOUG: Mr. Speaker, this Order for Return is basically just information on the employment situation as it stands, in item No. 1, and our concern is just to know the amount of people that are looking for jobs that are available at this time and are unable to find something to do. No. 2 of course deals with the number of jobs created by the public sector in the province during the past twelve months. I think it's important that we should know that to see how our industry and commerce is progressing. And No. 3 dealing with the private sector, of course, lets us know how corporate investment is going into our province and if we're moving ahead in that area. No. 4, the number of jobs that will be required between April 1st, 1971 and March 31st, 1972. It's hard of course to give an accurate figure on this but it's something that I'm sure there's some department working on at the present time.

The number of student jobs is always very important to us in the province. We have the universities emptying very soon and a good many students looking for jobs. This is the age group that can't afford to be out of work. At this time it's the first opportunity for a good many of them to acquire work and to go out and get it. The out-migration from the province during the past twelve months is also important. We know the in-migration is strong in some areas. If the jobs are good and there's a bit of pork barreling going on then we have in-migration. -- (Interjection) -- That's agricultural.

(MR. MOUG cont'd.)

The unemployment, Sir, I'm sure has increased in some sections of the year, particularly January, February and March, because the welfare has doubled in our particular area in January, it increased by 50 percent in February and pretty well doubled again in March. Welfare is fine for anybody if they need it and there's no other way but I don't think anybody wants to accept it just for the sake of accepting welfare. The labour force of the province in mid March was 370,000 people, two-thirds of them are men and one-third women. Employed at that time was 346,000 and unemployed 22,000, so there's a real need for jobs to be put together and made available to these people. I think that the numbers are cut down in the province on account of the minimum wage. I don't think there's any government, whether it's this one or the previous administration, that has any intention of a man going out making a living to establish a home or whether he's just doing it to pay his room and board, there's no way he can do it off \$1.60 an hour; it's impossible. Sixty-four dollars a week just don't -- it doesn't go the way the economy is. If that minimum wage is lowered and left at a reasonable figure -- I had the opportunity to go into a lot of warehouses, restaurants, grocery stores in 1947-1948. I was delivering a linen supply to these different places and you would notice that there was physically and sometimes mentally handicapped people that were working there and it was a job for them. And I'm sure in today's economy that some of those warehouses would still have these people, they'd be quite willing to pay them \$40.00 a week. That person could take home that \$40.00 and it helps his family put towards supporting him. There's no way he can do it at sixty-four, but now he's unemployed. This job is not available any more. They'll replace two of this type of person that's possibly physically handicapped with one man at \$1.60. So I think that this has an effect on the unemployment of today.

There is distributor services. I've noticed just in the past year and a half since the increase from \$1.25 up to \$1.60 the distributor trucks are just disappearing off the roads. These people were the type that couldn't find other jobs with higher money and now they've gone on our welfare roll and of course the post office could pick it up and do it cheaper than the new minimum wage is forcing the distributor to charge. I think with the postal rates, the Federal Government talking about increasing postal rates to eight cents on first class mail, that this is going to help this situation and we'll see our distributors back in operation. But I don't think it is the intent of this government to expect anybody to earn \$1.60 and establish a home or even pay his own room and board. If he's living with his parents or some relation or if he's rooming downtown here with perfect strangers, there's no way that he can do it on \$1.60. So I think that when they're shuffling the minimum wage around they should certainly give this consideration. I think that's all I have on this, Mr. Speaker. I'll let it go at that.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Minister has already spoken I must advise him. -- (Interjection) -- Order please. The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour) (Transcona): Would my honourable friend permit a question, Mr. Speaker? -- (Interjection) -- Well I have to have permission under the new order in this House and I would like to ask my honourable friend whether or not he was advocating a reduction in the minimum wage in Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. MOUG: I have to say to you that the reason - the minimum wage going up to \$1.60 creates a lot of unemployment. It takes the physically and mentally handicapped and puts them in a position where they cannot get these jobs around warehouses, restaurants, stores and distributors, distributors of handbills -- there's a lot of dollars taken in and handed out to these people that are capable of earning \$1.25 but there's no way that these people can get them the other \$15.00 taking them from \$50.00 on a 40-hour week up to \$64.00, and this creates a section of unemployment.

MR. SPEAKER: Has the Honourable Minister of Labour another question?

MR. PAULLEY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, a supplemental question. I'm sure my honourable friend is aware that the minimum wage in Manitoba is not \$1.60 at the present time. I'm not predicting what it might be. It is \$1.50.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I would like to hear the Minister's question.

MR. PAULLEY: My question, Mr. Speaker, to my honourable friend is: Is he advocating a reduction from \$1.50 of the minimum wage in Manitoba?

MR. SPEAKER: The question was asked before. The honourable member didn't . . .

MR. PAULLEY: I didn't receive an answer.

MR. SPEAKER: I agree. The honourable member doesn't have to answer. The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. MOUG: . . . Mr. Speaker, this Order for Return was for me to try and get some information from the government side of the House. The shoe is on the other foot now. He's looking for information from me and I haven't got very much information believe me. But I say to you that when the minimum wage is increased it forces a certain segment into the unemployment ranks, and whether you like to believe that or not I've given you instances, I happened to be in a job at one particular time, it's over 20 years ago, where I was going around to these places where they were hiring these people, and these people . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable member isn't answering the question. Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order in accordance with our Rule No. 100. You, Sir, in your wisdom indicated that because when the Order was first asked for by my honourable friend the Member for Charleswood you indicated a moment or two ago that I spoke to the question. The matter was referred for debate to Private Members' Day, and may I in all due respect, Mr. Speaker, refer you to our Rule No. 100 found on page 43 of our Rule Book which says "that for the purpose of sub-rule 1 an indication by a Minister that the government (a) accepts an Order for Return or an Address for papers; or (b) accepts an Order for Return or an Address for Papers subject to conditions; or (c) does not accept an Order for Return or an Address for Papers, shall be deemed not to be a debate of the motion for the Order of Return or the Address for Papers."

It would appear to me, Mr. Speaker, that an interpretation of that would mean that the mere speaking as to acceptance on the conditions or rejections does not preclude the Minister speaking at that particular time from taking part in something that is not a debate, because it was not a debate, and in all due respect to your ruling, Mr. Speaker, that I had taken part in the debate, may I respectfully suggest that you take under consideration and advisement the terminology as expressed in Rule 100 of our rules respecting Address for Papers and Orders for Return.

MR. SPEAKER: I thank the Honourable Minister. I shall take this matter under advisement. -- (Interjection) -- That is correct.

The Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney.

MR. McKELLAR: Mr. Speaker, just a few words on this Order for Return. I remember so well when the government were over on this side of the House that they led us to believe they had all the answers and when they were appointed the government, what did they do? They appointed boards, boards, commissions, and they even hired consultants, and where did they get some of the consultants from? They got them from Toronto, they got them from Toronto. Mr. Speaker, I think it's only right and proper that if we are going to have consultants come from Toronto to study the Insurance Corporation, bring in facts and figures, that we should hear what they have to say. I don't think we've really heard their story yet and that's one reason why I want to ask for this Order for Return.

Also, too, we heard when the government were on this side of the House that they had all the answers to the Nelson River and I'm sure that they have all the answers now and I think it's only right and proper that we should hear from their consultants on this very important subject matter what they're going to do with South Indian Lake and all matters feasible to Lake Winnipeg.

Mr. Speaker, I think it's only right and proper that this Order be accepted and as soon as possible tabled so that we may use this information to speak on the very important subject matters that are going to come before this House at a later date. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I agree with my honourable friend the Member for Souris-Killarney when he indicated that on a number of occasions when members of this government were on that side of the House that similar requests were made of the then government of the day headed by the Honourable Dufferin Roblin or the Member for Minnedosa. But I'm sure my honourable friend is quite aware of the line of action and response taken by my honourable friends opposite, which is just the reverse, just the reverse of what my honourable friend is saying now, and I want to say to my honourable friend, I want to say to my honourable friend that having the knowledge of that I'm somewhat surprised that he would introduce such an Order

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.)for Return. We accepted the reasoning and at some times I will admit the past administration in some respects were rather reasonable, and it, I must confess, Mr. Speaker, was the exception rather than the rule, but we did accept on a number of occasions for Orders for Return of this nature, the arguments of the then government that studies were under way, that studies were of such a nature that could not -- and I repeat -- could not be produced readily because they may have been prejudicial to the administration and to other agencies as well. And my honourable friend, the Member for Souris-Lansdowne now completely reverses himself and suggests by his Order for Return that we should do what in their wisdom and in their judgment -- and again, Mr. Speaker, I say in some instances they exhibited some judgment and this was one of the cases. For what does my honourable friend ask for? A list of all reports and studies commissioned by the government, its boards, commissions, to external consultants. In those days - not too far away, less than two years - his government said until such times as the reports are of a nature that they can be tabled and revealed, we hold it to ourselves until we have an opportunity of considering the same.

I'm sure my honourable friend well remembers the arguments that took place on Southern Indian Lake and the Task Force pertaining to the same, and how my honourable friend and his colleagues at that time wept bitter tears because we had the presumptive gall (in the phraseology of the former administration) to dare ask for such information.

Going further regarding the Order for Return of my honourable friend on Number 2: "A list of all reports, studies undertaken within Government Services since July 15, 1969." Here again, the Chamber literally was flooded with the tears of the previous administration that we dare even to suggest that the government of the day should reveal the contents of reports and studies of an internal nature. -- (Interjection) -- Yes, the flood gates are open and we are an open government but we also recognize that until such time some of the reports are finalized and considered they should properly be contained within the government - and that is not what my honourable friend is asking, Mr. Speaker. I'm sure that my honourable friend, the Member for Souris-Killarney if he would just reflect -- and it wouldn't take too long for my honourable friend to reflect that his request is an improper one.

And then "the number of preliminary" - get this, Mr. Speaker, because this is most interesting - "the number of preliminary and/or final reports and studies received in each category to date." Picture if you will, Mr. Speaker, a return to two or three years ago with such a request from the then members opposite and headed at that particular time, or led by myself.

And then, Number 4: "The number of reports and studies pending in each category to date." Why, how ridiculous! We didn't even have the gall -- and I guess we did have gall - lots of gall that's right. I admit that we had gall but we never had the gall to request of government answers to such - I almost said "asinine questions" as I have before. I know I can't say "such asinine questions" because I may run foul - it may be unparliamentary, but I doubt it.

But anyway, Mr. Speaker, the sum and substance of what I am trying to say is that the government cannot accept the Order for Return in its present form. I agree with my honourable friend. If my honourable friend wants to reconsider some of the questions that he proposes, we are an open government, and if we have any reports that we can properly lay before this House, whether they're routine reports or otherwise, we will so do. It will not be necessary, may I suggest, for the members now opposite to go through all of the lengthy debate and rejection of the previous administration, and in particular I again reply and refer to the position that was then taken by the Honourable Member for Lakeside in respect of reports on Southern Indian Lake and other reports that were allied to it. For I well recall, Mr. Speaker, my honourable colleague, the Minister of Finance, pleading with the government to table reports, and as I say, the tears oozing out of those beautiful eyes of my honourable friend, the Member for Lakeside, saying that we could not produce them when at the same time, or almost coincident with that, the reports were being published in the likes of the Winnipeg Tribune. -- (Interjection) -- That's right. And that group that I was with over the weekend, the latter part of last week, will replace the present administration in Ottawa as we replaced your Opposition a few years ago.

So anyway, Mr. Speaker, the sum and substance of what I'm trying to say is -- (Interjection) -- Baby Broadbent? - his message came through. So anyway, Mr. Speaker, the government cannot accept the Order for Return from my honourable friend, based on what I have said and also that there has been a precedent established in respect of some of the questions by my

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd.)honourable friend's colleagues when they were the administration of the day.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, after hearing the Honourable Minister of Labour replying to the request, I can't help but get on my feet. I feel that this is quite in order. They're just asking for a list of the reports, not the actual reports, and there's no reason in the world why you people can't give us a list of those reports. We're spending the people's money of this province for investigations, enquiries and so on and only one-half of the Legislature's members are able to know what's in those reports; the other half is to sit here and pass judgment whether you're doing a job, whether it is right, whether money is well spent and so on. How can we say it's well spent? I imagine in many cases it will not be well spent if you're afraid to table these reports. I think that's just what it is.

Why did the government have a consultative firm check on CFI before they forced it into receivership? I certainly would like to know and what is in that report? Did it recommend that such action be taken? Surely not. Here we're spending millions and millions of money and we on this side of the House are not to know whether such a report was made and is available? Why shouldn't the members on this side know? The Minister says that the previous government set a precedent in this connection. Sure enough I was part to the party on this side that pleaded with the government of the day at that time to table some of the reports that we knew were there and that we didn't get, and I feel to this day that they should have tabled them, that this was not a correct action on their part. And now you're going to do the same thing? Now you're going along and do the very thing that you told the government at that time was wrong and that they should table those reports? What a government! I thought we had an open government now, an honest government that really wanted to do the best for the people of this province, and here we see it's closed; it's not open at all.

I was surprised at the last remark that the Minister made about their Ottawa Conference. They mentioned at the conference that their new leader was a conservative socialist. This is a new term. I thought the present government in Ottawa was a conservative socialist party, the Liberals. This is actually conservative socialist, and now we've got a second conservative socialist leader in Ottawa. So I think at some future date I'll be having some more comments to make on this particular matter at a more fitting time. But honestly I feel that this government should accede to this request; it's just a list of the reports, it's not the reports themselves.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): The Honourable Member from Rhineland has taken a little bit of the edge off when I stood up before. I was all ready to say that we have just been treated in the House to one of the Minister's famous oratorical reviews on the basis that "I've got to get off the topic because I don't want to do it; let's get on another subject."

That's the point that he was trying to bring out - he was trying to say that we were asking for reports and nowhere in here does this Opposition ask for reports. And I can be very well assured and assure you that you don't want to give this information because you've obviously got more boards, commissions going on in this province than ever was before, and a list of all the reports and studies undertaken with Government Services since July 15th, 1969. Have you got so many that you don't know what's going on? It's pretty obvious that there's some answer here like we got from the First Minister to the Honourable Member from Fort Garry one day. He said I wouldn't like to have to set up a group to study what we are doing. Now really!

The Honourable Minister has just gone through a long dissertation of saying we didn't provide reports. Nobody on this side has mattered a damn about the reports; we'll have the reports when they're there. We're just asking for the reports that are in process at the present time and the government is afraid to give them because there are more boards and commissions going on in Manitoba than ever were before, so why they would turn this down I'll never know, Mr. Speaker. But please, please if we're going to have any more speakers from the government side, let's stick to the point.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

MR. EVANS: Well, Mr. Speaker, it's not my intention to discuss this matter at any length. I, for one, do not feel, as honourable members opposite do, that it's some great sin to have a board in existence or to have an additional commission or an additional agency in existence. What it does indicate is that this government is concerned about problems that are

(MR. EVANS cont'd.)facing the people of Manitoba and it's prepared to do something about these, whether it's a Law Reform Commission or whether it's a commission to investigate welfare costs or whether it's a board or commission in the field of education, or no matter what it is, let's not be sucked into the misconception that boards and commission are barren and useless. That is not the case whatsoever.

But frankly, Mr. Speaker, with all due respect to the honourable member who has introduced this motion for an Order for Return, the question is certainly very very vague indeed. He asks for a list of all reports and studies undertaken within the government service as well as reports and studies commissioned by the government or by any of its agencies, commissions or boards to external consultants. The fact of the matter is, and this is something that is not necessarily peculiar or special to the Manitoba Government, it is true of any Provincial Government or Federal Government in Canada. At any one day, at any one point in time, there are virtually hundreds and hundreds of studies and reports being prepared within the government service as well as by outside consultants. This is the process of government. Honourable members opposite who previously were in government surely know that before you make any policy decision or make any representation to this House that a considerable amount of research has to go into the matter, and consequently reports have to be prepared, have to be considered by the Minister, have to be considered by Cabinet or committees thereof, and consequently what we are doing in effect is asking, frankly, for a list of all the research and all the study that is going on within the government service with regard to every ruddy thing that occurs within government, from Agriculture through to Attorney-General's Department, through Tourism, through Highways, through Education, through Industry and Commerce and so forth.

I don't know myself what some of these reports may be. For all I know there may be a study in agricultural research on the sex life of the tsetse fly, who knows? But the honourable members across apparently want to know, they want the name of the study if such a study exists and the fact is, without doubt, that the honourable member does not realize what he is asking for. He, in effect, is asking for a list that is going to tell him, even if you do list the titles of the studies, is not going to tell him that much and in fact is going to cause many hours of time, many many dollars of the taxpayers' money to provide something which has very little, if any, use to the honourable members and I agree with my colleague the Minister of Labour that this is really a useless Order for Return. It's far too vague, far too general and it's an expenditure of the taxpayers' money on a very useless type of exercise.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

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

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. TRUEMAN: Mr. Speaker, I would ask leave to have this matter stand.

MR. SPEAKER: (Agreed) The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for River Heights that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing the following information pertaining to the strike against The Hudson's Bay Mining and Smelting Company, Flin Flon; Motor Coach Industries, Winnipeg; or any other Industry whereby welfare payments were made to striking workers:

- (1) the number that have applied for welfare benefits as a consequence of these strikes;
- (2) the number of such applicants who have received welfare benefits; and
- (3) the total number of dollars paid out to date for such benefits.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I can deal with this in very short order. The Order for Return is I think very straightforward and asks for what I would consider to be by the Department of Health and Social Services information that would not be too difficult to ascertain and provide and I don't mind at all indicating to the government, Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this particular order. There have been occasions, I suppose, where Orders for Return have been submitted for which we seek on the Opposition side various bits and pieces of information and then want to use in our own strategy in approaching, in developing an attack on the government, as members opposite who have sat on the Opposition longer than I have will know full well all about.

(MR. ENNS cont'd.)

However, this is a question that I think is of some concern to the public generally, simply that it's a question where I'm hoping as a result of the answer to ask the government to simply state their policy with the welfare payments in this respect. I would like to know by which criteria and how striking workers, workers who after all go on strike of their own volition qualify for welfare. I make it very clear that at this point I'm certainly not making any suggestion that they not necessarily be given welfare in certain circumstances, circumstances of need, circumstances of destitution, but what we are not getting -- I would not have quite frankly put this Order for Return in had the Minister given me a straightforward answer on what specific basis and to what extent this is occurring in our province - are striking workers receiving welfare.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that this is something that we shouldn't just gloss over, it's something of concern to all of us, to the taxpayers at whole, to labour and to management, in the sense that is this going to be a stated policy of this government to pay striking workers welfare? In that case of course, I suppose that it would be in order to press through the rank and file of union workers to see that the unions charge them less in union fees, because it would of course not be necessary to build up strike funds as have been in the past. On the other hand, perhaps management has a legitimate concern in this respect insofar as a good portion of their tax dollars are involved in the general assistance of welfare programs that are being supported by a government at large, and how this money is being used.

So, Mr. Speaker, my purpose in introducing this particular Order for Return is to hopefully engender a debate on the question, the principle of paying welfare to striking workers, and I would ask the government to seriously consider providing the information requested as a basis to begin this debate.

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

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Honourable Member for Lakeside would permit a question? I'm waiting for your . . .

MR. ENNS: Certainly, Mr. Speaker.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the honourable member would also consider that it would be a similar problem if an employer did not permit his people to come to work until they worked for reduced wages, as to whether that constitutes a problem in terms of whether the Welfare Board should treat the families in need as a result of that circumstance.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, there are many things that constitute problems and difficulties in our society. We have tried, as the government tries from time to time, in solving or finding solutions to them. I have merely attempted to find a solution to this particular problem that seems to be rising.

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

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, I have spoken on this when I said we would not accept this Order for Return. Am I allowed to make a few comments?

MR. SPEAKER: I have that matter under advisement. The problem exists, according to our rules, that if a member has spoken he doesn't get the opportunity again. I can't rule on it because I want to take it under consideration, so we'll just let that matter pend as well. Unless another Minister wishes to debate the question.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, the only thing I was going to ask is whether the debate on this issue will now stand open, that it's not held by anybody?

MR. SPEAKER: Yes it will.

MR. ENNS: Excuse me, just on a point of order, for clarification. The Honourable Minister indicated that he already has indicated to the House that he rejected this Order for Return. I just now moved it a few minutes ago, as I know I'm the first person to speak on it and unless my mental telepathy hasn't been functioning properly then I'm at some loss, because I would hope that the debate will continue.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I think there is a bit of a confusion there. The Honourable Minister of Health and Social Development probably is in error as to which question he is refusing; so therefore I would suggest that he can go ahead and debate this question at the present time.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Tourism and Recreation that the debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. BARKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie that an Humble Address be voted to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor praying for copies of any correspondence and agreements between the Province of Manitoba and Plains Agra-Corp. Ltd.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister . . . Order please. I'm in the midst of taking a vote.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, we beg your indulgence. I know that you were taking a vote, but I believe that the Minister wants to make an indication with regard to the question. I believe that the Minister had wanted to make an indication with regard to the government's position on the Order, and we would ask leave of the House to permit him to do so.

MR. SPEAKER: Granted. The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Mr. Speaker, the matter before us is a subject which we are not prepared to accept at this time for reasons of legality; we are not sure as to whether we will be involved in the courts on this issue and I just want to indicate that we cannot at this time get involved in a debate on the subject matter.

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I find the Minister's statement rather strange as we look back to the events that have taken place. It is my understanding that the facility is now up for sale, and surely, Mr. Speaker, the members of this House and the people of the province have the right to know what has transpired in an agreement between the representatives of the people and a group of private citizens, and for the Minister to say that there is confidentiality or there is some reason for not giving this information is very strange.

If the matter were before the courts or if there was a negotiation going on now between the Agra corporation and the representatives of the province I could accept the Minister's explanation, but I certainly cannot accept his explanation when the government of the day have concluded its business with Plains Agra-Corp. and have put up publicly for sale the facilities, and I find that this is, well, highly irregular that the government would even think of denying this information. It was public monies involved, the government has an obligation to not only explain but also to table all the correspondence and documents so that we can judge as to whether or not their course of action was correct or not. We certainly would like this information although the government has just denied it through a Minister. We would ask them to reconsider it and give this information. The information belongs to the taxpayers.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, on that same question, I would like to know from the Minister just how did the government acquire this property and how are they now in charge or being able to sell it? Did the other party - pardon -- (Interjection) -- well I think then someone else on the government benches should answer to some of these questions, because we were not aware that this would not be granted until leave was given that the Honourable Minister could make that statement, and certainly I think an explanation is due. Certainly we know that this is not before the courts, and if it is not before the courts then we have every right to know as members of this House what the situation is. Because if that were the case they could say this probably on everything that we wanted to know and get information on, that this is a pure assumption at the present time, and therefore it can't stand. Did the government acquire the property through a Quit Claim deed? Did the Agra-Corp. just turn the property back over to the government or on what basis did they acquire it, or is there an agency of the government that is trying to dispose of these properties at the present time?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, really it's a question of clarification and I'm rising on a point of order. Did the Minister indicate it was because of a pending lawsuit, because of the possibility of a pending lawsuit is that a suggestion of why he can't . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: Can I answer that question, Sir? I said that the matter is likely to be before the courts. It has been indicated from both sides that that is where it is going to rest for the time being.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Well I don't want to in any way take away from my opportunity to talk on this; my purpose is only to find out if it is before the courts at this time. But I am going to

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd.) ask leave for a question to be asked of the Minister.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources on a point of order.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. The Minister spoke three speeches ago and the fact is that the member now wants to have a question period with the Minister, and I appreciate that he is really seeking information. On the other hand, I also appreciate that if you start these kinds of precedents with regard to waiving away from the rules, we will start having question periods in the middle of debates. Therefore I think that if the honourable member wishes to make his point by means of a debate he can do so if he wishes to . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The point is well taken. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

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

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

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

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I just wish to rise on a point of order with regard to the Order Paper questions, because the last one, in spite of the previous discussion on it, the last one proceeded in the same way. I believe that what is supposed to happen is that the mover of the question puts it, a minister on this side of the House gets up and says that it will be accepted or rejected and that's all; and once that has happened the debate can then be led off by the person who put the question. For instance, on the last motion I think the Member for Carillon — La Verendrye — it was Carillon before; it shows you that I'm . . . in the past — the Member for La Verendrye should have had the right to introduce his position, and furthermore the Minister should not have been in the process of making a speech, he should merely have said yes or no, and I wonder if all the members agree that what I'm saying is correct and that we proceed in that way in the future.

MR. SPEAKER: I thank the Honourable Minister. I would agree with him that this is part of our procedural problem, and of course I think the attention of the members hasn't been with each resolution that has come before us and this is why we have also got into a dilemma.

. continued on next page

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for LaVerendrye.

MR. BARKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Assiniboia, that, an Humble Address be voted to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor praying for copies of any correspondence, agreements, and consulting reports between:

1. Government of Manitoba and the companies making up the integrated forestry complex at The Pas since June 25, 1969.
2. Between the Manitoba Development Corporation, formerly the Manitoba Development Fund, and the companies making up the integrated forestry complex at The Pas since June 25, 1969.
3. Between the Government of Manitoba and the Manitoba Development Corporation, formerly the Manitoba Development Fund, relating to the companies making up the integrated forestry complex at The Pas since June 25, 1969.
4. Any other documents between the Government of Manitoba, or the Manitoba Development Corporation, formerly the Manitoba Development Fund, to any individuals or companies, relating to the integrated forestry complex at The Pas, since June 25, 1969.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

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

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the honourable member will permit us leave to indicate our dealing with the question until next day.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, this address for papers was filed following the announcement by the First Minister of the development at Ruttan Lake by Sherritt Gordon Mines. During the course of the announcement, the First Minister indicated that questions such as the total assessment that was to result from the joint development by the province and the company would result in a new procedure for the operation of mining communities and the establishment of towns associated with the mining communities. In pressing for answers on this, the First Minister suggested that an Order for Return be filed with respect to the many topics that are mentioned and including the agreements between not only the government, but also between the Hydro and the Manitoba Development Corporation, if any existed. In turn, Mr. Speaker, this procedure was followed and the address for paper was filed, and then we found that the First Minister advised that he was not prepared to accept the address for paper to provide the information that was requested for here.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I asked that this be set over until today, Private Members' Day, so I could say a few words about this. I think that this development, first of all, is extremely important because it does involve a new departure in the establishment of townsites associated with mining developments, and it is important to all members of the House to know what sort of an agreement is entered into because it does involve public funds and it is a new step that involves something different than has gone on in the past, so I feel that the government is being less than open by refusing to provide us with copies of the agreement between it and the mining company, copies respecting the arrangement with regard to the townsite in particular, the servicing of the community with highways, with a road, the servicing of the community with hydro, the servicing of the mining operation itself with hydro and, if it in fact exists, any arrangements between the Manitoba Development Corporation and the company with regard to establishing its operation.

Now furthermore, Mr. Speaker, in his reply in the closing of the Throne Speech Debate the First Minister dwelt on this topic at some length as well, and I think it has to be mentioned at this time. In his reply to the Throne Speech he said, and I want to quote: "You know, it's significant, Mr. Speaker, that in the entire period of the Conservative administration of the province there was not one major resource development announcement other than the CFI announcement of 1966. That certainly did not come during your time." I don't know what that was. "Not once during the administration of my honourable friends opposite were any negotiations entered into with respect to the development of a mine, nor of a mining community, and I defy my honourable friend, I challenge him to pretend to say otherwise. It's as simple as that."

Now, Mr. Speaker, this can't help but breed a certain amount of incredulity in members of the House to make a statement of that sort, and making a statement of that sort begs for an answer. And I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that for members opposite, such as the Member for Radisson, that we perhaps go down the list and see if the First Minister has in fact done

(MR. CRAIK cont'd). . . . anything but throw up a smoke screen in making a statement of that sort, or is he in fact that unaware of what has been happening in northern Manitoba over the period of years? Not that the previous administration can take credit for it, but simply that the Province of Manitoba, whether it is at the assistance of the government or of private enterprise or whatever it may be, whether or not in fact it has had no development during the previous, as he said, eleven years or so prior to the announcing of Ruttan Lake.

Well, first of all, I think we should go over starting with 1958 when the shaft was sunk for the Chisel Lake development. The value of the resources in Manitoba at that time was \$33.7 million production; it was estimated at \$33.7 million. The mines in operation were Hudson Bay at Flin Flon; Snow Lake; San Antonio; Sherritt-Gordon at Lynn Lake. In 1959, the Thompson project commenced, which would be about the equivalent stage, I suppose, that the Ruttan project is in 1971. Intensive prospecting occurred in the nickel belt and in that year the value of mining production was at \$27.8 million, a slight drop until it got into production. It was going down during that one year at least. 1960-61, there was a reconnaissance, a very large reconnaissance program took place. There was exploration at Thompson, Chisel Lake, Stall Lake indicated the probability of a major new find. Exploration concentrated at Snow Lake, Sherridon, Southern Indian Lake, Lynn Lake and the Bird River area in eastern Manitoba, and the development took place at Thompson and Chisel Lake, and Falconbridge began exploration work in the Wabowden area. The value in 1960 went to \$30 million.

In 1962, Chisel Lake went into production. The value of production in 1962 in Manitoba was \$73 million.

In 1963, the following year, Pipe Lake and Stall Lake mines went into development. Osborne Lake went into development as well. The production went to \$128.8 million in 1963, and in 1964 the first oil exploration began on the Hudson's Bay.

In 1965, the drilling began at Fox Lake. Two new mines were announced by Hudson Bay Mining and Smelting at Anderson Lake and Snow Lake. The value of the production in that year, 1965, was \$144 million. Exploration - expenditures on precambrian work was between four and five million dollars and there were 25 companies active. Two new mines were announced that year: Falconbridge near Wabowden, and Birch Tree mine near Soab Lake.

1967. Pipe Lake came into production. Development work commenced at Fox Lake. The metallic production value of 1967 was \$148.2 million.

1968. The Pipe Lake expected to commence production. H.B.M. and S. operations carried on at Flin Flon, at Schist Lake, Chisel Lake, Stall Lake and Snow Lake and developments at Osborne and Bigstone.

Mr. Speaker, the value of production in 1969 was at \$168.6 million compared to \$33.7 million eleven years earlier, during that period of time when the First Minister made his claim that there were no mining developments in Manitoba. I think if you count them up you'll find that there are 19 new mines, Mr. Speaker, in that period of time. I realize that the members on the government side have a very limited interest in matters such as this. It's evident by the fact that the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources has lost track here and that most other members on the government side, really, I don't think have much of an appreciation of what is going on in the mining interests, with the exception of the Member for Flin Flon, of course, who is very close to it. But, Mr. Speaker, when the First Minister has the, whatever it is, I don't attribute him with having the gall and audacity of making misleading statements such as he accused us of making as he pounded his desk and cursed us for intellectual dishonesty and then stood up and made the statement that in 11 years there had been no major mining developments in the Province of Manitoba, it leads you to wonder whether, in fact, whether in fact the government is aware of what has gone on in the mining industry in Manitoba.

Then we come to the Ruttan Lake announcement. Ruttan Lake, the former Rusty Lake, was first explored intensively in 1960. The major discoveries from drillings were announced in the spring of 1968 and the mine went into production, into development work shortly after that, and what we are having now is our stages of development. What is new about Ruttan is the townsite associated with the mine, and if it is a new development the members of the Legislature should be advised on the details of it. I don't question that it is new but if there's \$7.5 million of taxpayers' money involved in it, this House have every right to know what the details are of that \$7.5 million. This is not a Development Fund loan, I take it; it's a government grant for the development of the town. The government cannot advise us there is no

(MR. CRAIK cont'd), . correspondence and no agreements on this. If there are none, then it would appear that there should be. So I would ask again that they reconsider the rejection of this request for information so that we can in fact see the direction that is being taken in northern Manitoba in the development of our mining communities.

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Churchill.

MR. BEARD: Thank you, Sir. I don't really see too much of a problem in the Ruttan Lake area. I believe — what I felt was the Premier was probably saying this new concept on taxation in that, as I understand it, I think that the buildings, everything on top of the ground is going to be taxed. If this is right, then it's only following what approach was taken in Ontario when they suggested, the government suggested that they were going to tax all the mining industry, then the industry itself came back and said, "Tax us, on those buildings above the ground and we will accept that type of suggestion," and in fact I rather go along with that because I do feel that as long as the companies accept the taxation that we have now in that they give almost grants in lieu of this taxation, then we must say that they feel that they're still getting the best of the deal. If they didn't, they would be coming to government and saying, "Tax us the same as you tax anybody else."

So I think that, according to this then, the approach in the Ruttan Lake is a new one for Manitoba; I can go along with that, and apparently the Sherritt-Gordon Mining Company are going to go along with that. If this is the case, then if immediate taxation takes place, then there should not be too much government money going into the production of the Town of Ruttan. I would hope that at this time that government have been able to iron out a program both with union, I suppose, and with the Sherritt-Gordon Mining Company, where there will be job preference given to those people living in the close area to Ruttan, and I am thinking of this. I think of the South Indian Lake people, Granville Lake people, Nelson House and such on. And I would hope that the union do not get hung up on this and demand the same type of work-day cycle or work-week cycle that is being used in other mining areas.

I think the unions must take a look at this as a new approach, just the same as the company must find a new approach for operating in the north and to operate and use the people of Indian and Metis origin, because to date really I can't see where any of the companies that are operating in the north have been of any advantage, really, to the people that live in the surrounding area, and this is one of the big problems that we're faced with. I don't think it should be put on the company's shoulders but I think the government and union have to come to an agreement in which they can sit with the company officials and find ways and means of using the Indian people, and if Ruttan Lake is going to be a new approach in as far as taxation goes, then I would hope that it will also give the people in the north the opportunity to get those jobs and to grow along with Ruttan Lake area. Certainly it's one of the most interesting ones that are in the area at this time, and it would be much more interesting for the Indian people if they can participate in it, if these companies can use local contractors that are now growing in the north and use the same approach as the Minister of Transportation used in building the roads, in the primary building of roads.

I believe it is being well established now that these people are prepared to work on a contract basis and they will in fact meet the deadline that government gives in respect to contracts in the north. And surely that is all that is being asked of contractors in the south. They've got to produce and produce by a certain date, and it doesn't matter -- the government is not too worried about how they do it as long as they do a good job. And I don't think we should really be too concerned about how the Indians do the job as long as they get it done and meet the specifications of either the government or the company. Certainly Sherritt-Gordon would win a great vote of thanks in the north if they can in fact come up with a program that will give the Indians of northern Manitoba first opportunity at the jobs and not have a blacklist such as was used at Gillam where they were blacklisted because they didn't adhere to the policies of a contracting company, which hurt them, hurt them a great deal, because they couldn't find the work force, an established work force, because they wanted them to do it their way, and I think now in today's society we have come to the position where we've got to accept work on a basis of contracts and deadlines and give the responsibility to these people to go out and work and do it whatever way they wish, but if they can come up with that, meet the deadline, then I don't care. I don't think any of us should worry about how they do it or how they get around to getting these things done. They may be extraordinary. They'll be certainly different to the approach that's taken in the south, but this is only to be expected. These people are in the north, they're the

(MR. BEARD cont'd).... experts of the north, and they're certainly the ones that can produce in the north if called upon. I would hope that, in following with this, we can see reports come back to us on this resolution that will in fact show us that these new approaches have been thought out, and that we will have a Ruttan Lake that will be the real jewel for the north.

MR. HARRY SHAFRANSKY (Radisson): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Flin Flon, that debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: An Address for Papers. The Member for Portage.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: By agreement, Mr. Speaker, this matter was to stand for some time. (Agreed)

MR. SPEAKER: Is it the intention of the House Leader to move on to Private Members' Resolutions?

MR. PAULLEY: No alternative, Sir.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' RESOLUTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The first resolution, standing in the name of the Leader of the Official Opposition. The Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Morris, Whereas private investment and private endeavour is the key to economic growth and the creation of jobs in Manitoba;

And whereas the responsibility for providing the proper climate for investment and economic growth rests with the provincial administration, and the government has failed to provide such a climate;

Therefore be it resolved that this Assembly instruct the Minister of Industry and Commerce to stimulate and promote investment in the private sector;

And be it further resolved that the Minister be directed to give more support to the recommendations and objectives of the regional development corporations in promoting regional economic expansion;

And be it further resolved that the Government of Manitoba give consideration to the advisability of a roll-back of provincial income taxes to a position competitive with our neighbouring provinces.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, this is the first Private Member's Resolution to be presented to the House. (Applause) I only hope that the acting House Leader will be as enthusiastic at the conclusion of my address as he is at the beginning; I am sure that he will. I hope that the Member for Crescentwood will be as enthusiastic as he is at the present time as well. -- (Interjection) -- Well, as I look at him, I think he's enthusiastic.

Mr. Speaker, this is the first resolution to be presented by our party and it's necessary, I think, before I deal with the specifics in the resolution, to explain our basic position with respect to this and other matters to be brought before the House.

It will be my attempt, in this resolution, to deal with the resolution as it stands and to deal with current matters, and to present for consideration alternatives to present government policy, not necessarily policies that we are in full agreement with, but rather items that should and must be considered if we are to arrive at solutions in this Chamber for the economic problems and the various other items that we must deal with in this province.

Now I have two purposes in introducing this particular resolution at this time. The first one is pretty obvious. I do not believe, and we do not believe on this side of the House that Manitoba can continue to have the highest levels of personal and corporate income taxes in Canada. We do not believe that these levels of taxation are necessary for the provision of essential government services in this province.

Mr. Speaker, we have approximately 370,000 people who are employed in this province and I have some of the DBS material in front of me to indicate those who are employed in the private sector and those who are employed in the public sector, and if I may, I'd like to make reference to certain general headings and the statistics which indicate, as of November of 1970, specifically the numbers that are listed in the category to give some idea of the total employment, its makeup and its character. In Forestry you have 70,000; in Mines we have an equivalent of 7,700; in Manufacturing we approximately have 50,000; in Construction we have 16,000; in Transportation and Communication and other utilities we have 45,000; in Trade and Commerce

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd). . . . we have approximately 60,000; in Finance we have 13,000; Community Business and Personal Services we have 88,000; in Public Administration we have 20,000; and in total we have as well approximately 50,000 to 60,000 who are in our agricultural community and in our farming community.

Now, without dealing specifically of the number of people who are employed in public corporations or by government, because we must add to public administration our utilities, our hydro and those corporations that are controlled by government, such as in the transportation field, because part of the transportation is controlled by government through the Canadian National - without knowing the exact breakdown, I would suggest the probability is that between 35,000 in Manitoba to possibly 45,000 people are employed in the public sector; the remaining 335,000 being employed in the private sector, and if we understand this and understand that the proportions are approximately 10 percent who are employed in the public sector, then the resolution and the necessity for the kind of climate which will create economic activity and job formation becomes pretty essential.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that our current tax levels are harmful to development. When the operation of these essentially destructive levels of taxation is combined with a general lack of enthusiasm and ineptitude on the part of the present government in their efforts to promote economic growth, I suggest that we have a very real threat to the future prosperity of this province. But beyond this sort of immediate and obvious objective, I hope by this resolution, Mr. Speaker, that I will serve a second and broader purpose, and that is to encourage the government to look at its whole attitude towards taxation, towards the necessary relationship between taxation and development in our economy.

We are aware, Mr. Speaker, that during this year the Federal Government and the governments of the provinces will be meeting to undertake finally a broad reform of the entire Canadian tax system. Now, the present government of Manitoba has already made some representations to Ottawa on this subject and they no doubt will be making more in the near future, but I hope that through this resolution, through the debate and discussions, that the form and direction of Manitoba's position on this vital subject will be changed to take account of some of the real factors that must be considered in assessing any system of taxation. Part of the background of this resolution is a series of firm beliefs about the nature of our economy here in Manitoba, and some of these beliefs could be described as political or even ideological in nature and others are simple matters of fact, and first - and I believe here that some of my friends on the opposite side would disagree - I have to state our basic position that private, economic decisions and activities of our people are the basis of our prosperity and will be a source of our further development, and the desire of individual Manitobans to earn economic rewards for their activities will be the primary motivating factor in our economic future as it has been in our past.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, and this is a matter of fact, we are not going to have economic growth in Manitoba without investment, and the source of that investment in Canada, in Manitoba and in the United States has historically been the private sector. Manitoba's current tax rate and the structures will discourage investment from this source, but regardless of the source, Mr. Speaker, capital for investment to increase our productive capacity and create jobs for our people is of crucial importance to our economic future.

Thirdly, and this is also a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, not a matter of ideology, the Manitoba economy cannot be viewed in a vacuum. We cannot pursue policies of spending or taxation that pretend that we live on a little economic island. We have a very open economy in Manitoba. We depend for much of our income in this province on exports of our minerals, our agricultural production and manufactured goods, and we depend on imports of capital for much of the investment that is required to develop our resources. Thus to a large extent the limits of economic policy for Manitoba are set by the nature of the whole economy of Canada and by the nature of the economy of the entire world, for the truth of the matter is that we are involved in that larger economy.

This resolution is also based on certain facts about the possible uses and effects of taxation, and I can list some of these uses and some of these effects. Taxation is used to raise funds for government activities. Taxation can be used to redistribute income within a society and to achieve a variety of important social ends. Patterns of taxation may be such as to encourage economic development. Patterns of taxation may be such as to foster and encourage interregional transfers of wealth and productive capacity. Taxation may be designed and

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) administered in a way that will have the effect of defending national and provincial autonomy.

Against this broad statement of the possibilities for a tax system, it is instructive to examine the clear directions and effects of the present government's tax policies. The present government has already raised the corporate and personal income taxes in Manitoba. They claim to be doing this in order to distribute Manitoba's income more equitably but it has the practical effect of discouraging economic development of this province. By inhibiting development, these tax policies tend to perpetuate interregional disparity in Manitoba and these taxing policies will tend to limit Manitoba's income by reducing the ability of Manitoba industries to compete in export markets. And finally, by weakening our over-all economic position, these tax policies will lead to a continuing erosion of our provincial autonomy.

The present tax policies of the government are failing, Mr. Speaker. They are failing in a way that makes it unlikely that the government's announced intentions for social reform will ever be realized, and they're failing because they are based on concepts that were originated in the 19th century and that are not appropriate in Manitoba. They are based on concepts that have been abandoned by almost every developed nation in the world, by those nations Socialist or non-Socialist.

The moral underpinnings of the government's policies are based on the determination to tax the wealth of some mythical group of "anti-social robber barons," to use the Premier's words, some anonymous and inhumane financial octopus. The business firms of Manitoba are small, even by Canadian standards. They are mostly single proprietorships, partnerships or small corporations. The incomes of even some of our senior personnel in this province are not usually large even when compared with the salaries of Manitoba's Cabinet Ministers, and those Ministers, Mr. Speaker, are not plutocrats. But even assuming that these terrible concentrations of evil wealth were characteristic of Manitoba, it's important for us to assess just how effective our personal and corporate income taxes are really taxing wealth in Canada, and it's important to us to trace the real incidence of the burden of this taxation, for personal and corporate income taxes are not succeeding in redistributing wealth in any effective way.

Increases in personal income taxes increase the cost of labour for production. The individual worker, the business executive, or the self-employed entrepreneur all must earn real income, that is, real take-home pay. To do this they will attempt to pass the cost of their increased taxes on to the corporations employing them, and the corporations in turn will pass the costs on in the form of higher prices to the consumer, and it's important to know, Mr. Speaker, that the economically strong members of our society, the organized labourers, the organized workers, the high-priced executives, the owners of plants, will be most successful in passing on the cost of taxation. The weaker ones among us, the pensioners, the unorganized labour groups, will be unable to pass on these costs and they will pay higher taxes; as well they will pay the higher prices for goods that the taxes have created. In the final analysis, those who are economically most powerful, the holders of that very wealth we set out to tax, will be most able to ensure that the costs of taxation will be passed on to the public at large. And the Member for Crescentwood will agree with me. He said the same thing just a few days ago. And that is the measure of the failure of personal income taxes in taxing the wealth in our society.

Corporate income taxes are simply added to the cost of producing goods and services, again raising prices and passing on the cost, and the use of corporate and personal income taxes, those particular forms of taxation that our friends opposite pursue with almost ideological and theological zeal, is rapidly diminishing in importance throughout the world, except, it appears, in Manitoba.

The weight of personal and corporate income taxes has been reduced in all the countries of the European Common Market. The British are in the process of redesigning their tax system and reducing personal and corporation income taxes. The European Free Trade Association companies are also reforming their tax systems along the same lines, and if we look at the list, Mr. Speaker, Belgium, and Holland, Denmark and Luxembourg and even Sweden, Norway, the United Kingdom, Italy, France - shall I go on?

The direction of all these reforms is away from reliance on high personal and high corporation income tax and towards a system of value-added tax as used in the European Common Market. Within the past few weeks, President Nixon announced that the United States is studying the abandonment of its high level of reliance on personal and corporation income tax in favour of the value-added European Common Market tax system. Now, the use of this kind of taxation

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd).....does not depend on political philosophy. It has been adopted in the Soviet countries, in Germany, in Scandinavia; review is under way in Britain and in the United States, and regardless of political posture or ideological zeal, Mr. Speaker, governments have learned that high levels of personal and corporate income taxes are not effective in achieving national, social and economic objectives.

Beyond its failure effectively to tax wealth, and beyond its immediate inhibiting effects on economic development, there is one other major failing of heavy reliance on corporation and personal income taxes. If the world were a unitary state in which international trade did not exist and in which there were no regional or international disparities in the levels of government services or income, things would be a great deal easier and our tax problems would admit of much simpler solutions. But, of course, this is not the kind of world we live in. Everywhere, high levels of personal and corporate income taxes are being abandoned because of their destructive effects on international trade, and I ask my honourable friends on the opposite side to consider the significance to Manitoba and to Canada of the experience of the nations of the European Common Market.

Mr. Speaker, let us understand our situation in Manitoba. Fifty-seven percent of everything we produce is shipped outside of this province, of which 20 percent of what we produce is shipped outside of Canada, either to the United States, to Europe or the Far East. Consider, if you will, the case of two nations, say Holland and Belgium. It may be desirable, from the point of view of the Dutch people and the government, to maintain a higher level of per capita spending for government services than is found in Belgium, but the Dutch people must sell to Belgium and they must buy from Belgium. If, through high levels of taxation, they load the goods they wish to sell abroad with the high costs of their government services, those goods will not be competitive in the international market, and by the same token goods from countries with lower levels of taxation will have a consistent competitive advantage as imports, assuming that there are comparable costs for all factors of production. In this kind of situation, the reliance of a nation on international trade - and Canada is one of the highest per capita international traders in the world - that reliance will compromise the nation's autonomy in selecting suitable levels of government services or the levels of government service selected will compromise the nation's ability to compete in international trade. Mr. Speaker, that has to be applied to Manitoba because this is where we stand in Manitoba today.

Confronted with this problem, the European Common Market shifted from wide reliance of personal and corporate income taxes with their irrevocable effect on the cost of production, to the system of value-added taxation now in use. Under this system, the value added to goods is calculated at each step of production and is taxed at each step. If the goods are consumed in the domestic market, these tax costs are passed on to the consumer. If the goods are sold in the international market, the taxes are forgiven at the border thus allowing the goods to compete more effectively, and imports are treated in a converse way. As imported goods arrive in the country, they have added to their price the level of taxes that would have been imposed had they been produced domestically. Now this system of taxation allows different levels of taxation, different levels of income, different levels of government services in countries without disrupting the competitive ability of workers and industries in the international market. It preserves political independence while fostering economic growth through effective economic integration.

Now let me give one example - a specific commodity - and here, Mr. Speaker, I was almost inclined to include my good friend the Member from Lakeside's mattresses but I decided that in order for the members on the opposite side to understand it fuller and better, we would talk about shoes. Let us deal with a specific commodity. Let us take shoes for our purposes of discussion, which is a particular commodity which is produced at exactly equal cost in two neighbouring countries and then moves freely from one country to the other. Country A may then impose a tax of \$1.00 per pair whether domestic or imported. Country B, with a lower level of government services, may impose a tax of only 60 cents per pair. The result will be that the shoe companies in the two nations will be in an unimpaired competition albeit at sharply different price levels, due to the different levels of taxation in the two. More important than the existence of unimpaired competition is the fact that Country A can pursue social and economic policies that are more expensive than those desired by Country B without damaging the position of its goods in the international market. The economy and the freedom of the two nations are protected. They may undertake quite different policies, with different

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd)....economic and social implications, and yet create no impediment to trade. The revenue produced by this kind of taxation can be sufficient to eliminate the necessity of taxing the incomes of the great majority of people in the state.

Now let's take Manitoba, for example. If a value-added tax were applied, I could envisage the exemptions for personal income tax to a level of perhaps \$6,000. I can visualize corporation taxes being reduced. I can see Manitoba being able to produce goods which could compete more effectively in international markets. I can see Manitoba not having to impose a value-added tax on agricultural production and perhaps not even farm machinery. On resources, Mr. Speaker, whose scarcity requires their preservation and which are in demand, the value-added tax need not be forgiven when exports occur. We could retain substantial revenues by collecting the value-added tax on exports of energy and raw materials, on hydro power, on oil, on coal, on natural gas, on most metals - yes, Mr. Speaker, including nickel - and most important, on paper and forest products. At higher levels, income taxes can be preserved in conjunction with taxes on savings and capital gain in order to ensure the over-all effect is as progressive as desirable, and taxes on the incomes of corporations can be reduced and adjusted to have the most progressive possible effect.

And so we come to the second purpose of this resolution, Mr. Speaker. It's becoming increasingly clear in Canada that Canada, along with other nations, nations like Sweden and the United States, must shortly abandon its reliance on the system of corporation and personal income taxes that we have used, and move instead to some form of value-added tax combined with the taxing of capital gains and savings. We may soon have no other choice. Among our major trading partners, only United States remains committed to high levels of personal and corporation income taxes and even they now, Mr. Speaker, are considering a change. Britain is changing; the European Common Market has changed, as has the European Free Trade Association, and the nations of the.....have also used a form of value-added tax, and that world wide reform of taxation must form the background of any discussion we have about taxation in Manitoba or taxation in Canada. While all the developed nations of the world are moving and changing, the government of Manitoba continues with a higher corporation and personal income taxes.

Now, the present government has already raised our income taxes. Our Minister of Finance has already announced his dedication to the ideas of the Carter Commission, out-dated before it was completed, and its qualified approval of the Benson White Paper with many of its disastrous proposals, all at a time, Mr. Speaker, when Manitoba, of all the provinces in Canada, should be arguing strenuously for abandonment of heavy reliance on corporation and personal income taxes. -- (Interjection) -- Believe me, Mr. Speaker, I doubt if the Deputy House Leader will ever understand.

The government of Manitoba should be going to Ottawa arguing that Canada should follow the examples of the European Common Market so that we can raise the funds we need as we wish, and in whatever amounts we deem advisable. We have seen the failures of our current taxation system in redistributing income, and that is a problem we must attack through government spending rather than taxation and we cannot do that under our current tax structure.

Manitoba, Mr. Speaker, has an open economy. Our prosperity depends on our ability to export competitively. And again, Mr. Speaker, let me repeat, 57 percent of what we produce is exported out of this province, 20 percent of what we produce included in that 57 percent is exported outside of this country. So our prosperity depends on our ability to export competitively, but instead of arguing for a system of taxation that will preserve our ability to compete, our Minister of Finance is urging tax measures that would further erode our position in world markets. If we are to expand employment, create job formation and develop opportunities in the lower income regions of Canada -- and rural Manitoba is one such region, and Mr. Speaker, I give notice to the other side that rural Manitoba and the problems of rural Manitoba and the problems of development of rural Manitoba are going to be discussed throughout this session, because if there is one glaring example of neglect on the part of the present government, it has to do with rural Manitoba, notwithstanding any kind of declaration by the Minister of Industry and Commerce who suggests that he is now going to change Regional Development Corporations to make it a political arm to be under his thumb. Mr. Speaker, I give warning to the other side that rural development in Manitoba is going to be a high priority for discussion this session.

Mr. Speaker, there is a real need for further development of government services and

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd).....for further social development in Canada, but we can't undertake that development until we have adopted a system of taxation that will permit us to set and to pursue our social objectives without crippling the competitive abilities of our farmers and our factories and our workers, and this is true regardless of our political views.

Now, in Canada it is past time when we ought - when we have to, at least - set up a real program of income security and..... acceptable distribution of wealth through a program of government activity - and we could have the freedom to do that, Mr. Speaker. In Manitoba alone we must move to assure adequate incomes for our senior citizens immediately, and we can have freedom to do that. The thousands of Indian and Metis people in Canada and in Manitoba should be provided with an accelerated program of education and training to assure them some degree of broad participation in our communities and our economy, and we could have freedom to do that.

The Progressive Conservative party, the Opposition party, believes in the principle of income redistribution but our conviction is based on the factual knowledge of government, that is, that the genuine income redistribution is accomplished, not by taxation, but by a carefully ordered structure of government expenditures. In fact, the effectiveness of any effort to redistribute income is contingent upon three factors: the spending priorities which the government establishes; the humaneness in which it administers its programs which have been established under the priorities; and the efficiency of government's operation.

I have views on the priorities and income redistribution in Manitoba and I place them before the Assembly for the purpose of discussion. In my view, Manitoba's income redistribution priorities are, firstly, the establishment of a system of minimum income maintenance for all Manitobans, and while I believe the exercise of private, economic initiative is fundamental to the functioning of our society, I am not so arrogant as to suggest or assume that the drive for economic success is the only legitimate social aspiration, nor can I ignore the fact that not everyone in our society benefits from our existing distribution of income.

The reduction of regional economic disparities in order to secure a relative redistribution of economic strength among the various regions of our province, and to ease the strain of growth in our urban areas, is also such a priority, Mr. Speaker. And thirdly, the maintenance and improvement of existing necessary governmental services, especially those which, like education, promote equality of opportunity, is also a priority. What is required in this province is a determined program of expenditure reform. Efficiency in government is essential for two reasons: First, to save tax money; and secondly, to place the increasing number of contacts between government and citizens on a sounder basis. Insofar as improved efficiency means better communication, a more efficient government is capable of being more humane. Now surely, Mr. Speaker, in a budget of over a half a billion dollars, there are..... of savings of 10 percent, or about \$50 million, and the time has come, Mr. Speaker, to actively seek those savings or face the alternative of another tax increase in this province.

Now Mr. Speaker, if necessary we the Opposition are willing to perform the functions of the Management Committee in eliminating the duplication, reducing the redundant programs, and cutting low priority spending. I notice that the Member from Winnipeg Centre has looked at me a little bit aghast - and I repeat our offer, Mr. Speaker. We the Opposition are prepared to perform the function that Management Committee should have been performing in eliminating duplication, reducing redundant functions, and cutting low priority spending.

Some of our objectives can be accomplished now within our existing system of taxation, but no matter how desirable they all may be, the limits of our ability to do them are set by the effects of excessive taxation on our economy, and this is the second objective of this resolution. I hope that the government's thinking on the question of taxation is open enough to recognize the merit, not of my words - that would be too much to expect - but to recognize the merit of the tax changes being made in every developed nation in the world. I hope that my friends opposite can be lured out of their safe and cozy dreams, lured away from cutting down the legendary robber barons. Perhaps now, Mr. Speaker, let's talk about the auto insurance.

The First Minister has talked about the robber barons of the insurance industry. Now surely, Mr. Speaker, what he is really talking about is the robber baron insurance agents. Surely he is talking about the agents who have been up in the galleries, the agents who have been outside in the hallways, the agents who have seen their living taken away from them. Surely they are the robber barons that we are talking about. Surely they are the mythical fat cats whom the members on the opposite side have decided to exploit and to confiscate their living.

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd).....

Now, Mr. Speaker, I hope at least for the members opposite, and I am sorry that the Minister of Finance is not present here, but I am sure that the Honourable Deputy House Leader will refer my remarks to him with his usual dispatch and with his usual advice. -- (Interjection) -- Well, Mr. Speaker, I must say to the Honourable Deputy Leader if he doesn't believe that I have said something I would ask him to read the speech again.

Mr. Speaker, I have offered some concepts for consideration in this debate in an attempt to turn this debate into a constructive discussion of what should happen in Manitoba, given our high personal and corporate taxation, recognizing that alternatives must in fact be discussed, proposed and introduced, recognizing the necessity of Manitoba maintaining a competitive position for its products. Now what I propose may not be a total answer, but I hope it will emphasize three necessities: the necessity of expenditure reform; the necessity of a rollback in taxes or the presentation of an alternative position on taxation; and the necessity of strengthening Manitoba's competitive position in the world economy. And I invite the members on the opposite side and I invite my good friend the Honourable Deputy House Leader, to open a window on the world and participate in a meaningful discussion on tax reform in Manitoba and in Canada.

Now, to return to the first and most obvious purpose of this resolution, Mr. Speaker. The resolution states that private investment and private endeavour are the keys to economic growth and to the creation of jobs in Manitoba. As I have already pointed out, about 10 percent of those employed in the province will be employed by government. The remaining 90 percent are employed by the private sector and may owe their living to the private sector. This has been historically true in our province and even the government's own statisticians can prove that to their own satisfaction. Because our economy is involved in the greater economy of Canada and the world where it is generally true, it's not a circumstance that even the Member for Crescentwood or even his new waffle buddy in the Department of Health and Social Development can afford to ignore. I think.....

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The honourable member has five minutes.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I believe by the rules I am entitled to go beyond 40 minutes, and I refer to Rule 32.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, may I inform my honourable friend he is not speaking on a motion of confidence, he is speaking in his capacity as a private member, and I believe that in accordance with the rules of the House, on a Private Member's resolution he has only the same time length as anyone else, including the First Minister or a Minister of the Crown.

MR. SPEAKER: I thank the Honourable Minister.

MR. SPIVAK: On the point of order.....

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. On the point of order - the Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my purpose on the point of order is to determine this and finalize this so that it will be cleared for the rest of the session. I would refer the Speaker to Section 32, item (1), subsection (1), 32 (1) of our rules: "Subject to sub-rule (2), no member except the Leader of the Government, the Leader of the Opposition, the Leader of Recognized Opposition Parties, a Minister moving a Government Order, a Member making a motion of non-confidence in the Government or the Ministers replying thereto, shall speak for more than 40 minutes in any debate."

MR. PAULLEY: It could be, Mr. Speaker, on your interpretation that we could consider the point raised by my honourable friend. I was referring generally to the Private Member's resolution and how the matter has been handled in the past. I have no objection to allowing my honourable friend to continue. Go ahead.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition carry on please.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, because of the precedent this will set, I assume that I am not being given leave but I am being allowed to continue as I believe I'm entitled to under the rules -- (Interjection) -- Well, Mr. Speaker, if it's a question I would have.....

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I have not made a ruling. I have allowed the gentleman to carry on. I do not wish to make a ruling at this time and until I make a decision whether I want to make a ruling on it we'll just carry on. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition. -- (Interjection) -- There is no point of order on a point of order and we were on

(MR. SPEAKER cont'd)... a point of order. -- (Interjection) -- On the same point of order? The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: Sir, in taking into consideration the point raised by the Leader of the Opposition, if you'll refer to the Index under Private Members' Business, Private Members Business - Time Limit on Speeches, and that is the very section that the Leader of the Opposition referred to on section 32, so one could conclude from that that the rule does state that on private members' business the Leader of the Opposition does have unlimited time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, the resolution goes on to say that the government has failed to create the kind of economic climate where Manitoba can grow and develop in a healthy way, where every Manitoban can have the greatest possible opportunity to prosper and be independent. The First Minister of course will say that it's all the fault of Ottawa. The good things are the result of the NDP Government in Manitoba, but the difficulties, why they're all Ottawa's doing. But that isn't good enough, Mr. Speaker. It isn't good enough when irresponsible statements and actions of our friends opposite have created, I suggest, an atmosphere of uncertainty in Manitoba, where their treatment of a private endeavour is offhanded and inept, and it isn't good enough as long as members of this government are more deeply concerned with their search for the robber barons and for privileges, more deeply concerned with practising broader patronage than has ever been practiced in Manitoba, and more deeply concerned with what their Party means have authorized them to think this year than they are about the welfare of Manitoba.

I would remind my friends opposite it is important to preserve the rights of individuals and of corporations in legitimate economic activity within a predictable legal framework. The legal exercise of private economic initiative is the foundation of our economy. It is of course necessary for any conscientious government to establish the limits to the exercise of that initiative, limits that will assure the community at large benefits as wide as possible, but it is not necessary or desirable to establish limits that attack the economic freedoms of our people. It is evident that the government does not agree with the traditional ideas about the kinds of economic activity that our citizens should be free to undertake. But thus far they have not seen fit to announce in any consistent or credible way their own particular definition of "legitimate economic activity," and that failure to define their position itself creates uncertainty and an added feeling of insecurity among our people. That failure to define raises the spectre of further government forays into the lives of our people, forays that could result in confiscation of the livings of Manitobans; and all that insecurity and uncertainty is in itself destructive of any hopes for economic growth in the future.

The third clause of this resolution is unusual, Mr. Speaker. It's unusual for this House to have to ask a Minister to do his job, and that is all this clause suggests. It asks very simply that the Minister of Industry and Commerce do the job that he's paid to do. We're not convinced on this side, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister is capable of doing that job, but the First Minister has confidence in him and the First Minister is reputed to be a fine judge of character. Now we would like on this side some evidence that the First Minister's confidence is justified, and, Mr. Speaker, we do not have that kind of evidence so far. Notwithstanding the pious declarations that the Minister makes when he has to answer a question about a particular item on his department, notwithstanding the great credit that was given to Jordan Wines who came into Gimli, essentially at the request of the Minister, but if I recall it had something to do with a distillery that was being built, several years ago in which there was an indication at that time that a winery could be forthcoming. The Minister says no but I say yes. I think I can verify that. Notwithstanding those pious statements, we of this side do not have reason to have confidence in the Minister and there must be some further indication -- (Interjection) --

I'll tell you why we don't have confidence in the Minister. We know the Minister does not want American investment in this province. We know that the Minister has refused to go down to the United States to seek American investment. We know that the Minister has vetoed programs that would publicize and promote Manitoba investment in the United States for people to come here. Mr. Speaker, we have to say on this side, recognizing our particular situation, recognizing our capital requirements, recognizing the necessity for job formation in the private sector, that a Minister who has that position and posture -- which by the way is opposite to the First Minister who a year and a half ago in New York gave a very pious declaration of his desire to have American investment here -- with that kind of posture by the Minister, with

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd)....that kind of action, we think, you know, that the Minister is not doing his job and we feel that there is justification for our position.

The third clause of this resolution is unusual, Mr. Speaker, because - not unusual, I'm sorry; I was referring to the Minister who is also unusual. The second resolution asked the government to allow the people of Manitoba through the regional development corporations to take an active part in building their own future. Mr. Speaker, it suggests that the government respect the knowledge and ability of the people of Manitoba, it suggests that our efforts towards development should be keyed to our regions and the needs and resources of the people. We suggest, Mr. Speaker, the government programs are not. I have not dealt with this in detail in this resolution because it will be our intention to deal with this when the government presents its regional development corporation bill, which we understand will be presented as indicated by the Minister outside of this House. We intend to deal with this when the Industry and Commerce estimates are presented. We intend to deal with this when the Agriculture estimates are presented. We intend to deal with this when the Mines and Natural Resources estimates are presented, because it will be our intention to expose, Mr. Speaker, the failure on the part of the provincial government to offer any constructive regional rural development program.

Now finally, Mr. Speaker, to taxation. In the context of the total Canadian economy, in the light of the fact that we depend on our export sales for income and on imports for capital for investment, Manitoba simply cannot afford to have the highest levels of personal and corporate income taxes in Canada. These levels of taxation are not needed to maintain essential government services in Manitoba. This year the Government of Manitoba has had an opportunity to take part in the reforming of the Canadian tax system. They should also take part in reforming the patterns of expenditure that they themselves are employing here in Manitoba, and they should remember, Mr. Speaker, that taxes are a matter of economics and not of dogma.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I conclude my remarks on this resolution in the hope that we have offered for consideration an alternative to the present government's program, in the hope that they will see their way clear to recognize the inhibiting factor that high corporation and personal income taxes has on the total economic development in the province, and in the hope that in their real interests to try and see that there's sufficient job formation and sufficient economic activity for raises and rises of income in our people's pockets to come from their efforts, that they will recognize the necessity of in fact altering the basic program so that the climate for investment will be encouraged and the incentive and opportunity for further private initiative will take place.

MR. SPEAKER: I recognize the Honourable Member for Crescentwood.

MR. CY GONICK (Crescentwood): I would like to ask the member a question, if he would agree to answer one. Would the member advise the House what difference there is between a value-added tax, which he's been promoting here this afternoon, and a sales tax in terms of its effect on the distribution of income.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the honourable member really wants another speech or not. I would say to you that there are certain similarities, there are great similarities, in the sense that they both are consumption taxes, but there are differences.

MR. GONICK: Is it not true, then, that what the member is advocating is a replacement of, in effect, an income tax and a corporation tax with the disguised form of a sales tax?

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, the answer is no. What I am suggesting is the introduction of a value-added tax and the raising of the exemptions of the income tax, not the elimination of the income tax nor the elimination of the corporation tax.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. It is now 5:30 and Private Members' hour is up. If anyone wishes a debate -- (Interjection) -- Well, the Chair finds itself in this quandary, that if someone else wishes to speak someone has to take up the motion. If we leave it open -- the Honourable Leader of the Opposition has already concluded his remarks so therefore we cannot leave it open in no one's name. -- (Interjection) -- By leave we can do anything this House desires. The Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the former Minister of Industry and Commerce would please outline very briefly to this House what his program for rural economic development was. What is his fantastic program?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, if I can be given leave for another 40 minutes, I will make that presentation.

MR. WATT: Mr. Speaker, on the point of order, I doubt if....

MR. SPEAKER: There is no point of order.

MR. WATT:at the next Private Members' Day we must start back at the beginning of the Order Paper, so to leave this resolution open....

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: May I suggest, in all due respect, this has been done before, that the debate has been stood open at the hour of adjournment when you leave the Chair and that the resolution will be at the top of the Order Paper open for anyone to continue the debate, and I'm sure that a trace-back will substantiate this, and my honourable friend, the Member for Portage, agrees that this has been done. So in all due respect, Sir, I would suggest that you do leave the Chair, it being 5:30, and if we're in error we can be corrected later.

MR. SPEAKER: I am now leaving the Chair, returning at 8:00 o'clock.