

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA  
2:30 o'clock, Wednesday, April 14, 1971

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions.

PRESENTING PETITIONS

MR. CLERK: The petition of Alexander Kitchener Mattick and others for the passing of an Act to incorporate Transcona Curling Club.

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

The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Minister of Agriculture) ( Lac du Bonnet) introduced Bill No. 18, an Act to authorize a payment of special emergency grants to farmers. (Recommended to the House by His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor)

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

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed, I should like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the loge on my right. I have the pleasure of introducing to the members Mr. Dennis Cocke. Mr. Cocke is a member of the Legislative Assembly of the Province of British Columbia. With him also is his wife up in my Speaker's Gallery. I should like to, on behalf of the honourable members of the Assembly welcome Mr. and Mrs. Cocke.

I should also like to direct the attention of the Honourable Members to the gallery where there are 45 students from Grade 12 Warroad, Minnesota, United States. Mr. Rauker is in charge of them. There are also 34 members from eastern and central Manitoba from the 4H Groups under the direction of Miss Gadd. On behalf of all the honourable members of the Legislative Assembly, I welcome you all.

Orders of the Day. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q. C. (Leader of the Opposition) (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, my question is to the Minister of Health and Social Development. In view of the incident yesterday in the highjacking, and the nature of the incident, can the Minister inform the House why three juveniles were being transported from Dauphin to Winnipeg unescorted?

MR. SPEAKER: The Minister of Health and Social Services.

HON. RENE E. TOUPIN (Minister of Health & Social Development) ( Springfield): Mr. Speaker, I usually take reports from the newspaper as they're written but in this case I'm having the matter investigated and I will have a report for the House.

MR. SPIVAK: A supplementary question. I wonder if the Minister would also inquire as to whether this practice was adopted when the department that was responsible was the Attorney-General's rather than the Department of Health and Social Development.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, it's under investigation and this would be part of the report.

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

MR. SPEAKER: The Minister of Finance.

HON. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q. C. (Minister of Finance) ( St. John's): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to file Returns to Orders for Addresses Nos. 6 and 7, dated March 31, 1970 prepared on the motion of the Honourable Member for Churchill. Copies of these two Returns were distributed last August to the respective party leaders and to the Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

HON. A. H. MACKLING, Q. C. (Attorney-General) ( St. James): Mr. Speaker, before Orders of the Day, I would like to table a number of documents: (1) Copy of returns under the Contraverted Elections Act for the calendar year 1970, a report which comprises a report from the Court of Queen's Bench and from the Court of Appeal. Eight copies of each of these

(MR. MACKLING cont'd) . . . . documents have been forwarded to the Clerk of the House for distribution.

Also a copy of a nil Return under the Trade Practices Enquiry Act for the calendar year 1970. Eight copies have been forwarded to the Clerk of the House for distribution.

A report of the Provincial Auditor covering the report in accounts for the year ending March 31, 1970 of the Liquor Control Commission. And a report covering the operation and enforcement of liquor law in Manitoba for the calendar year 1970. Embodied in this report at page 21 is a statement of administrative law and enforcement expenses for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1970. 56 copies of this report have been handed to the Clerk of the House for distribution.

I would like to also point out that copies of the annual report of the Liquor Control Commission were mailed to each member of the Legislature with a letter dated December 8, 1970 and I filed one of the copies pursuant to the Legislative Assembly Act at the present time.

I also, while I have my feet, Mr. Speaker, wish to file a copy of each regulation filed under the Regulation Act being Chapter 60 of the Revised Statutes of Manitoba 1970. These regulations, on or after the 12th day of March 1970 and on or before the 7th day of April 1971, being regulations 39/70 to 190/70, inclusive, and regulations (1) of 1971 to (38) of 1971 inclusive.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Labour. With respect to the situation at Flin Flon I wonder if the Minister could indicate to us, has the government considered the possibility, or explored the possibility at this time to bring that industry under the Manitoba law - Manitoba labour law to be specific.

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour) (Transcona): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to indicate to the House that continuing the good offer of the Government of Manitoba, I was in touch this morning by telephone with the Honourable Bryce Mackasey, the Federal Minister of Labour, and Mr. Mackasey has agreed with me as the spokesman for the government of Manitoba in this dispute that a more vigorous approach must be taken to resolve this dispute, and the end result may well be that steps be taken to bring the dispute under the jurisdiction of the Department of Labour of Manitoba because of the efforts that we are forwarding to have this resolved.

MR. ENNS: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I'll try once again. The question, not necessarily specific to this dispute serious as it is, is the government undertaking steps at this time to bring back the jurisdiction of that particular industry to Manitoba and to the Manitoba labour law.

MR. PAULLEY: I might say, Mr. Speaker, my answer would be that this would have to be a matter of joint agreement between the Dominion of Canada and Manitoba - and Saskatchewan - that it would be a tri-party agreement because of part of it being in the Province of Saskatchewan. I'm sure my honourable friend is knowledgeable of the fact that originally it was conceived that the whole of the operation was in Manitoba until such time as the boundaries between Saskatchewan and Manitoba were re-surveyed and a small portion was decided or found to be in Saskatchewan and that is the reason for the predicament we're facing in respect to the strike today. I'm sure had it have been in Manitoba, the matter would have been resolved long before this.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, one final supplementary question. It's precisely because of our agreement with respect to why the situation now exists in Flin Flon that I'm asking is the government now doing something about it with respect to calling that meeting that he refers to, certainly it would require Saskatchewan and federal government involvement, and to bring about bringing back to the provincial jurisdiction and I think acceding to the request of the union. . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I wonder if the member would state his question instead of providing an argument.

A MEMBER: We understand each other . . . I think we understand each other.

MR. ENNS: I'll ask you tomorrow.

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

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Labour is so adept at answering questions, I thought I should pose him one more question. Could the Minister of Labour who is responsible for the Civil Service Commission and the administration of the Civil Service Act, could he give a short explanation to the House as to why this government has hired 800 new civil servants in the last year.

MR. PAULLEY: If my honourable, Mr. Speaker, would care to produce an Order for Return, the answer will be short and without me having to talk.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Honourable the Minister of Education. When will the Public School Finance Board report be tabled and is it available?

HON. SAUL MILLER (Minister of Youth & Education) (Seven Oaks): No, it's not available. I don't know when it's going to be tabled. I'll look into it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Honourable Minister of Youth and Education. In some two weeks there will be some 15,000 university students looking for jobs and my question is, has the government launched a program designed to make jobs available to the students. Perhaps I should make it a two-prong question - and how many jobs is the government or the government departments making available to the students?

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, in the same method as last year, Manitoba hopes to lead the nation as it did last year in student summer employment; and with regard to the number of jobs, that is still unknown. We know the need is greater this year than ever before and we'll try to meet that challenge.

MR. SPEAKER: Has the member a supplementary question?

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Can the Minister give me a specific answer: How many did the government hire last year, and he says he has a program already this year - how do the students apply?

MR. MILLER: I suggest to the honourable member that is an issue for an Order for Return. You are asking for statistics.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I'm asking how do the students, or how can the students apply for these jobs?

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, the students can apply through the Student Placement Office, 1181 Portage Avenue.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. INEZ TRUEMAN (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, I address my question to the Honourable Minister of Health and Social Development. Is there a reply available as yet to the question that was taken as notice a couple of days ago concerning possible over expenditures by the department?

MR. TOUPIN: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Minister of Health and Social Services. During a recent labour dispute last year in our province involving Motor Coach Industries, an application was made for the payment of welfare funds to the strikers. Can the Minister indicate whether any welfare funds were paid to the strikers in question?

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, welfare is given to anyone who is in financial need.

MR. ENNS: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the Minister would mind answering the question. Were any welfare funds paid to the striking workers at the Motor Coach Industries?

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, if the strikers were in financial need they could have received welfare.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, one final supplementary question. I take it then that the same criteria is being used in the current strike at Flin Flon.

MR. TOUPIN: The same criteria set out in CAP are being used across this province.

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 whether the Minister could indicate whether he intends to meet with representatives of the Manitoba Federation of Fishermen, and if so, when?

HON. SIDNEY GREEN, Q.C. (Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management) (Inkster): Mr. Chairman, I'll be communicating directly to the Federation.

MR. SPIVAK: I didn't hear the answer, Mr. Speaker.

MR. GREEN: I'm communicating directly with the Federation. I'm in the process of doing so.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question to the Minister is does he intend to meet with them and if so, when?

MR. GREEN: Well Mr. Speaker, I've indicated that I am making my communication to the Federation whom I received a letter from. I think it's only common courtesy to speak to them about what they wrote to me about.

MR. SPIVAK: Well Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I can ask the Honourable Minister whether he would allow either myself or a representative of our party to be present when such a meeting does take place?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I'll be in the position of ministers of the Crown for as long as I can remember and I'll invite people to my office or speak to people in my office on the same considerations as have always been done.

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

#### ANNOUNCEMENT

HON. PETER BURTONIAK (Minister of Tourism, Recreation, and Cultural Affairs) (Dauphin): Mr. Speaker, before Orders of the Day, I'd like to make an announcement in regard to campsite permit procedure changes. I'd like to announce at the present time that plans for changes in parks' branch procedures concerning trailer villages and seasonal campsite permits in the Whiteshell Provincial Park. Following the close of the 1972 camping season there will be no further seasonal permits issued for sites in the trailer villages at Falcon and West Hawk lakes. This change has been prompted by increasing demand for more short-term camping facilities, particularly in close proximity to the Trans Canada Highway.

I wish to emphasize that alternative trailer villages' accommodation is being developed in the Whiteshell area, including a major campground at Nutimik Lake where camping sites will be available following the close of the 1972 season on a four-year lease basis; a trailer village site at the east end of Lac du Bonnet where sites will be available at the close of the 1972 season on a four-year basis as well. Developments planned for the Grindstone Point recreation area adjacent to the Hecla Island Provincial Park on Lake Winnipeg will have trailer village sites after the 1972 season as a further alternate location, with sites available on a five-year basis with a five-year renewal. For the Falcon and West Hawk Lake area of the Whiteshell, it is not a question of creating more campgrounds. Space is already at a premium on the beaches and in the townsites. More campgrounds would tend to over-populate the lakes and endanger or destroy the atmosphere that should be maintained in a provincial park setting. However, by the time the Falcon and West Hawk area sites are phased out of seasonal occupancy use in 1972 new campsites now under development elsewhere will be available in a quantity exceeding the number of those being phased out. I might also point out that due to the winter works program which we introduced a few months ago and is presently under way is providing for development of these new campground facilities, in Childs Lake in the Duck Mountains, 110 units there; Manigogo Bay, Lake Manitoba, 70 units; Bird Lake 80 units and on the Trans-Canada Highway near Hadashville, a major overnight campground. These projects are in addition to development work being done at Grindstone Point, Hecla Provincial Park, Lac du Bonnet and Nutimik Lake.

Our whole objective, Mr. Speaker, in providing these facilities is to keep pace with the increasing demand for camping space and make it possible for more people to enjoy Manitoba's outdoors, one of our greatest recreational resources. Further changes in campground use policy may be necessary in implementing a master plan for development of provincial parks and recreation areas across Manitoba which will also include the Whiteshell Provincial Park.

#### ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, relating to the Minister's statement I have two questions. The first question is: When the new plan for four-year leases is implemented, how will it be implemented? Will people have to line up for 24 hours or a week ahead of time or will priority be given to residents who are presently in place? That is the first question. And the second question is: In your plan to open up new campgrounds or trailer villages are any new lakes envisaged, especially in the Whiteshell area? What lakes will be opened up?

MR. BURTONIAK: Well to answer your last question first, as I pointed out in my announcement one is Nutimik Lake. There are others that we are looking at and that's why I also

(MR. BURTNIAC cont'd.) . . . . suggest that once we have our overall master plan for recreational facilities available, we will have further answers to your question. This will not I don't think take too long, perhaps in two or three years' time we'll be able to know where these lakes are so it will give us time, that's why we say that we are working on this four-year lease basis. As far as the other question, I think it will be pretty well on the same basis as we have now.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Portage.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Does this mean then that people will be lining up for days ahead of time if they wish to retain the place they presently have?

MR. BURTNIAC: Mr. Speaker, we're working on that program and we will see which way is the best way to accommodate these people. If there are some other devices we can come up with which would be more fair we'll certainly look into it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. ARTHUR MOUG (Charleswood): Mr. Speaker, in regard to that report I wonder on the four-year lease will the trailers be allowed to stay during the winter season or just during the holiday season?

MR. BURTNIAC: I might say, Mr. Speaker, that in respect to those two areas that I just mentioned and the four-year leases, these are only for short term leases, not seasonal.

MR. MOUG: . . . made reference to the two areas, you said the permanent ones where there's going to be a four-year lease. Can the trailers stay there year round or is it moved in in the spring and taken out in the fall and then go through that week-long procedure of getting it back in the next spring?

MR. BURTNIAC: In that particular area there are no trailers there now anyway.

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

MRS. TRUEMAN: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Honourable Minister of Health and Social Development. Has a report been prepared on the ministerial delegation's findings in Finland, Sweden and Denmark?

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, some members of the delegation and I would say practically all have completed their report. A full report should be available within weeks.

MRS. TRUEMAN: Mr. Speaker, would that report then be made available to the members of the Legislature?

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, I'll see that the honourable member gets a copy.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Honourable the Minister of Labour. Why was the Rules Committee Report tabled yesterday in the House made available to the press before it was made available to members of this House?

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I don't really know whether I should have to answer my honourable friend but I want to assure him that it was not made available to the press before it was tabled. I regret my honourable friend was not here to hear my remarks. He would have clearly understood that such was not the case.

MR. FROESE: I have to correct the Minister. I was here and I asked for a copy and it was not available.

MR. PAULLEY: I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, then may I say to my honourable friend I'm sorry that age is dimming my eyesight, I did not observe him in his seat at the time the report was tabled.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce. He is not in his seat. I wish to direct a question to the First Minister. And it's in reference to the CAE. I wonder if the First Minister would consider--our Economic Development Committee will be probably reconstituted in a matter of days--would he consider sending this committee to Ottawa in connection with CAE and if the proposal is not acceptable--I know this affects the whole Greater Winnipeg area in the lay-offs, it probably affects St. James-Assiniboia much more--would he include at least the MLA's for the St. James-Assiniboia area?

HON. EDWARD SCHREYER (Premier) (Rossmere): Well, Mr. Speaker.

MR. PATRICK: Before the Minister answers, I would be prepared to go at my own expense if this is what--I'm not looking for a trip.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, the offer of the honourable member I'm sure is appreciated although I don't think that that's the primary consideration. May I say to my honourable friend that I believe an undertaking was given in the past day or two to the effect that we were considering the advisability of establishing an ad hoc committee or delegation consisting of members of this House and we are considering that possibility. The suggestion however, that a standing committee of the House constitute a delegation to Ottawa is I think a very unorthodox and unnecessary one.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Well I have a supplementary question but it's possible that . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, this delegation that has already requested to go--I believe it's the Minister of Labour and Minister of Industry and Commerce--are they going with any specific proposals that the government has in mind or just to see what Ottawa has in mind? I'm sure that we must have some specific proposals, Mr. First Minister.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, possibly I can answer in concert with the Minister of Industry and Commerce. This has been under discussion; we have some proposals, suggestions to make, Mr. Speaker, to the federal authorities. It is anticipated that there will be representatives of labour and management journey with us to meet with the Honourable James Richardson, the Minister of Supply, to scout possibilities of having the matter resolved favourably to Manitoba. And may I add to what the First Minister said so far as expansion of the delegation, this is under active consideration and if deemed advisable that procedure will be taken and my honourable friend may be aware that this was the procedure taken by the previous administration in respect of Air Canada. First a small committee augmented eventually by quite a large delegation--I believe my honourable friend was along as I was on two or three of those representations to the federal authority.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: My question is to the First Minister. Yesterday you indicated that you would be considering the possibility of the Air Canada Policy Committee being called back into session. Have you made any resolution on that?

MR. SCHREYER: Well no, Mr. Speaker, we haven't come to any resolution of that just yet, however I'm hopeful that by, let us say by Monday, we'll be able to answer my honourable friend in a more definitive way. In addition to that, one other consideration, for example, might be to consider the advisability of having a delegation attend at a meeting in Ottawa with the appropriate federal authorities that might constitute members such as have a direct responsibility and interest for the area, the Member for Assiniboia, the Attorney-General, the Member for Sturgeon Creek, this is one alternative possibility and we shall see which of the two would be more advantageous in the public interest.

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. Can he give any assurance to the House that Deputy Minister Winston Mair will be in the service of his department for some years to come?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, that's a rather malicious question. I suppose it could be put to every member of the front bench or every member of the Cabinet. The fact is that the Deputy Minister of my department is a free man like every deputy minister in my department and like every deputy minister in the previous administration. I have no reason to think that he is not going to be working for the government for some time to come but ultimately that decision rests with him, the same as the decision as to whether the Member for--well mind you it doesn't rest entirely with him, but it may be that the Member for Portage la Prairie could decide tomorrow that he doesn't want to be here anymore or somebody else will decide for him.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Well, Mr. Speaker, in my supplementary I would pose a question to my friend the Minister that if he considers questions in this House asked in a malicious manner may I suggest to him that his motives are under question.

MR. SPEAKER: Would the honourable member place his question.

MR. GREEN: I rise on a question of privilege. My honourable friend has questioned my motives and I either ask him to withdraw or to state which motives of mine are under question so that they can be taken as a matter of privilege by myself or otherwise.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: I will not withdraw the question.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member has said that my motives are in question and I rise on a question of privilege and ask him to withdraw that statement.

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder if the gentlemen who have been discussing this matter would kindly reconsider the way they place their words before this Assembly. I'm certain that no one wanted to have anything maliciously placed or said by anyone. I do ask the Minister . . .

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, perhaps if I were permitted to ask a question I could help clarify the matter.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Well Mr. Speaker, and I rise on a question of privilege, there is a rumour that Winston Mair is resigning and it was my intent to phrase the question in such a manner to allow the Minister to answer without embarrassment to himself or to the deputy minister and to have the imputation placed upon that question that it was a malicious question I resent that very much and I will not withdraw my remarks.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, if the honourable member wanted me to confirm or not confirm a rumour that Mr. Winston Mair was resigning he could have asked such and I would have said that there is no confirmation of the rumour. That is not the way he put the question. He asked whether I can expect that Mr. Winston Mair will be here for some time and I say that put in that form I regard it as malicious. If the honourable member disapproves of that word I will withdraw the word "malicious" and I ask the honourable member to withdraw the suggestion that my motives are in question.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie has questioned my motives. I have asked him to withdraw the statement questioning my motives or else put the questioned motives before the House so that it can be determined whether my motives are in question or not.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, on the point of privilege perhaps my honourable member's hearing is not what it should be but, I said "if the Minister considered the question malicious then it was perhaps because of his motivation."

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the First Minister. It's a non-controversial question. I wonder if he could indicate to the House when it will be the government's intention to appoint a full time chairman of the Manitoba Development Corporation?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, perhaps the Honourable Leader of the Opposition would like to rephrase his question because as he puts it I think I would have to answer that even at the present time there is a full time chairman of the Manitoba Development Corporation.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, Mr. Speaker, the chairman or the person who acts as head of the Manitoba Development Corporation is titled the "acting chairman." I would like to know when is it the intention of the government to appoint a full time chairman in that sense.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, we can get into somewhat of a game of semantics here. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition is quite right. The incumbent is "acting chairman" but he is also full time.

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder if we are getting into a play upon words.

MR. SPIVAK: No, Mr. Speaker, I'd like a point of clarification if I can from the Premier. Are you suggesting that there is no distinction between an "acting chairman" and a "full time chairman" in terms of both government appointment and dealings with the public?

MR. SCHREYER: Oh, Mr. Speaker, there is a difference between an acting chairman and a full chairman but being part time is not one of the differences.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, then my question to the First Minister: is it his intention to appoint Mr. Rogers as chairman of the Manitoba Development Corporation?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I think that my honourable friend would be happy to know that we expect to be able to make an announcement in connection with that subject matter during the session--relatively soon I hope.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. Second reading government bills . . .

HON. JOSEPH P. BOROWSKI (Minister of Public Works and Highways) (Thompson): Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Transportation.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, before we get off Orders of the Day I'd like to table two reports, the Annual Report of the Department of Public Works, and two, the Annual

(MR. BOROWSKI cont'd.) . . . . Report of the Highway Traffic and Motor Transport Board, the Provincial Transport Board and the Taxicab Board.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

ORDERS OF THE DAY - GOVERNMENT BILLS

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: May I ask that this matter stand, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Can I ask that this matter stand, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Tourism and Recreation.

MR. BURTNIAK: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask that this matter stand.

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Member for Logan and the amendment thereto by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition and the sub-amendment by the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to be excused from speaking today but I certainly would like to open it up for anyone else to take part in the debate at this time.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. R. (BUD) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin by saying that with respect to the Manitoba ship of state, to which I intend to refer in a moment or two, the ship is foundering, Sir, on reefs of excessive taxation, on shows of economic difficulty and on tides of state control.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, I welcome the warm response from the government benches to my opening remarks. I wish first of all, Sir, to compliment you on your elevation to the highest office in which it is your colleagues' and your peers' power to honour a member of this Legislature. I've had the privilege and the enjoyable experience of having worked with you as a competitive party caucus whip in this Legislature during the past two sessions, I've had firsthand experience of your fairness, your diplomacy, your tact and your conscientious devotion to the duties that are imposed upon you in this Chamber and I look forward, Sir, to serving in this House with you in the Speaker's Chair.

I would like to extend one or two other congratulatory messages to members on both sides of the Chamber. I would like to congratulate the Member for Logan and the Member for Gimli on their address in seconding of the address in reply to the Speech from the Throne. They made a profound and effective contribution to this debate. I would like to compliment the new ministers in the Treasury benches, the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs and the Minister Without Portfolio. I would like to congratulate the new Whip of the government benches, the Member for Radisson, and the new caucus Chairman of the government forces, the Member for St. George. I would like to congratulate my colleague the Member for River Heights on having won the highest office that it is possible for us in our party, the Progressive Conservative Party, to bestow on one of our colleagues; and also--he's not in his Chair at the moment--but I would like to add a word of congratulation to my colleague the Member for Lakeside for the contribution that he made to my party's leadership contest and campaign.

Mr. Speaker, my leader has spoken of some of the individual performances and peccadillos of the different members of the Executive Council. My concern and I suggest the concern of a great many Manitobans, perhaps a majority, is for the stability and the reliability, Sir, of the government itself as a collective entity, as a crew for the Manitoba ship of state. Some crew, Mr. Speaker, some ship of state. As I said a moment ago, the ship is foundering on reefs of excessive taxation, on shoals of economic difficulty, and on tides of state control; and while those who travel upon this ship look desperately to its captain and its crew for the bold navigational initiatives that will steer them through their current sea of troubles, what do we have in the wheelhouse, Mr. Speaker, what do we have in the wheelhouse? We have Captain Schreyer and his flying circus. We have what surely must be the most colossal travesty of cabinet unity and solidarity in this province's history. What this does to the morale and the spirit of the travellers upon this ship I leave, Mr. Speaker, to your imagination. But it's depressing, it's depressing in its impact and in its effect. And it's this result of the present administration more than any other that troubles many Manitobans today. I am among that number. I am among those who find it if not frightening at least infinitely sad, Mr. Speaker,



(MR. SHERMAN cont'd) . . . . that Manitoba should be foundering and that Manitobans themselves should be foundering as a consequence of a government that is out of control; pulled this way and that by a crew, a cabinet, that insists upon carrying on like circus daredevils, like barnstorming stunt men.

There are some notable exceptions to the extravaganza of foolishness that we've witnessed in the last few months in this administration, Mr. Speaker. Among them the Minister of Youth and Education, the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs, the First Minister himself and perhaps even I would suggest my ambitious friend the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. I'm sorry that the Minister of Mines and Resources is not in his seat but I do exclude him from my references to flying stunt men and daredevils and circus performers because I feel that although he has engaged of late in at least one literary exchange that came to public notice with the First Minister on a question on which they obviously sincerely hold opposite views, he nonetheless has hewed carefully and conscientiously to the line of administrative responsibility vested in him in his ministerial role. He has conducted himself, I suggest, carefully, calculatingly and shrewdly in a manner befitting one who is seeking the leadership of his party. But for the most part, Sir, for the most part the whole thing has been a circus. One minister flailing at another, internecine warfare in the cabinet room, hurled charges, veiled threats. If it weren't so tragic for Manitoba it would be a huge joke. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the future of our province is at stake and therefore the situation constitutes a very bad joke indeed. Let us hope that this cabinet, this administration, will improve with age and that the process of maturation will occur in these next few months and that for Manitoba's sake the present administration learns to work together, Sir, before it tears us all apart.

Well let us move, Sir, from foundering ships and seas of troubles to the state of our province and what is needed and what this government is challenged to do about it. Let us move to the statement of the government's intent for the current year, the Speech from the Throne.

Let me say at the outset, Mr. Speaker, that there is much in the Throne Speech that I can support and laud, but it contains singularly little to fire the imagination or excite the blood; at least to fire my imagination or excite my blood. It is full of high sounding phrases while containing none of the nuts and bolts of a plan or program that would produce a higher and a better standard of living for increasing numbers of Manitobans; and none of the nuts and bolts of how you get to such a better living plain. It is vague and ethereal and high sounding and in many ways awfully nice, Mr. Speaker, but like the man said in the railroad station, you can't get there from here. The program spelled out in the Throne Speech fails, Sir, it fails to take into consideration the present malaise affecting this province's economy. It fails to take into consideration the load that is dragging at the neck of the Manitoba taxpayer. It fails to take into consideration the shackles on the spirit of the private entrepreneur. It fails to recognize the ambitions of young people. It fails to recognize a growing frustration with a lack in this province of professional and vocational opportunity. It fails to recognize the urgent requirement for capital. It fails to recognize the indispensable worth of private effort and private investment in the frontiers of social development. And it fails to recognize the very real existence of competition. Competition on our borders, east, west and south for our young people and for the opportunity sources that would fuel our economy and keep them here. It does not contain the nuts and bolts, Mr. Speaker, nor, I suggest, does this government have the vaguest idea of how to supply the nuts and bolts necessary to put those programs and plans so vital for our future progress together. The high blown phrases make for nice ceremonial semantics on opening day when the Throne Speech is being read but they're full of sound and majesty, Sir, signifying nothing unless the means to jobs and expanding capital are created and provided. In short, Sir, some of the NDP mountain tops look good but you can't get there from here.

So much for what the Throne Speech does say, Mr. Speaker; what of some of the other things it doesn't say. What about out-migration and the things this government should be doing about it? Is there any government attack promised on that platform? The treasury benches are uncharacteristically silent on it. Strangely we haven't even had a couple of cabinet ministers fighting over it yet. What about the chronic crisis on the student job front? Nothing said about that problem, no solutions proposed. What about Winnipeg's rightful place as a major world air centre? Nothing said about that subject. An institute of northern studies

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd) . . . .or a university of the north. Nothing. Restrictionist agricultural policies in Canada and in Manitoba that have threatened the family farm with extinction. Nothing. Energy development. Nothing. The physical fitness of our citizenry. Nothing. Development of our human resources including our native peoples. Nothing. The unemployment situation. Ah, here, Mr. Speaker, we cannot answer nothing. Here at last, Mr. Speaker, we're on to something. The list of fields of government inactivity is almost endless. We can pose a score of subject headings and fairly in each case, Sir, answer nothing. But we cannot do so on the subject of unemployment particularly insofar as the government's approach to it can be measured in terms of the creation and the provision of jobs. Here at last is a ray of hope. A government that is doing something. If any man doubt it he need merely consult the 53rd Annual Report of the Civil Service Commission and administration of the Civil Service Act for the year ending December 31st, 1970, copies of which have been distributed to all members of this Chamber within the past 48 hours. There he will find, Mr. Speaker, the reassuring information that this government has made a massive assault on the unemployment problem in this province by the simple expedient of feather-bedding in the public service, and by doing so, Sir, on a scale that is unprecedented in the history of this province and doubtless has no match anywhere in Canadian history save for that period when the Province of Saskatchewan was likewise in the hands of a socialist maladministration.

MR. GREEN: The date of that report?

MR. SHERMAN: An examination of that innocuous looking little 14 page report, Mr. Speaker -- and I have a copy of it in my hand -- reveals that during the last calendar year, that is 1970, no less than 720 new positions were established in the Civil Service of Manitoba and the total number of employees in the service increased by 800 over the total for the previous year. Moreover, the total in that previous year, that is 1969, was up by almost 500 bodies over the figure for the year preceding that. -- (Interjection) -- You're doing things all right. You're ladling it out, spending the province into bankruptcy.

In numerals, Mr. Speaker, as shown on Page 13 of the aforementioned report, the simple and alarming facts are these. In December 1968, the end of the last full calendar year in which the province was administered by a Conservative Government, the number of employees in the Manitoba Civil Service totalled 8,344. A year later, after approximately six months of NDP administration, it totalled 8,822; and by last December, after another full year of NDP government, it had swelled by a further 800 bodies to a total of 9,622. On this basis, Sir, by the simple process of arithmetical projection, we discover that in any given 12 month period of NDP government in this province an average of better than 800 persons are added to the provincial Civil Service rolls, most of them New Democratic Party faithful no doubt, and if the present government remains in office, heaven forbid, until the end of 1973, the rolls will total more than 12,000 bodies and represent an overall 50 percent increase in the size of the Manitoba Civil Service since January 1st, 1969. It should not be necessary -- never mind the footnotes, are you listening to my speech, Mr. Attorney-General?

MR. MACKLING: Read the entire booklet.

MR. SHERMAN: It should not be necessary to observe that this is a remarkably unique, remarkably singular approach to the unemployment problem in our society, probably singular in all North America. Nor should it be necessary to remind the Manitoba taxpayer of just who it is who is paying for all of this. In fact the framers of the TED Report must be turning over in their factories. One recalls that they -- (Interjection) -- I'll repeat that for the Attorney-General. The framers of the TED Report must be turning over, Sir, in their factories. One recalls that they called for the formation of thousands of new jobs in Manitoba but not surely all in the Civil Service. It's enough to freeze the blood. It seems safe to say, Sir, that when they talked of job formation this is hardly what they had in mind. Thus do we have, Mr. Speaker, the Socialist spiritician's solution to the more pressing economic problems of the day; and thus do we define for Manitobans the third critical flaw in the face of this government. The first is disunity and divisiveness, a disunity and divisiveness that robs the people of Manitoba of a leadership in which they can put their faith and on which they can rely and which tends by its very nature to disunite and divide Manitobans themselves. The second is a pervading mistrust of the private sector of our economy, a mistrust that shows itself in economic discrimination and retards the development of solutions to our problems. And the third is this government's investment in bureaucracy, its disposition to the building of a civil service that will grow and grow and grow, that will include formation of and provision

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd) . . . . of job after job after job to friend after friend after friend until the economy of our province is sapped, until the economy of our province is sapped, Mr. Speaker, until it is choked to death.

Mr. Speaker, let me conclude by reminding my friends that the mountains of Utopia, even Socialist Utopia, may be beautiful upon the horizon but you can't get there from here.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. J. R. (BUD) BOYCE (Winnipeg Centre): First of all, Mr. Speaker, I should congratulate everybody that should be congratulated including yourself and myself. No one congratulated me, I was very very hurt by my colleagues. But seriously I think we have been a little remiss that no one took the time to mention that in the change of leadership in the Conservative Party from the Member from Minnedosa to the Member from River Heights that we do owe a debt of gratitude to the former leader because when he was Minister of Highways, as our Minister of Highways mentions, he was a very competent Minister of Highways and I think that we should give credit where credit is due. -- (Interjection) -- Well I went and got the dictionary because once in a while the Member from River Heights gets carried away and I wanted to really understand what he was talking about -- Fort Garry, excuse me, Fort Garry -- and I thought maybe I should emulate his fine style, but I thought I could best sum up his contribution to the debate by one word that he used "pusillanimous". It's a beautiful word isn't it? It almost tastes like it sounds -- pusillanimous -- but this is -- oh just for the member's edification, I think that quotation goes "there was a tempest in the teapot full of sound and fury signifying nothing." Well the Member from fishside -- Lakeside, Lakeside, the rancher from Lakeside's back. I'm really glad the Conservative front bench is empty because -- I'm sorry . . .

MR. SHERMAN: I think you've mixed up a couple of quotations there but I'll straighten you out afterwards, go ahead.

MR. BOYCE: In case that isn't in Hansard, the Minister for Mines and Natural Resources says that it's empty even when they're sitting there. But of course this is perhaps an indication of the way this Legislature is going to be run while the, you know, the emasculated Liberal Party gets up off their knees and the thoroughly confused Conservative Party gets themselves back together again, that they're going to dash into the House and make some ludicrous statements and then rush out and see what the press has made with them because they're going to try and govern this province in the press apparently.

But, Mr. Speaker, I was really astounded, really astounded when the Leader of the Opposition moved as an amendment the other day and I guess -- mind you there was something the trouble with my hearing as the Member from Portage la Prairie accused one of our Ministers of hearing with difficulty -- that I guess I didn't hear the first part of it because the Leader of the Opposition stood up and offered to this House as an amendment some words and I kept waiting at the end of it for him to stand up and say mea culpa, mea culpa, mea maxima culpa, because the trouble that he was talking about was a review of the Conservative administration in this particular province. What does he say, as an amendment, as a serious, supposedly serious amendment to the motion from the Speech from the Throne? He says this government has failed to set priorities and proposed measures adequate to meet the real needs of the people of Manitoba. Indications in the Throne Speech, the government has failed to decentralize and instead has further centralized power, has increased bureaucracy, reduced individual freedom of choice and increased level of state control over its citizens. What nonsense! What nonsense!

I just can't help but going through his particular speech. You know it says in the rule book that you're supposed to talk extemporaneously so I try to, you know, abide by that rule. I hope I don't hash it up too badly. -- (Interjection) -- What, you hope I don't hash it up too badly or you hope I don't follow in your footsteps of hashing things up badly? But quoting from Hansard, the Leader of the Opposition says that the Premier has a mandate from the people of Manitoba to provide leadership. Well the people in Manitoba believe that the Premier does offer leadership to this province. He certainly offers leadership to the New Democratic Party, he certainly offers leadership to the New Democratic caucus and I'm sure he offers leadership to the Cabinet of this government.

In the Gilbert and Sullivan opera I used to get a charge out of that thing that "I always voted at my party's call and never thought of thinking of myself at all." While things are being resolved in this group sometimes there is disagreement and I certainly don't see anything the

(MR. BOYCE cont'd.) . . . . matter with that because this is a different type of government. As far as we're concerned the days of appointing someone as the honourable leader and when he says jump you turn around and ask him how high he wants you to go and how long he wants you to stay up is past as far as we're concerned. The people of Manitoba want to see it dead and buried, this type of procedure, because what they want is a honest expression of opinion and a selection of the best possible alternatives. Now many people have been better able to express the difficulty in coming to a consensus in issues which affect people emotionally. Pierre G. . . for example, says that there is no truth in the crowd. He goes on, he being of a particular Christian bent said that you couldn't even teach Christianity in Christendom because you'd come up with a consensus which in itself is not true. But this particular group does address itself and has amply demonstrated it in the past, we have demonstrated in the past that this government does and can and will come up with the best solution as far as the people of the province are concerned, not as far as the personal satisfaction of this government is concerned.

There was a couple of other little pearls of wisdom. Quoting from Hansard again on Page 33 the former Minister of Industry and Commerce, the Leader of the Opposition says: "At one time these Manitobans relied on fishing Lake Winnipeg but fishing is closed now." All of a sudden in the last few years mercury pollution took place. The reason that pollution took place was because of the total ignoring of the side effects of what my economist friends call the crude growth principle. You know, shove the industry in, flood South Indian Lake, do whatever you want to do as long as it builds up industry. To heck with the consequences, to heck with the side effects, and the Leader of the Opposition has the audacity to stand in this House and accuse us of having done it. This is the first government in the history of Manitoba that has taken into consideration multi-disciplinary approaches to all problems.

MR. SHERMAN: What are you doing to South Indian Lake?

MR. BOYCE: Well maybe I'm making a -- I beg your pardon?

MR. SHERMAN: What are you doing to South Indian?

MR. BOYCE: I haven't done anything to it.

MR. SHERMAN: . . . flooding at ten feet instead of twelve, that's all.

MR. BOYCE: Is that what they've done? Is that what they've done?

MR. SHERMAN: I'm asking you, or would that be revealing government policy?

MR. BOYCE: Oh I never take his opinion, that's why I was asking the Minister what they have done. -- (Interjection) -- Thirty feet. That's what they were going to do. Thirty feet. Oh I'm sorry, I thought it was only 28. He goes on, the Leader of the Opposition, to say that "the government's commitment to welfare reform and to income security is equivocal. The requirements for proper programs to assist those in our society who cannot make it on their own is urgent, but there is no evidence that the government has either the financial resources or the clear intent to implement such programs." Listen to that again. I think that's worth repeating three or four times so it sinks in. -- (Interjection) -- Oh, yah, oh I have to. I'm sorry, I have to -- (Interjection) -- Well, I just want them to show how much sense it doesn't make when I get through with it -- "to welfare reform and to income security is equivocal." -- our approach that is. "The requirements for proper programs to assist those in our society who cannot make it on their own is urgent, but there is no evidence that the government has either the financial resources or the clear intent to implement such programs." We agree that it's urgent. We know that it's urgent and we're doing something about it, but the former administration, you know, didn't give a tinker's -- is damn unparliamentary? -- (Interjection) -- I can say -- oh fuddle duddle -- they didn't give a fuddle duddle for the people of Manitoba, because what we have created up to now, and this government is taxed with the burden of resolving these problems, is helping the people develop the capacity to cope with change - and I mentioned it in the House in the prior two sessions and everybody over there went to sleep again -- they're not sleeping this morning -- thank you Honourable Member from Fort Rouge -- that the people in our country have to learn to cope with change. They have to be treated as human beings no matter if the type of living that they have been sustaining themselves with disappears, whether they're insurance agents or they're any other type of people who have been involved in something which for any reason, whether it's government action or private enterprise, which causes their redundancy.

You know, I don't know how many of you recall the public debate that took place in this House - I think my honourable friend the Minister of Labour was involved in it - when the

(MR. BOYCE cont'd.) . . . . boilermakers from Transcona had to go elsewhere to find employment. You know there wasn't too many, I think it was 600 wasn't it, about 600? Well, because the jobs became, for some reason or another, became redundant. And how many tears were shed on the benches across there? "To assist those in our society who cannot make it on their own is urgent, but there is no evidence that the government has either the financial resources or the clear intent to implement such programs." This man has the audacity to come before this House and accuse this government of this when they for years have been oblivious to the problem. Crude growth, money, free enterprise . . .

A MEMBER: Louder.

MR. BOYCE: Oh yes, my friend over there. I couldn't find it - you know, I was looking through all this drivel here for the -- you know, we can no longer have dogmatic approaches -- and the Member from Fort Garry gets up there and, you know, in the name of free enterprise, as if this group is against free enterprise.

MR. ENNS: You need the odd boiler in an industrial plant to keep those boilermakers around, you know.

MR. BOYCE: That's what he wants. He wants boilermakers. Well, you know, pick it up anywhere. Maybe my speeches do wander, my speeches or whatever they are, my remarks that I address to my colleagues wander a little bit, but I hope they make better sense than the member from Fort Garry's who stands up there and reads a dictionary and then he picks up a telephone book and he picks out some numbers like this, 3720439 - see, I told you it's printed. Ludicrous. I can make just as much sense out of numbers out of this phone book as you can out of that when you ignore the footnotes. Read those figures in context if you want people in this House to take you seriously in your presentations to your colleagues. Don't come and take two or three figures out of context and play games with them. I can make these phone numbers in this phone book just as significant as you did.

MR. SHERMAN: They'll take it seriously.

MR. BOYCE: Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry I digressed. When the Member from Portage la Prairie got up and if, you know, if he is saddened by the decease of his former party, I can understand why he didn't make his usual sparkling presentation to this House. But a couple of the things that he mentioned really stick out. He said, you know this government has in two years had a chance to clean up the little bits and pieces - the little bits and pieces as if they were nothing. And it's something that really bothers me - maybe it's me - but the Liberals in Manitoba or the Liberals in B.C. -- are there any Liberals left in B.C.? Are there some of them left in B.C.?

A MEMBER: Yes.

MR. BOYCE: You know, they speak in Manitoba one way and they speak in Ottawa another way. Well this is true of the Conservatives also. Well, since Asper has become a whisper I don't know what kind of voice they're speaking in. -- (Interjection) -- The gritty question is right. He talks about the problems facing Manitoba and he totally ignores, totally ignores the contribution, the great contribution that the Federal Liberal Party has made to the economic growth of Manitoba. Now we should expand on that perhaps, the great contribution that the Liberal Party has made to the economic growth of Manitoba. (1) You know, how much attention does the Liberal Party pay to the people of Manitoba, the wishes of the people of Manitoba, either expressed through their own elected members as M.P.'s in the House, the members of the Liberal -- well, the independent Liberal members of this House now or the former Liberal Party of this House or even the Government of Manitoba, when representations were made to the Federal Government relative to the transfer of the Air Canada air base which was instrumental in the difficulty with CAE at the moment. When the government made representation and the members of the Liberal Party made representation to the Federal Government as far as the location of the fish processing plant, how much attention was paid to the representation made to the Federal Government? Mr. Speaker, no one should have to draw to the attention of the Liberal Party the great fiasco of the control of inflation through the direct deliberate cause of unemployment. Once again Benson was on television last night saying, "We have to control wages; we have to control prices." The first man I have heard say publicly was Walter Gordon night before last said, "We have to control, if we are going to control anything, wages, prices and profits."

With this -- oh, Benson last night, he's nibbling at it again -- if inflation starts going up again, well we'll have to -- (you know, with the pipe bit) -- "We'll have to put in, you know,

(MR. BOYCE cont'd.) . . . .the wage control guide lines." Not a word about profits. And the Liberal Party - you know, the same thing's going to happen to us federally that happened to us provincially. They never learn. You know, maybe -- everybody in the House examines their conscience. If I had been in Ottawa, as some of my colleagues, when the debate on the implementation of the War Measures Act came up, I think I would have been inclined to have voted against my colleagues and with the government. I would have erred. I would have made a mistake. I bring that into this particular discussion because it's the Federal Government still hasn't learned, the Liberal government, the Liberal Party still hasn't learned that the only way to alleviate the situation in Quebec is . . . their problems that created this situation in Quebec, and they can't do it the way that they're bound and determined that they're going to keep trying at the expense of the people all the way across Canada, including the people in Manitoba. And when the Member from Portage stands up here in this House and offers an amendment to -- I think I got my amendments mixed up. I think I attributed -- did I do that? You know, they're both so ludicrous I can't tell the difference.

A MEMBER: They're both the same.

MR. BOYCE: They're both the same. Yep, that's what I did, Mr. Speaker. They didn't even notice. I wasn't corrected by one of the members opposite at all, Mr. Speaker. That's how -- most of them are just . . . You know, the formalities that actually don't signify anything, they go through the motions so that they can go out and read in the press that Spivak attacks the government. I'm glad that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition has returned. You didn't miss anything, Sir. Should I read this now? Oh. It's only 14 pages.

Mr. Speaker, with these few words I think I'll pass it on to more able hands than myself perhaps, but I just couldn't sit still and listen to the Member from Fort Garry come out with his "Nothing; nothing; nothing . . ." You know, really, this is what they've been doing for . . .

MR. SHERMAN: It's a simple description of your program, Bud, that's all.

MR. BOYCE: A simple description of your program?

MR. SHERMAN: Your program.

MR. BOYCE: Oh. Oh. I'm sorry.

MR. SHERMAN: Didn't you hear the Throne Speech?

MR. BOYCE: Darn right. Wasn't it terrific? Wasn't it terrific, eh? It must have been a New Democratic Throne Speech, because in my mind - oh, it talks about things like the establishment of some facility to co-ordinate the law enforcement part of our justice system, that they would take a look in some way at the police commissions, that we would even consider setting up a type of police school. I find that very interesting. You don't know what the ramifications of it are. You don't know what the ramifications of it are. Mr. Speaker, speaking about the police . . .

MR. SHERMAN: That's beautiful.

MR. BOYCE: I think - and I'm glad you mentioned it because I would have been remiss. . .

MR. SHERMAN: I'm glad you're glad I mentioned it.

MR. BOYCE: I'm glad you're glad that I'm glad that you're glad that I'm glad. Now if you want to continue to talk. . . Mr. Speaker, seriously . . .

MR. JAMES H. BILTON (Swan River): Don't get serious, Bud.

MR. BOYCE: . . . I mentioned -- I have to, just for a moment, the Honourable Member for Swan River, the former editor of the paper that never prints my articles.

Mr. Speaker, I mentioned the implementation of the War Measures Act, and while I'm on my feet I wish to say as a member from Winnipeg and a member for Winnipeg Centre, I want to compliment the Winnipeg Police Force specifically, and the police forces in our province for the way that they have handled some very ticklish problems that occurred as a direct result of the implementation of the War Measures Act in the Province of Quebec, because the government - not the government so much as the police in Quebec used the War Measures Act as a means of rousting around, in my mind for lack of a better term I would term a petty criminal, these people made a mass exodus from the Province of Quebec and many of them landed up in the City of Winnipeg. Now this hasn't been too generally known -- (Interjection) -- but they're all in the Conservative Party. This hasn't been generally known, but I think that the police force in the City of Winnipeg and in the suburbs has done a fantastic job, because I know of three or four cases where they have moved expeditiously to solve what could have been very very difficult problems because of the influx of this particular element into our society. -- (Interjection) -- The new Liberals? Well, with that, Mr. Speaker . . .

A MEMBER: What?

MR. BOYCE: Why don't you come and run in Winnipeg Centre next year?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. GEORGE HENDERSON (Pembina): Mr. Speaker, I want to begin my remarks and I want to assure you that it'll be quite different to anything you've heard so far this afternoon. I want to congratulate you to being promoted to the office which you have. I am now aware that this is an office which requires a man to be firm in his decision and also to see that fairness is done to all members in the House. I know you will try to do a conscientious job and I can assure you that you will have my co-operation.

Since I have come into this House, it seems that we must have had more turmoil than ever before. I don't believe, however, that I have been one of the people that have caused it. It appears at times as if we have a circus, and this last episode could make you think so, and that we're trying to create a very sensational movie and that some people are trying to become stars. I'm not saying that all of the people do this on purpose but I do believe that we could accomplish much more if a lot of people would try a little harder. During the last session we had to sit through hours and hours of debate which lasted morning, afternoon and night. This was not always funny and it was very tiring but it had its good moments as well as its bad. It was an interesting experience to sit here sizing up the different members as they made their contribution to debate and to try and assess what type of men they were and where they really stood. Even after all this time I feel that there's many members here which I still am in doubt about. I don't think that this can be said about me. I think I make my position clear.

I think probably I'd like to tell a little joke here on politicians. There's no use in being serious all the time. It seems as if there were some politicians over in Africa on a hunting safari, and after they'd finished their hunt they decided to spend a few days in the city before going home, and they were looking around the shops. They came to a store where on the meat counter there were several trays and they had brains on them. There were different trays with different groups of brains, and they had the brains of the farmers and they were at a dollar a pound; they had the brains of the teachers and the businessmen and they were \$3.00 a pound; and they had the brains of the politicians and they were \$5.00 a pound. So they decided to ask the native behind the counter why the difference in price, and the native just shook his head and said, "Listen, Mister, if you knew how many of those politicians we had to kill to get a pound of brains, you'd know the difference in the price."

I hope that I have portrayed myself in such a way that you know where I stand. I intend to follow that policy of being truthful and say what I believe even if some people don't like it.

I would like for a moment to remind you of a few of the things which I said when I took part in the first Throne Speech debate, and you'll have no bother remembering what I said because I made myself very clear on welfare and on education and I also spoke on agriculture and markets and other things. When I did speak, I don't think you had any trouble getting my message. I got criticism on my remarks, especially from some of the members on the other side and particularly the Members from Osborne and Elmwood. I got criticism from the teachers and I even had some from the press. They were wondering if probably my speech shouldn't have been scrutinized by caucus before I said it. But generally they were good remarks. Others told me that they thought I had the courage to say what other people thought but what they had not the nerve to say. I'm glad that I received some criticism from members on the other side. It really shows where they stand. I was glad a few teachers noticed what I said. When I said that many people were wondering if we were getting our money's worth in education, there was a letter went in the paper by some of the teachers criticizing me for it, and this happened to turn out to be a big mistake on the teachers' part because there had been people that had never read my remarks, and when they saw the letter from the teachers they took the trouble to hunt them up, and after that, that's when I got phone calls and the people told me they did agree with what I said. And, by the way, I never received a phone call or a letter disagreeing with me.

I've been very critical of education and welfare and I believe that I've been right, and it's been coming more to the forefront all the time. Do you hear many people complaining about the cost of education these days and the job it is doing? You don't really have to believe me. Just read an article here that was sent to all of you members from the Free Press. I'm sure that they must have thought it was a good article. If you haven't read it I really think you should. We have come to a time when people are not only criticizing the cost of education but they are really also losing confidence. They are asking not only whether we can afford future education costs but whether we should be willing to afford them. They're asking if the product is worth the price and if there has not been a mistake in what we achieve through education. If

(MR. HENDERSON, cont'd.) . . . .by any chance you have not read this article, I suggest again that you really do. I believe that it's time that somebody begins to speak on behalf of the taxpayers and the rising cost of education, and I intend to do just that.

What has happened in the Health and Social Welfare Department? Have you heard any criticism of this department which had a budget of 136 1/2 million, and I understand they're in the red of between 10 and 11 million today. Out of a total budget of 448 million, we are spending 38 percent of it in this department. Between Health, Social Services and Education we are spending 307 and some odd million. This is 68 cents out of every dollar of our taxation today is being spent in these two departments. 68 cents out of every dollar.

There really has to be something wrong with a system that does this. There's got to be something wrong. People can't afford this type of a thing, this much cost in those two departments. I really could say this in a form of a joke, but it's really a reality. We really have two departments now which really are working real well because when they're through with their education they can now go on welfare, because this is just about the way the program's working. It's no wonder it's costing a lot. When they're through with their education they're going on welfare and it's happening in Fort Garry and other places all the time now. We're reading about it every day.

I'm concerned about the reaction of these people who have been on welfare for so long. I wonder are they going to want to work when they're given work after being treated so good, and I wonder what's going to be done about the people that are on welfare now when they're asked to work and some of them will be refusing work. I wonder just where the government stands on that policy. By increasing taxes on the doers and on the savers we are doing away with initiative. We are encouraging people to accept welfare. We are actually encouraging people to accept welfare. Apparently now people even on strike, as we were told this afternoon, are going to be able to collect welfare. Now, folks, I think this is really serious. This is really serious. On top of this we have the 18-year-old youths which are living at home that can still get welfare, and this is not right. This is not right. I must say that I really feel sorry for the Minister that is in charge of this department. I really believe that he means well, and the only thing is he thinks he can be all things to all people and that this is the answer. He doesn't believe that he's like a man in quicksand, that he's getting sucked in deeper and deeper, and that he's headed in the way of no return. If I didn't believe that he was really serious in his department and that he's working hard, I would feel like calling for his resignation, but I don't believe these things. But I do believe that we should have a total reform of the Health and Social Service Department.

I'm also concerned about law and order in the province now. So much emphasis is being put on the prisoners and very little credit is given to the police. If they rough anybody up, it's called police brutality. Maybe we shouldn't be blaming the ordinary citizens very much when we have the actions of men like our Attorney-General, when he acts like he does. I want to refer you to an article in the Tribune on September 17th. There's no need of reading the whole article . . .

MR. LARRY DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Read it all.

MR. HENDERSON: Do you want me to read it all? -- (Interjection) -- Because it's you I won't bother doing it. But I will read the last paragraph which sums it all up pretty well. "Many Manitobans have every reason to wonder who they can depend upon. Will the police in the future bother to lay charges against demonstrators considered to be breaking our laws, knowing as they do now that there could be a stay of proceedings? Has the Attorney-General pre-empted for himself the role of judge? It appears that way." It's in the Tribune. If you want the article you can get it. There it is. I'd like it back.

Then we have the contribution that the Honourable Member from Crescentwood made at the time of the FLQ crisis. It was a contribution all right, but I really wouldn't say it was a good one, especially coming from somebody in the office of an MLA. I think it degrades the office. Parades and demonstrations in Winnipeg have become commonplace. We have radicals coming up here from the States who advocate violence and they are allowed in. School boards and universities . . .

MR. GREEN: I wonder if the honourable member would permit a question?

MR. HENDERSON: I will after I'm finished. School boards and universities should not harbour teachers who propagate extremism. These people are responsible for indoctrinating our young people with radical ideas. And this could be enlarged on but I think the message is



(MR. HENDERSON, cont'd.) . . . . there. Our provincial authorities say permitting entry of these people into Canada is a federal matter and that they can't be stopped unless they violate some one of our laws. It isn't very reassuring to be informed by our elected representatives that, while the province can pass these laws prohibiting entry of eggs and chickens, that they won't or that they can't pass a law heading off people that come in like the Panthers and other revolutionists. You may think that I am worried too much but I'm warning you to watch out. This is going to develop into a problem if it isn't watched. We would do well to look at it right now because I am one that believes that an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure.

Referring to my constituency, you must have heard of several bankruptcies this last spring. This is unfortunate but it's really not so awful strange. But the peculiar thing about it is that these people that went into bankruptcy were people who were helped into their debt by the provincial government. I don't want to be too critical because people in any business can go bankrupt and so we really shouldn't be too critical of it, but I am one that believes that loaning large sums of money at high interest rates when there is only a small return on the dollars that are invested in the first place, is a very risky business. And I believe that when you have money like this at a high interest rate and a lot of it, if you get a failure (which can easily happen) that it'll easily put a fellow out of business in a few years. Credit should be wisely used or it'll ruin anyone.

I'm very disappointed that the government hasn't seen fit to do anything about the Pembina Dam. This is really a great disappointment to the people in this area. With the interest that there is these days in tourism and recreation, not to mention the special crops that we have in this particular area and livestock, I think that this is very disappointing. I hope that Manitoba don't fool around too long and end up by letting the States build a dam on their own and that we'll lose the chance and the right to build a dam on the Canadian side. I will be speaking about this further because this is one thing that I am very disappointed in the government. It is not considered a priority item; they haven't done anything about it; there's no correspondence unless it's just in this last while between them and the Canadian government and I don't think it's very good.

I haven't said anything about the case of the farmer and this is really the same old story which everybody from the farm is saying about the cost price squeeze. But the only thing is that it's really getting worse. While our efficiency is still increasing, our prices are going down and this is making it very difficult. My belief is that if we want to get out of this trouble Manitoba must export to survive, and we must really get out and see that markets are found. I believe, really, that we have to put a lot of effort into this, and if we do I really think that we can come up with it. If you really want to and try hard, it'll make a difference. I know it's difficult but I think that's our answer, that we have to get out and find markets. As the Member for Gladstone said, when two-thirds of the world's population are under-nourished, we surely must be able to find a way to get our food to them and to be able to trade with them. This is where the population is, this is where the need is, and we have this surplus, and I think there should be a way found to deal with them.

I know, Mr. Speaker, that I dealt at length with many articles but I really haven't said much about the Throne Speech. But the Throne Speech, as I heard one member say, is more famous for the things that it didn't say. It's not so famous for the things it did say, it's probably the things it didn't say. It's in very general terms.

HON. RUSSELL DOERN (Minister without portfolio)(Elmwood): I thought you were against big government.

MR. HENDERSON: I feel that I have dealt with the things that really do concern my constituency, and I'm sure they do. I know they're concerned about the cost of education. This is one thing today that the people are more concerned about than you people realize, I believe, because the cost is going up and the rural people are paying more than their share to start off with, and they seem to be getting worse; and by all indications they're even going to get worse. But it's got to the point where people aren't even prepared to accept it; they're becoming antagonistic, that they're wondering about education. And really, we've really got to do some work on that. There's no doubt but they're very concerned about welfare and the way it's been used. When these people on strike and these students can get welfare as well as the other abuses that we know about, it's just terrible. Law enforcement is something that's concerning many people in the province. Many people aren't saying too much about it but they're thinking quite a bit. And of course the people out in my area, which takes in the Pembina Development Corporation

(MR. HENDERSON, cont'd.) . . . . and all that area, we've all been wanting the Pembina Dam and there hasn't been anything said about it. We have the cost price squeeze on agriculture and our main problem is the lack of markets. These really are the things that are concerning my constituency. They are really the things that mean whether they're getting ahead or not. I hope that during this session that we will be able to deal with them in such a way that they will be able to get relief.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I would first like to congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, on being appointed to the highest office in this House. Certainly my association with you in the Legislature over the past two sessions of the Legislature has been very cordial with one another, very frank with one another, and I am sure that you will continue to do your duties in the House as you have always done them in the previous, which is very admirable.

Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot here said this afternoon about all what the Throne Speech did not say. I don't intend to go into all that much detail about what the Throne Speech did or did not say, but the one thing that it hasn't got in it is any future aggressive type of thinking that will benefit the people of Manitoba. I must say one thing that I heard the word this afternoon; the Honourable Member from Winnipeg Centre, he made some statements about profits and what have you, and I think things are definitely looking up when we talk about profits, when we see on a store on Osborne Street the sign "less 40 percent." Now I can really understand why people aren't buying the stuff but I never thought that we'd ever see on that store a real capitalist way of selling things, and there certainly must be a lot of profit in the original price if you can put a sign up "less 40 percent." So things are looking up when we see signs like that on a store on Osborne Street.

But when I say about there's nothing aggressive about the Speech from the Throne, the Member from Osborne got real up tight yesterday, it would seem, about the fact that we suggest that something should be done along the east side of Lake Winnipeg and what would we do with the lands and the forests and the reserves and everything that was there, and the really aggressive way that he approached it is he's been listening to the misguide of economists of this country who absolutely say that you can't do anything because there's no market, and in this day and age, with everything the way it is all over the world, to say that there isn't a market for the resources of Manitoba is ridiculous. I'm sorry the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources is leaving because I have . . .

MR. GREEN: I'll be back.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Well, be quick. Thank you. But anyway, nobody takes the attitude in the government of Manitoba at the present time of being a salesman. Nobody says that we have something in this province. Nobody says that it's here and we're going to develop it and we're going to sell it. The Minister of Industry and Commerce in the Province of Manitoba, as far as I can see (and I don't intend to answer questions or comments from the floor too often), is finding out that everything he has learned is very different when you get into doing things practically in this day and age and way of life. He's finding that things are very foreign to what he learned and I hope he keeps finding it out much faster than he is. But nobody, as I said, is selling. Nobody is developing on the basis that we will go out and find a market. And then the gentleman from Osborne, at the same time he keeps mentioning, he keeps mentioning the business about Saskatchewan. You know, in Saskatchewan from 1944 to 1957 there was a decrease in people employed in industry in Saskatchewan of 67 in that period. Oh sure, there was a lot of people there because the development of oil was coming along, but they came paid by companies to build there and develop the province, dig around and what have you. But the actual people employed by new industry developed in Saskatchewan in the period of '44 to '57 went down by 67 people.

I must refer him to a book that I wish everybody would read. It's called "Douglas in Saskatchewan." Yeah. "Douglas in Saskatchewan." He went by some old theory and Bible which is presented by the Socialists and I tell you, you haven't changed one bit. You have turned around and you just continue to decide to spend the people's money putting it into businesses that will not develop -- (Interjection) -- We could get to that too, Mr. Minister -- that will not develop, and after you've got the money in there you have the problem because of poor management and you didn't turn around and take a look at the markets involved. You have to keep it going, or you have to put more money in because there's jobs involved. The little bit

(MR. F. JOHNSTON, cont'd.) . . . . about small businesses that we have in the Throne Speech today is something that has to be very cautiously watched. You will loan to small businesses, but if you don't definitely show those small businesses, management, if you don't loan to small businesses that have been well surveyed and researched before you go into them. . . -- (Interjection) -- We have a Manitoba Development Fund. Would you like the list? -- (Interjection) -- Well, I can't complain about the honourable member. He believes what he believes. But we will stand on our record as far as small businesses are concerned. But if you don't, if you don't definitely put management in and research the businesses that these people are investing in, you're going to be in trouble and you're not helping them one bit.

Then, of course, we have the welfare situation at the present time, the Minister of Welfare and Social Services with his large increasing staff, and of course Lady Bountiful, Una Decter, roaming all over the country and making statements like, you know, there are no such things as transients. Pay 'em all. Take care of them all. That's the attitude of the government at the present time. That's the attitude of the government when people in Manitoba are in real need of jobs. The Member from Winnipeg Centre is talking about he criticized last year, he criticizes this year - jobs at any cost. We don't talk about jobs at any cost. We never did. We created jobs in this province, and what does any man want? He wants the right to be able to go out, do a day's work so he can hold his head high, come home and talk to his family, enjoy the recreation in a province, enjoy everybody. . . (Interjection) -- That's right. That's what he wants. He wants to be able to hold his head high. He doesn't want to be continually having handouts. And that's what you're creating in this province. It was probably notable that you're looking at recreation through a lottery. I think I'm very interested in seeing that bill to see what happens as far as the recreation proposals are concerned, but again I say, this is what a person wants. He wants a job, be able to hold his head high, go home to his family after doing a day's work and enjoying the recreation in his area. And you're definitely not doing it with your Speech from the Throne.

Then of course we have the one-city concept that has been presented to us by the government, that is mentioned in the Speech from the Throne, on the basis that everybody is out of step in Greater Winnipeg except the Minister of Urban Affairs and the government. People in the Greater Winnipeg area who have listened to the public meetings, and it was disappointing to me as somebody that is sales-minded at all listening to the meetings that went on around this city -- I've never quite seen anything like it. It was like a canned sales talk for a product that is no good. And there was no statistics; there was nothing about the product, nothing given to the people. There have never been any meetings in the government with the local cities and municipalities. They have ignored the fact that all of the municipalities have presented problems to having one big city overnight. They have ignored the facts, all but two, and I might say the Boundaries Commission Report recommended that they be put together. They have completely ignored the fact that Winnipeg and St. James-Assiniboia are the only two places that have a general levy; there's district levies everywhere else. They've completely ignored the fact that we had an amalgamation that took us three years to put a pension plan together after you get the police, fire and everybody all satisfied with their pension plans. Completely ignored the fact that there's even hydrant charges, every type of charge, and you want to put this together all in one fell swoop. It's ridiculous. It can't be done. You'll have a scrambled egg that you'll never unscramble. But we go blindly ahead, completely blindly ahead, after -- (Interjection) -- Yes, wilfully, deliberately - thank you gentlemen -- and stupidly. Thank you. Yes, keep going ahead on the basis that everybody's out of step but us.

I tell you, gentlemen, that if you do put this city together in one fell swoop the Minister of Finance will again be working on the basis of shifting. He's made tax shifts that have shifted the people out of Manitoba; he's announcing more shifts that will probably shift people out of Manitoba; and now as Minister of Urban Affairs he's pushing through a piece of legislation that will shift people out of Manitoba. So, old Shifty over there is really working at it very hard and, as last year, he'll probably stand up and say that "I created the biggest tax shift and I've made the biggest shifts of anybody in this province," and they're all moving out. That's the shifts that they're making. Now it's all very well to say that there are some for it, but the presentations that have been made have to be listened to. The Boundaries Report wasn't listened to. It was conveniently thrown over the shoulder.

MR. DOERN: Did you read it?

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Yes. Did you?

MR. DOERN: It wasn't worth reading.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: And now that I've heard from the expert on municipal affairs, the man that's never been so much as a school board member, I'm sure that I'm much more thoroughly up-to-date. I can understand the First Minister's decision to make him a Minister without portfolio because I really couldn't think of one I could give him, but nevertheless the business of listening to what the people want and putting amalgamation together in Winnipeg on a very seriously studied and worked out basis has to be considered and, if it is not, we are going to have disaster and more shifting out of this province.

MR. DOERN: Tell us about St. Vital.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Well, again we hear from the expert and in St. Vital you had 6,000 people that were opposed, and if the new member for St. Vital does not take that into consideration I'm saying that he would not be representing the people that he is representing.

MR. DOERN: How many opposed you? Seventy percent.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: I opposed -- I don't really know what we're talking about now so I don't intend to get into it. I -- when we're talking about opposing me, I don't really know where you get the 70 percent but . . .

MR. CHERNIACK: . . . yield to a question then?

MR. F. JOHNSTON: No, we haven't been yielding all day, Mr. Speaker, so I don't think I will now. So, again, that's just another one of the ways that this government is harming the people of Manitoba by not looking ahead. There's nothing aggressive about them at all. Really, when you think about it, the plans for the development of all these smaller industries, which could cause us a problem if it is not thoroughly gone into, and then the amalgamation of the city, the tremendous spending that is going on in Welfare and other departments, the tremendous increase in people as far as the government employees are concerned, has to be paid for, and nobody, nobody on the government side at any time has told us how we're going to pay for it. We'd be very interested on this side of the House, and we will be very interested all through this session, to hear how it's going to be paid for. You can't pay for anything if your economy is not growing -- and ours is not.

I refer you to a book, I guess it was published in 1966, June of 1966, Manitoba Journal. You'll see a list of buildings that were proposed in this city that were to be built and half of them haven't been started. Take a look at the -- (Interjection) -- No, the only ones that were finished, Mr. Speaker, are the ones that were started when our administration was here. That's the only ones that were started. If you'd like to take a look at the building reports from the beginning of January, 1971 or the beginning of November, 1971, these are facts. Take a look at the building reports. -- (Interjection) -- Very good. Take a look at those too, Mr. Attorney, Mr. Speaker. The building reports in Regina are exceptionally good, and I'll tell you this, that the building -- as I said, let's get back to the ones in Manitoba; that's what we're concerned about, because every time you mention something to the present government, Mr. Speaker, they start talking about somewhere else. They don't seem to be concerned about here. If you look at them you'll find . . .

HON. HOWARD R. PAWLEY (Minister of Municipal Affairs)(Selkirk): Would the honourable member submit to a question?

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Sorry, Mr. Speaker. If the honourable -- I'll answer a question after, Mr. Speaker. But the amount of buildings that are being built, are they really buildings that are keeping the employment in Manitoba? Sure, you hear of a lot of small things going on. I have to congratulate you on your Winter Works program, PEP program. It's keeping people employed. I must say it's a little bit like trying to feed a horse from the rear end and get it to the stomach, but it is working a little bit. There is no way, there is absolutely no way that you can keep -- you know, you've got to keep things going; you don't do things backwards, and this is what this government did but it is keeping some people employed.

But, Mr. Speaker, I will tell you that the welders, the draftsmen, the architects, all of these people, engineers in departments, all of these people who are required to have employment are not having it in this province. It's all very well to say that you have a little program to clean trees and this type of thing, and we welcome it, but where is your program? Where is your incentive to put the people like the welders, the boilermakers, the machinists, and all of these people to work? There hasn't been any program involved at all and if you want to say, like the honourable member is saying again if he's mentioning socialism, you haven't got enough money to do it. You haven't got enough money to do it. Where are you going to find it? That's what we want to know. Find it. And it's pretty obvious that again we will have a

(MR. F. JOHNSTON, cont'd.) . . . tax shift that will tax the people that are here now because there's nobody coming in; they're all going out, and you'll continue to have them going out. You'll have people leaving this province and the only ones that are there to pay are the ones that are here now. And don't, Mr. Speaker - I'd like to remind the government - don't kid yourselves. Don't kid yourself at all; that the people that earn between \$6,000 and \$10,000 a year are 80 percent of the people of this province and you'll tax them; you'll have to tax them and you'll have them moving out. It catches up with you. It comes at you.

I was just about to say when the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources was leaving that I was talking about aggressiveness, and how he could agree with the Member from Osborne I'll never know because the Member from Osborne is regressive. He doesn't even think about anything. The Minister of Mines and Natural Resources at least believes that there is something in this province and we can put it together and we could sell it if we had to. There aren't any trees in a desert and they probably need some over there, or we could sell them some lumber. He and I would disagree bitterly on how we would accomplish the good things for the people in Manitoba because I don't think his way works and he doesn't like my way, but I'll tell you this. We agree on doing things for the province. We don't agree on listening to backward economists that are misguided at the present time. And that's what we've heard from the body of the speakers on that side of the House so far.

The nothing that I speak about, Mr. Speaker, is not what was in the Throne Speech. I've heard nothing, absolutely nothing, that would convince me that the majority of the speakers of this government that I've heard from to date in this session believe one bit in this province going ahead. Because they don't, they don't do it. They take the attitude there is no market; we won't create one. We won't go and find what somebody wants. We won't go and find what they have and maybe somebody else wants it or work for it. There is no salesmanship among them. And, you know, you can have the best product in the world, you can have the best organization in the world, and if you don't move it you're stuck. And that's what this government is stuck with - all kinds of great ideas and no way of doing it, because you haven't got the tax dollars, you are disappointing -- you've depressed any thought of people investing in this province. We've got the highest corporation tax, which we have said, and it shouldn't be the highest corporation tax; we've got the highest personal income tax, and I don't know where you're going to have people investing. So you say socialism, I've often said socialism. You say socialism. Tell me how it's going to work in the Province of Manitoba. Tell me how you're going to -- Mr. Speaker, I wish they'd tell me how they will develop northern Manitoba which is one of the roughest areas in the world, and I admire the Minister of Transport when he says our future's in the north. I don't disagree with him one bit.

MR. PAWLEY: For all the people.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: That's right. For all the people the future is in the north to use it, but would the Minister of Transport tell me how they're going to do it?

MR. BOROWSKI: Not by giving it away the way you did to CFI . . .

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, when we speak of CFI, and I don't really know how far we can speak on that; it is in the courts at the present time. I don't intend to get too detailed on it. But let me tell you that the impression that I have of CFI is that it is a very efficient operating plant. The Minister of Industry and Commerce says that they are doing marvelous things up there now. They only took it over in January and what they took over didn't just grow the day before. The forests are there. They're being brought into a plant that is there, they're being used and it's helping develop northern Manitoba, and the Minister of Transport is one man who says, "Do it any way you can but develop the north." Would he turn down something that would develop the north? But he chooses to criticize anything anybody else does.

MR. BOROWSKI: I sure as hell would turn down the CFI deal that you guys got into.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: That's right, Mr. Speaker. I guess the government might have turned down the CFI deal but it wouldn't be there now if you had, and it's there. It's there, and you very proudly, very proudly took it over, Mr. Speaker, and are operating something that is there. -- (Interjection) -- All right. Mr. Speaker, I charge them, close it up.

MR. BOROWSKI: After you blew a hundred million dollars?

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Close it up. Mr. Speaker, I charge them right now, I ask the government members to please get rid of the receiver, give it back to private industry. You don't want to do it.

MR. PAWLEY: After you've contracted a hundred million dollars away?

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Go ahead. Go ahead. Get . . . for 90 million dollars, Mr. Speaker. I ask you, did you put \$400.00 into it out of your pocket? Did you? Well, this is the ability of the Minister without Portfolio. That money came from the investment market and is guaranteed by the province and until that . . . CFI does not pay or show a profit.

MR. DOERN: What's it worth today? Fifty bucks?

MR. F. JOHNSTON: That's a stupid statement, Mr. Speaker. But anyway the -- if you want to say that the minute that it does not make money, go ahead; then you can be critical; but it's there. Even if it did have problems, and it will now that the government's running it, I assure you of that, because obviously, you know, when the government puts money in things, Mr. Speaker, you have some very strange things happen. People . . . that they don't care. You know, the Lord Selkirk is very strange to me, the reports I get from people in Selkirk that when it was put to sleep last winter for the season that all the pipes froze up, many of the toilets cracked; it probably cost some money to put in new pumps; it might take quite a bit of money to put it back on the river again.

MR. BOROWSKI: . . . put the money in it to help your friends out.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: I'm just merely saying, Mr. Speaker, that once the government becomes involved in any industry, the interest for good housekeeping -- just look on. They don't care. Here you have an investment in that very expensive ship out there, it's that size, and nobody even took the time to see if everything was being done right as far as housekeeping is concerned. Here again if you're going to go into something do the right thing - investigate, train, make sure the right management's there, everything about it.

So, Mr. Speaker, really, again I say I haven't heard anything aggressive, I haven't heard anything aggressive from this government. If they would turn around and they would say we are going to roll back the sales tax, roll back the corporation tax, they would then see something happen in this province, and they're going to have to do it or there'll be no investment, and it's proving. Where are the investments that I'm talking about? Ruttan Lake? Where is it? It hasn't started, Mr. Speaker. You know, it's on fairly reasonably good rumour that there were three proposals presented by the Premier that the Cabinet wouldn't even pass. When is it going to be then? When are you going to get the investment that you need? When are you going to take the doubts off of people who want to come into this province? When are you going to take the doubts off of people that know they have to have hydro in the north and get on with doing the job?

It's kind of ridiculous, Mr. Speaker, but this province is going into a standstill. And I again refer everybody on that side, and everybody I hope in this province, to the book called "Douglas in Saskatchewan", because you will see a history of absolute depression. You'll see a history of absolute nothing happening, and the same thing is going to happen to this province, Mr. Speaker. -- (Interjection) -- That's an irrelevant question. Twenty years? Well, 20 years from now -- you know, if that's basically what is happening, Mr. Speaker, is that we will have 20 years, if this government stays in power and God help us if it does - and I said God help us if it does and I don't really think it will - I don't really think it will because the people of Manitoba, you know, when you're in Missouri they say "I'm from Manitoba." You can't kid the people of Manitoba, you've never been able to kid them and you never will, and every one of them are saying, you know, where is it all going to come from? And that's what we're going to ask, Mr. Speaker. We're going to make darn sure that you've got the money. We're going to make darn sure that we work to have people invest in this province because the people themselves haven't got that much money in this province.

But I say, Mr. Speaker, my experience in two sessions with this government is they listen to nobody. Oh, they listen to men that they can find that worked in Saskatchewan for 20 years. They find a man to talk on the one big city or they bring him in for expert advice and really, really why they did it, they've got council men over there, men that were on Metro and what have you but they bring in a man who never was in Manitoba. The Minister of Urban Affairs was just diving into his desk the last session saying please let me read his program what he was. All I can say about that man is there wasn't one thing that said he'd ever worked in Manitoba in civic affairs, and if he done all the things they said he did and he wasn't 103 years old he could have only spent about a year at each one. So I really don't know where you find them, but you dig them up, you dig them up, you dig up the Blackburns and the Cass-Beggs and all of these people who know nothing about this province, pay them high salaries of the people's money of Manitoba to get nothing, because they haven't presented us with anything but regressive policies.

(MR. F. JOHNSTON, cont'd.) . . . . .

So, Mr. Speaker, the government Speech from the Throne, although many people before me spoke saying it had nothing, it really has nothing from the point of view that there isn't one good sales minded aggressive thought in it. Thank you very much.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. PAWLEY: Would the honourable member submit to a question?

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Yes.

MR. PAWLEY: The honourable member made reference to building boom in Regina, Saskatchewan. Is he aware that there was more dollar value building permits issued in the city of Brandon in 1970 than all of Saskatchewan in 1970?

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I'll answer his question very quickly, in fact I'll even tell him something that's amazing. In 1969 the building permits in Saskatoon were 42 million dollars; in 1970 they were 13. That's how far Saskatchewan was down. But, Mr. Speaker, if the Honourable Minister will take out a Building Report subscription and take a look at the building that is going on in Saskatchewan and starting at the present time, and I think most of it is going on because they're getting the devil out of this province, you'll find a big difference.

MR. PAULLEY: I wonder if my honourable friend would permit me to ask him a question. Have you looked at the latest population trends in Saskatchewan compared to Manitoba where Manitoba has increased, despite the admonitions of Izzy Asper, and those in Saskatchewan have gone down by about 8,000 in a year.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, again we get a referral to Saskatchewan. Well, Mr. Speaker, again we're having a bit of a boom in Saskatchewan but again we get a referral to Saskatchewan. Let's look at the figures in Manitoba and I'd like to refer to the figures, Mr. Speaker, in B. C. and Alberta.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I would suggest to the honourable members that the questions be questions on clarification. I do not wish to extend honourable members debating time by questions which open up further fields. With that . . .

MR. PAULLEY: I don't want to open up further fields but my honourable friend has referred in his discourse, if it may be called that, to certain population trends and exhibited or stated that we were not aware of certain trends. I would like to ask my honourable friend if he is not aware of the fact that the population in Manitoba has increased this year over last.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Well, Mr. Speaker, in all due respect to the Chair, Sir, I can't answer the question because I got told something; I wasn't asked a question.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question on the . . .

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): I believe the Honourable Member for Rhineland has the adjournment . . .

MR. SPEAKER: I was just going to mention that. The honourable member asked leave that others debate and that the question be left in his name. The Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I think that the debate has been somewhat enlivened by the contribution by the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek and I'm sure that all honourable members are indebted to him for the address that he made and which he has just concluded as well as to other members who spoke so eloquently this afternoon.

I must say, Mr. Speaker, that I enter the debate with some hesitation, and one of the reasons that I do so is to have the opportunity of being one of those members on the government benches to offer my congratulations to you, Mr. Speaker, for having assumed the office of the Speaker of this House, the highest honour which the Assembly has to afford on any of its members, and I know that I as well as other members in the House will feel not only the benefits of the kindly approach that you will take in presiding over the debate but we will also feel from time to time your innate toughness in causing us to adhere to the rules of order. May I say in advance, whatever I may say in the future, may I say in advance that I am very grateful that we will be able to appreciate both of these qualities which you will bring to this office.

Mr. Speaker, the second reason that I more or less hesitate to enter the debate is that I really feel that the debate to date with some exceptions, and I don't wish to minimize the quality of members' speeches, but I don't think that the debate has brought out anything which has been radically new to what we had left off with at the last session of the House. In the hope, Mr. Speaker, that real strong incisive debate is always an advantage whether it's an advantage to the government or an advantage to the opposition parties, it certainly is an advantage to the

April 14, 1971

(MR. GREEN, cont'd.) . . . . democratic process and to the people of the Province of Manitoba, and in the hope that possibly we can bring out and crystallize some of the issues that are facing us, I attempt to make this contribution.

I don't know that I will succeed but I attempt to make this contribution in any event, Mr. Speaker, and some of it will be in the nature of the offering of some political advice. I tried this approximately - oh, a little over a year ago, I tried to offer the opposition political advice which they in their wisdom decided not to take. I thought it was good advice but they decided not to take it in their wisdom and I believe that they suffered by it, so I stand here with full confidence that I can again offer good political advice and that it won't do any damage to us at all because they in their wisdom will again decide not to take it and therefore I can make this counselling without the least difficulty that I would in some way damage the position of the government party by offering good tips to the Opposition.

I can remember, Mr. Speaker, approximately a year ago at that time, possibly a little more than a year ago, that the entire opposition attack was related to the fact that over there are the bad doctrinaire people who are trying to foist ideological propositions on to the people of Manitoba and much of their speeches abounded with the word "socialism." I remember the honourable the former Leader of the Opposition who spent his entire attack one day attacking the government because they had hired Cass-Beggs and that he was a Socialist. At that time I tried to indicate that if the opposition would debate the issues which were before the people of the Province of Manitoba and if they looked at the programs that were being offered and that they attacked every idea, every good idea on the basis that it was socialist, that they would have the effect of converting far more people to socialism than any of the socialist leaders that we have had in the Province of Manitoba or in Canada, because if an idea is good and it's recognized to be good on its merits and the opposition can only attack it by attaching to it a label which they think is going to scare people, that rather than scare people, the people had the intelligence to look at the idea and if the idea is good and the opposition insists that the label be attached to the idea they will be engaged in an evangelical move to create people into socialists who never dreamed that they were socialists.

I can remember, Mr. Speaker, that I was talking at the meeting in St. James -- no, it wasn't St. James it was Charleswood-Tuxedo and we were talking about unification of government services in Manitoba. At one stage in the discussion somebody yelled out from the audience something to the effect that this was a communist plan - a communist plan, Mr. Speaker. And I said to the person: Well, that's very interesting, your referring to this as a communist plan. I know that the plan has received the backing of organizations such as the Chamber of Commerce - strange bedfellows for communists; the Metropolitan Corporation of Winnipeg, composed of Liberals, Conservatives, New Democrats; the Mayor of Winnipeg and all his council; the East Kildonan Council. Mr. Speaker, the TED Commission Report, the Bible, the new Bible of the present Leader of the Opposition, called for - and prepared by all of the existing establishment people in Greater Winnipeg - called for simply the amalgamation of Greater Winnipeg, and this plan is challenged now by the Leader of the Opposition, now by the leader of another party which is not an official party of this House, as somehow being an insidious plot from the left to undo our way of life in the Province of Manitoba. Well, Mr. Speaker, with that type of charge and the member who made it - and I was in the audience - I said you have just created more communists this moment than Stalin created in his entire existence in the Soviet Union.

MR. ENNS: . . . indicate a member made that charge, a member of this Chamber?

MR. GREEN: No, I'm sorry, I talked about a member of the audience. I will refer to charges that have been made by members of this Chamber with regard to the same plan and in the same way, Mr. Speaker, which is having the same effect on many many people, because during the last election I advised - you know, I gave free advice and I suggest to you that it was worth a lot of money, to stop attacking us on the basis of an ideological label; look at the program; find its weaknesses - and I admit that there are weaknesses, Mr. Chairman, because there's weaknesses in the best that imperfect human beings can create - find those weaknesses, attack those weaknesses and we will have incisive debate.

Now, we had two by-elections which were fairly representative of the kind of province that we are living in. One was in the rural area, one was in what the opposition would have led the people of Manitoba to believe was the lion's den itself, a suburb in Greater Winnipeg which was going to be destroyed in the -- the person who's not in this House but who says he is the



(MR. GREEN, cont'd.) . . . . Leader of the Liberal Party fought the campaign on the basis that they are destroying the City of St. Vital. We went into those two areas and we went to the people, we pushed the program. And what did they push in those two areas? Well, I understand, Mr. Speaker, that in St. Vital that there was some type of telephone campaign to the effect that there are insidious conspiracies at work within the New Democratic Party that are really not at the surface and that somehow there is no control over them. That was the scare in St. Vital.

The scare in Ste. Rose, and it was an interesting situation, Mr. Speaker, the Member for River Heights referred to it. He said that in Ste. Rose the Minister of Mines and Resources name was used to scare little children in Ste. Rose without much effect. Mr. Speaker, I was encouraged because I went to Ste. Rose. I shook hands with the people and they weren't afraid of leprosy when they shook my hand, they didn't climb under the chairs when they saw me on the stage, they seemed to be polite when I spoke to them, they applauded, and I even touched them - that's right. Mr. Speaker, it reminded me of the fact that the first time I had been in Ste. Rose was as a Minister, a relatively new Minister of Mines - the Honourable Member for Lakeside was in that position himself - only somehow I had a coincidental effect in that constituency because I was new, I was inexperienced, and I was introduced by a very nice gentleman of Glenella community who gave me probably what was the most accurate and shortest introduction I ever received. He said, "Ladies and gentlemen I want to introduce the Honourable the green Minister." I told the people of Ste. Rose that that was my first introduction in Ste. Rose, and now there are certain politicians who have unelectable candidates and think that they can make them more acceptable by running around referring to me as the Honourable the red Minister. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, it didn't work. I told you a year ago that the people of Manitoba are not to be insulted insofar as their intelligence is concerned by that kind of an appeal. I think that one of the members of the press gallery, Bob Preston, said to me. "Well," he said, "they tried the red scare and it didn't work, what will they try next time?" And I said, the green scare. Next it may be that that will work, or it won't work. I am suggesting to you that the political advice that - again I say I gave it gratuitously, free - apparently it didn't work last time and therefore I repeat I'm not afraid to give it this time.

First of all, I want to review what apparently are the issues in the Province of Manitoba, because much of what we have heard from the opposition, and I expect to hear this from opposition - I am not like the present Leader of the Opposition who when he sat on this side thought that it was the duty of the opposition to form a cheering section, that when the government spoke the opposition was to cheer. I don't expect you to cheer. You have been elected here on the basis that you oppose the government program and I say that I expect opposition and I don't expect cheers and I expect that opposition to be tough, just the kind of opposition that has been given by the Member from Sturgeon Creek a moment ago. I won't say that the same holds true with regard to all of the speeches that have been given in this House and I won't make reference to the speech of the Leader of the Opposition, because certainly that will be left for the Premier of this province. I would have a lot to say about the level that that speech reached or descended to in opposition tactics but I won't do that. I'll refer to the kind of tough, strong opposition that was referred to and given by the Member for Sturgeon Creek.

But let's look at the issues. One of the things that has been said - and this is what I wanted to review - is that this is a government that doesn't know where it's going, that has no program. Both the Leader of the Liberal Party by proxy, the Member for Portage la Prairie said that here's a government that doesn't know where it's going, and the same was referred to by other speakers in the House.

Well, let's look at whether this government knows where it's going, because in 1969 and in the years previous to that we presented a program to the people of the Province of Manitoba. If you will look at any of the election literature, if you will look at the resolutions that were presented in the House, if you will look at all of the media picture of the New Democratic Party prior to us being elected into office it will be easily discernible what this party said should be done for the people of the Province of Manitoba. No. 1. We said that the system of collecting taxes by a premium tax levied against each family as if they earned the same amount of money should be changed, and that we should change the premium tax into a tax which is based on ability to pay. The first thing that we did when we got into office, we took Medicare premiums and we reduced them from roughly \$117 a year to \$11.50 a year and we adjusted taxes accordingly. Now, that was No. 1 on our list of priorities and we did it, and I'm just indicating that so that at least you knew, the people in the Province of Manitoba knew that this government at

(MR. GREEN, cont'd.) . . . . least wants to do that and that was part of its program.

The next thing that we said - and it was No. 2 on our priorities at all time - is that we will take the existing scheme of automobile insurance which everybody says is wrong, which the Conservative Party in setting up a committee had indicated that there were difficulties with, which other parties had criticized, the Liberal Party had criticized in the House, which we had criticized, which has been subjected to investigations from coast to coast for the last number of years that automobiles have been invented, and we said that we could provide a better plan, a more effective plan, a more efficient plan, a less expensive plan, if that plan was provided by the public itself. And we did it. So at least the public, at least the opposition, at least everybody knew that that's one of the things that the New Democratic Party would be doing.

We said that the previous government in deciding on its method of the supply of hydro power was using a system which was questionable. That's what we said, Mr. Speaker. We said that this was a questionable procedure and we couldn't trust the existing administration to go ahead with it because it was going ahead on the basis of not being able to turn back from a program that they had already started upon, and that we would have another look at that program. There was only one party, that again doesn't exist any more, that took a definite position on that program and they said, "we wouldn't do it; we would not have a diversion of the Churchill to the Nelson." But our party said that we would have another look at it. The public knew it, the opposition knew it, we knew it and we did it. We took another look at it and we presented another program which is being proceeded with.

Another thing that we said in opposition, that was always part of our election program, is that we would reorganize the form of municipal government that presently exists in Greater Winnipeg because that existing system is not conducive to the needs of a modern urban municipality. And nobody disagreed with us. The opposition didn't disagree with us; the Ted Commission report said that there should be an amalgamation; the Liberal Party which now doesn't exist any more voted for that proposition in the House, Mr. Speaker. They voted for it in the House in terms that are, if anything, more strong than the terms that are presently prepared in the government white paper, because they voted in favour of a resolution which calls for the unification of all services in Greater Winnipeg under one government. The Liberal Party voted for that proposal, and I think, Mr. Speaker, that there hasn't been anybody who has approved of the form of municipal government in Greater Winnipeg. All of the suburbs didn't agree with that form of government, they criticized it for years. It's only in the last few months that suddenly there developed a real love affair as between the suburban municipalities and the form of Metro government that we have existing in Greater Winnipeg. So at least there's another thing that that party knew, this party knew, the people knew was something that the New Democrats would do differently than had been done by the parties on the opposition.

So let's look to see whether this government doesn't know where it's going, didn't have a program. There's a difference, Mr. Speaker; there really is a difference. There have been election programs in the past, many many election programs. The difference is that this government is the only government that Manitoba has had that announced a program before the election and carried it out after the election. That's the difference, and that's such an unusual thing, that is such an unusual thing to the traditional politicians that they have interpreted that to mean that any party that does this kind of stupid thing obviously doesn't know what it's doing. Any party that would enact its legislative program obviously doesn't have a program, it doesn't know what it's doing. I see the honourable . . .

. . . Continued on Next Page . . . .

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, would the Honourable Minister permit a question?

MR. GREEN: Yes.

MR. PATRICK: Is it not true that the First Minister during the election of 1969, a day before the election, said he believes in regional government and not total amalgamation because total amalgamation would be a great step --(Interjection)-- just one second. Is it not true that he changed his mind and should it be so wrong for the Liberal Party to change its mind after the facts came out in the report, the Boundaries Commission report, that the cost would be much greater ...

MR. GREEN: That's enough of my time, Mr. Speaker. That is not a question.

MR. SPEAKER: Well, I would like to comment on the question that was taking place. I've been pretty lenient about questions and I certainly hope the members will ask questions of clarification, but I do not intend to have members ask a question and make a debate out of the question, so I should like to ask the members to cooperate in this manner.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the First Minister has indicated that he will speak for himself and I know that he will do that and he will do it very well; we all know that. The fact is that never did this party talk about the amalgamation of Greater Winnipeg. We have always talked about the unification of services under a regional government in Greater Winnipeg and the various ways of achieving this. They were subject to argument two years ago, they were subject to argument a year ago, they were subject to argument two months ago, and they are still subject to argument. We have indicated, we have indicated that the policy paper is a means of achieving that type of government for Greater Winnipeg, but we are not going to sit, close the ears and close the eyes to any type of suggestion whereby this can be achieved more appropriately, and if you ask me whether we haven't profited by the two years in determining how to bring about this type of government then I say to you yes, frankly we have, and I do give the right of political parties to change their minds. What I say is wrong is for political parties to suddenly suggest that anybody who proposes this type of government is trying to destroy Greater Winnipeg, because I don't think that the Liberal Party intended to destroy Greater Winnipeg or St. Vital or any other municipality in Greater Winnipeg two years ago and I don't think that they intend to destroy it now. I think that their plan will have the effect of destroying it but I don't think that they intend that, that that is just a slip between the intention and what they suggest.

But the fact is that we have always said that what is required is a form of government in Greater Winnipeg which can meet the needs of the Greater Winnipeg citizens. And we did it. We proposed to the people of Greater Winnipeg a plan for the reorganization of their government. Not only did we propose it but we went into the lion's den and we fought it, and other people apparently didn't like the water, they thought it was either too cold or too hot and they stayed out -- and by the way I have something to say about that. We have for the first time, we have for the first time in Manitoba, maybe in the nation, a political leader who says when a country seat opens up - and in this I agree with him - he says I'm not really appropriate to that seat and I agree with him; then when a city seat opens up he says well, I'm not really appropriate to that seat either - and I also agree with him on that; and then he says - and in this I agree with him the most - he says it's not really important that I sit in the Legislature at this time.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I agree with him that it's not important that he sit at this time or at any time, and I think the people of Manitoba agree that it's not important that he sit in the Legislature. That's one thing on which they do agree with him. The fact is that I say let's examine these plans and let's say what's bad about this one and what's good about it, but once you start fighting these things on the basis that this represents some sinister ideology for and to our people which is creeping in and somehow subverting your freedom, then I say that the people will be turned off and they will stop listening. And I believe that they did stop listening. I gave you, you know, openly - I think I've repeated this, as I usually do, Mr. Speaker, repeat things - I repeated that that will not help and it didn't help and you didn't take my advice, and I'm rather happy that you didn't take it but I still think that it's for the good of democracy that we debate these issues and that we debate them incisively and therefore I don't mind offering the advice again.

We said in 1969 before we became the government that we would change the labour laws of this province, that we would take away those laws which interfere with the civil liberties of a human being if he happens to be a trade unionist, and that we would do that not for the

(MR. GREEN Cont'd) . . . benefit of trade unionists but for the benefit of all of us, because we don't pass special laws for trade unionists. If we say that a person should not be required to work or go to jail, we say that applies to lawyers, doctors, farmers, trade unionists, teachers, chiropractors - it applies to everybody. And if we say that a person shouldn't be prevented from walking down the street saying he doesn't like New Democrats or he doesn't like his employer or he doesn't like anybody else, or he doesn't like Sid Green, which there was one walking out here - and I suppose there are lots of us that would like to participate in that activity - that we say that he should have the right to do so whether he's a trade unionist or whether he's a cattle rancher or whether he's a real estate agent or whether he's an insurance agent, that he should have the right to do that. We not only said that we would do that but we did it.

We said that we would increase the minimum wage. We said that the province won't go broke if we increase the minimum wage. We said that the garment industry won't go broke if we increase the minimum wage. We said that it won't be, it won't be a problem that we have to run across to Italy to get workers and finance workers to work for very low wages for the garment industry if we increased the minimum wage. We said that we would do those things and we did those things, so that when we talk about a program and as to whether this party knew or knows where it is going, let us recall that all of these things were said before we were elected and that all we have been doing for the last two and a half - well, it's not quite that long but it will be - for the last two years is doing for the people of Manitoba in office what we said we would do when we were in opposition. We said that we would reduce the taxes on homes and substitute them for a tax which is more based on the ability of people to pay.

In the three sessions of the Legislature that we have been through - well, this is the third - you people are seeing brought to fruition the program of the New Democratic Party when we were out of office. And that's what's astonishing to you. It really is astonishing. That's why you say they have no program, because program in your minds is to say one thing and do another, and any party that says one thing and does that has no program. That's your logic, and according to your logic it fits - it fits.

Mr. Speaker, with all of these statements that we have no program, we get an incredible list of suggestions from the other side. I'm not going to comment on all of them. I really want to find out what their program is because we've indicated what our program is. I've listened to the attacks on the Speech from the Throne, I listened to them in the election campaign. Their program is that we will have no sinister people around and we will be in the hands of all the nice, honourable men on the other side, none of whom are sinister, that our taxes are too high in Manitoba. We have the highest, we found out - somebody over there has been sitting here for two years, or maybe he's been sitting here longer, and he said we have now found out that Manitoba admits that it has the highest income, corporate and personal income tax in Canada. If the member would have been listening he would have heard the Minister of Finance say when he introduced that tax that now Manitoba collects more money by means of the tax which is most related to ability to pay than any other province in the country. But he just found it out. And he's slow because it was announced in the Throne Speech debate. So they say that they would reduce the tax. How come we haven't reduced taxes? And there is a way. There is a way and we know because they themselves have already done it. There is a way to reduce that tax. They can take the 29 points in income tax or whatever it is, and I'm not good at the actual figures, but they can take the tax which requires now an average man earning \$6,000 a year with two dependents and requires him to pay roughly 28 or 30 dollars for his Medicare premium - for his income tax through Medicare, and they can put that into premiums so that he will pay \$117.00 for the same service. So they will save that man, they will reduce his taxes, they will save him \$28.00, charge him \$117.00 in the name of free enterprise, and they expect people to rally to their colors.

Well, Mr. Speaker, if we followed that system then why should we stop at the 39 points or why should we stop at anything. We could eliminate taxes in the Province of Manitoba. We could have the lowest taxes all across Canada in every field, in income tax, in tobacco tax, in sales tax, we could eliminate taxes and we could charge the people of Manitoba a premium, a government services premium. Now I figured out two years ago that the average Manitoban - and this is the man who drinks and smokes and who does other nice things - that the man who does all of these things pays roughly \$300.00 a year into Manitoba

(MR. GREEN Cont'd) . . . taxes - and that was based on \$300 million. We spend more since then, the opposition has been making a point of it - I think we are spending more to advantage but I use the figure \$300 million because it's an easy figure to use - that on that figure he paid \$300.00 a year in taxes. We could eliminate all his taxes and charge him a \$1,200 premium and then the Member for Sturgeon Creek, the Member for Brandon West could run around the country and tell people that Manitoba has the lowest taxes in Canada - not the lowest taxes in Canada, go to Manitoba where there are no taxes. Now the Member for --(Interjection)-- that's what I want to hear. The Member for Lakeside says "not a bad idea," and I say that's the program, the program is now coming out. The Manitoba Government says yes, let us finance government service on the basis of taxes which are based on ability to pay and the program of the opposition says eliminate all those taxes and charge a premium, charge those average guys \$1,200 for what they're now getting for \$300.00.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm getting a little tired of my own analogies. I kept referring that they will save you from the pussycats to feed you to the lions, but I think that I have to change that just for the sake of variety, that now what they want to do is save us from the hula girls to feed us to the cannibals and, Mr. Speaker, I don't think the people of Manitoba want to be saved in that fashion.

So let's add it up, let's find out - because they haven't told us - but let's find out by deduction what they mean when they talk about their program. We said in 1969 what our program was. I think that one of the reasons that we are here is that we told the people of Manitoba what our program would be. We enunciated it, we articulated it, we said that it's not going to solve all problems in Manitoba but it's going to solve some of our crucial problems.

Now, what has the opposition program been? Well, the Member for Lakeside has given us a hint. First plank in the opposition program: no taxes, all premiums. Instead of paying \$300.00 you pay \$1,200.00. Put that down as priority number one of the program of the opposition in the Province of Manitoba. Automobile insurance. We have indicated, and it becomes more and more evident that we were correct - and again I use rough figures - that there will be a \$5 million saving in the type of program that the public can manage for the people of Manitoba in their automobile insurance, that that program will be more fair, that it will be more efficient, that it will cover more things and that it will be less expensive. And we know that the opposition program is let's put automobile insurance back where it was. No, let's go further. Let's make it compulsory for the people of Manitoba to buy automobile insurance that is provided by private carriers. Let's say that instead of the people of Manitoba having control through their election of their elected representatives over what the automobile insurance program will be, let's put that control into the hands of people whom they have no say over. That's plank No. 2, plank No. 2 in the Conservative government program.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister has five minutes.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, plank No. 3 apparently is to put 30 feet of water on South Indian Lake. Plank No. 4, plank No. 4 is not to do anything with regard to municipal reorganization. I haven't heard -- I heard a suggestion from the Member for River Heights which was astonishing. He said that we should take this three-man commission, Mr. Taraska, Mr. Saunderson -- Judge Taraska, Mr. Saunderson and Charland Prud'homme, and let them give us a suggestion for municipal reorganization. All of a sudden, after everything that has happened, he took three people - he doesn't know how they feel about the question or anything at all - and he said because he doesn't know how they feel about it that that makes it --(Interjection)-- Oh yes, oh yes. I say to you, I say to you that we went to the people of Manitoba with a program; the people of Manitoba elected us on that program; we are now implementing that program. I know that that's astonishing to the Member for River Heights and I know why, but that's what we are doing.

The next program --(Interjection)-- you know, Mr. Speaker, I'm going to have to let deduction take care - and I'm sure that deduction can easily do a job and I'm sure that the people of Manitoba are easily able to deduce things - in order to be able to give my political advice, because that was the point of this speech, and I think that the Member for River Heights, the Leader of the Opposition, should listen to this political advice. The last time you listened but didn't do it you lost. This time you should listen, and I know you won't do it again otherwise I wouldn't tell you, so you'll lose again. But if those people are really honest about what they want for the people of Manitoba then the answer is obvious - coalesce.

(MR. GREEN Cont'd)...

You say that the Minister of Finance doesn't know how to judge what happened at a meeting. I say, Mr. Speaker, that the Leader of the Opposition has an equally, or in my view, has a very very peculiar manner of assessing what happens at an election. It turns out that after the last election where we elected two members, they won. I wish them that success in every single election that they participate in. But if you're right, if you're right, coalesce - coalesce. Realize the fact that there are no differences between you - and there aren't - go to the people and say here is the program of the government, here is the program of the opposition and let's fight those programs on their merits, let's take each platform, see which one is more efficacious for the people of the Province of Manitoba and fight us on that basis.

Now, Mr. Speaker, they have two problems, two problems which I know will not let them take my advice. The first is that they know that on a discussion of the issues they've got to lose every time and therefore if there is a coalition and if they have to fight us head on issue against issue that -- (Interjection)-- coalesce, coalesce, coalesce. Well I'm prepared, I'm prepared, I'm prepared. Let's fight on issues every election. You people coalesce; we'll put forward our program, you put forward your program, let the people choose. One of the problems is, Mr. Speaker, that they know on issues they're beat every time and that's why they won't coalesce.

The second one is even more significant. The second one is even more significant. All these years the real power in this country have decided that it is nice to have two political parties, because if one won't govern, if the people are dissatisfied with one they can always put in the other one and we have been saying this as long as we have been a political party. We have said that the other two parties don't really represent different points of view and they have continued to say, Mr. Speaker, because it's been in their interest to say so, that we do represent two different points of view. So the second problem with coalition is that to coalesce is to remove the hoax that there is any difference in principle or any difference in any program whatsoever as between the Liberal Party and the Conservative Party, and to do that is to destroy their credibility in the eyes of the people as a whole because for years -- don't you think for a moment - and they know it as well as we know it - that those people who have been voting Liberal and voting Conservative would vote for a so-called free enterprise party, a party that coalesced and said yes, we stand for something, because once that division took place and the people realized that they had been hoodwinked for 100 years by the suggestion that there are two of them when really there was one, that once they have to tell that to the people of this country then they lose again every time.

I'll conclude my remarks, Mr. Speaker, by merely saying that a year and six months ago or so, I gave you good political advice but you didn't take it. You lost. Today I give you again, I assure you, good political advice knowing that you won't take it, and you'll lose again.

MR. SPEAKER: Debate remains adjourned in the Honourable Member for Rhineland's name. The House is now adjourned and will resume operations again tomorrow at 2.30.