

## THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

8:00 o'clock, Thursday, April 15, 1971

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. EINARSON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I was discussing before the supper hour the matter of education, I would like to continue to make a few more remarks in regards to the Wilkinson Report and to inform the members of this House as I was informed, a committee presented this report to the First Minister and his Cabinet and the First Minister accepted with real favour. I understand the Minister of Labour also accepted it with real favour, but I noticed the Minister of Finance rise in his seat and wanted to ask me a question. I'm given to understand that he didn't take such favour to this report. However, be that as it may, I think in the very short time that I have had to look at it and having listened to the many elected people throughout the rural parts of Manitoba and having great concern for this real problem they thought that this in principle at least had some real merit. Now then, Mr. Speaker, I would just as soon wait for Mr. First Minister.

I have something else in my hand that I just got a few moments ago which relates to our Department of Education. A document here that I never thought, Mr. Speaker, that I would ever have the occasion to witness as a politician or a member of this Legislature. Whoever this guy Pete is I don't know whether that description fits him or not but I'm sure that the press must have received this document. The words to describe it is almost beyond my comprehension but it's the worst bit of rot that I think that I've ever laid eyes on. Now, Mr. Speaker, this comes from The Manitoban, it's published by the University of Manitoba Students' Union.

MR. MILLER: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I don't think it was the Manitoban . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education wishes a point of order?

MR. MILLER: Yes. I would like it clearly noted it is not the "Manitoban" and I wish the member would enunciate very clearly what he is reading.

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Speaker, if I did not pronounce it correctly, for the record I shall repeat it. "The Minitoban" put out by the Manitoba University, the Students' Union.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Transportation. Your point of order.

HON. JOSEPH P. BOROWSKI (Minister of Public Works and Highways)(Thompson): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to inform the member that I had those things photostated and delivered to your boxes and it does come from Manitoba. I thought it was a filthy paper, a shocking language and I thought the House should be made aware of the garbage that's printed in our university.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the Honourable Minister of Transportation for the comments he has just made. I concur wholeheartedly in what he has said to the members and to the people of Manitoba I hope. But I want to add a few more comments to this particular situation, Mr. Speaker. The hard-earned money, the sweat and toil of the thousands of Manitoban taxpayers who have paid money towards the grants to the tune of -- I won't give the exact figure but I think I'm very close -- to the tune of \$45 million in the way of grants to the University of Manitoba. I want to say to the First Minister -- (Interjection) -- Yes? This is really something coming from the Honourable Member for Elmwood. Is he tolerant? Is this the sort of thing that he thinks we should be allowed to be carried on in our university? That's his idea of education, Mr. Speaker. This is the Honourable Member for Elmwood who thinks that this is the kind of education that should be carried on in the University of Manitoba. I hope the people of Manitoba know this, I really do, and I hope that the First Minister of this Province will have an opportunity to answer to the people of Manitoba. I would now invite him to come to the constituency of Rock Lake and I am prepared to stand on the same platform and discuss this matter with my people. Really, Mr. Speaker, I really am.

MR. SCHREYER: Point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Point of privilege by the First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: I haven't received the particular paper that has apparently amused the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition, I see he's smiling, therefore I hardly know how to respond to the Honourable Member for Rock Lake; but my point of privilege is that surely the Honourable Member for Rock Lake; is not suggesting or implying that I am in some way responsible for that particular document or that I am condoning it.

May I just say this while I am on the floor, Mr. Speaker, with the permission of the honourable member, that the whole point is that some of the young people at the university haven't

(MR. SCHREYER, cont'd.) . . . . grown up yet, that's why they're at the university.

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Speaker, I reply to the First Minister's comments that he has just made. I had no intentions of bringing any mention of the First Minister into my remarks, but the Honourable Member from Elmwood made the comment and for this reason I brought the First Minister into my . . .

HON. RUSSELL DOERN (Minister without portfolio)(Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member from Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I was not defending the prank of some university students in their latest journalistic effort. I was saying that I believe that a \$45 million investment, if that's the correct figure, is a good investment I believe in higher education. I do not take as seriously their pranks as the other member does.

MR. CHERNIACK: . . . point of privilege. I think that document has to be filed, once it has been referred to.

MR. SPIVAK: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I would think that the Minister of Information, the Honourable Minister of Transportation should file it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rock Lake.

MR. EINARSON: Well, Mr. Speaker, if I may be permitted to continue. I think just to clarify the First Minister's thinking. I can appreciate the comments he made earlier, I would hope that the Students' Union is not a representation of all the young men and women who are attending university. Surely not. No, I just wouldn't accept that at all, but certainly the minority. But the fact remains that this government has a responsibility, Mr. Speaker, this is the thing I want to point out. I don't know whether the President of the University has some Socialistic leanings or not but I think the Minister of Education should bring the President on the carpet and read the Riot Act to him. And Mr. Speaker, if that doesn't suffice, I think the Board of Governors of the University should be brought on the carpet and be made to answer for this kind of stuff.

I want to say further, Mr. Speaker, that in the past few months I have talked to parents of boys and girls, respected boys and girls who were about to enter University, and they were telling me, "You know, Mr. Einarson, we are concerned about sending our sons or daughters to the University because we have found out what is going on." I just couldn't believe it, Mr. Speaker, but now I am coming to have some idea, some idea, Mr. Speaker, of what really is going on -- the comment has been passed on to me. You know I think it would be well advised if say our Universities were closed for one year because of the high cost and we don't seem to be able to find a way of solving this problem, but maybe our university should be closed for one year.

Well, Mr. Speaker, if this is the kind of stuff that we are going to be subjected to, my goodness, I'm wholeheartedly in support of those people who are telling me, that it is probably a good idea that we should be doing something like this. It's a sad state of affairs, Mr. Speaker, if this is what is happening and I can't help but feel because I'm a parent of some young people who are not too far before they will be entering university I hope, and it concerns me very gravely, very gravely, as to what my sons and daughters can look forward to.

I think, Mr. Speaker, this will suffice on the matter of education for this time. There are other matters that concern me and I hope to be able to deal with them when the Minister brings in his estimates on that particular department.

The other area that concerns me -- you know the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce talks about the voice of progress. He comes from a university, from the high learning of - I think I'm correct in saying and the Minister can correct me if I'm wrong - of Economics. You know, if we have to rely on that kind of economics and if this is what is being taught in our university, then God help us for the future of Manitoba.

The other area Mr. Speaker, that I would like to dwell on shortly is our agricultural problems. One of them is - and I'm not going to be critical to the extent that I was with the Department of Education - nevertheless I want to discuss briefly on our veterinary services clinic. I have received quite a few reports in some areas whereby things aren't going all that well. I don't want to be a destructive critic here, Mr. Speaker, so that I'm not misunderstood, but I think that when we have the municipalities, the councils who get together and decide an area, it seems to me from the information that I have been receiving some of the veterinarians who have spent many years to develop a practice in certain areas of the province have not been

(MR. EINARSON, cont'd.) . . . . consulted as much as they might have and for this reason, and I say this to the Minister of Agriculture, from the information that I have been receiving, that probably the harmony that has existed is not as good as it might have been.

The other thing that I'm informed of, and I put it in the form of question to the Minister, in the way of ARDA funds. Has the Minister made an agreement or is there any definite arrangements being made with the Federal Government to ARDA? As I understand it, there's \$15,000 that can be had for each clinic after it's established and in the area that I'm concerned with, which is Pilot Mound, in the document that I've received, no ARDA money is available. Now, maybe the Minister is left to negotiate this I don't know. But the question I'm wondering about, is he going to receive this money that should be forthcoming insofar as the setting up of these clinics is concerned.

I also want to talk briefly on another matter, and that is in the Department of Social Services and Development. First of all I want to commend the Minister for the recent announcement made in regards to the elderly persons housing which - there were four of them made at one time, one was for Crystal City and I'm appreciative of that, and there was three others made in other parts of the province. But I do want to make mention to him at this time that in the Town of Cartwright in my constituency an application has been in ever since last fall. Possibly it could have been overlooked. But I think that the qualifications, Sir, are much the same as in many other areas of the province, and I would hope that the Minister would look into this matter and see where the error lies.

There's another part of the Throne Speech that I would like to just read and quote: "Reports will be made to the House concerning capital plans for expansion and replacement of hospitals and other health facilities with special reference to relationships of these facilities to a community health care centre." Now, Mr. Speaker, when the Throne Speech was drawn up and the words that are used -- and you know I have the greatest respect for the Honourable Minister of Mines and Resources, maybe I'm off base on this, but I sometimes wonder, I think that he is one of those who is asked to compose the wording of our Throne Speech. And sometimes it's done in such a way that while the words used might have one meaning but as a layman sometimes I find it difficult to understand full well so I think to play safe I would like to ask a question to make sure that I understand it correctly. And I'm wondering by asking now the Minister of Health and Social Development if he is contemplating closing any of the rural hospitals in Manitoba in the near future or say a year or two hence? This is something Mr. Speaker, that there have been rumours and concerns the people of the constituency which I have the real pleasure of representing. -- (Interjection) -- Yes, Mr. Speaker, this is something they did in Saskatchewan but you know, two wrongs don't make a right. Two wrongs don't make a right -- (Interjection) -- Yes, at one time, Sir, he was, that's quite right. So was the Prime Minister of Canada at one time. But I guess he must have seen the light.

Mr. Speaker, I couldn't help but make some reply to the comments made last night by the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. I tried to listen to him quite attentively and it seemed to be a speech that was quite philosophical in nature and -- (Interjection) -- yes, that probably sometimes is the trouble. Not meaning this facetiously in any sense of the way, but I must say Mr. Speaker, that he was talking about the members on this side of the House how the two parties here show probably coalesce, or even some comment about the Honourable Member from Rhineland, he made some comment about this. But you know, Mr. Speaker, from listening to the news and watching the press and so on over the past month or really since the last session, I have come to the conclusion that I think if there's anybody should be coalescing is the First Minister and his entire cabinet. I fail to understand how the people of Manitoba can follow the idea that the First Minister, or probably I should say one of his other colleagues, will go off in one direction and make a statement about a certain policy for something that concerns the responsibility of government, another minister will go off in another direction, and then the First Minister has to come into the centre of the argument and make another statement. I can't help but feel Mr. Speaker, that this becomes a very dangerous course. While I know the people of Manitoba they respect the First Minister, and I think justifiably so, but I think the day will come Mr. Speaker, when the people will see the light and realize just what is going on.

There's one other matter that I wanted to bring to the attention - I suddenly thought of it and I should have mentioned it when I was dealing with the agricultural portfolio - but now I'm going to come back to it for a few moments. And that is the resolution that was passed that I mentioned here today in Clearwater where the farmers were very concerned about the high

(MR. EINARSON, cont'd.) . . . rate of interest that they have to pay on their farm loans. They say here that the Farm Union are sponsoring this and naturally I would imagine that they are the ones who are really responsible for it, and unless the Minister of Agriculture sees fit to reduce the interest rate by say five percent, they are not going to pay the interest or the principal on the loans that are now outstanding.

I would like to remind this House, Mr. Speaker, that my colleague the Member for Morris, when this legislation was brought into effect back in '69, the interest rate was to be 9 1/4 percent and I believe 7 3/4 percent respectively. In 1969, \$6 million was allocated for this purpose; in 1970, \$15 million was allocated for this purpose. Now it has been brought to my attention where one or two cases - and I have personal knowledge of them - where they have gone to the M.A.C.C. to get assistance in the way of a loan, say \$10,000. The Corporation looked at their operation and studied it to decide whether it was a viable operation that they could afford the loan of \$7,000 or \$10,000. In one particular case, Mr. Speaker, one farmer was turned down the loan of \$10,000, but rather they said no, we won't lend you \$10,000, we'll loan you about \$30,000 because we consider this is a more viable situation. I just happen to know that this particular farmer was right. He wanted to borrow \$10,000, but since they wouldn't loan him that - they were prepared to loan him 30 - he went home without anything.

You know, Mr. Speaker, I have risen in this House before. I have criticized the experts, not unduly, because I think they do have a place and they do perform a very worthwhile service, but there are times - and I want to make this point clear - that I think in this particular area a farmer knows best what he needs to provide a better incentive for his own operation and I think that the Minister would be well advised to look into this particular situation. I don't know how many loans were turned down in this regard, but I just happen to have personal knowledge of one or two and it could be the case where there are many more.

As I said, we were the party who were interested in reducing the interest rates, and I think that in the overall picture the farmers would have been much more acceptable to that considerable reduction in interest rates rather than the promise that the Minister of Agriculture made in Ste. Rose when he was campaigning for the election over a few weeks ago. And I can't help but agree with his colleague the Minister of Transportation when he criticized him for going out and making some promises that he knew full well he could never fulfill. That's the understanding that I have from the president.

So I'm wondering too - and it's stated in the Throne Speech - that ARDA funds are going to be negotiated for so that farmers can acquire sewage and water facilities for their homes. This, Mr. Speaker, I certainly wish every farmer could have these facilities and certainly they are deserving of them. I can't help but wonder in this particular area what is involved here. How much money, how much money in the way of a grant that each farmer is going to be able to get. Is it \$300, Mr. Speaker? If so, you know, it could be that a farmer may not have a water supply to start with. He may have to go and look for water so he can put in these facilities. This in itself, this in itself would cost him maybe \$300 or \$400. You know, if he gets a grant of \$300 from the Minister of Agriculture, the total project could maybe cost him \$2,000. How many farmers - and I was out into the constituency of Ste. Rose. I met with many farmers -- (Interjection) -- you bet, I don't mind saying so. And for this reason, Mr. Speaker, I'm qualified to speak on this particular matter because I don't think that the Minister of Agriculture is doing the farmers in Ste. Rose any service by providing them with a grant if it is going to cost them another \$1,700 to put these services in, because all he is doing is putting them into debt that \$1,700 by the cheese bait when he said we'll give you a grant of \$300. That's what happened in Ste. Rose and this is one of the reasons why they won their election.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that with these comments that I have made this evening - I hope the Minister of Education will take seriously the comments I have made insofar as his department is concerned and I look forward to probably making comments on the various departments as they come before us in this House. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: I was asking if the Honourable Member from Rock Lake would now permit a question? He referred to the Wilkinson report favourably. I would like to know whether he is stating the official Progressive Conservative party position in support of the Wilkinson paper?

MR. EINARSON: Mr. Speaker, I explained my position insofar as the Wilkinson report was concerned, where it came from, who had supported it, and I was speaking on behalf of the people of the constituency that I represent. I am not speaking on behalf of any members of my

(MR. EINARSON, cont'd.) . . . . party at the present time.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for The Pas.

MR. RON McBRYDE (The Pas): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. First of all, Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate you publicly as I did privately on your appointment to that high office. I know that you will do a good job there. Some of us, those of us who know you well and have called you Peter, and a few other names, are having a little trouble adjusting to calling you Mr. Speaker, but I think that we are adjusting and you seem to be adjusting to your new position very well.

I would also like to congratulate the opposition groups for the election of their new leaders and I hope they continue to lead you well. I hope you continue to do as well with their leadership as you have recently. Also, I would like to congratulate my colleague the Member for Logan and the Member for Gimli, for their contribution in moving and seconding the Throne Speech, and I would also like to congratulate our new colleagues who will be joining us soon. I think the members opposite might understand the feeling of warmth that we have in welcoming the new members for Ste. Rose and St. Vital to our ranks. I would also like to congratulate the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs for his appointment to that position.

Mr. Speaker, I think I'd better make a few remarks on the things that the opposition have said and I might as well start with the last speaker. I can recall that during the Lennon crisis shortly after we came to office - I think the Minister without portfolio recalled that one - (Interjection) -- The Lennon crisis. I'm not sure. John and his wife, I think.

Anyway, in regard to that crisis there was an assistant in the Minister's office who has similar attitudes to these matters that the Minister of Transportation has. I was there one day when he received a phone call and the lady on the other end was saying to him: "You know"- at least this is what he told me after that the lady on the other end was saying to him - "My daughter is 18 years old and I don't want her to have to see this Lennon fellow." And his response was - he's a very Conservative fellow - "If you haven't brought up your daughter well enough in 18 years that she's going to be corrupted in 18 minutes, then maybe you haven't done a very good job of bringing her up."

Now the honourable member mentioned that he has a number of children and I'm also in a similar fortunate position, but this kind of foolishness that appears in that paper doesn't really bother me that much. I'm quite convinced that my children will be able to deal with it. They'll have to deal with it in all walks of life, and I'm not going to keep them out of university or close it down for a year because someone demonstrated some foolishness. If we were to close down an institution because of foolishness, this Legislature might end up being locked up. -- (Interjection) -- That's right, that's what I said, -- (Interjection) -- I didn't hear the comment. Sorry. If you want to invite me to Rock Lake at the time, I'd be quite pleased to go down.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I would suggest that the member making a speech should not invite comments. I think that he should make his speech and if there are questions of clarification afterwards, I will entertain them.

MR. McBRYDE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Member for Rhineland was doing very well this afternoon and when he mentioned the idea of a provincial bank, I believe, he almost got one convert, and when he criticized the Regional Development Corporation he almost got a second convert, so if he keeps at it there might be some chance for disunity in his party yet.

The Member for Sturgeon Creek in his comments on the Speech from the Throne was upset with the federal government policies which have caused such high unemployment in Canada and in Manitoba, yet somehow he expected that the provincial government was going to solve all these problems caused at the senior level of government. He did congratulate it for the limited measures we were able to take in this regard. He also was upset by poor management demonstrated by the company which his Conservative Party and government had lent money to. Apparently last fall, long before voluntary receivership, they didn't properly dock the boat. At least someone has told him this. It wasn't difficult to understand his feelings. It wasn't difficult to understand the connection he was trying to make between this and the receivership of that company.

That Member for Sturgeon Creek - I wish he were here this evening - did give us an idea of what he appreciates. He appreciates, he said, good people who are aggressive and who are strong salesmen. And then he referred to some of the books that he was reading. I just happened to be reading one the evening before he mentioned it in his speech, and here's a strong aggressive salesman who took over the Avis International Rent-a-Car Company that had never made a profit in 13 years of life, and three years after they had earned \$9 million. Now that's

(MR. McBRYDE, cont'd.) . . . . the kind of man, that's the kind of man that the Member for Sturgeon Creek would appreciate -- (Interjection) -- And honourable members agree, so I'd like to take a moment to quote from the book that that man has written called "Up the Organization" -- the organization.

On Page 191, Robert Townsend says, under the title "The Sabotage of Free Enterprise". If you're going to function effectively in our organizational society it is important that you have a healthy contempt for our major institutions, public and private, and especially for their leaders. These clowns are not entitled to the respect they get as the vestal virgins of our society. It is not clear to me exactly when free enterprise became a joke. Was it after the civil war when big business, big government in the Supreme Court formed an unholy alliance to exploit the American farmer and laborer, or was it later when big labour got a partnership or when big military elbowed up to the trough or when big education cut itself in on the deal. Whenever it was, the heart of the conspiracy today against the American consumer is the New York-Washington axis, and our real adversaries are big lawyers, top government officials and high officers of big corporations.

"When the American system fails, it won't be communists who bring it down. We aren't in any danger of being destroyed from outside; we have perfected it by do-it-yourself methods. Our blow-up will come when the American housewife discovers that Park Clifford arranged for her to pay half of the punitive damage fee General Electric got socked for conspiring to defraud the American housewife. He has persuaded the . . . to accept the fines as tax deductions. This is the moral equivalent of letting the meat packers deduct as ordinary business expense the cost of the ingredients they use to make unhealthy meat look healthy so they can sell it to you. It is no wonder you can't get senior partners of major law firms to work weekends. I sympathize with them. If I were going to America what they're doing to it from 10:00 to 6:00 Monday and Friday, I'd have to get stoned on Saturday and Sunday too." I thought the member for Sturgeon Creek would appreciate those brief comments from the type of person he admires very much.

But mainly I would like to deal -- maybe I'd better for a moment or two make a comment on the remarks of the Member for Pembina. I must appreciate the Member for Pembina who knows that something is wrong with society, with education and with our welfare system, but he grabs at the simplest solution and has a need to believe that these are immediately going to solve all our problems. A hundred years ago they might have, but today it probably won't work.

Now I'd like to deal mostly with the remarks of the Leader of the Official Opposition. What he presented us with, Mr. Speaker, was basically a new version of his crude growth speeches reworded slightly from last session and from the time when he was Minister of Industry and Commerce. The true believer reasoning of the drummer boy approach to economic development was shown by him last session when he was making the statement, "ask the thousands of workers who are working at CFI, the thousands of local residents who are employed at CFI," when at that time, Mr. Speaker, there were about 200 people employed at that complex and only about 20 to 30 were local employees. Now, Mr. Speaker, this is the kind of unrealistic enthusiasm or the blind faith in crude growth solving all our problems that is demonstrated but is entirely unrealistic.

The essence of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition's argument and theory of economic development and their assistance to people were summed up by his example concerning the problems of residents on the east side of Lake Winnipeg. He referred to these people as depending on welfare, rabbits and polluted fish, exactly the sort of things they had to depend on under the previous government, although they didn't know the fish were polluted yet at that time. Most of these people are of native ancestry and their problems are real and their problems are serious. If that Leader of the Opposition were the Premier, then he would solve these problems by the crude growth method.

So let's look at the results that he would achieve, based on past performance of himself and his Conservative Party when it was the government of this province. He would help the Indian and Metis people on the east side of Lake Winnipeg with the same kind of economic development that helped the people of Easterville and that was planned to help the people at South Indian Lake. In my constituency there is a small little area, a settlement of non-treaty Indians called Young's Point. At one time this settlement was the leader of the Indian-Metis groups around The Pas. They had the best trapping area and they had good hunting and good fishing in their area. The government of the day, federal and provincial, came along and drained all

(MR. McBRYDE, cont'd.) . . . . their trapping area for farm land. Mr. Speaker, this isn't bad, this is part of progress, but no one paid any attention to those who depended on that for their livelihood, so the people at Young's Point now exist on welfare and rabbits as a result of that economic growth policy. Now, Mr. Speaker, this was a long time ago and it's just a miniature example of what this type of growth can have on this type of community.

Mr. Speaker, the type of crude growth has affected the people of Easterville. Easterville, formerly called . . . is an Indian and Metis community. It was flooded out by the Grand Rapids Hydro Dam project. The people there in that community depended on hunting and trapping and on fishing. The hunting and the trapping was destroyed with the flooding of the Grand Rapids forebay and the people existed solely on fishing, and now, as everyone knows, this fishing has been destroyed by the pollution of the lake, Cedar Lake and the Saskatchewan River system. So this is the kind of economic development, Mr. Speaker, that the Leader of the Opposition appears to be proposing for the people on the east side of Lake Winnipeg. -- (Interjection) -- No, I'll permit a question after.

MR. ENNS: Would the member permit a question?

MR. McBRYDE: Not till after. South Indian Lake, Mr. Speaker, was another example of the economic development that that party, when government, proposed for the people of South Indian Lake. The Conservative government pushed people aside without knowing how to get them involved in the developments that affected them. The economic development that is supposed to help the people in situations like those on the east side of Lake Winnipeg has not done much to help them. Perhaps the Leader of the Official Opposition proposes a type of development and work project that the Conservative government gave to the Indian and Metis people when the Grand Rapids Dam itself was being developed.

At that time, Mr. Speaker, a large outside company was contracted to do work and then sub-contracted, and finally the Indian and Metis people were hired at very low per acre rates, charged exorbitant prices for room and board and supplies until finally they had to go on strike to try and get a fair deal from that development project. Is this the kind of economic development that he is proposing for the people of Manitoba and for the people on the east side of Lake Winnipeg? Or perhaps the Conservative leader has in mind the great boon to the people on the east side of Lake Winnipeg that was announced for the Indian and Metis people in the Thompson area with the development of the Thompson mine. What benefit accrued to the original residents of the Thompson area? Talk to them, Mr. Speaker - very little. Again they have been pushed aside by economic development in their own region. Is that what the Conservative leader proposes for the people on the east side of Lake Winnipeg? Is that his economic development plan? Perhaps the Leader of the Opposition has in mind the type of great boon for the people on the east side of Lake Winnipeg that was predicted by the government at The Pas with the giant giveaways involved in the original agreement for that forestry complex. Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, only since the receivership has significant numbers of native people and other local citizens been getting employment on this project. For a while it was -- (Interjection) -- for a while it was an employment boon -- (Interjection) --

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. McBRYDE: For a while it was an employment boon only for people from Saskatchewan, Ontario, Quebec and Sweden. Even this may not have helped -- (Interjection) -- Finland, excuse me, Sweden's a pretty good place. Even this may not have happened if the Indian and Metis people around The Pas had not reached the stage where they were willing and able to take full advantage of the opportunity when it came along. But this is the kind of economic development system the Leader of the Opposition proposes. Don't worry about the people affected, they are expendable; make sure that we give away Manitoba so that some unknown foreign corporation can use their money to exploit our resources and our people.

I appreciate the Leader of the Opposition's concern for the very real problems facing the people on the east side of Lake Winnipeg and I'm sure that the MLA for Rupertsland appreciates his concern. However, it is well known that the crude private enterprise growth of the type he recommends has never yet solved the problems facing the people in areas similar to the ones he uses for his example to summarize his speech. My honourable friend would help the people on the east side of Lake Winnipeg develop by flooding them out, forcing them to re-locate, getting contractors to exploit them, establishing industries that would ignore them and shove them aside, by polluting their land and water and destroying their traditional livelihood, and finally, by abolishing their reserves. This is his development policy for the people on the east

(MR. McBRYDE, cont'd.) . . . . side of Lake Winnipeg. I'm sure that they, the people on the east side of Lake Winnipeg, will appreciate the Leader of the Opposition's assistance as much as the people of Easterville, Moose Lake, Southern Indian Lake and Nelson House have appreciated all the benefits of crude growth that have come to them. That is a Conservative answer, that is a Conservative economic development policy according to their leading spokesman.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is a complicated problem on how you assist people in communities like those on the east side of Lake Winnipeg and I won't pretend that the answer is all that simple. The Northern Task Force has made some comments on this subject, Mr. Speaker, and I'd like to refer to it at this time. On Page 60, Mr. Speaker, the Northern Task Force recommends that consideration be given to the establishment of an isolated communities development fund. Mr. Speaker, this is the type of fund that this government has mentioned in the Throne Speech and in previous announcements, a development fund for disadvantaged communities.

The next recommendation of the Northern Task Force is that the government increase its support to the people in isolated communities for the development of local industry. This would mean improving local existing industries such as trapping, fishing, lumbering, retail selling, guiding, etc. Every attempt should be made to assist people in isolated communities in viable new industries such as the tourist and manufacturing industries. Government departments should be instructed to hire as many local people as possible. This recommendation implies that the improvement of business and management skills, the provision of professional advisers who will be competent enough to advise without taking control. This recommendation means the improvement and expansion of co-operative fishing and co-operative retailing with government financial assistance. It implies the establishment of guiding associations and the exploration of game management and control by local communities. This recommendation means finding a method of improving the fur marketing systems in Manitoba. Local residents should have the priority and the exploitation of local resources. The establishment of new industry again means financial involvement from both levels of government.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this government has carried out a number of these proposals already and is in the process of preparing programs to meet some of the other recommendations. As already was announced, there is going to be a co-operative development program in Manitoba. Industry has been assisted to develop in such places -- such industries have been encouraged to develop as the St. Laurent ladder factory, the Indian Reserve Trailer Courts at The Pas. Further assistance has been given to the Pequis Garment factory and handicapped production has been developed on the Griswold Reserve.

Another recommendation, No. 30 of the Task Force, was that assistance and encouragement be given to isolated communities and groups to do contract work with the government and private industry, contracts to be made by community councils, co-ops, corporations and other organizations. Survey work, exploration work, bush clearing, road building, pulp cutting, language training and social animation, etc., could all be included in this. Mr. Speaker, this is presently being done and done very well through the Department of Transport. I understand that recently the people in the community of Norway House have held meetings with the Manitoba Hydro to see how they could be involved in the hydro development close to their community.

Recommendation No. 31 is that beside self-sustaining industries the government should consider public involvement in industry and new industry and the concentration of selective expansion of northern affairs projects and winter works type programs. The Task Force considers this alternative to be more beneficial than social assistance because it provides the training or learning experience and because it results in community improvement. Now, Mr. Speaker, this government, with the formation of the PEP program because of high unemployment, has expanded its program to include mayors and councils under the Northern Affairs Task and to include Indian reservations. So, Mr. Speaker, this government has been moving in a definite direction that'll help people like those living on the east side of Lake Winnipeg.

Mr. Speaker, before I finally leave the remarks of the Leader of the Official Opposition and his contribution to the Throne Speech, I would like to quote from the Winnipeg Tribune of two days ago, from a Frances Russell whom I don't know -- (Interjection) -- and what she has to say probably says it somewhat better than what I can say in regards to the speech of the Leader of the Opposition. "If the vague generalities of Throne Speeches are unenlightening as to the government's intentions, the negative criticisms of the Opposition Leader's reply are equally uninformative about what they would do if they were in office. This rule held true



(MR. McBRYDE, cont'd.) . . . . this week for Manitoba's official opposition party. Conservative Leader Sidney Spivak, who seems to be having great difficulty making the transition from Minister of Industry and Commerce to Leader of the Opposition, issued yet another clarion call for the government to undertake a real strategy for economic development. Fostering economic growth in Manitoba is really very simple according to Mr. Spivak. All the government has to do is lower taxes, open its arms to foreign investment, create a favourable climate for free enterprise and encourage technological advance and the capital will come flooding in. Mr. Spivak apparently has forgotten the events of his own tenure of office. His government tried all those things but Manitoba's growth rate didn't suddenly spurt ahead. His government not only encouraged but begged for foreign investment to come into Manitoba.

MR. J. DOUGLAS WATT (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, is the member reading a press report?

MR. McBRYDE: Yes. I stated the source of the press report, Mr. Speaker, and indicated that I was quoting from that report. -- (Interjection) -- "Mr. Spivak," as Mr. Watt, "is undaunted. He proposed the government look into another forestry development" -- excuse me, I missed a paragraph.

MR. JAMES H. BILTON (Swan River): . . . the name of the newspaper for the record?

MR. McBRYDE: Winnipeg Tribune. "His government not only encouraged but begged for foreign investment to come into Manitoba. It came in the form of Churchill Forest Industries Complex at The Pas. The government was so generous it was the Manitoba public and not the foreign companies that made the investment and now the province has inherited the whole tab. Mr. Spivak is undaunted. He proposed the government look into another forestry development on the eastern shore of Lake Winnipeg.

"The Conservative leader had harsh words for his successor's Yum Days campaign designed to promote Manitoba food products. Again Mr. Spivak seems to have a short memory. The Yum affair was clownish' Mr. Spivak said. It was true that Mr. Spivak did not author Yum Days, instead he authored the 1968 Business Summit Conference which featured a businessmen's pep rally, complete with brass band at the Metropolitan Theatre and a \$25,000 dinner at the Civic Auditorium" -- (Interjection) -- \$25,000. If it is the function of the Industry and Commerce Department to invent slogans and to go on promotions, Mr. Spivak doesn't take a back seat to Leonard Evans. Economic development worries every government in Canada and defies a simple solution. Even the wealthy Province of Ontario, which appears to Manitobans to have little to be concerned about, spends millions every year attracting industry through its forgivable loans and industrial incentive grants. The logical conclusion of Mr. Spivak's approach would be to have Manitoba trying to match Ontario in giveaways, a path which could put the province in bankruptcy through trying to grow. The limits to Manitoba's economic growth are set by the hard facts of geography and population. To overcome them Manitoba needs assistance of the federal structure of which it is a part." -- (Interjection) -- At some future date I might use the Free Press and compare it with the Tribune and the Brandon Sun and some of its reports on the by-election in Ste. Rose but not in this particular speech.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to move slightly in a different direction. As the Member for The Pas, I would like to make a few comments on the Churchill Forestry Project in my constituency. Mr. Speaker, some of the people in The Pas do not want to hear any more comments about Churchill Forest Industry, and I would also like to point out before I start, Mr. Speaker, that to criticize some of the developments or some of the things with regard to that development is not to criticize the people at The Pas, mostly it's to criticize the former Conservative government. Mr. Speaker, I'm also somewhat limited on what I can say on this subject because of the present actions taking place so I'll be very general and give some of the responses to people at The Pas the situation which was very close to them. I think everyone in Manitoba except a few members of the opposition realize that there must be a better way of bringing about economic development than the method that was used in the Churchill Forest Industries case. It was really an example of how not to develop. Taxpayers money was used to build the project; large giveaways were granted to unknown foreign interest . . .

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege . . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order. The honourable member has a point of privilege.

MR. ENNS: Several times now during the member's speech he has referred to the taxpayers use of money with respect to the development at Churchill. I say it's a blatant lie and he is lying. If he want to define the amount of actual . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order. I would like to hear the member's point of privilege. I didn't hear what he said up until now, but I wish he would state his point of privilege.

MR. ENNS: It's very simple and very clear. There have been several allegations made during the member's speech about the taxpayers' money of Manitoba being used in the development of the Churchill Forest Industry. The taxpayers' money to my knowledge - unless corrected - has not been used. It has been foreign investment from San Francisco, the money markets of the world, . . . that the Manitoba Development Fund borrowed and then has loaned back. Pardon me, please Mr. . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order. The member is stating an argument and he still hasn't stated a point of privilege. I would like to hear it.

MR. ENNS: I'll reduce it to one sentence. I want to know precisely to what extent the taxpayers' money of Manitoba - the taxpayers' money - so I challenge, to what extent the taxpayers' money has been used in this development?

MR. SPEAKER: Order. I have heard no point of privilege. The Member for The Pas.

MR. McBRYDE: I'd like to thank the Member for Lakeside for the opportunity to take a break. Large giveaways were granted to the unknown foreign interests; there was poor accounting on how and when money would be disbursed.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Point of order, please.

MR. ENNS: Again he has said large giveaways. I want to know has the government written off the \$92 million? Has the government written off the \$92 million?

MR. SPEAKER: Order. That's a question, that's not a point of order.

MR. McBRYDE: The giveaway I was referring to in this particular instance was not the money but the forests and the rights to timber in northern Manitoba and the government's agreement to subsidize roads and other projects. There was no guarantee, Mr. Speaker, that local people would be employed in this project and there was no guarantee that there would be any control of pollution.

Now, Mr. Speaker, another problem was that the town of The Pas, under pressure from the provincial government, signed an agreement which really cut them off from any tax benefit for a considerable period of time from this development. Therefore, citizens of the town were forced to pay increasingly high taxes to cover the expansion caused by Churchill Forest Industries. In fact the town was very close to being in serious financial difficulty and would have been in serious difficulties if the provincial government hadn't persuaded them to cooperate with the federal government to have The Pas declared a special area.

Mr. Speaker, there was no planning ahead for the type of problems that increased growth would cause. There was only one consideration and that was how to get industry in spite of the cost and not worrying about planning for the development and growth of an industry in that area. So, Mr. Speaker, what were the people of The Pas gaining by this larger development? Mr. Speaker, a few people were getting jobs, business interests were getting some increased profit but having considerable difficulty collecting debts from sub-contractors in the main company concern; the town was very close to bankruptcy and local taxes were very high. Policing and other services had to be increased. It became impossible to rent a house in the town of The Pas at a reasonable rate of rent and people were and are still facing the problem of air and water pollution.

Mr. Speaker, the situation was at The Pas that people had very little faith that the companies involved in the project would carry through with the project. The people could see the great and extravagant press releases that didn't meet the realities that the citizens could see at the site itself. The workers at the site were unsure of what was going to happen. Mr. Speaker, it was not the New Democrats who came to me about problems and concerns, although some of them did about what was going on at The Pas, in fact most of the people who came to me were Conservative and Liberal businessmen in the town of The Pas . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The member has five minutes.

MR. McBRYDE: . . . who were very concerned about what they knew was happening. Mr. Speaker, I was not aware of the receivership action until after it was taken and announced publicly, but I was not surprised and the people in the town of The Pas were not surprised that this action was taken. Mr. Speaker, I don't think I heard one negative comment about the receivership action from Liberals, Conservatives, or New Democrats or Social Crediters around the town of The Pas.

(MR. McBRYDE cont'd.)

Mr. Speaker, that doesn't mean there aren't still problems at The Pas. The expansion that was unplanned for by the previous government is still keeping taxes high and the agreement still exists that does not require the complex to pay a number of municipal taxes. Air and water pollution are still a very real concern, not just from this project, Mr. Speaker, but from the project up river in Prince Albert.

There is still some problem because of slow court action in regards to the bills that were unpaid at the time of receivership. There could still be more rapidly expanding training programs in The Pas area and in the Wabowden area. However, Mr. Speaker, the best at this time is being made of a formerly bad situation. The most promising thing is that local people are getting an increasing percentage of the available employment at the CFI site. The provincial-federal agreement negotiated by the province has prevented financial disaster for the town of The Pas; and most important, Mr. Speaker, people are now sure and confident that the complex will get into production and remain in production, a confidence they didn't have before. Housing problems are still difficult at The Pas but it is slowly improving with the additional subdivision and the 100 units of public low rental housing that are presently being built.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the people on this side of the House, and I'm sure the members of the opposition, are aware that the complex at The Pas is an economically marginal operation and always has been and that's why the Conservative government previously did the outrageous things they did to attract that development to The Pas. But, Mr. Speaker, there must have been a better way to do it. There has to be a better way to do it. The people of The Pas aren't complaining if they have this project. I'm sure no community in Manitoba would complain to have a \$90 million project dropped on their doorstep. No one would complain about that. -- (Interjection) -- Just for the clarification of members opposite, I'm not complaining about the project itself being in The Pas, I'm complaining about the method at which the project arrived at The Pas and the problems that were not considered at that time by the previous government in this development at The Pas.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order. The member's time is up.

MR. McBRYDE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

. . . . Continued on next page

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. MOUG: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join in with members of this Legislature in congratulating you on behalf of the people of my constituency, Charleswood, to your appointment as Speaker, the high office that it is. Also, to the Member for Winnipeg Centre, I'm sorry he's not here. He asked yesterday if somebody would be good enough to also congratulate him, and I think that's in order. To the two members, the mover and seconder from Logan and Gimli, I also extend them best wishes from Charleswood. -- (Interjection) -- Yes, those members in St. Vital and Ste. Rose, they did a good job, too, I guess in their own constituencies. I hope they can be a little more operative, a little more capable of accomplishing something in the House than the other 28 of their colleagues.

Tonight, Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak briefly; I know there's other members here that want to get up and have their opportunity. I'm going to speak towards schools and education, rather than go into a replay of the other speakers and go on the Throne Speech. Now when I mentioned education, I wanted to speak on that, probably the member from The Pas won't be particularly satisfied with it. I know he wasn't with the fact that the Member from Pembina spoke on it. I thought the Member from The Pas would be mentioning something about Operation New-Start in the north, but apparently now he was busy speaking with things that was benefitting his area and he was being critical of them. I hope the people from The Pas have the opportunity to read Hansard tomorrow. I think that'll be real good.

At any rate, Mr. Speaker, the constituency of Charleswood takes in a part of River Heights, west, and the Renfrew Street area, Tuxedo and the entire municipality of Charleswood. Within the municipality of Charleswood, Sir, there is a problem with education and picking up the costs of it from the municipality because there are two districts in the one municipality. The district at the west end joins in with St. James-Assiniboia which is called Assiniboia North No. 2, and is therefore on a different assessment at different times. Charleswood was reassessed in 1967 and showed a substantial increase, and since that time the north side of the river has not been reassessed and therefore when they go to bring their money together to pay for the cost of education in this school district, there's more money taken out of the Charleswood side of the district than there is from St. James-Assiniboia. A school tax on real property I always feel is a bad situation and makes it particularly hard for those on low and fixed income, and when they go to pay their tax bill it is a problem for them. When the government of today took over an additional five percent of the foundation costs, I don't believe this was sufficient. I think if the government would have put up 85 percent instead of 75, they would have been more realistic.

Further on education, Mr. Speaker. It is not my intention to ruffle the white hair that the Premier wears in this province, and I don't want to create the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources to start pulling on his side burns, but I just have to mention something about aid to private schools; I feel in our area the member that's representing them should mention private schools. Today in education, the costs, the problems we have is far greater than we're willing to realize and recognize. In the Charleswood constituency there are both private and parochial schools. The public school has left lots to be desired over the last 75 years. Apart from the religious aspect, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to mention private schools. There are people paying real property tax which is collected approximately \$500.00 per year on the average home in the area and these people know that about \$250.00 of this goes directly to the cost of education. This is a small portion to what it actually costs to educate their children. We first must remember that these people take this \$250.00 into consideration as well as paying an additional \$400.00 per student per year to cover their annual fees in private schools. Not only are these people paying the full cost of the private schools, but they are also subsidizing public schools because they are paying five percent sales tax which goes directly towards foundation costs. They're involved in the 85 percent that I mentioned earlier, and 50 percent as well of the real property tax is thrown into this pot. They're paying into private, they're paying into public, they're getting hit both barrels. The United Nations declaration of Human Rights, and Canada supported it, it says in part: "Everyone has the right to education. That education should be free and compulsory, that parents have the prior right to choose the kind of education that should be given their children."

I say to you, Mr. Speaker with that, that any government that claims that they're working for the people and for the ordinary Joe that wants private schools, that wants to send their child to parochial school, they should read that and take something out of it. I think, Mr.

(MR. MOUG cont'd) . . . . . Speaker, that the people are being fair in seeking support and aid towards the cost of education in the school they wish to send their children to, be it private, parochial or public. Whether we are right to class some of these schools as private, I'm not sure. These schools could be classed as private and yet there's nothing to stop anyone of us from sending our children to this type of school. I've sent two of my children to private schools, Sir, one is still St. Mary's Academy. They were accepted, nobody tried to block them or shut the door on them; calling them private schools to me, Sir, doesn't seem to be a true picture. What it does for us, I think, as people of the province that are trying to do well by our families is give us a wider choice of education for our children. Many schools, even at these rates that they are charging the people to have their children go there, they're being forced to close the doors; and in these two schools Sir, that I refer to in Charleswood, that are forced to being closed, religion does not enter into it. Basically, I don't think religion enters into it even when a person sends their child to a parochial school. I happen to be a WASP. I sent one of my boys to St. Paul's High School in Tuxedo for two years, I felt it would be good for him, and as I say I have a daughter going to St. Mary's Academy. They do well in those schools. I think they have something to offer that the public school system today does not offer. In private schools, the teaching staff is a more dedicated type person. They feel they have an obligation to fulfill to the students. They are willing to spend extra hours before and after school. They're not the type of person that puts the key in the lock at 9:00 o'clock in the morning and takes it out at 4:00 sharp in the afternoon. They prepare the next day's work in the evening getting ready to teach our children the next day to make sure they can carry on in a responsible manner.

Public schools today, Sir, are a totally different aspect. Our children are subject to teachers of all ages. There's the 18 year old group that are there teaching. I don't know if their heart is really and truly in their job. Some of these teachers are of an age group that have not yet accepted the responsibility that is necessary to make good teachers. The private school type family is more concerned with their children's education than they are about the economical measure of saving these few dollars and exposing their children to the public school system.

In regard to parochial schools, Sir, I feel that these people are justified in wanting their children educated in religious schools if they deem it right. It gives them an opportunity to be aware of the several religious viewpoints and obligations. I don't believe that any of the people, Mr. Speaker, that I've spoken to in the Charleswood constituency, and there are many of them in there that are involved with private parochial schools, that are wanting anything unreasonable or unrealistic. They're asking only that the money they pay towards education, whether it's on real property or whatever way they pay it, they want it sent directly to the school of their choice, providing they don't have any children in the family, such as my own instance where I send some to private and some to public. If they are only attending private schools they feel that their money should go to the school of their choice. There's two schools as I mentioned within the constituency that are within a very few months of closing down. Everybody was surprised when the reopened their doors on September 1st, last year. The necessary funds are just not available to keep these school operative. The schools that I refer to, Sir, have approximately 900 students and the day that these schools are forced to close their doors could spell disaster for the Department of Education. They are moving into one small area, two schools out of approximately 7 or 8 in the one constituency - that if they close those two doors you have 900 students the next day looking for desks, books, teachers and all the other expenses that go with it. I feel that the people in this area should be given greater consideration than they have been in the past and this may mean the cabinet of today getting together and agreeing with each other. I know it's going to be a hard thing for them to do, Sir, but it's something that they're going to have to do in order to solve this problem. I don't believe that there's any of the people that are expecting the same grant system for private and parochial as you would compare with the public schools. They just want support of some kind such as their own tax dollar that comes from real property from their own home, they want that directed to the school of their choice.

I think if you look at universities today, Sir, and particularly when we get this kind of information out of their monthly newspaper or weekly, whatever it happens to be, and the amount of dollars that the provincial government gives them in grants, I feel it quite justified that some of these dollars be paid. You could almost say that a university is a private school,

(MR. MOUG cont'd.) . . . . it is in a sense, it's as private as the schools I send my children to, I have to pay a tuition fee for them to go there, and if you want to go to the University of Manitoba you pay a tuition fee to go there. And the province I don't think at any time has ever felt justified to say that they don't intend to give those schools their grants.

Now, I want to get back with George Henderson again - pardon me, the Member for Pembina. I don't know whether the Member for The Pas would disagree with this or not - I'll have to check it over. It's welfare so it's definitely in conjunction with the Member from Pembina -- (Interjection) -- Yes, George's department, Town of Manitou, 1971 pamphlets printed by the provincial government, Sir, setting out every individual's personal rights in relation to their application for assistance or supplementary assistance to their present income were made available not too long ago. Since the introduction of the Age of Majority Act, the Charleswood Welfare Department has noted an increase of over 100 percent. Now there was the engraved invitation that everybody got. It says, "come on down, if we don't give it to you, here's what you do after we don't." Now that, Sir, has created a 100 percent increase in our municipality on welfare, and every indication of what's going to happen when universities and schools are out. I don't think there's any way that a person can measure it today. The majority of the young people who have made application to the Municipality of Charleswood are residing with their parents, who could, in my opinion, support the young adults but who, for obvious reasons, do not assume this responsibility. They feel young people do not feel too proud to walk into the office and ask for welfare, and the parents feel that if the government has it set up this way, they are 18 years old, they are an adult, they can go in and pick this money up. They're not interested in work. Our council placed four of the first ones that came in with the Engineering Department for part-time employment. There is more of a problem facing the young female adults in jobs when you're in a small municipality like this. A large number of the people that are coming into our offices now looking for welfare, they make requests, Mr. Speaker, such as in "order to reduce or eliminate their personal debts." We had one person come in and ask for \$125, he wanted to make some monthly payments on a car, personal debts. There was one wanted a finance company payment, a bank payment and furniture, a milk bill. We had one case in particular that requested assistance to make a payment on burial plots for the entire family, the payment on his life insurance plus the full payment of his mother-in-law's funeral expenses.

Sir, on this particular item, and I have some figures I took out of the Charleswood office, and in January '69, we had 9 people on welfare, '70 we had 16, in 1971 we have 32 -- and I don't think this has anything to do with the NDP's being in power, I think it's just a fact that they don't give the kids any reason to work, the young people, the 18 year old in particular. In February '69 it was 10 and '70 it was 19 and '71 there was 29. Two dropped there on account of the PEP program. But once the word was out and the students caught on to what was going on after that word came out in Fort Garry in March, there was 11 in '69, 20 in '70 and 37 in '71. They went from 29 to 37 just because they knew the money was there and available and they didn't have to work to get it. Some of the applications we get - here's one on January 7th - a boy 18 years old, he resides with his father, he received three weeks municipal assistance then was offered employment with the Engineering Department, he accepted the job. 19 year old lives with his parents went to work with the Engineering Department instead of taking assistance. January 13th here's a boy that resides with his mother, she's on mother's allowance, this man received two weeks municipal assistance, applied for part-time work with the Recreation Department in Charleswood, is being paid \$2.05 an hour. There's a boy came in there - not a boy - full grown man, 26 years old, on February 10th, he declared himself medically unfit. He was a transient and he wasn't registered for Medicare so we gave him a \$10 bill to go down and get a doctor's certificate, the results proved him to be physically fit; we gave him \$10 to go and get some food and come back to work for Public Works. He hasn't come back. But we're not paying him welfare.

There's another boy 19 years old he lives away from home, he was offered work in the Public Works instead of assistance, he never reported for work. We have a girl come in on March 16th, 22 years old, she resides with her mother who is on welfare. This young woman was told to register with Manpower - should be Ladypower, I imagine - for work and was to report back to this office. To date she hasn't come back. Those are a few of the examples of what we came across in our area and I think that dealing with them or passing them a shovel rather than passing them a cheque seems to work quite well. Regards, Mr. Speaker,

(MR. MOUG cont'd) . . . . to an area such as Charleswood, I wrote a few notes down here to go towards the member responsible for Urban Affairs but I think that I'll -- I'm going to leave that because I'll have a chance to use that during the debate on the reorganization of the urban area and I know our good friend the Minister Without Portfolio is waiting to go.

I just had one last thing to mention Mr. Speaker. I noticed yesterday that the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources was tendering some more -- sorry he's busy speaking to the Premier -- the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources tendered some more of his advice to this side of the House. I suggest to him that if we were to make use of this advice, the Conservative Party would be in much the same plight the NDP were in when he was taking his perennial run at the leadership just prior to the term where the Premier came along and finally created a spot for him in this society. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood, Question? Did the Honourable Member from Osborne want a question?

MR. TURNBULL: Yes, I have a question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Providing the member will submit.

MR. TURNBULL: If the previous member would submit to a question. -- (Interjection) -- You do? As the member is an elected official of a civic community, I was wondering if his speech should be taken as a recommendation to his constituents to take their children out of the public schools for which he is partly responsible.

MR. MOUG: No, no, no, you're lost. You should spend more time in this Legislature and if you get an opportunity to get on civil government do it, because you're going to learn a lot. The municipal councils, Mr. Speaker, have no jurisdiction at all or whatsoever, and if you check two seats ahead of you, to my good friend the Minister of Education -- (Interjection) -- I am, believe me, you're so far out of the fence, somebody left the gate open a month ago. You are so far away from what you're talking about, it's impossible to believe . . . no jurisdiction whatsoever. But one thing I did want to say to you. -- (Interjection) -- Yes I am, I said Mr. Speaker, about every second word. I'm looking at you but I'm speaking to the speaker; I got one wall eye. To the Member from Osborne, if he realizes that all the responsibility is of the municipal governments elected officials is to collect the tax, they forward it over -- (Interjection) -- not a bit, not a bit -- I do not and I'll tell you what. I've raised five children that I'm proud of . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. MOUG: . . . educated and cost money and if you can come back and tell me that story as good as I told you -- you'll never catch up with me, it's impossible, you've passed the age group.

MR. SPEAKER: I should like to point out to the members that if I give the Honourable Member for Elmwood the opportunity to start he'll only have two minutes in which to get started then I'll have to call the question. Are you prepared to have it now? The question -- Order please -- the question is on motion of the Honourable Member for Logan, amended by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition and in subamendment thereto the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie that the motion be further amended by adding . . .

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Yeas and Nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members. For the members who were absent, the question is on the amendment by the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie on the amendment by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition to the motion by the Member for Logan.

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

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

NAYS: Messrs. Allard, Barrow, Borowski, Boyce, Cherniack, Doern, Evans, Gonick, Gottfried, Green, Hanuschak, Jenkins, Johannson, McBryde, Mackling, Malinowski, Miller, Pauley, Pawley, Petursson, Schreyer, Shafransky, Toupin, Turnbull, Uskiw and Uruski.

MR. CLERK: Yeas 20; Nays 26.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the sub-amendment lost.

The Honourable Member for Elmwood, The Honourable Minister of Tourism and Recreation.

MR. BURTNIAK: Mr. Speaker, I was paired with the Honourable Member for La Verendrye. Had I voted, I would have voted against the amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Elmwood.

MR. DOERN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin by congratulating you on assuming the highest office that this Legislature can bestow on one of its members and wish you well in handling the difficult members opposite.

I would like to largely concentrate my comments on the government's proposals for urban reorganization and some of the reactions to that plan because I think that the honourable gentlemen opposite and the honourable lady will some day realize that they have made a sad mistake in opposing the government plan, because I believe that as a result of the public hearings they were deceived and consequently adopted a position which they will shortly regret. The government under the minister responsible for urban affairs held public meetings throughout the greater Winnipeg area I think for the purpose of educating the public and for getting some feed back from them, and they indeed did convey their message and they indeed did get some feed back. But I think that the kind of feed back that was given to the government was quite different in kind from that which some of the honourable members of the opposition believed, because members of the opposition party and some of the municipal people used the public meetings as a forum for attack against the government. It was a marvellous opportunity for anyone who was bent on attacking the government to, under the guise of an impartial citizen, attend a meeting and consequently attempt to embarrass the government.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Would the honourable member permit a question?

MR. DOERN: Will I permit a question? Yes.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, is the honourable member accusing the elected member in civic affairs in the City of Greater Winnipeg of using tactics such as that?

MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I intend to enlighten the Member for Sturgeon Creek if he will bear with me. There was no real citizen group that came forward during the series of meetings conducted by the minister responsible for urban affairs.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Would the member permit another question?

MR. DOERN: I believe I have the floor. No. At each one of those meetings, not surprisingly, members of the official opposition appeared to ask questions and I think this was not surprising, but I recall that my honourable friend who saw all sorts of dark manoeuvrings and jerrymandering which was, since he believed there was a possibility of this, the Premier acceded to his concern and appointed an impartial commission. This was no particular concern of the government. If someone felt that there was a danger of this, then the government was willing to show that it had no such fear and immediately rectified what was considered to be a dangerous situation, much to the pleasure of the Member for River Heights who drew this matter to the attention of the public.

The municipal mayors -- as I say, the members of the official opposition were out in full strength, the Member for St. Vital I believe attended a meeting, the Member for Sturgeon Creek, the Member for Fort Rouge, the Member for Charleswood, and on and on and on and on, all were present. My good friend, the Member for Assiniboia was not reported as attending any meetings. I don't know whether he did or not, but that was an interesting point. His colleague and House Leader, the Member for Portage la Prairie did make some statements, however. So at these meetings members of the opposition went out with friends and supporters and attempted to create a fuss and to create some sort of opposition against the government, and to a certain extent . . .

MR. F. JOHNSTON: On a point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER: Point of privilege. The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: My point of privilege is this. The honourable member is saying that the members of the opposition purposely went out - I'm a member of the opposition - purposely went out and created trouble on purpose, and I'd like Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker I'd like that retracted.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I have not heard a point of privilege. I only heard a statement.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: He's imputing motives.

MRS. TRUEMAN: On a matter of privilege. The member did say that we went to these meetings with apparently ulterior motives, of making a fuss.

MR. SPEAKER: Order! I'd like to hear the member's point of privilege.

MRS. TRUEMAN: . . . organization because it was my duty.

MR. SPEAKER: I don't hear any point of privilege, I hear a statement again. Carry on.



MR. DOERN: Mr. Speaker, I warned you you'd have trouble with the opposition.

MR. SPEAKER: I shall take care of my own troubles. I can inform the member I do not need his advice. There is enough gratuitous advice going from one side to the other.

MR. DOERN: There is no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that the municipal mayors of course combined and held a series of meetings and attempted to form a solid party against some of the government proposals. They weren't successful in their endeavours, however, because they did not of course get the support of the Chairman of the Metropolitan Winnipeg Corporation, they did not get the support of the Mayor of Winnipeg, they did not get the support of the Mayor of East Kildonan; and they were unable to muster a support through their regular organization. They had to form a special organization for this; and I think it wouldn't be surprising at all if the Fall or if when the elections are held for the new council that we see in effect a mayor's party, because I recall that Miss Pearce, the Alderman in St. Vital indicated that there should be meetings and that there should be discussions to see whether or not the formation of a mayor's party should occur and I think that will be a definite prospect in the elections that occur.

Also, of course, the reactions to the government plan I think were more friendly than normal, in view of the fact that there was a conservative leadership contest in the air and that the by-elections themselves were called about that time, and I think that the result was that the members of the opposition took a more extreme position than they originally intended, and I really think that this was an exercise in self deception, because as I said many of them attended these meetings, they attempted to gauge what they thought was opposition to the plan, which I think was really pretty minimal, and the result is that they reacted to this. They thought that they were seeing something that the government had missed; that there was tremendous resistance and they were going to win St. Vital, and they were going to get some great reaction on the part of the suburban areas. I think it was predictable right from the beginning that the municipal mayors were going to oppose this plan and should hardly have come as a surprise to anyone. And it was probably predictable as well that members of the opposition would stake out a position different from the government; so really the opposition that occurred was hardly surprising.

What is surprising was that the leaders of the two main opposition parties in effect - well, at least one official one - developed plans in response to the apparent unpopularity of the government plan. There was the Asper plan, Spivak plan and then finally of course the mayors' plan; and there was some similarity between these plans. Finally in the end we began to develop almost a consensus because the kind of thinking on the part of some of the people in regard to these plans was very similar. For example, Mr. Asper said that the mayor's plan was in harmony with his. -- (Interjection) -- I won't permit one now. Mr. Asper said that the mayors' plan was in harmony with his. The Mayor of St. Boniface said that he could agree with 70 percent of the Liberal Leader's proposals, that they could probably work out the other 30 percent. Elswood Boles said that he was supporting the Liberal plan. Well, this was hardly surprising. The Leader of the Official Opposition developed a plan, and his had some striking resemblances to the mayors' plan. Both of them said they would try a voluntary period. They weren't going to rush into this, they saw a little static perhaps and they were going to take this into account and instead of proceeding with something that was ten years overdue they were going to wait another year or two and defer it a little longer, maybe a decade if necessary, let's not rush into things, and they would then after a voluntary period, if it were an unsuccessful amalgamation then they would force the amalgamation at the end of that time. Really all that they were doing, all that they were doing was to delay what they actually admitted. They saw the merit of the government plan. They just felt that maybe we should wait a little longer, put it off a little more.

There were some, there were some amusing developments during that whole series . . .

MRS. TRUEMAN: Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Is this a point of privilege?

MRS. TRUEMAN: Would the speaker entertain a question?

MR. DOERN: Yes.

MRS. TRUEMAN: I wonder if the speaker might not be able to realize from his remarks that he had witnessed -- wasn't this really a very fine demonstration of citizen participation?

MR. DOERN: I think it was a very fine instance of citizen participation and liberal participation and conservative participation and suburban mayor participation.

A MEMBER: What does the Mayor of Charleswood say?

MR. DOERN: Mr. Chairman, there were some unusual and interesting developments during the whole series. For example, a good friend of the Honourable Member for Rhineland, George Forest conducted a series of unusual protests against the government plan. On one hand he -- (Interjection) -- excuse me, Monsieur Forest. On one hand he played Lagimodiere and then on the other Mahatma Gandhi, because he went to Ottawa to warn the government in Canada of the impending revolution in the Red River colony one time, and then the other time he conducted a hunger strike . . .

A MEMBER: He went to the mayor to get the money, and he didn't give it to him.

MR. DOERN: . . . against the government. I never heard what happened. I imagine at this moment there's a skinny man trekking to Ottawa on snowshoes.

Also we had the development in St. James-Assiniboia of a questionnaire that was circulated, there was a great deal of talk on referenda and the need to have it, and we had discussions about the value of holding one, so questions were circulated about "Are you in favour of the Manitoba Government's 48-man central council concept for Greater Winnipeg without knowing what it may cost you"? Or, "Would you prefer to keep your own local council and change the representation of the present Greater Winnipeg Metropolitan council to be delegates from your local council." Well, that doesn't really make sense, doesn't make sense, Mr. Speaker. Perhaps the Member for Sturgeon Creek understood it. He's the fellow who didn't understand the fact that -- he was adding up all the opposition votes against us, and he pointed out to us, Mr. Speaker, how if you add the both opposition votes against us you would find out that that percentage would probably be greater than the votes of certain individuals in certain constituencies. We tried to explain to him that he had about 70 percent against him and he said he just could not understand that logic. It was his own logic, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, that questionnaire which St. James-Assiniboia council developed was really loaded. It had a big scare word in one part; "Are you in favour of a plan without knowing the cost." And juxtaposed to that on the other hand they have: "Are you in favour of a different type of system of representation?" Well, really that's not a balanced form of question. -- (Interjection) -- Mr. Speaker, I'm glad that the member raised that question because this leads to my next point. It's always useful for a teacher to have a student who is, you know, hard to convince, someone who is not as bright as the other boys in the class, because it gives the teacher a chance to explain his argument and to make sure that everyone in the class progresses and that no one, that no one is left out. -- (Interjection) -- Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, I have to take that. If I were a teacher I would keep that boy after four. Mr. Speaker, the problem, the problem in the phrasing of any questionnaire is first of all to phrase a fair question. That was not done in the case of St. James-Assiniboia. The second problem is of course the question of interpretation of results, and I think that this is really where the problem comes in. How on earth could one possibly frame a questionnaire or hold a referendum that would make sense that people would vote on and would agree to the results unless there were extensive meetings held before to frame the questions, and there was agreement in advance on how to interpret the results.

Now let me give you an illustration. Mr. Speaker, a number of years ago during a flag debate, a number of the members of the government who were then on the opposition conducted a poll at the Red River Exhibition. My honourable friend the Minister of Mines would remember that very well, and my honourable friend the Minister of Consumer Affairs who -- a lot of people aren't aware of it but he's one of the finest and most aggressive and dynamic salesmen in this province and if you could see him in action, if you could see him in action giving people questionnaires, where the ordinary person handing them out gave away a dozen, he gave out 200, it was quite extraordinary. The Member for Sturgeon Creek would have been impressed. We conducted at that time a poll on the Canadian flag. You recall the debate on three maple leaves or one maple leaf with a red ensign, etcetera. And we had a questionnaire that gave the following questions: (1) Are you in favour of the red ensign? Secondly, are you in favour of a flag with one maple leaf or three maple leaves, or some other type of flag? We had a number of questions like that. We tabulated the results of some 15,000 ballots and had them all figured out so many thousand in favour and we gave the percentages on a daily basis, and at the end of that period we released the statistics to the newspapers. One of the papers took as its headline the fact that the red ensign had 40 percent of all the votes, and that the other new types of designs, changes, amounted to 60 percent and their headline read: "Most people

(MR. DOERN cont'd.) . . . . prefer the red ensign." Now, the other newspaper -- (Interjection) -- I'm afraid that there are two of them now. Another one is surface. -- (Interjection) -- Well, we were talking about the questionnaire, remember, we were talking about -- if I could go back -- (Interjection) -- I have to repeat myself again. We're discussing the referendum and the questionnaire. The second newspaper, Mr. Speaker, fixed on the idea that 60 percent of those people balloting were in favour of a new flag, and their headline read: "Most people, 60 percent, want a new flag." So I suggest to you that here was what we thought was an uncomplicated form of balloting; the results were the same, the percentages were the same, but the interpretation of both questions was different. -- (Interjections) -- Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm trying to illustrate a point out of the one government debate. My honourable friend the Member for Sturgeon Creek keeps failing on the substance of the point.

Mr. Speaker, I have more material to cover and I would like to continue, but since it's near the hour, I wonder if I could hold the debate in my name.

MR. SPEAKER: I'll call it 10:00 o'clock. The debate will remain open in the name of the Honourable Member for Elmwood. The House is now adjourned and stands adjourned until 10:00 a.m. tomorrow (Friday) morning.