

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
8:00 o'clock, Tuesday, May 13, 1969

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I have a message from His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor.

MR. SPEAKER: The Lieutenant-Governor transmits to the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba estimates of sums required for the service of the province for capital expenditures, and recommends these estimates to the Legislative Assembly.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Attorney-General, that the message from His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor, together with the estimates accompanying the same, be referred to the Committee of Supply.

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

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, with leave I would like to make a motion with respect to the Public Utilities Committee changing one of the members on the committee, Mr. Jeannotte, substituting a member for him. By leave I would move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Finance, that the name of Joseph Jeannotte in the Public Utilities and Natural Resources Committee be struck off and the name of the Honourable Member from Birtle-Russell, Harry Graham, be substituted therefor.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed?

MR. MOLGAT: No objections.

MR. PAULLEY: No objections, Mr. Speaker.

MR. LYON: I'm sorry I haven't it written out, Mr. Speaker. I just received the ...

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

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce, that Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair and the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MATTERS OF URGENCY

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, before the motion is put I want to say a few words about the conduct of business in the House. Now I recognize that this is essentially a government responsibility, but I only want to point out that it seems to me that we could be using our time to better advantage than we have been using. When you look at the present Order Paper before us you find that on today's Order Paper at the back, Page 14, there are presently 21 government bills, none of which have yet been given second reading, all of which are printed and have been in our hands. Three of them were introduced in the House on the 18th of April, one on the 21st of April, eight of them on the 24th of April, two on the 25th of April, one on the 28th, one on the 29th, and two on the 30th of April. So of the total of 21, some 16 were introduced prior to the end of the month of April. When I say "introduced" I mean the actual printed copy delivered to our desks.

Now it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that we should be proceeding with second reading of these bills and consideration. Every year there's a tendency, towards the end of the session to hurry things up and I'm not blaming the government for this at all. I think all of us share this responsibility. All I'm interested in here is getting some reasonable discussion of the matters before us instead of having them done in a spirit of "it's time to get out of the House and go back home." And so we are faced at this stage with this large number of bills, some of them having a fair amount of discussion involved in them. We understand that the government intends to proceed as well on some other bills, notably one concerning school financing and changes in the method of dealing with the teachers in the province insofar as negotiations for salaries and so on. We know that if the government does proceed with this bill, it will be fairly controversial and will require relatively a fair amount of time in committee.

Now I appeal to the government, Mr. Speaker, to proceed on second reading of bills rather than carry on daily in Supply which does not then provide material on which to call the Law Amendments Committee, that we should be proceeding to deal with these bills, get them in process in the House, get them hopefully, those that are going to pass the House, into the committee stage where they can then be dealt with and have an orderly flow of business in the House. What I am afraid of otherwise, Mr. Speaker, is that we will find that we will be through with

(MR. MOLGAT cont'd). Supply in a day or so, the government then will exert pressure on the House to accept the speed-up motion, and once we get to the speed-up motion, the procedures are such that we normally sit in the morning, a bill can come up for second reading then, we sit again in the afternoon and the bill is back before us once again, and again at night; and I don't think that it provides for the reasonable discussion which can be had by following through a more normal flow of business. We could then be using our mornings for committee meetings of Law Amendments Committee or whatever other committee is necessary to discuss these bills; there will be no need for the speed-up motion in the sense that we could conduct the business of the House quite properly without it, and I think it would be for the betterment of legislation in the Province of Manitoba.

So Mr. Speaker, I strongly recommend to the government, in fact I appeal to them, in the interests of proper discussion of the bills that are facing us, that this would be the better course. It will speed up the whole business of the House. Far from delaying it, it will speed it up and we will be using our time to good advantage. As it is, we have not been using our mornings for committee hearings when we could have, but if we are to proceed in this way I think everyone would be the better, the public would have the advantage that they would know a little time in advance when the bills have gone through the House, when they will appear in committee, and have the opportunity then to appear before our committees and express their views. Mr. Speaker, I believe that the practice followed in this House of referring our bills to committees outside of the House is a very important one. I think it is the essence of democracy. Admittedly, it takes time on occasion. It means that members have to sit through long periods of committee hearings, but the benefits I'm convinced far outweigh the time that's required. In any case, we are paid for the time we spend here, and it's only by giving the public an opportunity of knowing a little time in advance that a certain bill will appear in committee on a certain date that they can go there. I think that this is to the advantage of the members who can then get some expert advice from outside of the House, and I think we end up with better legislation for it. So Mr. Speaker, I appeal to the House Leader and to the Premier to proceed with the second reading of bills in an orderly fashion and let's get them into committee and let's use our time effectively in the House. We could be working in committee hearings in the morning and I think everyone would be better for it.

MR. SPEAKER put the question and after a voice vote declared the motion carried, and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply with the Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN: Last night when we completed our work we were still under 1 (a), Minister's Compensation. The Member for Hamiota.

MR. EARL DAWSON (Hamiota): Mr. Chairman, I noted with interest one of the things that are mentioned in the TED report was that one of the Commission targets was the creating of more jobs and retaining of our young people in the province, and I wondered if the Minister could tell me how he is going to handle the brain drain that is taking place in Manitoba. I'm sure that this side of the House has mentioned a number of times that many people are leaving Manitoba - they are better educated people - and if we are going to create the number of jobs that the TED report suggests we have, where are we going to obtain the people?

I noted with interest an article in the Brandon paper in relation to a seminar that West-Man Regional Development is holding for young people between the ages of 17 to 20. This is held in the West-Man region and they have invited Grade 12 students to attend. I understand it has been operating since Sunday - I think today is the last day; and a survey was taken by a Dr. N. E. Spence of these young people, what their plans are for the future, and the amazing thing to me, Mr. Chairman, was the fact that 51 percent of the young people attending that seminar said that they will leave the province. I am not sure if they were asked for their reasons, but there were some comments in the same article saying that the reasons for them leaving was of course the lack of jobs; the area that they are living in has not been built up; it lacks industry, etc. So I think this very survey proves what we have been saying on this side of the House, that there definitely is a brain drain, and I wondered how the Minister was going to come up with the answer in view of the fact that the TED report suggests that we create all these new jobs, and I wondered if the Minister could also tell me what is meant in his remarks and in his

(MR. DAWSON cont'd) press release when he mentions that the Manitoba Development Fund is going to take risks. As I said last night, I believe that the Manitoba Development Fund should take some risks, but he says that they are prepared to invest more and help out these smaller businessmen in a manner which will be a startling one, we'll say, or something that is really new to the province, but yet I have been unable to ascertain or read, in any of his remarks, just what will be happening with MDF to make these startling changes that he suggests.

One of the other things I noted in the TED report, it is suggested that more aid be given to the regional development corporations that are situated throughout Manitoba. If the Minister recalls, and I think he asked to have the resolution stand in his name for one time, it was a resolution that I submitted where I suggested that the Manitoba Government give serious consideration to greater financial support of regional development corporations. Now the TED Report pretty well says the same thing, that we have to make these development corporations more meaningful, and they must have more money to do this. They must have their own research people, etc., because they know the area; they know what the area type of industry would be more readily obtained in their particular areas and could survive. And I wondered if the Minister would give me a reply to that one, what his thinking is in this particular area.

There was another recommendation made by the TED Report, where it suggested the Winnipeg Stock Exchange should be built up. Now this is something that I'm in full agreement with and I think that everyone in the House would be in agreement with. It ties in very much with what I said last night and what I've said in the past, that I feel many of the Manitobans are investing money outside of this province because of various reasons. I'm not sure what the reasons are. Maybe it's because they haven't the faith in Manitoba that they should. However there's much money going out. The Minister pointed out to me last night there's some money coming in, that's true, but I think that the people that are living here would like an opportunity to invest. The Winnipeg Stock Exchange, enlarged and built up, could be one step in the right direction. I think that another thing that I must agree with, I believe the Ted Commission suggested this one and this was a Manitoba investment corporation with common stocks. This is not a new idea. This is one I believe that I suggested in 1967. This would be a way of attracting and getting the people of Manitoba to invest in the province in the way of the investment corporation as suggested by TED, and I wondered if the Minister would give me his views on that one.

There was another one that I am very interested in. There has been a problem in the Brandon area with annexing property for expansion, and I noted in the TED Report that they suggest that steps should be taken by the government to give Brandon authority to annex the property that is necessary to them for expansion, and when the Minister is on his feet I wondered if he could give me his reply to this: Is the government prepared to take steps to give Brandon the authority to annex property or will the Minister's reply be the same one he gave me on amalgamation of the City of Winnipeg, that the Premier has written the various Ministers for their opinions? I think that the question of Brandon being allowed to annex property has been one that has been in the air for two or three years and should be resolved.

While the Minister is on his feet, I wondered if he would tell me if a reply has been received from the federal government regarding the letter that the Premier announced to the TED Commission delegation that were being hosted by the provincial government, where he announced that he had written a letter to the federal government regarding the uranium enrichment plant in the north. I'm very curious to see if there has been a reply to this and what cooperation there will be.

Now three of the things I asked the Minister last night - I don't know if he deliberately evaded them or if he did not hear me, but I do recall the Member for Elmwood repeating the same thing that I did - were: what is the Minister's intentions on the Standing Committee on Economic Development? That is the committee that has been suggested by TED to be made up of members of this House; and what - I think that he did not reply to this one too; was the Advisory Council made up of the business sector of the province of Manitoba? He did not reply to that one as well.

I wonder, too, if the Minister could tell me - and I know it comes later in his estimates, but just in case I don't get -- I'll ask the question now; in case I don't get the answer I can do a little more digging. I wonder how much money has been spent on the garment industry in the City of Winnipeg and elsewhere. Of course, there are garment-producing places other than the City of Winnipeg. How much money has been spent to assist them in the people that the

(MR. DAWSON cont'd) Minister, through his Immigration Department, has brought over from Europe and other countries. How are they being subsidized and what has been the total spent on them to date?

I think that's all I have right now except to make one suggestion to him, that I think that we've heard so much about Manitoba being a great convention province, and I think this is true, but I believe we've made many many mistakes. We have the Manitoba Travel Bureau and the Golden Boys and everyone else promoting for conventions, but we don't have that one central office for conventions. I believe the City of Winnipeg under the Winnipeg Council have their own convention office and they do a lot to promote conventions for the Province of Manitoba, but we seem to have everyone working against -- not against one another but at opposite ends of the situation, and I wondered what the Minister thought about having one convention office sponsored by the provincial government where all towns, cities, etc., could send in the information of them hosting conventions or the office chasing conventions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Leader of the New Democratic Party.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, it's always a pleasure for one to take part in discussing the estimates of all of the departments in the government of Manitoba, and I think one of the most intriguing departments however to consider is the department headed by the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce, and I want to extend to him my sincere sympathies because of the fact that he has a very hard task before him in trying to get Manitoba moving out of the doldrums.

Now I know that when I say this I'm running into pretty touchy waters. The Honourable the Member for Lac du Bonnet last evening took the opportunity to chastize the Official Opposition, as it so happened, because of their mealy-mouthed approach to the Department of Industry and Commerce, and of course I suppose if I criticize the department I may be running into the same predicament. But I'm used to this, Mr. Chairman, because I've run into it long before this House met. I read many utterances by my honourable friend the Minister of Industry and Commerce which in effect meant that if we were not with him then we were against Manitoba, and of course my honourable friend knows full well that such is not the case, that those of us on this side of the House have a responsibility and we accept that responsibility, and other functions that we have on this side of the House is to try and prod the government into action.

I would like to, for a few moments, Mr. Chairman, just go over the statement that my honourable friend gave to us yesterday evening on the introduction of his estimates for the Department of Industry and Commerce. But may I first of all extend to the members of his staff my understanding of their positions, the difficulties that they are having because of the directions that they have to pursue, but I think that by and large they are a well qualified group of civil servants and I've had the pleasure of working with a number of them in the best interests of Manitoba. We have not been successful in our endeavours, but there has been some endeavour and I thank the staff of the department for their efforts.

As I listened to my honourable friend on the introduction, it seemed to me, Mr. Chairman, the same old guff that we have been receiving from ministers of Industry and Commerce ever since that government took office are still coming through the ozone. On each and every occasion that the Department of Industry and Commerce presents its review to this House, the comparisons are on a percentage basis. And if one looks at the first page of the statement issued by my friend the Minister yesterday - "Manitoba: State of the Economy. The unemployment rate in Manitoba was 3.5 percent, considerably below the 4.8 percent level for Canada as a whole." My honourable friend did not tell us what I believe to be true, that the unemployment rate in Manitoba in 1968 over 1967 represents an increase - and it is an increase - and to compare the same simply on a percentage basis with the level of Canada as a whole to me is most misleading. And also, I think my honourable friend could recognize, if he would, recognize the fact, or at least consider what I believe to be a fact, that one of the reasons that we have had a relatively low or lower unemployment percentage figure in Manitoba is not due to any activity of government but rather to inactivity of government, and there's been the exodus in population of wage earners in Manitoba because they haven't been able to find jobs due to the lack of expansion in the Province of Manitoba.

In the same paragraph on the first page my honourable friend, again percentage-wise, says, "Wages and salaries increased 9.3 percent in Manitoba compared with 6.9 in Canada." I don't suggest that my honourable friend is in error, but by jiminy Christmas, if you start

(MR PAULLEY cont'd) from nothing and just make a minor increase percentage-wise, you can justify on percentage figure a greater increase. It's something like the beef and rabbit stew, a 50-50 deal. On a steer and one rabbit make a beef and rabbit stew. So on a percentage basis you can establish one point, but on a factual and actual basis it's something far different entirely. -- (Interjection) -- Yes, my colleague from Inkster says Rockefeller and I have lots of money, on the average. So questions of averages, Mr. Chairman, is relative. But I want to commend my honourable friend. He is an average Minister, but in arriving at the average I have to have some possibly that are of lower capacity and others that may be of higher capacity, and I don't know really -- I think I would be unfair to my friend if I attempted to suggest where he really stands in that average.

The same thing goes on, Mr. Chairman, with the figures of the department, or the figures of the Minister on Page 2 of the first section dealing with Record Retail Sales. "Last year," he says in his statement, "the value of retail sales reached \$1,146,000,000, an increase of 3.2 percent over 1967." But my honourable friend does not tell us how much of this is due to cost increases and price increases, and I think he should if he is going to be but fair. How much of that 3.2 percent increase figure is due to inflation in prices? I would suggest a considerable amount, Mr. Chairman, is due to price increases, and it's misleading for the Minister or for the department to tell this House that there was a 3.2 percent increase in retail sales because it could reflect a booming economy or an increase in economy when it's quite conceivable that the reverse is true.

So on we go, and we come down to the next point raised by my honourable friend, "Manitoba's Position on the Road to 1980." Well, something like I suggested to the Minister of Health and Welfare the other day, they're on the track but we want a little more steam out of them, and I'm afraid that it is not coming to the degree we need, even in the Department of Industry headed by my very versatile friend. He talks of the increase in Manitoba's population of 8,000 over the previous year, but he doesn't tell us how many of the figures are of natural increase; he doesn't tell us of the number of immigrants that came into Manitoba; and he doesn't tell us of the exodus of Manitobans who were not able to find a job in Manitoba and left Manitoba for further fields. I think this is the type of a report that we should be receiving from the Minister.

I respect the necessity of advertising for Manitoba. I respect very much the slogan of onward, ever onward to 1970, the year of our Centennial. And I suggest to my honourable friend that he should do this, but give us the facts in the House so that we can properly assess what is happening. Again, percentage figures dealing with the question of increase in personal income compared to others in Canada. "Thus the province has been able to meet both TED targets of increasing at a rate greater than 3.5 percent per year as well as exceeding the Canadian average income per person." It's an odious comparison that really doesn't mean very much to the average citizen of Manitoba, particularly when we know for a while that about two-thirds of the citizens of Manitoba are in receipt of less than the average income in Canada. My honourable friend would not dare of course, I presume, indicate to us that such was the case.

Again on Page 4, dealing with the question of employment: "The TED Commission used a constant level of unemployment for Manitoba of 2.5, so that the province's employment was expected to increase by 37 percent." But the constant level of unemployment, by the Minister's own words in his first page, that we had an unemployment level of 3.5 percent, which seems to me to be at least one percent greater than even that suggested by the TED Report.

And so on the story goes in every page of my honourable friend's statement to this House yesterday. Dealing with the question of net output per person employed in Manitoba, an 8.2 increase over the 1966 figure in the TED Report, comparing with a Canadian increase of 3.4. "The gap that existed in 1966, amounting to 5 percent, has almost been closed." And it so might be, and yet at the same time as my honourable friend in his statement indicates increases in output of Manitoba citizens, others are calling constantly for greater output of our labour force in order to meet the challenge of other jurisdictions.

Gross Output. "The annual growth rate for Manitoba has been 7.1 per year, compared with a 3.9 annual increase for Canada as a whole." Again I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, an odious comparison, unless my honourable friend would compare Manitoba with Manitoba or apples with apples, instead of apples with grapefruit as he does in his statement.

One statement that my honourable friend does make, on Page 5 I believe it is: "We

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) have made a good start so far, and in 1968 Manitoba proved "it can be done." It can be done I know, so I want to see a little more action, a little more proof than that presented in this House by my honourable friend the Minister.

He talks of dynamic developments promised of future expansion dealing with the Nelson River Power Project. "Construction on the 565 mile D. C. Transmission line will be well advanced." No reference at all to the possible detrimental effects, and again I raise the question of Southern Indian Lake.

He goes on about the high level of investment in Manitoba. "The high level of investment expenditures throughout Manitoba in the past few years are now providing new capabilities and opportunities." Most of it government expenditures, and we're still falling behind the average I would suggest in Canada, despite the figures used by my honourable friend the Minister.

In his section dealing with goals, my honourable friend says, "Accelerating economic development in Manitoba is not easy." How true a statement. How true a statement that is, and what an admission when one compares this sentence itself to some of the utterances of the Minister out on the platforms in areas in Manitoba. "But it is my belief," he says, "and it is the belief of the authors and contributors to the TED Commission, that it is not impossible." What is not impossible? To accelerate economic development in Manitoba, and I agree with that. I agree with the Minister that it is possible, but I suggest that the direction being given by the government deters rather than contributes to the economic development of Manitoba.

And on the same page dealing with goals, my honourable friend says, "Our fundamental goals have not changed. They remain much the same. They are to increase the number of jobs, particularly the number of high paying jobs for Manitoba as broadly as possible throughout the regions of the province." Now I'd like my honourable friend to give us a statement, to give us a statistical document to substantiate the statement that he is making. Because, Mr. Chairman, in the latest Dominion statistical reports, the level of income, per capita income in the Greater Winnipeg area, which is a higher wage scale area in Manitoba, is going down comparatively with the rest of Canada. Now, Winnipeg is now, if my memory serves me correctly, in 48th position insofar as average income is concerned in the Dominion of Canada. So I ask my honourable friend to just give us a little broadening, a little more information and a little more proof of what is contained in that particular section because it just doesn't seem to me to hold water. Even in his statement he said, "To realize these goals will not be easy" and what goal is it to increase the number of higher wage paying jobs? First of all he says we're doing it, and then he says, "To realize these goals will not be easy." Now, I suggest to my honourable friend, you can't have it both ways. So give us the facts.

Then he goes on to suggest that it is the private sector that creates new jobs, not government, and I suggest to my honourable friend if it wasn't for the government undertakings in the Province of Manitoba at Gillam and elsewhere, that the unemployment rate in Manitoba would exceed by far the national average, and we have not attracted into Manitoba in the private industry sector the jobs required for the citizens of Manitoba, and in particular the jobs or the type of jobs that create - to use the Minister's own statement - high paying jobs. And because we have not been providing that type of job in Manitoba, is the reason for many of our university students, the graduates of MIT and other institutions of a higher learning area leaving Manitoba, and this is why. This is why it's ever necessary for the Department of Industry and Commerce and other departments of government to bring in from the outside capable personnel to fill jobs that Manitobans could well fill.

Another true statement - and I want to give my friend credit, even if it's in his statement, because there are a few truisms in his statement - when he says "We will not achieve our goal simply by standing up in this Legislature, making hurried statements of intention." I want to say to my honourable friend I agree most heartily with him. So I say to him, cut it out! We've had enough of intentions; it is time for a little bit more action from my honourable friend's department in extending the economy of the Province of Manitoba.

And on and on it goes. Dealing with the question of department reorganization, "It is vital that we process more goods in Manitoba for the purpose of selling them in the export market." What a true statement, but my honourable friend makes the statement and in half a dozen other places, in delivering the guff from the department, he says, "We're doing it." Again I say to my honourable friend, Heavens to Betsy, let's be consistent in our statements. And certainly we're not, as one gives even a superficial consideration to the statement of the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd)

Then, in his statement here he refers to the question of fish marketing and the necessity for expansion: "Industrial development is a major economic objective for Manitoba" - he goes on and on and on, talking of the necessity for development, utilization of Manitoba products to sell in export markets; there must be merchandise - "The Manitoba product must be promoted and recognized as an item of quality and of good value." It's unfortunate my honourable friend wasn't in the House here some years ago when the previous Minister of Industry and Commerce, who is now the Minister of the Treasury, was the Minister. I note he's not in his seat at the present time. And I wouldn't be a bit surprised, Mr. Chairman, that if soon my honourable friend the Minister of Industry and Commerce does not, in his endeavours to promote Manitoba products, give us the same guff that we got from a former Minister, that we have to have specialized dishes for Manitoba, because I recall that my honourable friend there was dealing with putting up signs on the entrances to Manitoba: "Here is Manitoba, the home of Plum Duff." And of course, Duff was our Premier at the time, the Honourable Provincial Treasurer was the Minister of Industry and Commerce, and somebody suggested at that time that another sign should be put up there accompanying it, advertising "Evans Trout". This is what we have become used to insofar as the Department is concerned.

My honourable friend this afternoon, when I raised the question of Booth Fisheries and the Fish Marketing Board - and again I want to emphasize that I'm not criticizing the establishment; I'm not criticizing the establishment of a fresh water marketing board for fish - but my honourable friend chastised me this afternoon because I showed concern for the employees of Booth Fisheries in Selkirk, and he said to me, at least he inferred to me that it was improper for me to use the name. Well, here's the Minister of Industry and Commerce, who apparently doesn't know what's going on in Manitoba. The Minister of Labour, he didn't know what was going on insofar as Labour is concerned in the fishing industry, the closing down of the plant at Gimli. Apparently the Minister of Health Services, the representative for Gimli, didn't know.

MR. JOHNSON: Didn't know what?

MR. PAULLEY: That the B.C. Packers Fish Plant at Gimli has been declared as being redundant in the industry and is going to be closed down.

MR. JOHNSON: On a matter of privilege, Mr. Chairman, I know more about that than my honourable friend will ever know.

MR. PAULLEY: All I can say to my honourable friend, he didn't indicate this afternoon any knowledge of it because he sat quietly by.

MR. JOHNSON: Can I ask my honourable friend a question? Does my friend believe in a rationalization of the industry or does he not?

MR. PAULLEY: I don't want to have to start treating my honourable friend for a burst blood vessel so I suggest to him he just calm down, and in this case may I be your physician? So just simmer down because I'm concerned, I'm concerned with the possibility of the employment of 25 individuals at Gimli, and this is because of the apparent declaration of the redundancy of the plant at Gimli. So I suggest to my honourable friend, you investigate, before you blow your top, insofar as the people of Gimli are concerned.

MR. JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, I would suggest, with all respect, that the honourable member leave the affairs of Gimli to the Member. I'll look after my problems.

MR. PAULLEY: I would say, Mr. Chairman, I would be perfectly happy and willing to leave the affairs of the people of Gimli to the Member if he was doing it, but apparently he is not. -- (Interjection) -- Now look, my chirping friend, you just go back to The Pas for a little while.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order. that the Leader of the New Democratic Party be allowed to continue.

MR. PAULLEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. You know, I really love, I really love to consider the actions of the members opposite because it is so typical of them, when they are called to task for their deficiencies, like a howling mob, almost without exception, they rise up off of their rears, air their brains briefly, and then have to admit that they were wrong.

MR. LYON: Would my honourable friend permit a question? Speaking of redundancy, would he not say that his present speech falls into that category?

MR. PAULLEY: I will let the members of the House judge the quality or otherwise of my speech and the remarks that I am making, and I want to say to my honourable friend the House Leader, the Attorney-General, I would accept the assessment of other people far in

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) preference to the assessment of my honourable friend.

I asked the Honourable the Minister of Labour, dealing with the industrial development in Manitoba and the production of labour, did he know of what was happening? He didn't. I asked the First Minister. --(Interjection)-- I want to say, I want to say to my honourable friend, who is about the same size as the present Premier, that neither he nor his party will ever sit in the front benches opposite and I can appreciate the fact of him putting up his hands in holy terror at the thought. -- (Interjection)-- Fine. Fine. And I will accept his judgment, and if my chirping little Minister from The Pas will just desist for a little while, we can get on with the expose of the deficiencies of the Department of Industry and Commerce and further expose of the deficiencies of the whole caboodle on that side of the House. -- (Interjection) -- Thanks to Medicare that you brought us into very reluctantly. I even tried to solicit some information from the First Minister this afternoon as to who were the members of the Fish Marketing Board and what action is being taken; if facilities are being declared as being redundant by the Fish Marketing Board, what are the intentions; and I couldn't get from that vast array of talent (so-called) from that side of the House, any intelligible answer at all. They just simply don't know what's going on in Manitoba, be it with fish or anything else in Manitoba. --(Interjection)-- My honourable friend the Minister from The Pas says he's looking for some intelligent criticism. We know, don't we, Mr. Chairman, that he hasn't got the capabilities of assessing whether any criticism is intelligent or otherwise, and we've seen that for so long. So I suggest to my honourable friend once again, that if he wants to chirp get up to Southern Indian Lake while there's still an opportunity to get on the branch of a tree to do some chirping because, due to the action of that government over there, there won't be any trees before very long.

MR. CARROLL: I've been up before you.

MR. PAULLEY: And I've been there too.

MR. CARROLL: What did you find out?

MR. PAULLEY: I found out up there that the people have come to the conclusion of the errors of their ways in electing representatives such as my honourable friend the Minister of Consumer Affairs, and they're going to change. And this goes for the Minister of Labour as indeed it did for the representatives of the Conservative Party in the last by-election. So my honourable friend, he might just as well enjoy himself for the balance of this Legislature because he will not be here, and if he hasn't already done so I suggest to my friend that he start making his contribution to the retirement fund for members of the Legislature, because he may need it. -- (Interjections) --

So I say, I say to my friends opposite, and this might seem, it might seem an occasion for joviality for members opposite and maybe some on this side as well, but I want to say, Mr. Chairman, the criticisms that I am giving to the Minister are sincere and well deserved and are factual, that we've had so much guff from preceding Ministers of Industry and Commerce, a comparison, as I mentioned a short while ago, of apples and grapefruit - and yes, my friend Mr. First Minister, from you too. True, here this afternoon with just a simple question, you had no answer. There have been a number of times, my dear friend, that you've been asked questions; you have no conception at all of what is going on, and it's difficult. Prove it! The man proves it himself; I don't have to. And ever since an expose to national coloured TV my honourable friend has grown in stature in some quarters, but by the same token seems to be losing his grasp of what is happening in the Province of Manitoba daily, and I suggest it might be that my honourable friend the First Minister is soliciting and obtaining information from some of his colleagues in the Cabinet, and I suggest to him that he desist from doing so and start investigating into the problems of Manitoba himself because of the bum steers he must be getting from his Cabinet Ministers.

MR. JOHNSON: It's a broad statement.

MR. PAULLEY: Of course it's a broad statement and I'm accustomed to making broad statements of fact, and this is what annoys my honourable fisherman friend from Gimli.

MR. JOHNSON: And what's wrong with a fisherman?

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, there's nothing wrong, there's nothing wrong with a fisherman. There's nothing wrong with the fishing industry except that they haven't received the consideration that they should have been receiving from the Government of Manitoba, who don't seem to have any knowledge of the problems of the fishing industry, and whether they have any knowledge or not they certainly haven't any solutions to the problems.

MR. JOHNSON: You don't know a inch mesh from your wife's hairnet.

MR. PAULLEY: That's right. I may not. I may not, but by Jiminy Christmas, I do know that in the home town of my honourable friend the Member for Gimli, that a plant is closing down because it's been declared redundant, and possibly over the weekend my honourable friend will take a little flyer down to Gimli and find out what's happening in his constituency if he doesn't believe me.

MR. JOHNSON: my campaign chairman.

MR. PAULLEY: You're going to need more than him then, because he won't be there to be your campaign manager in the next election.

MR. JOHNSON: Lots of . . . opportunities in this modern society.

MR. PAULLEY: I didn't hear what my honourable friend said. I don't know even if he knows what he said.

Mr. Chairman, one can go through the full statement of the Minister of Industry and Commerce, and I sometimes think, or I think now after listening to some of the members opposite, that he was aided and abetted in compiling his statement by some of the other Ministers, because it's really the guffiest of the guffiest bunch of guff that I've read in many a year. And I say to my honourable friend, I know that he has, I know that he has the sincere desire to help in the advancement of Manitoba, but for goodness' sake, give us the facts on the true situation prevailing in Manitoba at the present time so that we can make an assessment of where we are going. I'm sure we are all concerned; we are all concerned with going into the second century of Manitoba on a basis of advancement, and I suggest that if the honourable Minister would but co-operate with those of the rest of us that are sincerely desirous of doing this instead of handing us tripe like this, we could go into the second century of Manitoba on a sound basis.

My honourable friend, dealing with the question of industrial training and immigration, says: "Vital to the achievement of Manitoba's goals is a skilled work force." He's right. There's so many statements, Mr. Chairman, he makes in this document that he's so right about, but having established the correctness of his statement, we find as we assess the progress of Manitoba that his statements are not really being carried out because, as I mentioned before and others have mentioned in this House, that while my honourable friend does say: "Vital to the achievement of Manitoba's goals is a skilled work force," we're still losing our skilled work forces in Manitoba.

The Honourable Member for Hamiota just pointed out the assessment of the students at Brandon - 51% desire to get out of Manitoba because of the fact that they fear that there isn't going to be the job opportunities commensurate with their educational standards. Now these are young men and women who are just on the brink of being able to make their full contribution to the destiny of Manitoba. Why, why is it, Mr. Chairman, that a group of intelligent young men and women would arrive at such a conclusion if it were not so. My honourable friend admits that it is vital to achievement of Manitoba's goals, and yet at the same time even those that are going through our universities and our technical training schools today are doing so, feeling that instead of being able to make a contribution to their native province, or to their province, they've already got their eyes on pastures outside because of the lack of the creation of opportunities here in Manitoba to use their skills.

So I say to my friend, the objectives are good, the TED objectives are good, and I'm not criticizing them. I do criticize the Minister, I do criticize the government, because they're in my opinion, only giving lip service to the need of achieving goals, only giving lip service to the creation of jobs, and we're still losing skilled personnel to the outside, at the same time as my honourable friend, when he's dealing with the question of immigration, says: "Continue to identify shortages of labour, continue carrying out promotional campaigns in overseas countries, and encourage employers to combine in joint recruiting ventures.

And what are we receiving? We're receiving more and more recruitments, it's true, mainly in the low-paying wage scale industries in Manitoba, particularly the garment industry and I'm not objecting to anybody who works in the garment industry. They're fine people, all of them, and do and will make their contribution, but at the same time, as the average wage income per capita wage is going down in Manitoba due to the fact there's a lack of job creation in the higher wage income group, their places are being taken population-wise by those in the lower wage scale group. And I say to you, Mr. Chairman, this simply is not good enough for Manitoba. And make as many comparisons percentage-wise as you like, until such time as

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd) the average income rates in Manitoba are raised, until such time as we have throughout the length and breadth of Manitoba job opportunities at relatively high or middle income groups, all of the guff of the department is not going to solve any of the problems of Manitoba.

So I say, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the task that the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce has accepted as being before him, and I wish him well, and I wish this my native province well, but until and unless there is a change of direction by the government in the creation of job opportunities of the higher levels, in the creation of new industries in Manitoba which will give returns in the higher paying industries, we're still going to continue, comparatively speaking, the relative position we are now in in the Dominion of Canada. So I say to my friend, good luck. Your objectives are well. I appreciate your sincerity. But there's a lot to be done in Manitoba, and odious comparisons on percentage figures will go nowhere to solve the problems that we have in Manitoba.

MR. HILLHOUSE: Mr. Chairman, a great deal has been said, during the course of these estimates, regarding the fishing industry on Lake Winnipeg, and I would like to make it clear to the House that the reason why I have not taken part in that particular aspect of this debate is due to the fact that Bill No. 50 will be coming up for second reading in a few days, and at that time I intend to devote as much time as possible in discussing that bill from the standpoint of what is beneficial to the fishermen of this province. That is the reason why I have not entered into this aspect of the debate, plus the fact that we only have five hours left in Committee of Supply to deal with over half the departments of this government. There are some of these departments that would take at least 15 hours to deal with, and that is the reason why I've kept silent on the question of the fishing in Lake Winnipeg, but I'm fully aware of what is happening and I believe that the Honourable Member for Gimli is also aware of it, and I am fully aware to deal with that situation when the bill comes before the House, which I consider to be the proper time to deal with it.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Chairman, I think it's necessary to reply to the two speakers who have spoken, that is the Honourable Member for Hamiota and the Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party. I may suggest that in listening to him there was certainly lots of guff, and the guff was coming from him. I am one who holds the Leader of the New Democratic Party in high regard. I think that he has and he continues to make a very significant worthwhile contribution to this House and to this province. I think and I witnessed, certainly in this House during the period of time that he was absent, that notwithstanding the fact that we do have some very articulate and outright spokesmen on behalf of the party, nevertheless there was something lacking in the fact that the Leader of the New Democratic Party was not here, was not able to contribute in his usual spontaneous and free manner and enter the debate in a rather perceptive way.

I say that because I find his presentation today, this evening, as I have found his presentation in dealing with our estimates in the past, as intriguing as he finds the statement that was made by me in the introduction of the estimates. I find it intriguing because the manner and form in which the Leader of the New Democratic Party attacks the department is simply to take a statement and to stand up and say it's not so, not necessarily have any statistical information which will say that it's not so, but simply that we as members of this House must accept what he says as being correct because he's saying it. And there's been a tendency, in terms of attacking the department in the statistical information of the department, to simply stand up here, in this House and outside of this House, and say that the facts and figures and information that's being supplied is incorrect, is balderdash, is guff, and words that are very similar. And I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, and to the members of the House, that the information that was presented to this House was compiled by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics and has been presented in a rational way to try and reflect the economic progress that is occurring in this province, with an attempt to try and show the direction that is taking place. And I suggest to you as well, Mr. Chairman, that it really simply shows that we have made progress, that certainly a lot remains to be done, and there is no question of a commitment on our part to try and do everything that's required to achieve the results that we all want, which is the further progress in our economic development.

Now the Leader of the New Democratic Party has dealt with the matter of the fish marketing board, and I would agree with the Honourable Member from Selkirk that this is a matter that more appropriately should be dealt with on Bill 50, but I think it's important

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) because I think he himself is basically giving the House a bum steer on a fish matter for the simple reason that the Packers' decision to close is not a decision of the board, it is a decision of B. C. Packers, and insofar as the information of the government is concerned, Booth are not closing as suggested by the Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party. And my reason for condemning the Leader of the New Democratic Party in the questions before the Orders of the Day stems from a basic criticism that I have, as a Minister attempting to try and encourage development in this province, with a tactic that has been used constantly by the Opposition of bringing into this House names of firms who are doing business here, and in some way, through some suggestion or innuendo, suggesting that something is wrong, or in turn suggesting that the government is at fault, and I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, and I say this with sincerity, that there has been a tremendous disservice done to this province by those on the other side who constantly bring names of corporations into this House for some speculative information or for some criticism on which that information has either not been checked out or verified before questions are asked. And it's very simple.

The members of the Department of Industry and Commerce, I as the Minister and the Deputy Minister, are available to any member of the House that wants or seeks information; that information will be forthcoming as quickly as it can be obtained, and it's not our intention in any way to mislead any member of what has happened in this House. But I object very strenuously, and I can say as one who has tried earnestly and sincerely to further the economic development in this province, that there is a real criticism registered by those in the private sector with the way in which the criticism of industrial development and concerns are mentioned constantly by the Opposition in the question period and related other matters; information that is inaccurate, statements that are based on hearsay and innuendo that is implied. I'm not sensitive in terms of this. I'm saying this to you so that you'll understand that one of the objectives of the TED Report was to try and change a frame of mind. And I can quote that passage and that passage applies to the members of the Opposition as well as to others in this House. I'm not suggesting that everyone has done this, and I'm not in any way trying to make a blanket charge against each one, but there is a constant urge on the part of members in this House to stand up at an appropriate time and simply mention the firm's name, mention that there's some trouble involved, and mention that the government's at fault. And in your attempt to try and imply that the government has lacked leadership in whatever form this may be, you are doing a tremendous disservice because the constant references to the firms, the innuendos that are suggested, hurt those firms and in turn I suggest to you they hurt and have hurt the image of this province in industrial development.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Honourable Minister would permit a question? My question, if my honourable friend would permit: would he ascribe the same tactics that he's accusing us of using to the tactics of the administration in respect of Air Canada. Is it because of the criticisms of Air Canada and their policy that we lost it?

MR. SPIVAK: There is no comparison between the issue of Air Canada -- no, no. There is absolutely no comparison, Mr. Chairman, between the issues on the Air Canada situation and the reference that I made. It was not necessary for the Leader of the New Democratic Party to mention the names. That information could have been obtained by simply asking either myself or the member of the department, and it would have been unnecessary to mention it in this House, and to again -- (Interjection) -- Oh no, oh no. This is one time on my estimates that I intend to lay the blame where it should belong, and it belongs to those who constantly use this House in a way which really deprecates the attempt here to try and show that we are really interested --(Interjection)-- No poppycock. That we are really interested in industrial development.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I'd just like to ask the honourable member, who appears to be making what he wants people to suspect is a serious charge, could he tell us the name of one firm, and if he doesn't want to say the name out loud would he give the opposition members the name of one firm that has been damaged as the result of its name being mentioned in the House? And tell us to what extent this firm has been damaged? Or is he just saying this to try to make an impression?

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Chairman, I can tell the honourable member that there is one firm who is investing substantially in this province, who cannot understand why their name has to be mentioned in this House and why this should become a public issue. They are an old established firm who have done business for a hundred years and they cannot understand an attitude in this House that would have their name mentioned.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Chairman. Let me ask the Minister again because that's not what he said. I can understand people not wishing their names mentioned, and that's beside the point. In the House sometimes we feel a name should be mentioned, but he said there are firms in Manitoba whose names have been mentioned, who have been damaged as a result of their names being mentioned in this House. He doesn't want to give the names. Would he give us the information, tell us which firms and how they were damaged by their names being mentioned in this House.

MR. SPIVAK: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I can do that and I'll tell the honourable member, but I did not say that statement. That statement is correct as well. I said there are firms whom we have dealt with to try and get them to come into this province who have suggested to us that this is a very peculiar House, that there seems to be a tendency on the part of the Opposition members to continually mention firms who are coming in and to use it for whatever political purposes they see fit at the time, and I suggest to you that this is the case whether you like it or not - and you do not want to hear this, this happens to be the truth - and it's time for some recognition that if we are really going to be seriously interested in industrial development and we are seriously going to be interested in trying to further the economic development in this province, there is a legitimate position that can be taken by the Opposition, and questions in fact can be and should be asked of the government with respect to industry, but it is not necessary to bandy names of firms around unnecessarily, or based on hearsay or some innuendo.

-- (Interjection) -- Mr. Chairman, I would like to continue if I may.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, may I . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister has the floor.

MR. GREEN: May I ask a question, Mr. Chairman?

MR. SPIVAK: I'll accept a question after I finish my statement.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to know. . . .

MR. SPIVAK: No, I'd like to finish my statement. Now the Member from Hamiota talked in terms of a report out of Brandon and talked in terms of the problem of creating more jobs, the brain drain, and the Leader of the New Democratic Party mentioned this as well. There's no doubt that we have a problem in this province, as well as eight other provinces in Canada, where people are leaving. That is to say, there are more people leaving than are coming in from interprovincial migration. It's not just peculiar to Manitoba. It happens in Alberta; it happens in Saskatchewan; it happens in all the other provinces except Ontario and B. C. ; and it has happened for the last four years. It is not peculiar to Manitoba. Our objective is to try and create enough economic activity to hold our people, and I suggest to you that in fact we have achieved those results. The statistics bear it out, but more importantly, if you look at the out-migration figures, the net out-migration figures of 1966, you would recognize that by 1968 we have been able to reduce this by some 62 percent, and that can only come about if in fact there were enough job opportunities.

Now interprovincial immigration, which is now part of our program activity, is not something that is peculiar just to Manitoba. It has existed in the Province of Ontario and has been responsible for its growth in population and for its economic growth as well. As a matter of fact - and I've repeated this before in the House - between 1947 and 1965, in actual immigration from outside of Canada, the Province of Ontario received as many people as it received as a result of net figures of birth over death. Now that's a pretty significant one and their growth would not have occurred without immigration, and if you apply the logic of the Leader of the New Democratic Party there would really be no reason for Canada to bring in immigrants, because obviously if we have unemployment in Canada of 4.8 percent, surely to God we should employ those people rather than bring in 170,000 immigrants. But immigration is needed because we bring in skills that are not readily available to meet certain specific needs, and I think there's a recognition as well that we are always going to have an unemployment problem with people. -- (Interjection) -- Oh bosh with government like ours -- you are always going to live with an unemployment problem, and certainly the Economic Council of Canada have said that in terms of virtual employment that would be an unemployment figure of 2.5 percent.

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd.)

Well, I must say to you that we bring our people to this province under a program in which the federal government is involved, and they must therefore meet all the criteria that is set up under the federal system. There is a point system, and if they are brought in unskilled they can only come in if they have the other qualifications of education and background and they are coming to an area that requires the unskilled people. These are federal standards that are set up and people only enter Canada if they meet those federal standards. They certainly don't enter in if we as a province say we want them; this has to come through the federal government. They're screened by them and they're based on the point system which takes into consideration the needs of industry in the area and the requirements at the time.

The Honourable Member for Hamiota mentioned the Winnipeg Stock Exchange, and I would suggest to him that one of the matters of the Citizens' Committee that I referred to in the TED program that we'll be undertaking would deal with that. This is one of the financial institutions, financial matters that in fact should be considered, and I would endorse the TED recommendation on this and I would suggest to him that this is something that we should seriously consider should occur.

The honourable member mentioned whether we had received a reply from the federal government on the uranium enrichment, I can say that the Prime Minister has already replied to the Premier; that in turn another letter is being forwarded to him. Of necessity the letter is a matter of confidence, but obviously we have at least achieved some recognition from him. I can say as well that the TED Report has received widespread enthusiasm outside of this province and the uranium enrichment development has attracted much attention, that there have been conversations already held with those who in fact could be interested in this development and I would say at this point, insofar as I'm concerned, there has been substantial progress made on this very dramatic and interesting undertaking for the province.

Now the Honourable Member from Hamiota asked for information in connection with the garment industry which I do not have readily available but I will get for him.

The Honourable Member from Hamiota mentioned about a convention office, a convention facility, which I think more appropriately should be mentioned - or questioned of the Honourable Minister of Tourism and Recreation. The TED Report has very significant items relating to tourism particularly, and I'm sure the Minister of Tourism in examination of this item will deal with it and will give his recommendations to the Premier.

The Honourable Member also asked about the Standing Committees, and rather than repeat the answer, because I know that the Honourable Minister of Health and Social Services had to answer one question six times in his estimates and I don't think it's necessary for me to repeat that same exercise, I would refer him to the answers on the Standing Committee to Page 2113 of Hansard where the answer in fact has been given.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. GREEN: Is it a question too?

MR. DESJARDINS: It's just a question.

MR. GREEN: Well, I did have a question that I wanted to ask. I don't want the floor but I wanted to ask a question. The Minister said that there were firms who would not come to Manitoba as a result - this is the second statement that he made - he said that there were firms who couldn't understand what was happening in our Legislature and this was a problem in them coming to Manitoba. I'd like to know whether the Minister would give us the names of the firms who wouldn't come to Manitoba as a result of speeches made in this Legislature.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Chairman, I did not say that. I said there were firms who we were trying to entice to come into Manitoba who had questioned the tactics of this House in bandying names about. I did not say that they would not come, I'm simply suggesting to you that they could not understand this House and the manner in which it operated insofar as economic development was concerned.

MR. GREEN: Are you able to indicate that one firm has been lost as a result of anything being said in the Legislature?

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Chairman, I can't indicate why a firm makes a decision necessarily to come or not to come. I can simply say to you that I have been told by firms who have questioned the manner in which the House has banded firm names unnecessarily.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, the Minister and this government are certainly not very consistent. What they're asking for is a blank cheque. Exactly. The Minister just made two statements. He doesn't want us to mention any firms; it's not right. -- (Interjection) -- Just a minute, Red, you can get in after. Now this is the first thing. The next statement was that we criticized the provincial government. We say that they lack leadership; and that's wrong, there's nobody will have confidence in Manitoba. You did say that. You read that in Hansard tomorrow. Now what are we supposed to do? We can't criticize the government and we can't ask questions. There's the Manitoba Development Board. We have asked information on that; we've asked them to give us the information on the QT or to even let the Leaders of the different parties sit on the Review Board. But who do we have on the Review Board? The Members of the Cabinet. Mr. Chairman, to say the least, this is certainly a temptation for them to play politics, what he doesn't want us to do. It's supposed to be very independent, but my honourable friend and the Minister have cut more ribbons around Manitoba lately - it's to their credit. It's supposed to be independent. The public is not supposed to know but this is fine. They want to take credit for this. Now the Minister doesn't like us to give the province a wrong impression and this is right. But what is this government doing? When is the First Minister - what has he done in the question of national unity for instance? He's set the west back for years and years.

MR. SPIVAK: That's a matter of opinion.

MR. DESJARDINS: Certainly it's a matter of opinion. Certainly it's a matter of opinion, and I think there's an awful lot that would agree with me, and members of your own party my dear friend.

Now, when my honourable friend presented the report, the TED Report, what did he do but cry and cry and cry. You couldn't hear anything he was sobbing too much - blaming the federal government. Does my honourable friend insist that the federal government is to blame for all our troubles in the economy of this province? Is this what he's saying, because this is all that we've heard. Now if he doesn't believe that, why does he keep on crying? Why does he keep on? He tells us the people won't have confidence in the Government of Manitoba; they won't want to come here. And he does the same thing in the federal government. You remember, Mr. Chairman, how much he cried on numerous occasions.

I would like to quote to my honourable friend something very interesting, and I will quote now from the Free Press of June 21, 1968. This was a day or so before the last election, if you remember well, Mr. Chairman, and this is what the Minister had to say and I quote: - well, the story I'm reading now: "Industry and Commerce Minister, Sidney Spivak, Thursday warned a group of local businessmen not to attach too much importance to the outcome of Tuesday's federal election. Mr. Spivak was speaking to the Winnipeg Real Estate Board at the Westminster Motor Hotel. 'Whoever is elected, the course of action is pretty well determined,' he said. 'I feel that there are factors and dynamics working in this country that will reshape our national identity and our economy. Although the politicians can give expression to this process, they have very little control over it.' " Now this is what my honourable friend is saying. He is telling the people before the election was over - Don't worry, it doesn't mean a darned thing. But then we get a report, he tables a report in the House and at least three-quarters of the speech is used to cry and blame it on the former government.

Now let's get together and let's decide on the rules. If we're going to fight this in the proper way, if we're going to look after the affairs of Manitoba, we won't attack another government that's not here to defend itself. Nobody from this side of the House has ever said don't attack the government; don't go after the best possible deal. But why waste the time of this House crying, crying all the time over something that we have no control over. Just because we happen to be on this side, they'll single us out a little more because it happens that we belong to the same party. Same party - we do not! We have nothing to do with the House of Commons. We're not elected to the House of Commons; we're elected here to do our duty here and we have to ask questions. The Minister knows that this government is the worst government in Canada when it comes to giving -- or the lack of information that we receive from this government. We have a very good example right now in this Bill 15, and the Minister has the gall today to get up and chastize the Leader of the Opposition, the Leader of the New Democratic Party -- (Interjection) -- Pardon?

MR. SPIVAK: He's not the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. DESJARDINS: Well, the New Democratic Party. I'm very sorry. You don't make any mistakes but once in a while I slip. But anyway he knows who I mean, and you can't be very

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd.)... interested if you're looking for a slip of the tongue like that. Just tell me why you think we should have a set of rules for you. Don't touch me; we've got to stick you in cotton batten and don't you dare say a thing about the Minister of Industry and Commerce; but you can go ahead with the Spivak Broadcasting Corporation and go ahead and give all this malarkey to the people of Manitoba. It's very active. But what do we do? We ask a simple question; we can't get the answer. And now he tells us, you ask the questions and I'll tell you on the QT outside.

Now if this was the way that we were supposed to rule, if this is the way the democratic form of government was working we wouldn't need this beautiful Chamber. We'd meet in the halls and you could whisper on the QT and give us some information. No, Mr. Speaker, I think in this instance that the members of the New Democratic Party are certainly within their rights. I'm not suggesting that they should purposely try to embarrass certain firms. I'm not saying that. But when this is the only way we can get information, we're told, every day we're told -- the Honourable Member for Morris said the government - a member of the front bench - he doesn't even know himself and he doesn't care, he doesn't want to know; he's ready to accept blindly what is told to him by the members of the front bench. Well on this side of the House we're not that gullible. We're not going to give you a blank cheque and we're going to keep on asking questions, Mr. Speaker. Your point of purposely trying to embarrass the company is well taken; fine, but you do the same thing.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to, if I may, just answer the Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Minister.

MR. SPIVAK: And I'll do this very briefly. First of all I would like to really attack a fiction that he is attempting to create here and he's done it in the past, that in some way there is a suggestion that we are crying to the federal government, and as soon as the TED Report was filed we immediately said that the federal government are to blame. That is not so, Mr. Chairman. We simply indicated, as I've indicated already in the House, that some of the things the TED Report suggests should happen can only happen if in fact federal influence is used and federal support occurs. This is not in any way to take away from the obligation of the provincial government or the municipalities or the obligation of the private sector, and the Honourable Member for St. Boniface has created this fiction again and he's just repeated it.

Now with respect to the statement that was made before the federal election, I happen to be one who believes, notwithstanding the ability that the Prime Minister has shown in his particularly articulate manner of handling things, that national unity of this country would have been better served if Mr. Stanfield had become Prime Minister, and I still believe this and I think I have a right to say that. I'm not sure that the course of activities would have been that different, I just think that the result may have in fact occurred better.

Now I would like to inform the honourable member....

MR. DESJARDINS: go along with Mr. Stanfield?

MR. SPIVAK: I would like to inform the Honourable Member for St. Boniface....

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, can I ask the member a question, because he brought in Mr. Stanfield.

MR. SPIVAK: I'll answer the question afterwards, Mr. Chairman.

MR. DESJARDINS: You don't like questions, do you?

MR. SPIVAK: I would also suggest, Mr. Chairman, that all that is asked of the Opposition is that if a question is to be asked, ask the question. It is not necessary - and I can take the examples of the one today - to have used the names of the firms. Surely to God it would have been easy to have asked that question in a way - and I'm not trying to zero in on the Leader of the New Democratic Party but it did happen today - surely it would have been just as easy to have asked that question by asking whether in fact there are certain operations which are considered redundant by the Fish Marketing Board and are going to be closed and employment may in fact be affected. We will furnish the information. We have in the past. I don't know what information insofar as the Department of Industry and Commerce is concerned that hasn't been furnished, but I suggest to you that there is a way in which this can be framed. But there's a state of mind that exists on the part of the Opposition that has to change, and unless it changes I'm suggesting - and I repeat it again and there may be some who dislike it - you are going to be hurting this province, and your intention is not to hurt it, but in your desire to try and minimize the accomplishments of the government, and that's your function - or to expose them, to use the

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd.) . . . terms of the Leader of the New Democratic Party - and in your enthusiasm I'm suggesting to you that you are doing a disservice in this one area.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Minister made a statement that the election of Mr. Stanfield would serve the cause of national unity there. May I ask my honourable friend if he agrees with Mr. Stanfield on this question of national unity? Because some of his members don't. Would you answer that question?

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Chairman, I've made my statement already.

MR. DESJARDINS: In other words, you don't accept that question. It's a wild statement that you don't want to back.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I find the Minister of Industry and Commerce, who is a businessman, to be naive beyond all comprehension when he talks about and makes very broad statements about members of the Opposition damaging the Province of Manitoba by mentioning the names of businesses in the House, that in some way this is going to affect the businessman who is thinking of investing in Manitoba. Well, may I say for the honourable member's benefit, and he knows it, that the businessman will invest in Manitoba or not invest in Manitoba for one reason only, and that is whether he will make money here, and he couldn't care a tinker's damn about what is said by members of this side, or by members of that side for that matter. Mr. Chairman, let's take the names of businesses that have been mentioned in this House and let's see whether any business would be deterred by virtue of what was said. Churchill Forest Products gets \$3 1/2 million at 6 1/2% interest. That's raised in the House. Is a business not going to come to Manitoba by virtue of that? By virtue of the fact that they found out that someone got interest from that fund, from the fund controlled by that government at 6 1/2 percent?

Simplex Chemicals is mentioned in this House because public monies to the extent of \$28 million were used to build a \$30 million plant; the other \$2 million may have been water anyway. And businesses are not going to come to Manitoba because they hear this mentioned in the House? Would any businessman behave that way?

I'd like to tell my honourable friend a story. This is a story that is told by Lincoln Steffens, who wrote in the 1900's, and he was talking about New Jersey. Steffens was a mud-raking reporter who liked to show that governments sometimes did things that the people should know about. And he indicated that the New Jersey trust law had enabled a particular trust to accumulate that sum by virtue of the preferred position that that trust got, and he called this trust all kinds of names, and he named names and he named businesses, and he demonstrated that this trust company, by virtue of what the New Jersey parliament had done, had been able to bilk the people for millions of dollars. And then Steffens went to visit the head of this trust, and he came in and he found him to be a very personable man. He expected to be castigated by this person for having exposed him and for what was done in New Jersey, but he found that the man was perfectly personable. And after their conversation he said to him, he said: "After all those things I said about you and what you've done in the State of New Jersey, how is it that you can treat me so nicely?" And Bill (that was the name of this individual) said: "You haven't done me any harm at all." He said, "When you publicized what could be done by trust companies in New Jersey to get money from the people, trust companies started to blow to New Jersey like they never flew before."

Now Mr. Chairman, the Minister knows that. There hasn't been anything that was said in this House about firms that is going to deter any business from coming here. And the names that were mentioned - the Leader of my Party said that certain -- it would have been preferable, the Minister says it would have been preferable; and let's look at the naivete of the person. If my Leader had gotten up and said: "Is it true that certain firms in the fish processing industry are becoming redundant and are going to have to lay off employees?" Well, how many firms are there? And how much better is it, how much better is it that the firm that the member is talking about is identified rather than people wondering which firms are redundant and all of them being redundant. Is there really a significant difference between the statement that was made and the statement that was made by the Leader of our party? I'm sure that if the Leader of our Party had put the question in the way the honourable member says it should have been put, the Minister would have got up and said: "Which firms are you talking about? Why are you casting a cloud over the operations of all firms in the Province of Manitoba?" Isn't it he who is being facetious about the role of the Opposition?

(MR. GREEN cont'd.)

Mr. Chairman, the very first speech that this member made in this House . . . the Minister runs a straight line with the one that he's made today. He conceives of the Opposition as a cheering section for the government. He says that everything is fine in Manitoba - if it weren't for the Opposition; and I can appreciate why he feels that way, because he is a tremendously energetic person; he works very hard to get industry to the Province of Manitoba. Sometimes he can't understand why it's coming, and when he can't understand, he blames the Opposition. They haven't cheered loud enough, and if only they would have cheered loud enough Manitoba would have had a much better image and, regardless of whether money could or could not have been made, firms would have come here. Well Mr. Chairman, let me disabuse the Minister of the notion that his trips, that his publicity, that all of the fanfare of the beating the drums for '70 is going to attract industry to Manitoba. Industry will be attracted to Manitoba if they can make money here.

Now Mr. Chairman, the Minister reminds me of a very comical story which perhaps he knows, because it's a Jewish story, and it concerns a fellow who is, in English we say a "marriage broker", in Jewish it's a "chatchun". I'm sure that will trouble Hansard a great deal so I'll spell it. It's c-h-a-t-ch-u-n, and I can't translate the "ch" - it's another "ch". And this marriage broker visited a family of very modest means in England - a Jewish family, who had a nice son who was working in the ship yards. And he said that he would like to make a marriage contract. He would like to effect a marriage between this labouring son and Princess Margaret, and he asked the parents whether they would permit the son to marry Princess Margaret. And the parents didn't know about that; it was too much of a change for them suddenly to become associated with royalty, and they wouldn't know how to act, and they told him to come back after awhile; they would consider it. He came back a week later and pursued the problem, and it was fraught with all kinds of difficulties - the question of kashrut, the eating, and other things, the customs, and marrying outside of the faith. All of these things arose, but the marriage broker pursued the problem. He came back week after week and pursued the problem, and finally the father and mother said: "Well, we've considered this and there are many, many objections but on the other hand, the fact that our son would marry Princess Margaret, marry into royalty, has overcome everything else and therefore we approve"; and the marriage broker said: "Good, the deal is half settled."

Now Mr. Chairman, that's the way it is with the Minister. The Minister is doing everything in his power to bring industry to Manitoba, and he goes out and he has convinced Manitoba that they should accept this industry, and whenever it doesn't come he can't understand; the deal is half settled; and he says that the only reason that it's not fully settled is because those dolts on the other side of the House haven't been properly cheering, haven't been properly indicating to industry that if they come here their names will not be mentioned - and I'm not sure that businesses like their names not being mentioned. I know that the Minister of Industry and Commerce did a great deal when he was in business to see to it that the name of his particular product was not mentioned. But Mr. Chairman, it sounds good and really it's like scare tactics. "You people had better shut up because if you don't shut up I can tell you that businesses are worried. You're doing irreparable damage to the Province of Manitoba." And when we're specific, Mr. Chairman, I venture to say that there hasn't been a single business that has been damaged as a result of their name being mentioned in this House. I would venture to say that there is not a single business that has not invested in Manitoba by virtue of their names being mentioned in this House. And in view of the fact that the Minister himself says that the economy of Manitoba is dependent on private investment, on private initiative, and there's the economy of Manitoba, after all, patterns the lives and decides the fate of all of the people in Manitoba. And if we're not able to talk about the very forces upon which the lives of all Manitobans are contingent, Mr. Chairman, we may as well go home. Then of course you wouldn't have a cheering section, but at least you wouldn't have people mentioning names which you could say causes trouble.

Mr. Chairman, I can't accept the fact. I've been in this House for three years; I can't accept the fact that the Opposition is in any way to be blamed for the inability of the Minister of Industry and Commerce to accomplish what he thinks should be accomplished. And I'm not suggesting that he isn't working hard. I think the story I told indicates that he's working very hard, but all of his failures can't necessarily be laid at the doorstep of the Opposition. The Opposition is doing its job as an opposition should, and when times change and if the Minister of

(MR. GREEN cont'd.)... Industry and Commerce is one of the lucky fellows to be in the Opposition when times do change, then he's going to do the same thing. And we're going to expect it. And if the foundation that he has built in his department is strong enough, then they are strong enough to survive the democratic process, and if they are not strong enough to survive the democratic process, then they're not worth having, and that's what the Minister has to understand, and that's what he couldn't understand in the first speech that he made in this House, and what he apparently still doesn't understand. If what they are doing is not strong enough to survive the criticism that is inherent in the Chamber that we are in, then it's not worth preserving. And if it is strong enough, then it won't matter a tinker's damn the kind of criticism that it gets.

Mr. Chairman, I wanted to speak on another subject but when the Minister charges me, symbolically or collectively with other members on this side, of doing damage to the province, then he raises a very serious point which causes us to examine ourselves. And I suggest to him that he should now examine himself and see whether the charges that he made are true or whether he is just trying to silence legitimate, democratic debate on this side of the House. I ask him to examine the first speech he made in this House and see whether in that speech he wasn't saying the same things. He said: "Never have I heard a discouraging word except in the Chamber;" that all over Manitoba people are happy. The people in South Indian Lake are happy; the 30 percent of the people who live below the poverty line - they're not discouraged. It's those Opposition fellows who are discouraged and they don't know enough to cheer. If only they'd cheer everything would be fine in the Province of Manitoba. That is what he's saying.

MR. CARROLL: Tell us the other story about the poor Minister who had the members of the Opposition on his back.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, apparently the story that I told about the rich man and the poor man sat very well with the Minister of Consumer Affairs. He can't forget it and I hope he never forgets it, because it's a very true story. It wasn't told in a political vein on that particular occasion, but the story has a great deal of truth to it.

I wasn't going to talk about this particular subject; I had another subject which I think is very important and perhaps the Minister can do something about it even without the cheering on our side of the House. Mr. Chairman, some time ago the Province of Manitoba and Canada and other countries in the western world were called upon to accept, and I believe they did a very humanistic job in this respect, they were called upon to accept a series of new immigrants who were escaping from political oppression in Czechoslovakia, and the Government of Canada was very generous in the things that it did in order to accept these immigrants, and I think that the Province of Manitoba took its share and hopefully at that time wanted these people to be rapidly adjusted to the Canadian way of life and to find a satisfactory role to play in the Province of Manitoba. I commend both governments for what they have done in this regard. I sometimes wish that we were as well disposed to people who feel that they are escaping from a political oppression which requires them to go and fight in Viet Nam, that is a political oppression which causes people to seek to come to Canada from the south of us to escape what they believe is an oppression, but apparently we don't view the two groups in the same way, whereas I certainly think that there should be something of the analogous situation. The Attorney-General thinks that the United States is right to send its young people to be killed in Viet Nam and I don't, and if I were in the United States I wouldn't go and fight there either.

MR. LYON: If I were in the United States, Mr. Chairman, I would try to be a good citizen. My honourable friend obviously wouldn't.

MR. GREEN: Well Mr. Chairman, I'm sure that the Honourable the Attorney-General would not have tried to be a good citizen in Czechoslovakia. That's the difference.

MR. LYON: And I know the difference between right and wrong, which my honourable friend obviously doesn't.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, would the Honourable the Attorney-General have said that in Czechoslovakia I would have obeyed the law because it was the law. No he wouldn't have. We know that he wouldn't have so it's not the answer to say that the person in the United States is being a bad citizen when he says that he won't fight in Viet Nam.

MR. LYON: Mr. Chairman, if I have to choose my bedfellows between the United States and Russia, I'll sleep with the United States any time.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, we are talking about fugitives from political oppression, and I say that there are fugitives from political oppression all over the world. The Honourable

(MR. GREEN cont'd.) . . . the Attorney-General says that the only people who are subjected to political oppression are those in Eastern Europe. I only agree with half of what he says. I say that there are other victims which he won't recognize, but nevertheless I'm dealing with the people who came here from Czechoslovakia. And my understanding, Mr. Chairman, is that these people from Czechoslovakia are here, that they are being given training in English, that they are being provided with an allowance, and that once they learn English they are expected to accommodate themselves in finding employment within the normal frame of the Manitoba economy, and Mr. Chairman, it sounds like a legitimate program but I have received a delegation of these people to come to speak to me and I find, Mr. Chairman, that it's not an easy situation for them - and they're not looking, by the way, for an easy situation. They're only looking for a situation by which they can become adjusted to the Manitoba way of life, and apparently, Mr. Chairman, other than the teaching in English and the opportunities for employment which are the same as to every other person, they are pretty much on their own. And by that, Mr. Chairman, I mean that there apparently is no orientation program to take these people who are Czechoslovaks into the normal pattern of the Manitoba way of life. I wonder whether there isn't anything being done with the Community Centres, with other social agencies. I remember, Mr. Chairman, when I was a member of the YMHA, when immigrants came after 1946, special programs were set up whereby these people were socially involved in living in Manitoba. Now that situation, as I understand it, and I admit that I spoke to these people in their broken English and my broken German, and we had to communicate with each other therefore through these substantial barriers, but nevertheless my understanding of the situation was that they were not, certainly, not well off, they were not affluent, but money was not the serious problem. Education in English was not the serious problem - they were getting that. The serious problem was (1). Adjustment to and integration with the Manitoba way of life - there appeared to be no club or other social activity through which they could enter the mainstream of Manitoba life; and secondly, there was nobody who could deal with their problems as individuals. Some of these people, Mr. Chairman -- one was an electro-technician; one was a dentist; others were in the process of acquiring technical trades; and there was no one, apparently, to whom they could relate as an individual and who could give them the kind of guidance that my friend the Member for Burrows gives to students in the high school. And these people are not even as readily adjustable as people in the high schools because they don't speak the language, and Mr. Chairman, I think that this is a serious situation. It's one, I think, which properly falls within the ambit of the Minister's department and it's one that I think is not being dealt with in a satisfactory manner and I hope that the Minister will be able to either tell me that I'm wrong - and I'd be delighted to hear that I'm wrong - or if I'm not wrong to tell me that they are cognizant of the problem and that something is going to be done about it.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Chairman, in the few moments that remain, let me just suggest a couple of things. I'd like to, if I may, deal with the problem of Czechoslovakian immigrants during the next period of time in the estimates because it's a rather lengthy report and I think the Honourable Member for Inkster has really asked a very pertinent question. We have analyzed the situation and have in fact made certain commitments in our estimates, which I think are significant, to deal with the specific problems he talked about.

May I simply suggest to the Honourable Member for Inkster that he's very naive when he suggests that businesses have still come into this province and are still doing business and are still very happy with the fact that their names are mentioned in here. Business consists of more than doing business in this province. Business consists in having a national reputation; business consists in the ability to be able to finance endeavours, not only in this province but in other provinces; business consists of being able to apply technology, have market services, have other information obtained, and no business wants to be able to have its name bandied around in a form with which it is inexperienced and unable to deal with and unfamiliar with, and I suggest to you, and I say this in sincerity and not as one who simply suggests to the Opposition that you have to cheer the government - I don't expect you to do this; you haven't in the past and I don't think you will in the future - but I suggest, and I know in that there's agreement, but I suggest to you that there have been occasions in this House where firms' names have been mentioned and they have in fact been affected and their operations not only in Manitoba but outside have been affected by the unnecessary use of the names. And in the specific question that was to be asked by the Honourable Leader of the New Democratic Party, if he had asked that question I would have indicated to him that there are no firms, so far as the fish marketing board

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd.) . . . are concerned, that have been declared redundant yet, but one firm has indicated that they would close. And that would have been the answer and I would have then identified it, and that would have been all that's required. It was unnecessary to have the firms' names mentioned.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, may I suggest to my honourable friend that, either by himself or his staff, he research into this matter because I had a conference over the noon hour today of the firm at Gimli, that the firm B. C. Packers were in negotiations with the union representing the men, and that they have been informed of the redundancy of the plant at Gimli, and it's on this basis that I transferred this information. We can't talk in riddles. My honourable friend the Minister of Industry and Commerce is quite capable and often does merely pontificate and talk in riddles, but in order for us on this side of the House to try and penetrate the skulls of those opposite, it's necessary for us to call a spade a spade. And I reject completely the proposition of my honourable friend that we are rendering any disservice to Manitoba, or to any firm in Manitoba, or to any firm that is likely to come into Manitoba when we exercise our democratic rights as representatives of the people of Manitoba to mention names in this House. And if my honourable friend wants us to continue to accept their propositions of not fulfilling our duty in opposition, then I reject it completely. This has been the line that the government has taken in respect of the Manitoba Development Fund. They are in possession of facts that they will not give us, take into our confidence. Apart from the Manitoba Development Fund, the same is true insofar as the approach to the reports on Southern Indian Lake and this has been the attitude of government - the government we have in Manitoba and they criticized those of us on this side of the House because we're attempting to fulfill our duties. Now say what you like about the party to my right, they may not be here for much longer. -- (Interjection) -- But leave us alone because we are going to fulfill our rights, and we are going just continuously to ask questions while you fellows are over there for the short period of time. . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise and report. Call in the Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply wishes to report progress and asks leave to sit again.

IN SESSION

MR. M. E. McKELLAR (Souris-Lansdowne): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Pembina, that the report of the Committee be received.

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

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce, that the House do now adjourn.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried, and the House adjourned until 2:30 Wednesday afternoon.