

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

8:00 o'clock, Tuesday, June 2, 1970

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

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion and after a voice vote declared the motion carried, and the House resolved itself into a Committee of Supply with the Honourable Member for Elmwood in the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN: We're dealing with the Department of Industry and Commerce, on resolution 62, and an amendment thereto by the Honourable Member for Fort Garry. The Leader of the Liberal Party, the House Leader.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, traditionally when this motion is moved, namely to reduce the salary of the Minister of the department concerned, it's certainly not to be taken as a personal affront to the Minister but rather it's a difference of opinion with the Opposition in the way the government or the department are conducting the affairs of that particular department. And as I enter this debate, which I hope is in a serious vein, I certainly do not mean to take away from my honourable friend, the Member for one of the Brandon constituencies and the Minister, but after having said that, Mr. Speaker, I must say that I think the motion is well-conceived in that if this government - and I have many friends on that side - if this government has made what I think in my opinion is a serious error, the error is that they have shaken the business and professional and industrial community of this province, and while the Minister may desperately try to bring back the feelings of confidence in the business community, I am sure that in his innermost heart he will find that it is not happening that way.

I think that a million people in a nation of 22 million people, situated in a continent of nearly 240 million people, cannot isolate themselves from the rest of that society whether they like it or not. And I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that there are many people in Manitoba today, wage earners, business, professional and investment people, who are genuinely concerned with what is happening in our province today. It is true that some are trying to alarm the community for certain reasons.

MR. MACKLING: Political.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: I would say that politicians have some blame in this regard. Then there are others in the business community who themselves may over-emphasize what they consider to be a serious state. But I'm not talking about those. I'm talking about the people of this province who aspire to live here, bring up their children here, and try and carve out a decent living for themselves. And I'm alarmed, Mr. Chairman, at the way the affairs of Manitoba sit today where people who maybe intend to build a house or expand a business or invest in some small measure, whether it's by bonds or investment of any kind, or whether they're unemployed and looking for a job, I'm concerned about where we stand today. And I say again that I know my friends opposite have the best of intentions but they cannot isolate this province from what is going on around us.

I don't mean to dwell on the auto insurance issue, but this is a sign - at least many people in this province take it as a sign - of what direction this province is going in. It's an issue that isn't black and white by any means. I recognize there are problems. But when the government, by a decision taken within their group, decide to nationalize a section of a particular industry, then they must examine what they are doing in the over-all picture. And if upon examination they find that without proper study and proper explanation that they are going too fast for many of the people, well then, they have to pause and reconsider and this falls within this department, the pause and the reconsidering. And I'm not talking now about auto insurance, but I'm talking about the waves that will be made from this decision. And let's not kid ourselves, people all across Canada are looking at what's going on in Manitoba today. Let's not kid ourselves about that.

We have been quoted in newspapers in the United States, in all the major centres across Canada, and I think it would behoove this government to take it easy. When I say take it easy, I mean be very considerate and give every side of the question a chance to express their views and to propose their solutions - and, Mr. Speaker, so far in this Session, outside of a few moderate voices over there who haven't spoken that much, be, well maybe radical is too

(MR. G. JOHNSTON cont'd.) . . . strong, but the ones who are truly convinced that they are right are coming across loud and clear, and whether by mischance, certainly not misquotation, perhaps by misinterpretation, what they think is not coming across to the people. I know they're acting within their conscience for what they think is best for their people, and all of our people, but I ask them, through the Minister of Industry and Commerce, whether he can truly stand up and say "I'm acting in the best interests of all the people of this province."

I think for the first time for many years, we've had in this session a new interpretation of what the position of minority groups are within the province. Certainly as I read and as I have observed in this House in the nine years that I've been here, the members, the politicians have leaned over backwards to make sure that the minority groups of the province - and I'm not talking ethnically now, I'm talking both ethnically and business, in every context that can be imagined, I'm sure that many people in this province are saying, well, is this government being fair in what they're doing at this time? And again I say, I'm talking about auto insurance but I don't wish to harp on that. But I find that with great regret that the members of our group have to support this motion, that we do not think that this government has considered all sides of this question, and by not doing so they have caused a great deal of unease, a great deal of hesitation amongst the people that we look to to supply the jobs, to supply the expertise and to supply the skilled labour. I'm sure nearly every member in this House could relate a personal story about someone who is either leaving or considering leaving Manitoba, and it's a hell of a thing to say, I'll tell you, but it's there. The thoughts are there, and these people who are considering this, many of them are considering it in very cold blood as to what they should do. Others consider it in an emotional manner.

But, Mr. Chairman, I'm truly concerned about what is happening in Manitoba at this time and I say this, and I have friends on that side and it grieves me to say it, but I've run into too many occasions, too many occasions where I find that what I thought were Manitobans willing and wanting to stay here the rest of their life, they're now saying, "Well I wonder; I really wonder." And, as I say, Mr. Chairman, it's with regret that I support this motion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Minister of Mines.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I'm rather intrigued at the reasons given by the Leader of the Liberal Party for the support of the motion. He starts out by suggesting that the motion has nothing to do with the personal competence in office of the Minister who is handling the particular portfolio; that the motion is put, rather, as a means of demonstrating that the public is not happy with the state of affairs that the ministerial department is concerned with. At least that's the way I took his remarks. In other words, he is suggesting that really it's the policy that is being adopted by the government, with particular reference to this particular Minister, that is being opposed by the members whom he represents and it's that policy against whom he directs his attack.

Well, Mr. Speaker, what is the policy that has been stated by the Minister and the state of industrial development and the state of the economy which is different than what it was when it was handled by the previous administration, because that's wherein the Member for Portage la Prairie appears that he must take a stand. I'm not certain at this point, but it appears to me that he was very happy even though he was an Opposition party, a member of the Official Opposition; that there was really no problem with the basic type of policy which was followed by the previous administration; that the issue upon which he feels it necessary to support a motion reducing the salary of the Minister to one dollar is the fact that that policy has changed. And I think Mr. Speaker, that that's a very significant point because we have been saying for years that insofar as the basic development of the Province of Manitoba is concerned, that the history has been for the business community to consider itself divine. And I, you know, I have no objection to that. In all the three years that I have been in this House, I have not criticized the business community. I have said that they are doing exactly what a businessman should do - try to advance his interests. And I've never criticized them, but the fact is that the attitude of the people who look at this community in this respect, is that the business community is divine, that they will operate on the basis that there will be two parties, both of which is wedded to the business community, and when the public is dissatisfied with the performance of one, the business community then says, "Well, here is your choice; another party that is also devoted to our cause," and the Official Opposition in the last Legislature has been demonstrated by the Member for Portage la Prairie to be in opposition in name only, a sham opposition, because really they believed in everything that the previous administration was doing, and what

(MR. GREEN cont'd.) they object to about this administration - and they choose to single out the Minister of Industry and Commerce on which to direct their attack - what they object to is that this administration does not consider there to be a divine right of business, a divine right of kings, a divine right of labour, or a divine right of anything, and that's the problem. That's the problem.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: I wish it was that simple.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I know what the honourable member says when he says, "I wish it was that simple," because almost everybody who goes into politics runs into the problem which his words suggest; I wish it was that simple. And I'll state his problem which I know is going on in his mind today, that sure, it would be nice if we could do things otherwise, but if we try, the business community is so economically powerful that they could ruin us, and therefore, despite the fact that we elect a chamber of delegates of 57 people ostensibly to govern the affairs democratically of our community, really we have no freedom to do it; there is no way of doing it; there are forces much more powerful than ourselves, and we have to advocate the government of this province to those forces. That's what makes it difficult. And, Mr. Speaker, that is what has made it difficult throughout the years, and if you say that any change - and this is the only way one can interpret your remarks - that anyone who seeks to change the economic status quo is going to ruin Manitoba, then I recognize the criticism that you are making of our party, because indeed we have operated on the basis that the economic status quo is not divine; that there is nothing unshakeable about it; that there can be moves, and that we intend to make those moves.

And what are the moves which have been initiated by the Minister who you are now attacking from the point of view of reducing his salary to \$1.00? What he has said is that we will not be bound by any doctrinaire position which says that the only way that Manitoba can develop is by giving something to the business community to develop it. That's the only change that has been made, because the Minister of Industry and Commerce has said that he's willing to consider free enterprise development; he's willing to consider co-operative development; he's willing to consider a hybrid development between free enterprise and co-operative, or between free enterprise and Crown corporations; he is willing to consider taking equity and giving it back; he is willing to consider Crown corporations; he is willing to look at the broad spectrum and say that "whatever tool will best serve the Province of Manitoba, I am willing to consider it and I'm willing to advance a program on that basis." And that's what the Opposition objects to and they refuse to recognize, and that's what the Member for Portage la Prairie -- and, Mr. Speaker, it really bothers me coming from that party, for them to say that we are ruining the economy of the Province of Manitoba, that there is great misgiving, that there are problems that are being created.

Mr. Speaker, let's look at the situation as it existed without this party. I've had occasion to say in the House previously, the \$200 billion that was lost in a period of some 20 months, \$240 billion that was lost in a period of 20 months, and people lost their savings, people had their property nationalized, in a different way but nationalized, taken away from them, \$240 billion worth, and the New Democratic Party didn't have a hand in it at all and the Minister of Industry and Commerce didn't have a hand in it. But that's not the worst situation. We've got a government in Ottawa that says because people are eating a little bit too much and because they are building a little bit too much, because they are living a little better, and because the basis upon their better living is being paid for -- (Interjection) -- well I know you don't like it but listen for a change. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that that is what is happening, that there is an inflationary situation, that this results in a shift in the economic status quo, that the creditor class is paying too much for that change, and that the government doesn't like this.

The Prime Minister of this country has said that he is going to create deliberately, not as an accident but as a matter of design, by deliberate policy, he is going to create 500,000 people, 600,000 people, unemployed people in this country. He's going to do it as a matter of constant government policy, and when we get to 6 percent unemployed that will not satisfy him. He says if we have to go to 7 percent we're going to go to 7 percent, and it will not deter him, and he says that he is going to create 100,000 people unemployed per percentage point; he's going to do it deliberately; he's going to do it because people are eating too well and living too well, and that doesn't bother the Member for Portage la Prairie. What bothers the Member for Portage la Prairie is that the Minister of Industry and Commerce in this province says that

(MR. GREEN cont'd.) if we can, by means of using public money, create industries which we are attached to and which results in some of the equity being derived by the Province of Manitoba and by its people, for thinking such a dastardly thought his salary should be reduced to \$1.00. Mind you, he doesn't want him unemployed but he wants his salary to be reduced to \$1.00.

So, Mr. Speaker, what the Member for Portage la Prairie has said to the people of the Province of Manitoba is that you should be ashamed of yourself for thinking that it's possible to elect a government that can change the status quo; that you had no right to do that; and now that you have done it, it's true that we are sitting in this Legislature and you are attempting to indeed make certain changes - and by the way, they're really not very great changes because one of the things that he said is correct, and I agree with him; you can't move very quickly to change the economic status quo, that the best that you can do is make small changes - but because you have had the audacity to elect a government which will try genuinely to say that everything that is happening is not wonderful and certain changes should be made, and because this has disturbed certain people, the Minister says that the people of Manitoba have to be rebuked and he will do it by reducing the Minister of Industry and Commerce's salary to \$1.00. And, Mr. Chairman, that's all that it amounts to, because nothing else has happened.

It's true that certain people have been annoyed, because every time you change the economic status quo it annoys people. I am quite certain that if the entire labour movement during the Conservative regime had said that if you pass a law which creates trade unions as legal entity that we will not work, that the government would have said, "Well, we won't pay any attention to that. If you don't work we'll put you in jail, like we did in 1919. We won't stand for that. You're trying to upset the economic status quo." But, Mr. Speaker, because it happens to be -- and you know, I really believe that the Member for Portage la Prairie believes that society is governed by the divine right of business, that there are a group of people who he said, "They create the jobs," which is economic nonsense. You will find no economist who will say to you that work in the world is created by businessmen. The only people who would say that are people like the Member for Portage la Prairie and people who are as obtuse as the Member for River Heights. That is not what creates jobs. What creates jobs is a community where there is a demand for people for services, and if you wish to create those jobs by saying that you are going to confer upon somebody the divine right to create them, you can do it that way and that is the way that has been tried generally by North American communities for years and years - and it's never worked. The fact is that it has never worked. You have never been able to show in the best of times that the system that you are advocating has worked. In the height of American prosperity the President -- (Interjection) -- In the height of American prosperity -- Well let's look at it. Can you find any twenty-year period in North American history where there has not been a serious business decline where thousands of people have been unemployed? Let's, Mr. Speaker, -- (Interjection) -- I didn't hear the member -- We're going to try. We're going to try. -- (Interjection) -- And you say -- you see that's the difference, that's the difference. The Member for River Heights acknowledges that the present system doesn't work.

MR. SPIVAK: No.

MR. GREEN: He says that you cannot find a twenty-year period in American economic history where there have not been serious recessions or serious depressions. During the height of American prosperity, during the height of American -- We're going to try. -- (Interjection) -- Well I suggest to you, if you want an example, if you want an example it's better in Sweden. If you want an -- somebody says it's better in Siberia. The Member for Birtle-Russell says it's better in Siberia. Maybe he knows, I don't know. But he says, if you want another example the Member for Birtle-Russell says it's better in Siberia. I've indicated, I have indicated . . .

MR. GRAHAM: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Chairman, on a point of privilege, on a point of privilege, Mr. Chairman, I never said anything about Siberia.

MR. GREEN: A point of privilege?

MR. GRAHAM: I've sat here perfectly wordless. I'm spellbound by the tangled way of

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, a member of the opposite benches --(Interjection) -- Fort Garry - said that it was better . . .

MR. SHERMAN: On a point of privilege. On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. On a

(MR. SHERMAN cont'd.) point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, I did not cite Siberia and I did not make that remark. The Minister will have to look elsewhere on these benches.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I withdraw Fort Garry. I withdraw Birtle-Russell. Who's next? Mr. Chairman, I can't cite the member for Swan River . . .

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. I wish the Minister would conduct his search for that member on other than the estimates' time.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I didn't make the motion, Mr. Chairman, and I didn't speak to it in the language that it was spoken to by the Member for Portage la Prairie, who I'm sure would like it better if, when he makes that kind of attack, nobody would answer him. I know that that's his view of democracy so he doesn't want me to talk, but the fact is I was going to say that I can't cite the Member for Swan River because he's not sitting in his seat, but I rather suspect that he made the remark. But nevertheless, somebody over there - I gave the example of Sweden - somebody from the Conservative benches gave the example of Siberia, so now you have two examples and you can choose whichever one you like. The fact is that we know, we know without a shadow of a doubt, that not everything is well in the world. There are many many good things and we all respect and love the environment in which we live, and I want honourable members to know that there is no doubt about this. I have grown up in this environment. There's everything that I love about it, but the part that I love most is the democratic system which says that there are means and ways of changing things which are not right or which you think can be done better. I love that more than anything else, and what I hear from the opposite side continuously is that you can't change this, because if you change this, someone is going to take a big hammer and hit you over the head and kill you. I've heard that throughout this session and I say to you, if that were the case - which I don't believe to be the case, by the way - then I wouldn't say, "Let the man with the hammer hit me over the head," which is what they keep saying; I'd say, "Find a way of getting that hammer."

Now, Mr. Chairman, I'm not saying this because I don't believe it's true. I believe that there are many many things which are done very very well. I believe that there are many things which can be done better, and we as an administration have gone to the people of Manitoba last spring and we said there are things that can be better done in the community, and we were elected on that policy. Now we are proceeding to try and do them and the Member for Portage la Prairie, is in effect, saying that "if you try this, there's a whole bunch of people who are going to squeeze you for it and who are going to make it impossible for you to do these things." Well, I don't have that disrespect that the Member for Portage la Prairie has for that community. I don't believe it for one minute. I have travelled most of my life in that community. I know, like everybody else, that they'd like to do the best they can, that they'd like to pay less taxes, but I've never seen anybody who doesn't want to pay less taxes. I think that every single person who I have met, when they have come to my office and said, "Make my tax return", not one of them has said, "Try to see that I pay as much taxes as possible." Not one of them. That goes for people in the lower income groups, people in the middle income groups, people in the upper income groups. So that no matter what you do, anything that changes the economic status quo is bound to have a reaction from certain people and they will use whatever degree of bargaining power they have to deal with that reaction.

But I don't believe what the Member for Portage la Prairie said, that they will ruin the economy if you try and do things better. I just don't believe that for a minute. And if that were true, I wouldn't by virtue of that knowledge say, "Well then, I can't do anything." I would try to figure out a way of preventing them from ruining me. That's the way I react. And you said that there's nothing that you can do to prevent them from ruining you. The thing to do is to ask for a few crumbs, and take off your hat, and say "Your Worship," and bow, and say, "Please do these nice things for us." Well, I have never reacted that way. Those people over there who believe in rugged individualism and freedom, apparently that's the way they say one should react. I won't react that way. I've never done that type of thing, and I will try to see whether there are any problems in the world that can be remedied through democratic action. That's what this Party is trying to do; that's what the Minister of Industry and Commerce is trying to do, and that's what the Member for Portage la Prairie objects to. He really objects to the notion that there is a way within the democratic society of changing things, because he believes that we are governed by divine right and that those divine rights belong elsewhere than within the Chamber of this Legislature, and therefore I won't support his motion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does the Honourable House Leader have a question?

MR. G. JOHNSTON: No. I wish to take part in the debate.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Proceed please.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think members of this House will recognize that the Minister of Mines and Resources is a master at debate. All his life he has practised. He's won a gold medal in University for debating . . .

MR. GREEN: I won no award for debating.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Well, then I apologize for attributing to my friend more honours than he deserves, but if I had been the judge I would have been inclined to give him a medal for his performance tonight, because if there's one thing he didn't talk about it's the problem that faced the people of Manitoba. He took a few thoughts that I tried to express and then he twisted them around to suit the 40-year-old doctrinaire Socialism position and expounded. As a matter of fact, I was surprised that he wouldn't allow the Minister to rise and respond because we're talking about -- (Interjection) -- the Minister of Industry and Commerce.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, just on a question of privilege. It's my understanding, and I assure you that that's the only reason, that when a motion of this kind is put, the Minister sits until the motion is disposed of. But that's a tradition. It doesn't have to be followed but that's the reason I got up to speak.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: When the Minister spoke I don't think he mentioned one word about jobs in this province. Not one word. He talked about the divine right of business -- (Interjection) -- Well, who talked about the divine right of business? Who did? -- (Interjection) -- I did not. I did not. I made an allusion to the auto insurance industry where there's going to be three or four hundred jobs lost by my own friend's opposite quotation and confession, not by anyone else, and was there one word mentioned about this in this department by the Minister? Did he say what he was going to try to do?

A MEMBER: He sure did.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: No, he did not. He did not. He may have offered a few platitudes but he never discussed the problem that faces some people who are going to be out of jobs -- and three or four hundred people, by the words of members opposite. And this is the reason I take part in this debate.

I don't defend business. They're not divine. And when it comes time to pass some laws, when it comes time to discuss and pass laws that may offend people in business, and if I consider those laws to be right and just, I will vote for them and I'll speak for them. And for my friend to get up and give us the 40-year-old Socialistic talk, in my opinion is ridiculous; is ridiculous. I believe he mentioned about the system as it is in Canada -- and I presume North America -- has never worked. Did he not say that? That it has never worked.

MR. GREEN: That's right.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Well, I don't think there's a system in the world that has ever worked 100 percent.

MR. GREEN: I never said that either.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Well, I say it. I'm sure that there is not a system in the world that has ever worked properly 100 percent and I make no defence for business that it has worked properly, but I say this, that both his ancestors and my ancestors came to this country and to this province with a hope that they could find a better way of life for themselves and their children, and while it has never worked properly or 100 percent, it hasn't been that bad; it hasn't been that bad. Certainly there's been bad things. There's had to be laws passed against child labour because it has been exploited. There have been all kinds of laws that had to have been passed, and there are still laws that have to be passed to protect the people. -- (Interjection) -- Oh yeah, this is the simplistic answer; you know, this is the simplistic answer that we'll supply a few people who only want an easy answer.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. Please do not interrupt the member unduly.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: And for my friend, and I have high regard for him as a person, to get up and make the defence that he made. We're not in Czarist Russia or Nazi Germany, we're in Canada in the Twentieth Century; and we don't need that kind of a defence, we don't need that kind of a defence. The people of this country are not stupid. They realize that we improve as we go, and the community in the way we're operating now will not be changed by one government in four years or two years or one year. Let us come back to Industry and Commerce where the motion pertains to this government. Can members opposite say they're

(MR. JOHNSTON cont'd.) happy, they're satisfied with what's going on today in Manitoba?

MR. GREEN: It's much better than it was.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Well, I hope the Minister joins in and shows us how much better than it was. I say to you, I say to you, that this poor man that is the Minister of Industry and Commerce has one hell of a job to try to do when the Member for Crescentwood makes statements that he does; when the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources makes some of the statements that he does. And I know that they're sincere when they say it. And other members on that side make statements like perhaps we should have a government operated grocery store; perhaps we should nationalize the life insurance companies.

MR. CY GONICK (Crescentwood): All businessmen are misguided fools.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: All businessmen -- not all, but the Chamber of Commerce in certain areas are misguided fools because they offer some suggestions. My friends opposite know exactly what I'm talking about and it makes the First Minister cringe when he hears these statements I'm sure. I'm sure it does, because he's got to go out and try and sell this province, and he can't sell it with statements coming from the Member for Crescentwood such as have been coming.

MR. GONICK: On a point of privilege, Mr. Chairman. Would the member cite those statements that he's so annoyed with.

MR. JOHNSTON: Well, Mr. Chairman, I've been challenged to cite some statements and while it would take me a few moments to go through my file I only have to refer members of this House to the preamble of a resolution passed by the Manitoba Chambers of Commerce in meeting, and I'll read the preamble -- and believe me, Mr. Chairman, they didn't dream this up, these people are genuinely concerned about of what they speak, and I quote: "The preamble also states, whereas members of the Manitoba Legislature and members of the Cabinet of the Manitoba Government have made general statements indicating specific interest in government participation in industry and business; and whereas the Government of Manitoba introduced a bill in the Legislature to provincialize the automobile insurance industry," and so on.

MR. GONICK: Well, what's the matter with that? Is that what you're objecting to?

MR. G. JOHNSTON: No, but if my friend from Crescentwood would give me some time I'll bring him plenty of quotes. If this debate is going on tomorrow, I'll stand up and read him some of his quotes; and he knows very well what I'm talking about.

MR. GONICK: I'd like to hear them.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: You'll hear them, you'll hear them. So, Mr. Chairman, I say that the Minister of Mines did not add one thing to the debate other than to state the doctrinaire position of socialism which existed, in his mind, which existed forty years ago, and I would like to hear from the Minister of Industry and Commerce.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Just before the Minister speaks I just want to point out for general information that after this evening there'll be one hour remaining in debate. The Honourable Minister.

MR. GREEN: I would like the Honourable Member who has just spoken who said that I spoke for forty minutes on doctrinaire socialism, to tell me . . . I would like him to tell me which part of my speech, any part -- I'd like to know which part he identifies with socialism.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, the member developed the last half of his speech, so I thought, around the divine right of business, and he quoted the divine right of business I'd say six times or four times . . .

MR. GREEN: And you say that's socialism?

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Who in this House has said business has a divine right? You attribute . . .

MR. GREEN: Everybody says - everybody . . .

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, much as I would like to enter into the debate at this time in reply to what has been said by the Member for Portage la Prairie, I'll desist. I'd like the honourable members opposite to pay particular attention to the Minister of Industry. Someone said last night in debate here that the - was referring to some particular weakness on the part of the Minister of Industry and Commerce. I would say that the only weakness I'm aware of is perhaps one of being too kindhearted, but in the end kindheartedness is an ultimate strength. I believe that the Minister of Industry and Commerce is articulate and knows what

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd.) the process of industrial development is all about and I think it will be very worthwhile for honourable members opposite to listen with attention.

MR. EVANS: Thank you very much. I appreciate the opportunity to participate in this debate and to try to shed a bit of light and wisdom and to cast away some of the emotion and the heat. I think there is a thesis being presented in this House which is entirely false, and that is that the business community of Manitoba are afraid of the present administration; that businessmen are afraid of us, they're running out of the province to beat '70; that they don't want to talk to us; that they're afraid to approach us; that they're shaking in their boots and never again will they invest a penny in the province's economy.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to state categorically that that thesis is 100 percent false, and I think that the members opposite are doing a disservice to the economic progress of this province by blandishing this falsehood, by continuing -- by continuing -- to do in opposition which they claim that we couldn't do while we were in opposition. You know, you should never attack the efforts of the present government when they were in government, when the Conservatives were in government, you should never attack their efforts in economic development because all you were doing was undermining the confidence of all and sundry. That you know it's fine for members opposite to do it now that they are in opposition - what we couldn't do they feel that they're perfectly at liberty to do so.

But the fact of the matter is, Mr. Chairman, that the business community of Manitoba is working with the present administration; that the business community of Manitoba is happy to work with the present administration, and I can very categorically state that I have had the pleasure - in fact one of the pleasures of this job has been the fact that I have met hundreds of businessmen in this province, very capable businessmen, who have expressed satisfaction with the record of this government and I'm sure that many of them are prepared to give testimonials just as Transair Limited gave testimonial categorically not long ago. We have businessmen working for us, for the people of Manitoba, on the Manitoba Development Fund. We have some very keen, capable, intelligent, devoted businessmen who are working for us. They let us appoint them, you know, they didn't run away; they said sure, we'll work with you for the betterment of this province, and they are working for us, and there they are on the Manitoba Development Fund working consistently to help us to develop this provincial economy.

We have the Economic Development Advisory Board which again consists of a number of very capable businessmen who are, not running away, but are right there putting their shoulder to the wheel with this administration to make things happen. We have a Manitoba Export Corporation which I'm pleased to announce is going to expand its activities. A number of devoted businessmen who are prepared to work with this administration to help things happen, providing 100 percent co-operation. I would like to also refer to various members. I don't think there's hardly a constituency in this province where I haven't over the last few months that I've held this portfolio, had conversations with businessmen who are interested in expanding their enterprises, who are interested in doing things -- there's not one constituency in this province I believe where I haven't had the opportunity to meet with these people either in my office or in a general meeting or on some special occasion. And this goes for the Member from Portage as well. I've had opportunity to work with one very significant company in his town and I'm sure they're very happy with the service that I gave him and the Department of Industry provided for him.

The Member for Pembina. I can refer to examples of business groups in his constituency which aren't running away from us. They're not unhappy; in fact they're damn pleased with the efforts that we have put forth and with the sincere desire that we have shown that we're prepared to co-operate with them. We're not taking a doctrinaire approach, we're saying we're prepared to co-operate because we all have to work together.

Now the Member from River Heights thinks it's a laughing matter. That's what he thinks about the economic problems that are facing this economy . . .

MR. SPIVAK: On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. I never suggested that the matter was considered to be laughable at all. I may be laughing, but for other reasons, and I'll explain later.

MR. EVANS: The fact of the matter is that we have had excellent relationships with many, many key business people in this province; in fact we've had some people in the millionaire category who are prepared to work with us on a dollar-a-year basis because -- and they're not afraid of us, they're not running away, and I think, Sir, that this puts the lie to this thesis that the business community is afraid of this administration. It's utter nonsense. In fact

(MR. EVANS cont'd.) there is one businessman's association which is actively co-operating with this administration, and we've had several meetings with a newly formed group of businessmen who have formed themselves into an association because they are concerned with the development of Manitoba's economy, because they are concerned with the development of western Canada generally.

Now, I will admit to one fault, Mr. Chairman. That is we have not tried to emulate the previous administration in many of their extravaganza hoop-de-do campaigns and giveaways. We haven't put on any \$30,000 dinners where we've attempted to - I don't know what you'd call it - to engage in massive therapy or massive hypnotism at one shot; we haven't given away large resources to large foreign corporations, foreign enterprises, making deals which involve fabulous giveaways in natural resources; nor do we intend to emulate the previous administration on this score.

I repeat, Sir, that the criticism that the members opposite are making of the efforts of the administration, of the state of the Manitoba economy is contributing to this lack of confidence which they say now exists. They're contributing to it. They said when we were in opposition we should not say a word against their efforts, we should not say a word against the efforts of the government of the day because this was bad, bad, bad; because this was going to undermine the confidence of the business community; but it's fine for them to harp, to carry on like a broken record, not listening to reason, not listening to the facts of the situation, but continually harping that things are bad.

Now, Mr. Chairman, very briefly, I would like to put this on the record because I think the record speaks for itself, it has far more importance than all the euphemisms all the poppycock that we've heard across from the other side. The fact of the matter is that the North American economy is presently undergoing a structural readjustment, that the Federal Government of Canada has engaged in an anti-inflationary policy and this policy of high interest rate and short capital supply or short money supply has indeed made it difficult for economic expansion. As a matter of fact, just to give you one example, the City of Calgary which has been in the past one of the fastest growing cities in Canada - I have a recent newspaper clipping here from Calgary relating to the fact that 65 million dollars worth of construction had to be suspended in that city because of high interest rates, and the fact that the construction industry was having extremely hard times in that city . . .

MR. JORGENSEN: Because of Federal policy.

MR. EVANS: Because of Federal Government policy? Well, I don't disagree with the member on that score at all. In fact he supports my contention that there is . . .

MR. JORGENSEN: Deliberate policy on the part of the Federal Government to pull down gross income . . .

MR. EVANS: There is a deliberate policy, there has been a deliberate anti-inflationary policy which has caused . . .

MR. JORGENSEN: . . . but it doesn't strengthen your argument . . .

MR. EVANS: . . . which is -- well, just listen a moment. You know, if you people were attending university, I'm sure you'd flunk every course that you attempted, because you don't listen. You know, that's the first lesson, you must be prepared to quietly absorb information.

The fact of the matter is that while there is a structural readjustment taking place in the North American economy; while there is unhappy business times for many parts of our economy, the fact of the matter is that the Manitoba situation -- and I'm going to particularly refer to the first few months of this year because this is the period that I assumed office as Minister of Industry and Commerce beginning around the first of January -- the fact of the matter is that all the recent statistics, the bulk of the recent statistics indicate that the Manitoba economy is probably far healthier than probably any other provincial economy in this country.

MR. JORGENSEN: That's in spite of you, not because of you . . .

MR. EVANS: Well, for example, Dun and Bradstreet recently issued a statement. They stated, and this is from a newspaper clipping of a couple of days ago, that in the first quarter of this year, in the first quarter of 1970, Manitoba had a record low level of business failures. -- (Interjection) -- But you don't listen, you don't listen. Well, if you listen, it goes in one ear and out the other.

MR. SPIVAK: What does that mean?

MR. EVANS: What does it mean? It means this, that while we had a record low of

(MR. EVANS cont'd.) business failures in the first quarter of 1970, the national total showed an increase of 13 percent in the first three months of this year over the corresponding period of last year. I think that's a very significant statistic, that for all of Canada there's been an increase, there's been a rise in business failures of 13 percent, whereas we've had a record low of business failures in the same period. Now that's a record which speaks for itself, this is a record which speaks for itself.

I referred previously, and I don't intend to repeat, although I think I should because it's obvious that the honourable members across haven't appreciated the data, and the fact is that the unemployment rate in Manitoba has barely changed in the first four months of this year. The average of the first four months of this year is just slightly higher than the rate of unemployment in the previous year, whereas this is not the case for all of Canada. For all of Canada there's been a substantial rise in the rate of unemployment.

But here's another figure that I'd like to remind honourable members, and this is an area that many honourable members opposite are particularly concerned with and this is the health of the manufacturing sector, this sector which we are all so very concerned about, or at least certain people are very concerned about, the manufacturing sector of the Manitoba economy, that the Canadian total increase in manufacturing shipments - now this reflects the activity in the Canadian factories in total - for the first three months of this year compared with the first three months of last year, showed an increase of less than two percent, 1.8 percent to be exact. This is for all of Canada. In the same period in the Province of Manitoba, factory shipments showed a rise of over six percent compared with the same period in the previous year.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I think the record speaks for itself. The question, the Honourable Member for Portage you know kept on referring to the fact that people are unhappy in Manitoba, they want to leave the province, they're leaving the province in droves and that pretty soon possibly, at least this is what I believe he inferred, you know, there just won't be anybody left because of this administration. Well, I made the point earlier that population changes are not necessarily the significant indicator of economic change, but since members opposite are always harping about population changes, I'd like to point out a couple of very key figures with respect to population movement and population increase. His beloved province, which is under the beloved administration of the Liberals, Saskatchewan, there was a net loss of people through interprovincial migration, in the first three months of this year, January, February - now listen to this, I wish the Honourable Member from Portage would listen to this because this important, - because you know, you just can't stand up and repeat what you said a half an hour ago after you've listened to these figures. These figures are taken from the Dominion Bureau of Statistics compiled in Ottawa, they're not compiled by the Manitoba Government, they're compiled by the Federal Government, by the Liberal Federal Government, and they're talking about the Liberal Province of Saskatchewan -- of course we all know it's not going to remain Liberal for too long -- but the net loss from Saskatchewan -- now listen to this figure, the net loss of people, we're concerned with people, the net loss of the people from Saskatchewan through interprovincial migration totalled 5,900 persons in the first three months of 1970. This is compared with 2,500 in the same period last year and only 800 in the same period of 1968. So in 1968 -- just be quiet and listen. You can have your chance to talk, but let's get the record straight. You know, you're saying, all is going to wreck and ruin in Manitoba, you know, everything's going to pot, but this is not the case -- while there are many members on that side making this allegation, there are many members on that side making that allegation, but I'm maintaining, Mr. Chairman, that the record speaks for itself and I am pointing data, statistics that are compiled by independent Federal agency and this record is speaking for itself. Now, you're all interested in population so I'm talking about population. I repeat, three years ago Saskatchewan lost 800 people in the first three months of the year; last year they lost 2,500 people and this year they lost 5,900 people in this same period.

Now let's look at the situation in Manitoba. Now, Manitoba, as Saskatchewan, as many other provincial economies do have an agricultural sector which suffers a loss of people and we have suffered some loss of people over the years too. Three years ago, the first three months of the year, January, February, March, 1968, according to the Dominion Bureau of Statistics - and we've rechecked these figures several times - there were a loss of people for Manitoba amounting to 1,500; 1,500 people left in the glorious days of the Conservative administration in 1968 -- 1,500 people. In 1969, this was slightly down to 1,100 people. The first three months of 1969, Manitoba suffered a net loss of 1,100 people. Mr. Chairman, how

(MR. EVANS cont'd.) many people left Manitoba -- and there was some outward migration --- how many people left Manitoba in the first three months of 1970? The figure is 300 -- 300 people left Manitoba in the first three months of 1970 compared to 1,100 people when the Honourable Member from River Heights was Minister of Industry and Commerce. The latest -- and I wish honourable members opposite would listen and not engage in side conversations, because I guess the truth hurts -- the latest Dominion Bureau of Statistics population estimates for Manitoba is for April 1st of 1970. The population of Manitoba as of April 1, 1970 stood at 981,000 people, which is an increase of 4,000 people more than April 1st of 1969. Now, if you're interested in population.

MR. SPIVAK: . . . total population between '68-'69?

MR. EVANS: But let me refer . . .

MR. SPIVAK: Well 1968-'69 was . . .

MR. SCHREYER: Oh, well you pick one year, I'll pick another year.

MR. EVANS: But, Mr. Chairman, let me refer to the latest population figure for Saskatchewan. I honestly wish the Honourable Member for Portage would listen. What's happening in Saskatchewan? The latest population figure for Saskatchewan was 943,000 people as of April 1, 1970, which is a decline, an absolute decrease of 18,000 people from April 1st of 1969. There's 18,000 people less in Saskatchewan as of April 1st this year compared to last year.

Now, the point I'm making, Mr. Chairman, is that to the west of us we have an ultra free enterprise, ultra capitalistic administration whose Premier basks and glows in the shadow or in the light of Adam Smith presumably, in his wealth of nations where he said, where he coined the phrase laissez faire, you know, government should not be involved in businesses whatsoever, so . . . -- (Interjection) -- Yeah, of course they haven't dispensed with the government automobile insurance in spite of their doctrinaire points of view on capitalism. Here you are, you have this glorious capitalistic administration to the west of us and they've suffered -- in the last twelve-year period for which we have data available, they've lost 18,000 people, and glory be, here's this tainted government of Manitoba, according to the members opposite, this government that can't be trusted by the business community, that everybody is afraid of, shows a substantial increase; where we show business failures lower than anywhere else in the country, where we show factory shipments higher than the national average; where we show unemployment rates substantially lower than the national average. These are the statistics that speak for the economic performance of this province under this administration, and that's what I'm standing by.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Roblin,

MR. McKENZIE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I hope that the Minister of Industry and Commerce will frame that speech and put it away, and put it away and remember, and take a look at it twelve months from now, and I'm sure it'll haunt you for the rest of your days. Mr. Chairman, if you ever saw a window-dressing job in all your life there was one there. You talk about a window-dressing Minister of Industry and Commerce who's supposed to be leading us in economic development, that is the last straw, Mr. Chairman, beyond a shadow of a doubt.

These figures that the Minister has been reading into the record here, this is the past performance of this Conservative Government who built trust in Manitoba so people would bow their . . . in development . . . Let me ask the Minister to read into the record one year from now the performance of the past twelve months and I bet he'll walk away in shame with the figures that he'll have at his disposal. I hope the Minister remembers what I say because I'm sure it'll haunt him the rest of his life when he takes a look at Manitoba.

But basically, Mr. Chairman, the reason that I got on my feet was to try and get the Minister out of this horrible problem that he's in whereby his salary has been reduced to a dollar, and it looks like he's not going to get his salary increase as I see the debate carrying on here tonight. But maybe during the course of my remarks I will offer him some good sound sincere advice and if he will heed my words I'm sure that we'll get him out of this difficult problem he's faced with at this time.

(MR. McKENZIE cont'd)

The issues that are shaking this province at its bootstrap today, the issues that are rocking Manitobans today and the people are going home scared -- I'll read them into the record: Bill 56 has scared the living daylight out of the people of this province and don't let anybody kid you it hasn't. Bill 56 wasn't on the Order Paper when those statistics were compiled. We were going around listening to the First Minister making speeches all across North America, saying what a pragmatic socialist he was, he wasn't going to interfere with big business, he was going to be a fair, square guy and give us a fair chance in this province; but now the worm has changed and the wheel has changed. Here we got Bill 56 before us now, which is a brand new ball game, and I submit to the Minister of Industry and Commerce, let the word get across this country with that bill and see where your statistics are going to go. They're going to go zing, right down the drain. That's the first issue.

The next thing that concerns the businessmen of this province, and I speak with them every day, is the remarks that continually come over from the government of the day, they're concerned about people who have vested interest. What's wrong with somebody who has a vested interest? I'm a man who has a vested interest, and why do you continue to keep throwing it back at us over here because we have a vested interest in something that we're somebody different. We're people who have lived, we've worked, and why shouldn't we have an vested interest in the economy of this province, and why shouldn't we have a vested interest in the economic development of this province; and because we have a vested interest, is there something wrong with us? Are we not playing fair; are we second rate citizens, or what is the government trying to get across? This is what's scaring the people of this province, people who have vested interest. There's nothing wrong with having a vested interest as a citizen of this province. I don't like that remark and many, many, many Manitobans don't like it.

The second thing that concerns me and concerns many Manitobans -- the profit motive. What's wrong with the profit motive, Mr. Chairman? Is it a sin to make a profit? It's a dirty word with this government. This is what built this society in which we live in. This is what's built this province and made it what it is today, the finest place to live in North America, right here in Manitoba, and it was done with a profit motive. In a matter of one hundred years -- one hundred years we started to build this province and we've done it with the profit motive, no other reason, the profit motive and the ability to work, and that's made Manitoba what it is today. But for some unforeseen reason Mr. Chairman, that wheel has changed. Now, nobody wants to work, because -- (Interjections) -- no, no, this profit motive keeps coming up all the time. Don't make a profit. So if you can't make a profit, why work? I hear it coming over every day from across the opposite bench.

The next thing, Mr. Chairman, that has shook the -- and this is a point, the high level diversion. The waffling, wavering, policy of this government on that economic project there in the north which will put Manitoba as one of the top dogs in this province, and this government standing waffling, wavering -- we're waiting for answers, nothing is coming. Mr. Chairman, this has shook the business economy of this province and shook their feelings and where are we going to go; are we going to waffle for another six months? We were supposed to get an answer in January, February, March. Now the other day Cass-Beggs says we'll get it in July, and . . . he's going to say well we maybe get it by Christmas. In the meantime the Minister of Industry and Commerce is in trouble, definitely he's in trouble, his salary's been reduced to a dollar. -- (Interjections) -- Certainly. And that is another one of the reasons because this government, Mr. Chairman, can't make up their minds what they're going to do. Are you going to build it or aren't you going to build it, the high level diversion or the medium level diversion, are you going to build something? In the meantime the Minister of Industry and Commerce's salary's on the line because he can't say what's going to happen economically.

Mr. Chairman, before I sit down, the next point that has shaken the economy of this province and shaking the trust that people had in government is this Minister of Agriculture over here. You can imagine the conflict that they've got over there between the Minister of Industry and Commerce and the Minister of Agriculture. Now I could just imagine what a meeting would be like between those two Ministers as they try to give our economy out in rural Manitoba a little bit of boost. There's no way that you can deal with this Minister of Agriculture, because he doesn't know basically what's going on, Mr. Chairman. He doesn't understand that there's problems out in Roblin constituency. He went to Rome when he was

(MR. McKENZIE cont'd) supposed to go out to a meeting in -- and look after their problems --

A MEMBER: And see the Pope.--(Interjections) --

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Industry and Commerce is in deep trouble I assure you, and if he will -- and I give him some hope, if he will stand up before we adjourn tonight and give me some idea, just a little idea of what's going to happen to the economic development of Roblin constituency then I will stand up and vote that you get your salary back, but I want you to assure me Mr. Minister, that you stand up and give me some hope for Roblin constituency under this government and if you can satisfy me Mr. Minister, then I'm on your side.

. Continued on next page

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. GORDON W. BEARD (Churchill): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. -- (Interjection) -- Probably two things. First of all, the Minister of Industry and Commerce better be very careful because if he gets the Member for Roblin's vote he's going to lose mine. If he's going to stand up tonight and say that there's going to be a high level diversion then I'm going to see to it if at all possible that he even loses that dollar.

I will not be voting in favour of the dollar because I don't believe that this is right way to do it and I don't believe my friends believe that either. We've gone through this in one session where the Member for Selkirk did it throughout the whole of the estimates and really it didn't achieve anything, nor is it going to achieve anything tonight. But on the other hand, I would say that just because I will not be supporting this it is not the fact that I support some of the things that certainly have been discussed tonight, and of course Bill 56 is one that bothers me a great deal. The Minister, the House Leader, spoke about the hammer and how one takes away the hammer, and I would say that probably this government in Bill 56 is using the money of public taxation as a hammer against companies that have been investing money in this province for a great number of years, have made money and would have continued to make money and would have continued to invest money. So I would say that really the hammer is in fact in the hands of government in far too many cases and they have got to be careful just how they use this, because it becomes a club, and certainly when we use public funds to compete with private industry, then I think that we are on the wrong track.

But by and large, I think that the Minister of Industry and Commerce is struggling along, as other Ministers have had to in the past. He has a different philosophy. He has yet to prove just what he is going to do. We've been waiting. I am one that really does not agree with government taking too much of a financial interest in businesses because businesses can go broke just as well as they can make money, and certainly any figures will show you that that's a calculated risk, and I don't think governments are voted in to take calculated risks with public money. But on the other hand, I do feel that if they think that they want to take a portion of shares in a business, this is their philosophy and they will have to live with it, and I would say to them that in all probability it will come back to haunt them from time to time, just as it has the business of any province and any business within any province, because certainly you do not make money all the time. You are bound to lose it at different times.

I think that it took courage, for instance, to loan money to Versatile. I know nothing about the agricultural industry except that it is at its lowest, and Versatile are going to have to run hard to regain their position in the financial world and, God bless them, I hope they do. I hope they do. But this is one in which possibly you've had to put your neck on the line the same as the other government did in respect to the Churchill Forest Industry, and it's funny, I think tonight the Minister spoke something about being very careful about giving away valuable natural resources, yet on the other hand we find them saying that we certainly hope that private industry can keep their head above water in the Churchill Forest Industry, because if they can't, then who is going to be able to operate it properly? There's a lot of money involved in that and I once again say that unfortunately I would hope that this discussion would come to a close in respect to that particular industry. I've got a lot of faith that it will do good for Northern Manitoba but it won't do any good as long as we start talking and continue to debate the doom and gloom that surrounds it. We have got, as government, certainly a large investment in that community area and I think we should be showing faith rather than discussing it time after time. Certainly, as far as I was concerned, the recent edition in Toronto that came out in respect to the Churchill Forest Industry was written by one man that really did not know the area himself. I'm sure he hasn't gone up there and lived for six months and looked around and decided whether this is good for an area or not. It's certainly not the best future but I think that I have faith that it will continue to operate and will continue to pay off, and I would certainly hope it would because it would be a terrible albatross for we who represent Northern Manitoba to have to carry on our backs if it did fail.

I would also like to point out to Cabinet that when they are discussing the figures of population, that they're wonderful things to be able to talk about but it always comes back to me that you really wouldn't be able to discuss these figures unless you had the mining industry behind you in this tremendous development through the last 10 years to support the population rise in Manitoba, because whatever way I look at it, if you deduct population growth in Northern Manitoba, then we are certainly losing in the southern areas, and if this is the case

(MR. BEARD cont'd) then I think that we should be looking again North, and I won't take up any more time but I just wanted to get that particular point across because I think it is important and it is often forgotten about when we're discussing the economic future of a province or the confidence of people in the Province of Manitoba. I think that in discussing business in Manitoba generally, with Manitobans, certainly they're perhaps a little confused. I don't think they're as confused as much as the people of Saskatchewan. Fortunately or unfortunately, over the weekend I had the opportunity of being with the Chamber of Commerce of Saskatoon, and they had a dismal record to place before us which was not good at all. They showed that problems in resources such as potash and agriculture have done a terrible job for the Province of Saskatchewan, and tossing around some figures there, we find that one major house builder last year had approximately 284 houses started in the City of Saskatoon, this year they haven't started one. One of the large automobile industries had sold 154 cars; this year she's sold 15; and this is the drastic impact of the economy that has hit many of the Saskatchewan areas and it is because they are dependent on two things right now: one is potash and the other, of course, is agriculture.

MR. GREEN: Who developed the potash there?

MR. BEARD: Well, you know, at one time at the original, there was quite a fight in the House as to whether it was the responsibility of the New Democratic Party who had just been voted out or whether it should be the Liberals who took advantage of something that was coming along anyway. But I don't think either one would be rushing to take credit for that. It was something that was unforeseen; it was an unfortunate thing; but that is the way business happens in a province that is dependent, so dependent upon two things, two resources, and we in Manitoba are fortunate today that we have a larger diversity of resources to depend upon, and I would hope that we keep these things in mind as we encourage the development of the mining resources that we have available within the province and that we would certainly have policies and programs which would encourage not only development of mines, but the fabrication plants to go along with them, so that we could be sure that we haven't got all our eggs in one basket, or even two baskets.

But at this time, once again before I sit down, I'm not ready to support the lowering of the salary to \$1.00 because I don't think that for the Minister of Industry and Commerce would have any impact on the Province of Manitoba's economy except that, well, it would be on the Minister's economy, I guess, but -- (Interjection) -- I thought it was down to 33 at one time, but I would hope certainly that we have as glowing a report from the Minister next year, if the session is over and we start a new one; if it's the same session, well then I suppose he can carry on with a new figure. But again, I would have to say that no high level diversion, not at this time.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for River Heights. But before I allow him to speak, I would like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the Speaker's Gallery where we have 10 mayors and councillors from various communities in Northern Manitoba. They are in Winnipeg for the first meeting of Northern Affairs Mayors and Councillors which is being held today and tomorrow. On behalf of the members of the Legislative Assembly, we welcome you here this evening.

The Honourable Member for River Heights.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY (Cont'd)

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, unlike the Minister of Health and Social Services the other night on Bill 56, when he stood up and said, "I am now inclined to enter the debate although I wasn't intending to," and then pulled out his prepared text, it's my intention to enter the debate today but it was not my intention to enter it in the way or to discuss it on the terms and conditions that I will now elaborate as briefly as possible.

It was my intention to enter the debate to indicate a desire on our part for support for a program that the Premier had announced or indicated in January of this year, and a program in which I had been concerned to try and implement during my term in office as Minister of Industry and Commerce, a program that we had looked at. It was not introduced but it was a meaningful program and the kind of thing that we should have been discussing during the Industry and Commerce estimates and the kind of program that should have been dealt with, and that was

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) the possibility of a Native Development Fund, an Indian and Metis Native Development Fund. Now, this project is worthwhile; this project should in fact be discussed within this House. It's not appropriate in the context of what's happened today to discuss it . . .

MR. SCHREYER: Did the honourable member say a Native Development Fund, an Indian and Metis Development Fund?

MR. SPIVAK: No, a native development. In case of a misunderstanding, I'm referring to a Native Development Fund. I'm not sure what the First Minister meant by this. I know what we had discussed and proposed in our considerations and this would have involved the Manitoba Development Fund, and would involve -- (Interjection) -- Bill 17 is not what we were discussing. No, not at all. Not at all. What we were suggesting and what we would have been interested in was a project that would have involved and tied in with the Manitoba Development Fund.

However, because of what has taken place, and I think it's necessary just to make a few comments. The first comment I'd make is if the practice in the past has been that the Minister should not be put in a position of having to defend himself with respect to a reduction to \$1.00 of his salary, I think that what has happened today would justify that that practice be continued and we do not deviate in the way we have today.

Secondly, I must suggest to the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, there is no more logic to the divine right of business than there is to the divine right of government, and I must suggest as well, Mr. Chairman, that you've heard a comment and a commentary in a very moderate presentation, moderate way, by the House Leader of the Liberal Party, which many of the members on the other side, particularly the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, tend to ignore and to want to push away. Throughout the debate in this House, I've noticed and watched a particular tactic on the part of the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. There's a continual action on his part that may not be apparent to the members on this side but is apparent to the members on our side, that when a debate takes place and various ideas are presented, and even criticisms, there's a tendency to use his hands in this way to sort of indicate we should get on with it, get over with it and forgotten and then we can move on to the next thing. Because, frankly, the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources is not really interested in the ideas or the criticisms; he just wants to get it over with so he can get on with the job because he feels - and I think this is clear - he feels that he really knows what's best for the majority of the people in this province, and he feels he knows what's best for the people of Manitoba.

Now let me suggest that the Honourable Member for Portage indicated that a large segment, a number of people whom he's been in contact with, have lost confidence in the state of Manitoba's economy and its future. I dare say that there are a lot of people who have probably lost confidence in the ability of the western world to handle its financial affairs, and no one going through, no one examining the period of inflation that we're going through, and no one who does any superficial, let alone any in-depth analysis of what is taking place in the United States and in Canada, would not be concerned about the economy and the ability of government in the 70's to deal and to cope with problems that appear almost insurmountable and problems that appear to be beyond the grasp and even knowledge of the so-called expertise that we now have in the western world. But at the same time, all the people whom I believe - and I think I'm correct, and if I'm not correct the Honourable Member for Portage will be in a position to say so - but I know from the people I've talked to, the people who I've talked to are concerned about the competence of the business community because they understand and they know what the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources refused to accept and many other members refuse to accept, that the people who make things happen in the province are individual entrepreneurs and they are the ones who cause employment . . .

MR. GREEN: That's not true.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, I know you say it's not true; you'll have a chance to debate it. But they're the ones who cause employment; they are the ones who create economic activity, and the statistical information that the Minister of Industry and Commerce, the statistical information that the Minister of Industry and Commerce presented so enthusiastically was not developed; those statistics did not come from the action of government, but they came from the action of the private area, from private enterprise, who in fact accomplished it. No, I say to the First Minister -- (Interjection) -- You do it with your left hand. Now, that there

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) is some concern for where this government is heading and where Manitoba is heading there's no question, and if you want to ignore that you can ignore that, but the reality is there.

MR. MACKLING: A lot of people like us.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, a lot of people like you and we'll see how well they'll like you at the next election, whenever it happens. -- (Interjection) -- Oh yes, we'll wait until then.

I must tell you the best example of the problem of competence is in the Chamber of Commerce itself, because the truth of the matter is, as the Chamber of Commerce indicated several months earlier, that they felt that the government's program was a good program, that it should be supported, and they felt that criticism as such was not justified, and here we now have criticism being levelled at the government and a feeling generally on the part of many that this should be ignored, that this isn't too important, that this is insignificant. Now the Chamber of Commerce are not the only group or segment in Manitoba who are concerned about the government. The auto insurance industry is; the people who are employed are. -- (Interjection) -- There were 10,000 people out there. Yes, there were 10,000 people out there, and if you don't want to admit that as a reality, if you suggest that those people were satisfied with you -- (Interjection) -- Some - if you would suggest that the majority were satisfied with you, then you're mistaken. Well, I want to tell the Honourable First Minister, he can talk about a significant minority. If he's prepared to go to the people, let's go to the people and we'll see whether they really are prepared. -- (Interjection) -- All right. But I want to tell the Honourable First Minister -- (Interjection) -- No, I know you wouldn't break your word. You would never break your word in the heat of the moment. Never would you break your word in the heat of the moment. There are a few people in this province who believe you have broken your word, and you're not going to be able to convince them any differently.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, on a point of privilege . . .

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to be able to continue.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable First Minister is raising a point of privilege.

MR. SCHREYER: Yes, Mr. Chairman. The Member for River Heights is perhaps not the most experienced parliamentarian but he's been here long enough to know that he cannot slip on to the record something which he himself would not be allowed to do if it were unparliamentary, but slip it on the pretext that others may think so, and any comment he wants to put on the record he has to be prepared to take responsibility for, whether he's quoting a press release or quoting someone indirectly without a press release. Now if he wants to say that I have broken my word in some specific respect, he should take the responsibility and say that that is his view also, and he should say in what specific respect. If he's referring to the question of the automobile insurance issue, let me assure him once again that just as I said that there would be no election until a defeat in the House or the passing of four years, I'm not going to call it on their mere heckling but I will call it dependent on the outcome of the vote on Bill 56.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable First Minister earlier this afternoon anticipated my comments and he was incorrect. Today he anticipated my comments tonight and he is correct. The insurance agents in Manitoba believe that he has broken his word and there is no . . .

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, the honourable member had better indicate in what respect this seems to be the view.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, I would suggest to the Honourable First Minister that if we can arrange a meeting so that he and I could be present with the insurance agents -- the insurance agents believe that there was a commitment that was given to them by the Premier -- (Interjection) -- I don't have to give him chapter and verse. I don't have to give chapter and verse, and what I'm suggesting, I should tell the Honourable Minister of Finance, is accepted because many of them were present with the First Minister. They were given their word that there was going to be a proper review of auto insurance and there was going to be a fair determination before the government would take any kind of action, and they are of the opinion that the First Minister and the government, in the manner in which they have handled themselves, have not lived up to their word. -- (Interjection) -- Is that junk? You tell it to them. You tell it to them. Tell it to them to their face. You tell it to them to their face. They'd be very happy to hear it. In fact, they'll be very happy to debate it.

Now I've referred to the Chamber of Commerce. We now have the issue of the auto insurance, the question of confidence. Let me just refer to the unbelievably stupid statement

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) of the Attorney-General when he read the speech of the Minister of Industry and Commerce to the Real Estate people in Manitoba. Now let me ask you, was that statement a statement of a person who was trying to build and develop confidence with the business and professional community in this province? Was that statement a statement of someone who was trying to develop a relationship in which there could in fact be development? Well, I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman, there'll be opinions given on this and the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources shakes his head and says yes it was. Well -- he shook his head in approval. -- (Interjection) -- No, you didn't move your hand there. You didn't move your hand there.

Well, Mr. Chairman, I suggest that that's another example. We have the speeches of the Premier before the New Democratic Party youth, in which he talks about the business establishments who are fighting him, and he specifically said to them, "We have to be on guard because they are fighting us." Now I'm asked to name chapter and verse in this House. The First Minister stand up and talks about the establishment. I'd like him to stand up and name chapter and verse of the establishment in the business community who are in fact stopping him, who in fact are resisting him. -- (Interjection) -- Oh, and the Chamber of Commerce? -- (Interjection) -- The Chamber of Commerce declared war. Yes. Now after the statement of the First Minister, the Chamber of Commerce came out in support of the Premier.

The Chamber of Commerce has declared war.

A MEMBER: After what kind of provocation? No provocation.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, in a few days we are going to discuss the issue around MacDonal'd Air Base and when that chapter of government action -- (Interjection) -- Oh yes, when that chapter of government action is disclosed and when the blackmail that was actually conducted by the government is disclosed on the matter of the record . . .

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, I think that the reference by the Honourable Member for River Heights to some agreement between the Government of Manitoba and a group that has under that agreement obtained lease rights to MacDonal'd Air Base, in the context of that the honourable member used the term "blackmail". I think, Sir, that that term is clearly unparliamentary. Not only that, the agreement was one that was entered into by the previous administration, subsequent to it being entered into the terms were not being lived up to. They were almost hopelessly unable to live up to it. The agreement . . .

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. There is no -- on a point of privilege, Mr. Chairman, there is no need for the Premier to explain his position. There's been a statement made. If he does not like the statement this is fine.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, my point of order is very simple and I'll restate it. The honourable member used the term "blackmail". He did not even take the time to elaborate first in what sense it was blackmail in his view; and even so, the term "blackmail" is unparliamentary.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Chairman, I indicated that this matter will be discussed . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. I would ask the honourable member . . .

MR. SPIVAK: Yes, I intend to withdraw it, Mr. Chairman, I just . . . I indicated that the matter will be discussed further in this House and there'll be greater opportunity to prove the case. -- (Interjection) -- I am going to withdraw the word "blackmail".

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member I then take it, is withdrawing that expression? Thank you.

MR. SPIVAK: So we have a few examples, Mr. Chairman. Now let me say to the Premier and to the other members who are present here from the caucus of the Minister of Industry and Commerce. You were elected to develop a program for Manitoba that would in fact bring about greater social reform. What has happened in the past few months is that you've fumbled in your economic development program and you have lost a great deal of your humanity. You've lost a considerable amount of your humanity and it's apparent in your attitude to the plight of the insurance agents in this province and there is a concern, and that concern is real and the Honourable Member from Portage la Prairie in his very moderate statement to you, expressed it and you are not prepared to accept it, but it's true. You've lost part of your humanity in the problem of not facing up to the serious dislocation to those people whom you are directly going to affect as a result of your government action.

MR. SCHREYER: Would the member permit a question?

MR. SPIVAK: I'll permit a question at the end.

MR. GREEN: That's not true.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources says it's not true. The Member for Portage la Prairie is not here but he's given me permission to read a letter and I assume I still have his permission to read the letter.

MR. GREEN: I hope the name is not cut off the bottom.

MR. SPIVAK: The name is not cut off. This is a letter to Mr. Keith Bowes, Bowes Trailer Sales, Portage la Prairie, Manitoba, 1970 Surrey Supreme 600 Trailer." Dear Keith: After my conversation with you on Saturday, my wife and I had a talk and decided that under the circumstances it would be advisable to cancel our order. We stand to lose not only our own job but our home also and there seems no possibility that we will be able to remain in Manitoba. I would like to thank you for any trouble that you have gone to on our behalf, Keith. Would you be so kind as to return our cheque for \$500.00 as soon as possible as we wish to put our affairs in order. Thanks again, Keith. Best regards, Dave, 59 Green Avenue, Winnipeg 15, Manitoba." -- (Interjection) -- It's written from the Merit Insurance Company. -- (Interjection) -- Well, maybe the Peace King can. If you can, you'll be allowed to stand up.

What it says is that he's going to be leaving.

MR. CHERNIACK: Yes.

MR. SPIVAK: And what is intended, from what I gather from the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie . . .

MR. CHERNIACK: Oh, third hand evidence.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, I tell you, Mr. Chairman, I'll sit down and let the Honourable Member from Portage la Prairie . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable House Leader of the Liberal Party.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, I intended to read that letter myself into the record so the Attorney-General can bray all he wants but I speak the truth and I speak from others who I believe, and what I'm saying is, the Minister of Industry and Commerce has failed to talk about the loss of jobs in this industry.

Now if a plant closes down for some reason or another, there's a great hue and cry. The Minister will stand up and give all kinds of explanations and talk about what he is trying to do about that particular operation; but we haven't heard anything from him under his departmental estimates about what he is trying to do to help the people who are going to be displaced or thrown out of work by government action. Now this letter, this letter is to a trailer manufacturer in Portage and the reason for the reading of the letter is to show you the pyramiding effect of the loss of jobs, or the loss of even one jobs, what it means to other people. -- (Interjection) -- Well, Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. GREEN: How about it? How about it? One job. You're talking one; what about the 100,000?

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Master of the red herring speaks from his seat again. He's a master, I admit that.

MR. GREEN: Well, what about it?

MR. G. JOHNSTON: I appreciate his remarks, but the Member for River Heights gave way because someone sneered on the other side as to the authenticity of that letter. -- (Interjection) --

MR. MACKLING: The Honourable member can speak for himself. The Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney I'm sure can have his day in court too.

Was the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie in the House when I was speaking on the auto insurance debate? (Yes) Does he recall the case I cited, that I can prove chapter and verse, if you want to know the name of the insurance company that sold that policy. You don't want to know that? It's the Merit Insurance Company.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Well, Mr. Chairman, the Attorney-General obviously is trying to prove some obscure point which the rest of us don't appreciate, but the letter is authentic. The loss of the sale is authentic. The loss of wages to the people that makes the trailers is going to be authentic and this is what I'm directing the whole tenor of my speech to when I speak to the Minister of Industry and Commerce, when I say what are you doing about this group of people that are being dislocated or unemployed. Let's use the word "unemployed". Dislocated is a very nebulous word. What does it mean? I'm talking about the people that are thrown out of work and this is what this debate is all about. This is what this debate is all about; and I sit down and I would like to hear from the Minister of Industry and Commerce when

(MR. G. JOHNSTON cont'd) the Member for River Heights is through; but I stand here in my place and I say that's an authentic letter to a manufacturer, and while miniscule in itself it represents loss of jobs, loss of confidence and loss of wages to Manitobans.

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

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Chairman, I gave way to allow the Honourable Member . . .

MR. SCHREYER: I'm not aware of any - when we're in Committee of the Whole in doing the estimates, I'm not aware of any procedure whereby a member can make his speech and then yield the floor not for a question but for someone else to make a speech. At that point it's a matter of rotation of speakers. -- (Interjection) -- Well, the Member for Portage did not merely ask a question or answer it; he made a statement and therefore we go into the normal rotation. After all, it's no great disadvantage or handicap to the Member for River Heights because he will have his opportunity to speak in the normal course . . .

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order, I may say that there is a disadvantage for the simple reason that all my intention would be would be to read an article from the Free Press dated January 10, into the record and then I'll sit-down, I'll try and complete it as quickly as . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: On the point of order, the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce.

MR. EVANS: The Honourable Member from Portage la Prairie directed a specific question to me and you know, I would like to have the opportunity to reply and I don't intend to take very long.

The fact of the matter is . . .

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Chairman, again the only reason I gave way to the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie - I asked him if he would stand up - was there was a question . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. I would think that although what the Member for River Heights may say is so, that once in fact that he did yield the floor to another member, that if a member on the opposite side wishes to speak, then I would have to recognize that member. (Why?) Because I do not believe the Member for River Heights controls the debate and if he yields the floor then I think it is not wrong to rotate the speakers at that point. The Honourable Minister.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, the fact of the matter is, you know, the Honourable Member from Portage directed a question to us or stated categorically or inferred that, you know, we were doing nothing, you know, for the automobile insurance or those people who may be affected some way or other by the program.

Now the fact of the matter is, Sir, this House has spent hours upon hours upon hours discussing various general questions and never getting down to many specifics, and indeed we could have talked about many types of programs, job creations in Manitoba that can provide alternative opportunities for people who may be displaced. Now, the fact that we've taken and are taking and are prepared to take an equity position in certain enterprises to make things happen, to create jobs, you know, the additional jobs created in Morris or the additional jobs created at Fort Garry, these represent alternative job opportunities. Now, I want to state now that, obviously all the members of the House are concerned about this, and this government is concerned about the question, but I would like to refer to one specific item. You ask me, what have I done. Well, I'd like to make one specific example of what we've done, and I'm on record in the newspaper on this matter and I stated the matter categorically to the committee from the Village of Wawanesa, that the Department of Industry and Commerce and the officials from the Manitoba Development Fund were taking a very intensive look at the economic environment of the village of Wawanesa and district. As a matter of fact, I've instructed officials to go down there post haste - indeed I think they're either there today or they're going down there tomorrow - and the fact of the matter is that we are concerned and this department of Industry and Commerce along with the Manitoba Development Fund are very earnestly and actively looking into the possibilities of providing employment, of providing industry in the village of Wawanesa. And you say, well what have we done. Well there's something that we're attempting to do and I hope that there'll be some favourable news to announce in the near future.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I'd just like to read into the record an article from the Winnipeg Free Press dated January 10th. The headline is: "May Ease Tension. No takeover speech cheers insurance men. A statement by Premier Ed Schreyer of Manitoba that his

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) government doesn't contemplate the nationalization of any industry here has brought guarded approach applause from general insurance companies and their agents, says a Press statement issued Friday on behalf of the companies and agents. The statement referred to a talk Premier Schreyer gave the Sales and Ad Club of Winnipeg earlier this week in which the Premier was quoted as saying: 'Those who are afraid of any degree of nationalization of industry have found that in fact there has been none and none is contemplated.' The Premier's document could do much more to relieve the current tension existing between the Schreyer government and the insurance industry, the statement said."

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman . . . -- (Interjection) --

MR. SPIVAK: January 10, 1970.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Chairman, I am surprised, although I shouldn't be really, that the Member for River Heights would try a cute little maneuver like that to quote out of context entirely the reporting of a speech that I gave to -- (Interjection) --

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Chairman, I will file the article and I would ask the Premier to examine it and see whether I quoted it out of context . . .

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Chairman, let me explain . . .

MR. SPIVAK: There's a point of privilege here, Mr. Chairman, I did not quote anything out of context.

MR. SCHREYER: You just read something.

MR. SPIVAK: I just read it word for word.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, let me - Mr. Chairman, in that case I'm quite prepared to withdraw the statement that the member quoted the report out of context. Let me then, so that honourable members will understand the context, give the full context of the situation. At the time that that particular speech was given we had already been several months into a study and investigation of the feasibility of a public auto insurance program. Several months into it. The question was raised whether or not the government of the day had any plans for the extensive public ownership of industry, and I said that with respect to industry that we did not have any such plan, and I went further to say although it wasn't reported there, that with respect to manufacturing industry, secondary industry in particular, that I had never felt - and I'm quoted by the way in the Winnipeg Tribune interview which was published shortly after the election of last June - that I have felt all along that secondary industry, manufacturing industry was something that could just as well if not better, be carried out under the aegis of private ownership and operation in most cases. I'm on record many, many times in this respect, that the utilities are something that could well be owned and operated in the public domain, and I regard the underwriting of risk and automobile insurance as being also very much in that light.

I'd like, in the minute or two left, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to deal with some of the points made by the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie. I certainly realize that there will be some dislocation as a result of any program of change, public ownership in particular in the automobile insurance industry. I also point out to the honourable member that just about every change of significance that has ever been wrought in our economy and our society has resulted in some dislocation to someone; and as a case in point I refer to -- I think it's a good example -- the US-Canada auto agreement of 1964-65. It was entered into by the two governments, United States and Canada because it was felt that on balance, despite some of the negative effects, that on balance it would redound to the benefit of the majority of people of our respective countries. We can get into an argument as to whether or not it has really accrued to the benefit of the Canadian purchase of automobiles, but that's a separate issue.

Nevertheless, after the judgment was made by the government of the day at the Federal level, they did enter into this auto agreement knowing full well at the time that the likely effect would be to cause serious sale reductions to the Canadian Automotive Repair Part industry. And that is exactly what happened, Mr. Chairman. The government of the day did take steps to set up what is known as the transitional adjustment benefit program, so that all those people - and there were a number of thousand - that were employed in the automotive repair industry in Canada which industries would likely be forced to the wall because of the auto pact, that a program was established whereby there was a means of paying transitional assistance or adjustment benefits amounting to so and so much based on one week of benefits for each year of service in the industry to a maximum of 26 years or 27 years. Now there

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd) was dislocation, temporary unemployment while retraining went on and while these people found other jobs. Some of them by the way found jobs not in automotive repair plants, many of which closed, but in the expanding automotive assembly line plants.

I suggest to my honourable friends that over the years, over the decades, over the centuries, every time any change in economic method was brought about it has resulted in dislocation to someone. What is important is that the agency or entity that is bringing about a change, whether it be public, and certainly whether it be private, private or public, I don't think it should matter, has some onus placed upon it to come forward with a program, to come forward with a means whereby those who are put into a position where they are suffering dislocation are given some means of compensation, retraining and re-employment, and I . . .

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would point out to the Honourable . . .

MR. SCHREYER: . . . accept that responsibility and I have indicated so on previous occasions. Now I think that -- (Interjection) -- Mr. Chairman, I realize it's 10:00 o'clock. . .

MR. G. JOHNSTON: . . . be willing to have the First Minister have the floor the next time the committee convenes, because I would like to ask him some questions.

MR. SCHREYER: I have no objection, Mr. Chairman, to having the floor the next time the committee meets. Perhaps you would like to call it 10:00 o'clock.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Chairman, at the same time I rose earlier, I indicated that I wanted to speak.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, I'm afraid that we are now at the hour. There is only one hour remaining in debate. Committee rise. Call in the Speaker. The Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask the House Leader what the business tomorrow will be?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, let me indicate that there will not be occasion to have to ask this question again because we will be dealing with the estimates tomorrow and that will leave bills on the order paper.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Flin Flon, that the report of the committee be received.

IN SESSION

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

MR. SPEAKER: It is now 10:00 o'clock. The House is adjourned and will stand adjourned until 2:30 tomorrow (Wednesday) afternoon.