

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Tuesday, April 13, 1971

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions. The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

PRESENTING PETITIONS

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present a petition of Alexander Kitchener Mattick and others praying for the passing of an Act to incorporate Strathcona Curling Club.

MR. SPEAKER: Reading and Receiving Petitions; Presenting reports by Standing and Special Committees.

REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour) (Transcona): Mr. Speaker, I beg to present the report of the Special Committee of the Legislature on Rules of the House, and also the report of the Independent Committee of persons other than those directly involved in the public service to consider the matter of members' indemnities, the matter of other remuneration and expense allowances to members of the House and the committees thereof.

And if I may, Mr. Speaker, I would like to explain to the members of the House that in accordance with a resolution passed by this Assembly at its last meeting the rules committee were instructed to select and have appointed an independent committee of persons other than those involved in the public service to consider the matter of remuneration, etc., and the committee unanimously agreed that on receipt of that report that it would remain a secret document until presented in this House, and accordingly that was done, Mr. Speaker, and that is the reason why I have handed now to the Clerk of the Assembly an envelope containing the report, copies of which will be distributed to members of the House and also of course, copies of the report of the Committee of the House.

So therefore, Mr. Speaker -- now that I have formally on your behalf actually Sir, because you were appointed chairman of the Rules Committee when former Mr. Speaker, Mr. Hanuschak was appointed Minister of Consumer Affairs, you, may I say, very efficiently became the presiding officer of that committee -- so therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would like to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources that the report of the Special Committee of the Legislature on Rules of the House together with the Report of the Independent Committee be referred to the Committee of the Whole for consideration and report to the House for final adoption.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion. The Honourable Member from Morris.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSON (Morris): Mr. Speaker I should like to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Fort Garry, that debate be adjourned.

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

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

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed I would like to draw the attention of Honourable Members to the gallery where we have 65 students, Grade XI standing from the W.C. Miller Collegiate. These students are under the direction of Mr. Schmidt and Mrs. Braun. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member.

We also have 25 cubs of the No. 118 Burning Bush Cub Pack. These Cubs are under the direction of Mr. Scott. The Cub Pack is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for Radisson.

There are also six students from Churchill under the direction of Mrs. Irene Dickman. These students are from the constituency of the Honourable Member for Churchill. There are also 17 4H Club members under the leadership of Mr. Pringle and Miss Jean Butcher. This club is from the constituency of the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie. On behalf of the honourable members of the Legislature I welcome you all here today.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland. We have nothing before the House.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, you failed to mention where the students from the W.C. Miller came from and they happen to come from my constituency.

MR. SPEAKER: My apologies to the honourable member. Thank you for reminding me.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Minister of Labour.

REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

Mr. Paulley: Mr. Speaker, if I may before the Orders of the Day, I have pleasure in presenting the Annual Report of the Board of Internal Economy Commissioners.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q.C. (Leader of the Opposition) (River Heights): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I have a question either for the First Minister, the Minister of Labour, or the Minister of Industry and Commerce. I wonder if he can inform the House how many of those who are proposed to be laid off by Canadian Aviation Electronics were formerly employed by Air Canada and were left here or transferred here when the Air Canada Overhaul Base was taken to Montreal?

HON. LEONARD S. EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce) (Brandon East): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Actually there was a question, a similar question asked of me a couple of days ago and I took it as notice. In the meantime, and I'm not prepared to give you a detailed estimate at the present time, I have been speaking to management. I toured the plant yesterday and met with union representatives as well and its a very difficult question to answer. The company themselves do not know how many employees who were formerly employed by Air Canada will be affected by the lay-off. They themselves cannot give us this information at the present time. I will endeavour, as I indicated on the last occasion when the similar question was raised, to provide this information to the House as soon as it is available.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Is it likely that any members who were formerly Air Canada employees are liable to be laid off?

MR. EVANS: Well, Mr. Chairman, as I indicated to the honourable member, I have discussed this matter with the management of the company and I simply cannot give you a factual answer at this time, and if management can't tell us this information, I am sure that I am not going to stand here and pretend to answer the queries of the honourable member.

MR. SPIVAK: A supplementary question. Has the government made contact with the Federal Government with respect specifically to any Air Canada employees who may be laid off, and the obligations that were undertaken at the time the Air Canada Overhaul Base was taken from Winnipeg.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, we are looking into this matter.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. SAUL A. MILLER (Minister of Youth and Education) (Seven Oaks): Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to table a number of annual reports which are required pursuant to Acts of Legislature. They are the annual report of the University of Winnipeg; the President's Report for the Brandon University; the Report of the Board of Governors for the University of Manitoba, year ending March 31st, 1970; and the Annual Report of the University Grants Commission.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I have a further question for the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce. Has the Minister of Industry and Commerce - can he tell the House if he has taken any further initiative in respect to the C.A.E. layoff? If he proposing a brief to the Federal Government and would he undertake to send a delegation from this House composed of all parties?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, we are in continuous contact with Ottawa and we are endeavouring to arrange a meeting as soon as Ottawa is prepared to meet with representatives of the Manitoba Government, the management and union. As soon as they are ready to meet us, we will be on the plane down there; and as I said, we are in constant communication - the officials of my department and the Department of Labour, I understand, are in constant communication with several departments in Ottawa in this matter.

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I have a further supplementary question. Was the Minister able to determine when the 300 employees will be laid off, will the man hours fall below the 700,000 hours which was, I believe, guaranteed by the government at that time or not?

MR. EVANS: Well, Mr. Speaker, this is one of the matters that we are endeavouring to determine and we are analyzing the situation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the First Minister. In view of the lack of information and possible competent information with respect to this particular issue, would he consider calling together the Air Canada policy committee, so that a full report can in fact be given to them?

HON. ED. SCHREYER (Premier) (Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, I really have to wonder about the practicability of the honourable member's suggestion but we will take it under consideration.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. INEZ TRUEMAN (Fort Rouge): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Honourable Minister of Health and Social Development. Would the Minister please inform the House whether his department has over-expended its 1970-71 allocation?

HON. RENE E. TOUPIN (Minister of Health and Social Development) (Springfield): Mr. Speaker, in some expenditures we have. I wouldn't try to give you a definite answer regarding figures today. I will take the question as notice.

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

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Highways. The question is, when does the government of the Province of Manitoba going to raise the last quarter mile of Highway No. 30 - this is right along the U.S. border to the Customs Office? Annual diking is the case now and I think the highway needs raising. It's just for a quarter of a mile and we have this repeated diking. Is the government going to do something about it?

HON. JOSEPH P. BOROWSKI (Minister of Public Works and Highways) (Thompson): Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the fact that there is flooding there now. The fact is there has been flooding for three years and I think the town, the mayor and council have some responsibility to protect their town. We are not in the business of building dikes, we are in the business of building highways and if dikes are required then I suggest that the Minister of Mines and Resources should be the man that should be spoken to.

MR. FROESE: A supplementary question then. The town has done all the diking they can. This is Highway No. 30. They have no right to dike on the highway and certainly it's a matter of raising the road.

MR. SCHREYER: On a point of order. I hesitate to interrupt my honourable friend when he is dealing with a matter that is, I understand, of immediate concern to the residents of his area, but clearly the question as put is argumentative, and persistently argumentative, and it's clearly out of order.

MR. SPEAKER: The point is noted.

MR. FROESE: A supplementary question then. Will the government of the Province of Manitoba pay the cost of diking that they have had to do at Gretna?

MR. BOROWSKI: I'm sorry I didn't get the question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FROESE: Well the diking that they had to carry out at Gretna, will the government pay the cost of this? And if I'm not directing it to the proper Minister I would like the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources to answer it.

HON. SIDNEY GREEN, Q.C. (Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management) (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I'd have to look at the matter which my honourable friend is referring to in the context of the Flood Control plans being undertaken by the Province of Manitoba and give him an answer when I am able to ascertain its position.

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

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, I have a question to direct either to the First Minister or to the Minister of Public Works. It is to do with the MacDonald Airport facility. I understand it was announced for sale some time ago, and my question is, will the farmers in the area who had the land taken from them by expropriation in

(MR. JOHNSTON cont'd.) the early 40's will they have an opportunity to purchase back their land at a fair and equitable price or will they have to compete with the highest bidder for the whole facility?

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, there are in a sense two parts to that question. The Minister of Highways may wish to answer the other part, but it seems to me, Sir, that when land is expropriated by the Crown in the right of the Federal Government some 30 years ago, that it's hardly incumbent upon the Crown in the right of the Provincial Government 30 years later, to feel under any particular obligation, except to make sure that all people have an equal chance to acquire the assets by competitive bidding. Now I believe that is the policy position we are following and I don't think that it represents any deviation from past practice.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I have a supplementary question to the First Minister. Does the First Minister not believe that there is a moral right of these people here, in that they had their land forcibly taken and when the land is to be put up for sale again, surely they should have the opportunity to purchase it back.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, one has to assume that the expropriation procedure that was followed in 1941 or 2 was an equitable procedure and I would hesitate to cast aspersions on the expropriating authority at the time, the Government of Canada 1941 or the arbitration officers or the courts, whoever it was that dealt with it. I really can't go beyond that, except to say once again to my honourable friend that I am aware of other parcels of land that have been expropriated by the Crown, both Federal and Provincial Crown, and where subsequently the land was disposed of by sale by routine calling for bids and this case is no different.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the First Minister. I wonder whether he could indicate whether he has been in contact with Premier Smallwood in connection with a proposed Uranium Enrichment Plant in Newfoundland?

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I sometimes have to wonder whether the Honourable the Leader of the Opposition is completely serious in his repeated references to the possibility of a Uranium Enrichment Plant. I know that it remains a possibility but his suggestion that the government of Newfoundland is on the verge of acquiring a Uranium Enrichment Plant, I simply point out to my honourable friend that the Government of Canada, through the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources, has indicated that the Government of Newfoundland and BRINKO are flying kites -- and I think I should let the matter rest right there.

MR. SPIVAK: A supplementary question. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the First Minister can indicate whether or not the indication of a uranium enrichment plant was made in the Speech from the Throne in Newfoundland.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, even if the Speech from the Throne in the Province of Newfoundland did make reference to a uranium enrichment plant, I don't know that Newfoundland has anything on us, because I know that Manitoba's TED Report makes reference to a uranium enrichment plant, and I'm afraid that both Manitoba and Newfoundland will have to wait some time before that comes to reality.

In the meantime, I repeat, the Government of Canada has given us assurance, in writing, that before the Government of Canada takes any policy decision with respect to a uranium enrichment plant, they will keep Manitoba advised.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the First Minister would admit that if in Newfoundland you can fly kites from a Speech from the Throne, you can do that in Manitoba as well?

MR. SPEAKER: I would hope that all members would conduct themselves seriously because I certainly didn't hear the question, therefore I can't even say whether it was valid or not. But I do wish members would take note that I did mention the other day that the question period is starting to drag again. Some of these questions really could be given as notice to the Ministers and we would have much shorter replies and less debate about them.

The Honourable Member from River Heights.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the First Minister would table the correspondence with the Government in connection with this.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to tabling the correspondence in question. Of course, the Honourable Leader of the Opposition knows that convention requires that we obtain the consent of the other party to the correspondence and if the honourable

(MR. SCHREYER cont'd.) member wishes to ask formally by way of an Address for Papers, I'll produce the documents after obtaining permission from Ottawa.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct a question to the Honourable Minister of Labour. Can the Minister of Labour give the House any more information concerning the strike at Flin Flon and has the government taken any further action to bring the dispute to the end?

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, through you in answer to my honourable friend, the answer is "Yes, definitely." I am meeting with the Executive Assistant to the Federal Minister of Labour this afternoon to discuss the matter in the absence in Manitoba of the Federal Minister of Labour. I also will be conferring with the Minister of Labour in Ottawa next week, if not sooner, as a result of our endeavours to assist C.A.E.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I wish to thank the Honourable Minister for his answer but I have a supplementary. Does the Minister have any information concerning the impact the strike is having on the City of Flin Flon?

MR. PAULLEY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I certainly have. As a result of the association that I have had with management, labour and also Chamber of Commerce and the local council, I'm fully aware. I also understand that my honourable friend the Leader of the Opposition is now cognizant of the fact of a strike and sent one of his colleagues as an emissary to Flin Flon.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. ARTHUR MOUG (Charleswood): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Health and Social Services. In view of the rapid escalating costs of welfare in area municipalities, is the government giving any consideration to changes in the Age of Majority and Health and Social Allowances Act?

MR. TOUPIN: I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, I didn't get the last portion of the question.

MR. MOUG: Has the government given any consideration to changes in the Age of Majority Act and the Social Allowance Act?

MR. TOUPIN: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Rouge.

MRS. TRUEMAN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct my question to the Honourable Minister of Transportation. Would the Minister please look into the possibility of adopting for Winnipeg the method of dealing with the obnoxious fumes from diesel buses, which is used in San Diego. I have a clipping from The San Diego Times which indicates that their buses now smell like lavender talcum powder.

MR. BOROWSKI: I'd be most interested in seeing the clipping.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for La Verendrye.

MR. LEONARD A. BARKMAN (La Verendrye): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture. Can he tell this House whether he's considering changes that would make the marketing of hogs, through the Manitoba Hog Marketing Commission, compulsory for all the producers in the province?

HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Minister of Agriculture)(Lac du Bonnet): Well, I think, Mr. Chairman, the Honourable Member for La Verendrye is a member of the Legislative Committee that has been dealing with the subject matter and I know that the member knows the recommendations of that committee to this House, which will be revealed in due course.

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

MR. SPEAKER: The Attorney-General.

HON. A.H. MACKLING, Q.C. (Attorney-General) (St. James): Before the Orders of the Day, Mr. Speaker, I would like to file a Return to an Order of the House No. 36 which was due from the last sitting of the House. I apologize for its being filed now but this was a very complicated and detailed compilation of moneys spent to various outside counsel during an extensive period of time. I file this Order for Return No. 36 from the former member for Ste. Rose, now Senator.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD cont'd.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. GORDON W. BEARD (Churchill): I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Finance, I suppose. Could he indicate to the House whether they're going to have a bond issue this year?

HON. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q. C. (Minister of Finance) (St. Johns): The question was whether we have a "what"?

MR. BEARD: Do you intend to have a bond sale this year?

MR. CHERNIACK: I'm not prepared to make a statement on that as yet, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. Now that we're in the canning business could he tell us how much money will be spent in renovating the Morden Cannery and how much acreage will be assigned to canning crops in that area?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member is asking a couple of very detailed questions which he can't expect me to give to him off the top of my head so I think I should take the question as notice. But I'm sure the honourable member is very much aware that the action of the Manitoba Development Corporation, as his honourable friend who represents the constituency beside his will attest to, that the action of the Manitoba Development Corporation has, in large measure, stimulated farm incomes and employment in southern Manitoba and I'm sure the honourable member is very happy at the action of the MDC.

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

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct my question to the Minister of Health and Social Services. Could he inform the House as to how many 18-year-old adults who are living at home, who are on welfare?

MR. TOUPIN: I would like to ask the honourable member to file an Order for Return, please.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. Private Members' Resolutions.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I believe that all members have agreed to proceed with the debate on the resolution proposed by the Honourable Member for Logan, seconded by the Honourable Member for Gimli as amended by the Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. Jenkins for an address to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor, adjourned by the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie. The Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, may I add my voice to the many others who have saluted you and wished you well on the occasion of your appointment to your present high office. One must commend the government for the good judgment it has shown in your nomination to this all-important and prestigious post. I tender my best wishes to you, not only on my own behalf, but as well as on behalf of the Liberal Party in Manitoba, its leader and the members of our caucus. You have served this House well for several years now as a member and I know you will respond to your new challenge with the same dedication, moderation, sense of propriety and courtesy which was the hallmark of the many roles you have served from both sides of this House.

Let me also say that you will have the unqualified co-operation and respect due to you and your high office from the members of the Liberal caucus.

Mr. Speaker, we look to and have studied with great interest the Speech from the Throne delivered last Wednesday. Indeed, all of Manitoba watched with interest for this was not an ordinary speech; it was a speech from a government which has now met in this House three times since its election in June of 1969. We had expected much more, much more. This government has now had almost two years in office in which to clear up the backlog of minor bits and pieces of legislation and housekeeping - I might say some of which had been overly long detained by the previous administration. In that catching-up endeavour, the Liberal Party was more than pleased to co-operate and not obstruct this government by opposing for the mere sake of opposing. However, as all Manitobans will recognize, the time for housekeeping is past and this government, now given the majority it needs to carry out its programs without reliance upon members on this side of the House, might have been expected at this session to launch the program, establish the priorities and begin the arduous and difficult path that must be followed if Manitoba is to receive its fair share of the national prosperity, if Manitobans are to have equality of opportunity with all other Canadians and if Manitobans, among themselves, regardless of the regions in which they live, are to have available to them equality of access to social, cultural, educational, economic and recreational facilities for which

(MR. G. JOHNSTON cont'd.) . . . government must be the catalyst.

As I say, Mr. Speaker, we awaited this speech and statement of policy with optimism for we dared to hope that the government would at last come to grips with the major problems in our society that act as the barrier to progress of the human condition in this province. Those hopes, that optimism, was dashed last Wednesday.

We are not unmindful of the fact that today Speeches from the Throne are becoming less and less precise in terms of policy enunciation and are becoming more and more a general statement of intent by governments.

One thing emerges loud, clear and unmistakably upon studying the Speech from the Throne. Our disappointments and the regrets of all Manitoba must be expressed as we behold a government which has no clear idea of where this province must go, much less any policy or plan which will take us to our destination.

It is a speech which necessarily shakes our confidence in this government's ability to lead Manitoba into its second century, for it is revealing a lack of vision on the part of this government, not so much by what it says but fundamentally because of what it does not say.

I would like first of all to say that I would like to comment on some of the good things of the Speech and then later on some of the omissions. In fairness, it must be pointed out that as the Leader of the Liberal Party, Mr. Asper, said last Wednesday, there are many points and policy statements in the Throne Speech which the Liberal Party can support. Indeed much of what is suggested in this area bears a striking resemblance to the policy statements which have been issued by the Liberal Leader as he toured Manitoba for the past several months. He has said, and I restate here, that the Liberal Party does not resent having its ideas plagiarized by this or any other government, just as long as those good ideas are implemented, for we all recognize that the origin of a good idea is not that important; what is important is that the valid suggestions of all concerned Manitobans be listened to and adopted by a concerned government. Unfortunately the Throne Speech does not plagiarize enough of the Liberal policy. That is a matter for the public to consider and not this House.

We note that the government continues to talk about economic growth and has finally started to talk about regional disparity. We will await the specific proposals in this regard before commenting on the effectiveness of this government talk in combating these problems.

We believe that the proposal to assemble more statistical data as suggested in the Throne Speech may be a positive help in making it possible for economic growth to take place, but we will be watching and watchful that the government does not introduce legislation to make a province of bookkeepers out of us all, requiring us to fill in more forms, send in more data and have our privacy further invaded.

There will be a widespread support for the expanding of regional veterinarian clinics throughout rural Manitoba and we congratulate the provincial government for negotiating with the Federal government to make grants to farmers who wish to install sewer and water facilities on their farms. We must add the hope that a more aggressive program will also be introduced to bring sewer and water facilities to the thousands of Manitobans who live in towns and villages and remote areas of the north.

The proposed reform of corrections for youth offenders, the promise to create better employment opportunities for our native people, the promise for improvement in the facilities of our elderly citizens, the shifting of 1-1/2 mills from property tax to general provincial revenues, the promise that the Frontier School Division Board will now become elective; the enactment of the Personal Property Registration legislation, the improvement in the facilities for the collection of small claims, the promise of improvement in our legal aid system for people with little or no financial means, the codification of our labour law, the review of the minimum wage standards, the introduction of Personal Investigations Act to provide privacy to individuals and society and similar housekeeping and laws updating proposals are needed but should be introduced and speedily passed so that we might get on with the more serious issues facing this province. I'm glad to see the Minister of Mines agrees with me.

Some of the items that disturb us though, Mr. Speaker: instead of coming face to face with those critically important problems which beset this province, the government has chosen instead to speak in vague generalities. It has become more and more apparent that this government is either unwilling or incapable of presenting the bold, imaginative, and innovative programs which would hasten the day when Manitobans do not have to leave their native province in order to seek careers, when the growth of this province ceases to be only one-third

(MR. G. JOHNSTON cont'd.) of the national average, when the climate of social and economic attractiveness can be created in this province on a regional decentralized basis so that Manitobans too will share with the national affluence. Instead, a picture of this government becomes more and more clear, a government which has a disturbing tendency to centralize power in the hands of fewer and fewer people, to institute state control over nearly all aspects of the individual's life, and to encourage an overwhelming bureaucracy of government civil servants. Examples of the further trend to bureaucracy abound in the Speech from the Throne. Why should we create a new Environmental Agency and a new Environmental Council when in fact we already have a government commission, The Clean Environments Commission, which is charged with protecting against pollution and whose powers could, by legislative changes, be expanded rather than setting up two new government agencies?

The government speaks of establishing day centres for the children of working mothers. This is also a plank of the Liberal Party platform, but we must express the hope that the government itself does not intend to go into the business of looking after the children in government institutions. It is the function of the state to encourage and grant financial incentives to volunteer groups and to industrial groups and the like, and to establish the care standards.

We see the government paying lip service to aid those forgotten citizens of our society, the senior citizens, who have contributed so much in the building of this country, but is it not strange indeed that the government's only answer is to build more institutions which will be state-owned and to which our elderly citizens will be confined? This approach fails to accept the real challenge offered by the Liberal Party resolution which will allow the cost of nursing home care to be covered by the Medicare Plan.

Then, true to the commitment of this government to create more and more red tape and complexity in our society, we have the proposal to create more bureaucracy. We are disturbed that we'll see another parade of appointments, perhaps politically oriented, to new boards, tribunals and commissions whose function could readily be assumed by any of the massive existing administering agencies of government, just as the government's proposed Economic Development Fund function could be administered by the present Manitoba Development Corporation without the necessity of creating another governmental board.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Manitoba do not need an expansion of the bureaucracy. We do not want an extension of the proliferation of government boards, permit licences, tribunals, enquiry bodies and other agencies. Surely it is time to disband rather than to increase the bureaucracy, and yet this government has no policy in this area. In fact, one cabinet minister recently suggested that the Civil Service in Manitoba could continue to increase at the rate of about seven percent a year. This is a trend that should be arrested, for we live in a province which has a higher percentage of civil servants than many other provinces in the country. One analysis has suggested that in the past 25 years we have had an increase of only 23 percent in population; at the same time we have added 1100 percent more in government-operated boards, tribunals and the like. I submit to this House that it is this overwhelming bureaucracy which this and the previous government seems to be bent on creating which has alienated our youth and stymied our development, and also destroyed the initiative of many of our people who do not wish to go from one government board to another in order to exercise the freedom of choice which governments exist to protect and not impair.

Mr. Speaker, the Speech from the Throne gives us many opportunities to judge this government as one which does not have a clear set of priorities, does not have a committed thrust, and does not know where it is going. One example cries out for attention. If there is a new department of government required -- and the Liberal Party has urged this in a resolution -- a Department of Northern Development. The potential for all of Manitoba to such government activity is enormous, yet this government chooses to ignore that suggestion and establishes instead a Department of Co-operative Development. The Liberal Party supports a co-operative movement and the rights of free people to associate in any manner they wish, whether it is as producers or consumers, but we do not believe that in 1970 it is the responsibility or the proper function of government to promote or make financial assistance available to those who wish to form co-operative business enterprises. In fact, the co-operative movement is no longer an infant. In Manitoba the movement has several hundred co-operatives and nearly 200,000 members, and several hundred million dollars of annual sales, and is well able to foster, develop and maintain its momentum without the aid of a new government department. We must question whether this government believes in the private industry and private

(MR. G. JOHNSTON cont'd.) . . . enterprise concept. We must express some concern over the government's intention in this regard and we must warn the government that unless we are to have complete socialization in Manitoba the source of most government revenue will still be the private sector through the tax as it pays. Should the government launch a program to compete through co-operatives with small businesses which serve this province by means and by providing most of the tax revenue and most of the employment opportunities, then the economic consequences for Manitoba will be very serious indeed.

Because of past utterances by Ministers of the Crown in this regard, I do not believe that I am being unduly alarmist in raising the question. Our concern is heightened by the fact that the Speech from the Throne makes it clear that this government has newer, greater spending plans for the forthcoming year. While some of these programs are specific, there is not a specific program to increase the productivity and economic progress of this province. One can only see a future creation of public debt increased and perhaps uncontrolled government spending, and inevitably the tax increases which must follow. The Speech from the Throne leaves us the prospect that this government may spend this province into a serious economic position unless at the same time the government does something to enhance our economic productivity and creation of wealth.

Ignoring the housekeeping legislation after two years in office, having been granted a majority from the public, the Speech from the Throne, the first of our new century, tells us these things. First, we are to have mandatory, compulsory state-owned monopolistic auto insurance. Yes, I'm sure many over there are still very happy as to what they've done to some people in this province.

MR. GREEN: For the people.

MR. JOHNSTON: To the people. To the people. The second thing, the various cities constituting Metropolitan Winnipeg are to be forced into a merger regardless of the wishes of the people of those cities — (Interjection) — not for what you are doing. -- (Interjection) -- Well, I'll debate that question with my friend at another time. We did not vote for the type of plan that you are forcing on the people. I seem to have touched a sore point, Mr. Speaker, so perhaps I'll leave that for the moment.

The third item, the government is going into the mineral exploration business. This is an industry fraught with difficulties and large lists and sometimes large losses. It's preposterous to propose that government should be going into these industries when they already own the resources and can get an excellent return without investing any money, simply through royalties and tax arrangements. But my friends -- one of them just said don't, we're going into the business ourselves.

4. We are going to create a special government department to promote the establishment of co-operatives even though the co-operatives are well-established in this province and are now being well-managed in the Department of Agriculture.

5. We see the government alter its promise to the electorate during the recent by-election, that it would make a homeowner grant of \$50.00 per home to reduce real property taxes, and to have this promise substituted by a proposal to grant tax credits to municipal governments instead.

6. We are hearing the government promise bits and pieces approach to the policy of shifting municipal tax burdens for education, but we still wait to see the long-term plan. Perhaps if we had a by-election every month we'd get five percent a month taken off.

7. We hear the government raise the red herring of the Federal Tax Reform Plan. Indeed what the government is saying in its Speeches from the Throne is that the debate of the past two years has not moved it from its lonely position of being the only provincial government in Canada to support the Benson Tax Reform Plan even though the rest of Canada has heard the debate and, along with Mr. Benson himself, realize that the White Paper on Tax Reform in its present form, if enacted, would be severely damaging to the west and in particular to the Manitoba economy. It is difficult to express confidence in a government which appears to be so blindly tied to theory and ideology that it is unable to accept the weight of advice and authority that would prevent the Federal Government from enacting a Tax Reform Plan which might succeed in a new society or in the sanctity of the ivory tower, but it has no relevance in a province such as Manitoba where economic growth must be the number one priority.

And finally, we are treated to the spectacle of this government in its efforts to pose as

(MR. G. JOHNSTON cont'd.) . . . the friend of agriculture, to make a blanket four million dollar grant to all farms on the basis of a dollar per acre with a maximum of \$100.00 per farmer, this in a day when universal approaches are being questioned. Surely it cannot inspire confidence to see the government giving all farmers \$100.00 regardless of need, regardless of wealth, regardless of economic necessity. To make a hundred dollar grant to a farmer who made \$10,000 last year and at the same time make an equal grant to a farmer who made \$1,500 is a good indication of the real level of concern of this government. -- (Interjection) -- Yes, I'm sure that the Minister of Agriculture feels he's struck on the real go-getting plan of all times.

MR. MACKLING: How many of your constituents don't want the grant?

MR. G. JOHNSTON: I'll tell you quite a few of my constituents, through specialized types of farming, are making an exceedingly good living and they will admit it to you. Others are in trouble and need the help. Is this the answer? Everybody \$100.00 is the NDP answer, is it?

Well, Mr. Speaker, what is missing from the Throne Speech? What would we like to see? Parties in opposition to the government are not merely to criticize alone but also they have an obligation to place before the government and the people programs for those which the government has proposed. Indeed, the Leader of the Liberal Party has done so in several areas recently, including detailed programs for Metropolitan Winnipeg government reform, industrial development, rural redevelopment and northern development. It will also be noted that the Liberal Party has tabled a number of bills and resolutions that it intends to introduce for consideration at this session. We are unable to understand the major and obvious omissions from the Throne Speech: 1. Where is the aid to private schools that has been approved by this House and which has been promised by the Premier? Must Manitobans assume that the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources has won the first round . . . ?

MR. SCHREYER: On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. My point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, is that it's possible to sit here and take only so much misquotation. The promise that I made, if it's necessary to explain to my honourable friend I'll explain it, but it was not to be taken as a promise for this particular session and he knows that. So I wish he would be a little more fair about these things.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Well, Mr. Speaker, . . .

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, on the point of privilege. Mr. Speaker, you are new to this House and I'd like to know whether the precedent that's been set here will be followed. Now, will you take it now that anyone who claims he's misquoted or misinterpreted is going to have a right to rise in the midst of debate and to indicate to the House, in the manner as the First Minister has just now?

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

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry if I have offended the First Minister, but it's my understanding from what I have read in the newspapers that a promise was made.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, on another point of privilege . . .

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Well, Mr. Speaker, I refuse to yield the floor unless you so rule.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of privilege. Mr. Speaker, the member has said that the House voted to give public aid to private schools. That is not correct and that is abuse of privilege of the House. We did not vote so.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, if that's the point of order . . .

MR. GREEN: A point of privilege.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: . . . I haven't been here very long, but it's my understanding that this House approved in principle a resolution last year introduced by the Member for Rhineland. -- (Interjections) -- Well, apparently my friends opposite are very sensitive on this point and perhaps that's why they decided to leave it out of the Throne Speech. Perhaps the members of this House and members of the public will have to wait until the NDP Party fight it out behind the scenes then. Is that what you're suggesting we should do?

MR. SCHREYER: Well you had 80 years, you know, and you didn't do such a good job of settling that issue.

MR. SPEAKER: Will the Honourable Member for Portage proceed.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Well, perhaps I'll move on to another point that perhaps will not offend my friends as much. Does the government realize that the Manitoba fishermen cannot continue to exist on the handout basis that they are existing on now? Does not the government

(MR. G. JOHNSTON cont'd.) think that there should be a long-term plan made considering the seriousness of the problem for the fishing industry, the 900 fishermen on Lake Winnipeg, the 200 fishermen on Saskatchewan River and hundreds of others who are affected? Not a mention of this problem or any long-term solution.

Where is the Bill of Rights that is so urgently needed and ought to have been symbolic of the new world in which we are entering our second century? Its absence is even more surprising because it was referred to in the last Throne Speech. Are we to believe that this government is still unable to come to grips with this fundamental issue? Has it not moved to implement some of the major recommendations of the Royal Commission Report on the Status of Women, many of which are within provincial jurisdictions? Where are the programs to provide help to our students who will within a matter of a few weeks be entering the labour force only to find that there are no summer jobs for students again? Where are the programs that will make a major thrust meaningful to improve the economic and physical well-being of our senior citizens, who remain buffeted between federal and provincial authority, each claiming it is the other's responsibility?

After two years in office, can this government do no better than to make pious statements about the economic opportunities for our native people? Can we not expect at this time the government to introduce some major and detailed programs to improve the lot of native Manitobans who are denied justice in our society, particularly those who have come to and settled in the Greater Winnipeg area? And after two years in office, after our party has continually spoken out against the neglect of our rural towns, is it wrong for us to expect a major thrust in the strategy to help spur the growth of Manitoba's forgotten citizens, the people who live in the rural areas? And after so many years of Liberal spokesmen pointing out the need for legislative reform, could we not vote for a program to make the legislative process more meaningful, to improve the position and the ability to perform of the members of the House, to grant him assistance and research facilities he requires in order to do his job? How can anyone do anything but express astonishment that there is no word in the Speech from the Throne on this government's posture and plans to deal with the Federal Government and the rest of the Canadian provinces on constitutional reform, pollution, native people's rights and the amending formula for the Canadian Constitution, which will see Manitoba a second class status if we don't look out for ourselves. In only a few weeks the Federal Government hopes to finalize many important aspects of constitutional reform which will affect the lives of Manitobans for perhaps another century, yet this province has not put forward a position which will help to reduce the regional imbalances and the impediments to our development. And, most critical, where are the programs, not the slogans or the statements of intent, but the actual point by point program that this government is prepared to introduce to spur economic development within this province and to arrest the brain drain, to create opportunities for Manitobans so that they will not have to leave their towns and cities in order to find careers elsewhere. Surely this government cannot be so blind as to what is happening in Manitoba economically to be content to insert a few sentences into a Speech from the Throne and let it go at that. Are we therefore to assume that Civil Service growth, as is practically guaranteed in the Speech from the Throne, is more important than real economic growth? Must we reach the inevitable conclusion that this government is not interested in decentralizing government services and moving government departments closer to the people, but rather is interested in a shift of more power from people to bureaucrats?

The Liberal party has proposed major programs for health services and education reform, and economic development programs for Northern Manitoba, yet this burning problem, this inequity in our society which affects a large sector of our population, is still ignored in the Speech from the Throne. We see no real push for regional development in the decentralization of government services. Instead we see comments about Manitobans controlling the operation of Manitoba business - something which we can agree, but where is the statement of policy that we have asked for on the welcoming of foreign investments?

Where is the Manitoba code of good corporate citizenship that must be proposed in conjunction with the attracting of foreign investment? Where is the land bank that the NDP have always in its years of opposition supported? Where are the tourist development policies that could make a significant contribution to the province? Coming. Never-never land. Where are the programs that will launch Manitoba as a convention centre for the North American Continent that were talked about a few years ago? Where are the commitments by the people

(MR. G. JOHNSTON cont'd.) of Manitoba to a transport policy which was so urgently needed in Metro Winnipeg. What is the position of this government on the inner beltway for Metro Winnipeg? In short, where are the urban policies that will end the neglect by the provincial government? Forcing a merger of the cities? A superficial act, but will this solve the problems?

In the final analysis, one must criticise the government because this Throne Speech lacks innovation. It merely expands existing programs and adds to the administrative morass. If this government was serious it would have told us its job targets on a year-by-year basis. It would have told us whether it wishes to see an increase in the population of Manitoba or be satisfied with the zero growth that we presently enjoy. It would have clarified its relationship between government and private enterprise and government and foreign capital and the responsibilities of the non-resident investors who come into Manitoba. It would have made a clear commitment to remove the economic injustices suffered by rural Manitoba. It would have adopted a program to de-centralize government departments and moving some of them out of Winnipeg to the areas in which they serve. A bold government, an innovating government would surely offer leadership concerning the problems of rapid change which hurt our farmers. For two decades, despite different political leaders, our farmers have continued to suffer and decline in numbers. Our farmers clearly need long-term policies, policies which honestly face up to the problems at hand.

The Throne Speech offers no leadership on these matters, so we would ask: what about the long overdue backlog of reforms? What will happen when this government is forced to fall back on its party thinkers and its party platforms? Where will they get the new ideas and the new approaches? It is then that we see this government at its disappointing worst, for what do we get? We get the government in the auto insurance monopoly; we get the government going into business; we get the government which forces amalgamation in Greater Winnipeg. What we don't get is a government which understands clearly, unmistakably, there is no room for dogma in order to solve Manitoba's problems. The First Minister may be a Liberal; he may be a Social Democrat; he can be anything he chooses to call himself, and this is of no relevance; but what is relevant is that in the end the New Democratic Party and not the Premier must generate the momentum and the innovation which will make Manitoba realize its place in Canada. The Premier cannot do this alone. I wonder if his party can help him.

The New Democratic Party has been traditionally concerned with social welfare reforms of the type that have already been enacted into law. Some remain. Legal aid improvement, dental aid improvement, and some others. But what has now become clear after two years of NDP government is that this government has been very slow to adopt the new wave of social welfare reform, the concept that people, and not the government, must govern; the concept that we must abandon our universal approach to government and allow government to look and zero in on the people who need the help, and leave alone those who do not need the help by governments in their lives. But, instead, the NDP government is more keen to get the government into the business world, to compete against private enterprise. It appears to be in favour of increasing the bureaucracy. It is reluctant to encourage private entrepreneurship and is in favour of a centralized government rather than a decentralized one. It is unable to understand and communicate ideas on a new federalism that must govern Canada, and in which Manitoba must have a voice.

Mr. Speaker, let us be well understood that Manitoba is small in its place in Canada but it's important and it's in the centre. Today, as never before, Manitoba is at a crossroad. We can continue to drift into a dead end or be a backwater or a colony of the east, a province too frightened or too weak or feeling too inferior, or we can boldly lead and plan and risk and challenge and thereby grow. I refer this House to a study conducted by the Government of Canada on the future, 29 years from now. I am not a spreader of doom and gloom, I am a realist; but that study shows that unless a dramatic reversal occurs, this province will be an insignificant entity by the year 2000 unless some dramatic, bold and aggressive steps are taken.

MR. SPEAKER: I hate to interrupt the honourable member. I would like to point out he has five minutes.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So I say again, Mr. Speaker, we need a government that is not afraid to inspire and to lead and to motivate.

So, Mr. Speaker, by the tone of my speech I am sure the government members know that we do not support their Throne Speech and, further to that, we propose an amendment to the

(MR. G. JOHNSTON cont'd.) amendment. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Member for Assiniboia, that the motion be further amended by adding to it the following words: "1. This government has failed to set priorities and propose measures adequate to meet the real needs of the people of Manitoba. 2. Indications in the Throne Speech, the government has failed to decentralize and instead has further centralized power, has increased bureaucracy, reduced individual freedom of choice, and increased the level of state control over its citizens."

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

. continued on next page

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Osborne.

MR. IAN TURNBULL (Osborne): Mr. Speaker, in the third session of this Legislature I must congratulate you on attaining the high office of Speaker. I am sure that you will be as impartial in that office as you have always been in your dealings with members, and that you will mete out justice and fair dealing to all members no matter what their position is in this House.

I would like before I begin to draw attention to the two chairs that are on either side of me here. They are, I think, indicative not of a lack of support for this government but of the support that this government has in the Province of Manitoba. I think it is fair to say, Mr. Speaker, that the two members that will be here are representative of a cross-section of support; one of them after all represents a suburban area in the Metro Winnipeg region and the other comes from a country constituency. I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, that I have to disagree with the previous mover of the amendment to the amendment. His speech, I thought, was one that could hardly inspire anyone and I must admit following him is a most uninspiring task.

However, I must turn from congratulating you, Mr. Speaker, and my two colleagues that are soon to join us here, I must turn from these pleasantries to the opposition benches and I see over there in the midst of all the dark and foreboding faces and the deeply furrowed brows, one man - although he has left the house now - one man who seems to be most contented and happy, and he was the man, Mr. Speaker, who moved to a new seat from neither the left nor the right - and I am sure he didn't know which side he came from - and he has now assumed the position of the official Leader of the Opposition. I wish he was here to hear me congratulate him but, as usual, he is running around the corridors stirring up rumour and strife, I guess, about what this government might or might not do.

He did though, Mr. Speaker, after much off-stage manipulation, manage to become leader, and he does present the perfect image of a happy and smiling leader. Indeed, I think all he needed now to complete the image was a lollipop. Maybe that's what he went to the refreshment room to get was a lollipop. He is to be congratulated on receiving now his position. He looks I think when he was here, and unfortunately he's gone, he looks much relaxed now when he was in his seat, gotten a haircut and spruced up, and I hope he can continue to be relaxed, Mr. Speaker. He has, after all, a reason to be relaxed. He doesn't have to face a general election for at least two years, so in the next two years he can relax and I hope I don't disturb him if he hears that I would like to draw the history of his party to his attention and I do wish him well in the next election because he knows what will happen to him if he doesn't win.

The speech of this new Leader of the Official Opposition, the Member for River Heights, was somewhat different from the speeches made previously by him. You will recall that in the last session of the House he did say repeatedly that he would speak about economic growth over and over again. His recent effort I think was somewhat different and really it was quite good, as long as he stuck to reading his jokes. The comic part I thought though was a trifle familiar. It, for me anyway, had some reminiscence of another leader, who I don't happen to see in the gallery today. I began to think that that other leader, instead of contesting two ridings in this province, had decided instead to preserve for himself the task of writing the speeches for the Leader of the Official Opposition. Regardless though of who wrote the speech, I found myself preferring the old speech. At least the old one, the often repeated speech, recognized many of the factors contributing to economic growth in Manitoba.

This newly packaged version of the old speech stressed only three factors. The three factors contributing to economic growth were, first of all, capital formation; secondly, technological development; and thirdly, the formation of attitudes towards economic development. It was, in short, a cruder form of the crude growth approach to economic development. In that crude growth approach great emphasis is placed on capital formation arising from retained earnings, retained profits. No one disputes that retained earnings are a great contribution or can make a great contribution to economic growth and development in this province as in any other province. To be effective however the earnings need to be retained not only by the companies that make them, but retained within the province in which they are earned.

For capital investment to stimulate growth there must be some assurance that the retained earnings will be used in Manitoba and will be re-invested in Manitoba. If those

(Mr. Turnbull, cont'd).....earnings were used here in this province for development and investment, then it's possible, I suppose, that a tax reduction might be justified. But there is no such assurance made by either of the two leaders, one a nominal leader and the other the actual leader of the two groups on the other side of the House, nor were there any statistics mentioned nor any proposals which would show the proportion of corporate earnings retained in Manitoba. I would like anyone on the other side to provide at a future date the proportion of private corporate earnings earned in Manitoba that are retained in Manitoba and re-invested in industry here.

Now my lollipop friend who is running around the halls might of course have found a quick answer to the proportion of retained earnings here in Manitoba if he had stayed in his desk seat and if he had asked that other erstwhile ex-leader of the Conservative Party about earnings and corporate re-investment here in Manitoba. He could have asked the Member from Minnedosa what the proportion of retained earnings are in the funeral business here in this province. After all, the Member for Minnedosa has been designated as an executive officer of SCI, a firm owned and directed from Houston, Texas, which recently acquired control of a Manitoba firm, Clark-Leatherdale. The Member for Minnedosa might inquire of Mr. Strong, an executive officer of SCI, whether the Manitoba earnings of that firm will be retained and re-invested here or whether those earnings will go to the head office in Houston, Texas. He is already familiar with - that ex-leader of the Opposition - he's already familiar with and a party to Mr. Strong's orders from Houston, Texas, to come to Winnipeg and to prevent, by the use of unfair labour practices, the organization of a union by Manitobans within Manitoba.

If corporate earnings are to be retained and re-invested here, there is every possibility of stimulating economic development. The retention of corporate earnings is exactly what this government is doing. I know that the members opposite will not agree with the method that has been used to retain corporate earnings here because the method I speak of, of course, is the formation of the Public Auto Insurance Corporation, and the investments earned from that corporation will be passed on to the purchasers of auto insurance premiums and, hopefully, other earnings will be diverted to investment in industry in this province.

Now I can appreciate why the Member for River Heights rejects such a novel means of retaining corporate earnings in the province. However, I would like to compare the extent of capital expenditure in this Province of Manitoba with capital expenditure in Saskatchewan during the years in which the Conservative Government here operated economic growth programs and policies. Capital expenditure per capita in 1959 in Manitoba was \$731 per capita. Now from that figure in 1959 it went down, capital expenditure went down during the year of Conservative administration until in 1963 when it was \$711 per capita. By 1966, capital expenditure per person in Manitoba was \$899. That is the record of capital formation, capital expenditure in Manitoba in the years of the Conservative administration. It decreased in every year except one. By 1966 the figure of \$899 here in Manitoba could be compared to a figure of \$1200 per capita in Saskatchewan. The Saskatchewan picture of capital expenditure presents quite a different view. In the same period, from 1959 through to 1966, capital expenditure per person in Saskatchewan rose from \$698 to the figure of \$1200 which I quoted earlier. Every year, practically, capital expenditure in Saskatchewan went up.

Now I will not use a crude analysis of the figures to reach the conclusion that decreasing capital expenditure in Manitoba from 1959 to 1966 was caused by the Conservative administration and rising capital expenditures -- oh, he's back. Where's your lollipop?

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, just for the information of the Honourable Member from Osborne, my lollipop is with the Premier right now.

MR. TURNBULL: I hope he enjoys it. I wouldn't want to draw the conclusion that the rising capital expenditure in Saskatchewan from '59 to '66 was caused by the New Democratic administration there and declining capital expenditure here in the same period was caused by the Conservative administration, but I will say that capital formation alone is not the answer to the illusive goal of economic growth. The relationship between capital and output is complex. A crude growth approach advocating every conceivable incentive to attract capital does not lessen that complexity nor will it result in a better standard of living. Capital attracted by massive government grants means nothing if it results in the private earnings generated by that capital being transferred out of the province to Switzerland, to Toronto or to Houston, Texas.

(MR. TURNBULL, cont'd)..

Economic growth requires more than the attraction and formation of capital. In fact the technological change embodied in capital formation is more important than the increase in the amount of capital available. It is technological change that determines the attraction of subsequent capital and the patterns of industrial location. While increases in capital may contribute to growth, it will be crude growth with all the detrimental spillover effects so evident in places like Gary, Indiana, and Buffalo, New York. In these states, these centres, crude growth has resulted in pollution, slums, rising crime rates and the migration, the out-migration of industry from those two centres to other areas which are more pleasant to live in.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on to indicate other factors which contribute to economic growth. High levels of education, for example, are considered to be more determining in provoking or stimulating economic growth than is the formation of capital, and the proportion of fast growth to slow growth industry brings to mind the question of industrial mix. Fast growth and slow growth industries seem to be in a relationship that can bring in high wage earners, highly skilled people, which in turn can contribute to other industries locating here.

None of these factors were given adequate consideration by the promoters of the crude growth approach. Their concern is with capital formation as the main and, perhaps in their minds anyway, the only factor needed to stimulate development. This preoccupation with capital formation has not meant proposals for more rational use of the scarce capital available. Rather than use the available capital which historically has been in short supply in Manitoba for investment in labour intensive industry, the Leader of the Official Opposition suggests that we invest further money in the development of forestry on the east side, east of Lake Winnipeg and in the eastern part of Manitoba.

Now that development of forestry, Mr. Speaker, is a rather peculiar suggestion. In every region of Canada except British Columbia, the value added, the value added in the forestry industry has declined. He suggests that we move into the development of forestry, and I would like to ask him, if he was only here, by what means? Does he suggest that we use the same methods that his government did to locate industry in The Pas? Does he suggest that we give away cutting rights? Does he suggest that we give away large tracts of public land, along with a few of the taxpayers' dollars, to encourage location of someone, anyone, in the eastern part of Manitoba? Is that the kind of economic development that he would like to see repeated over and over again throughout Manitoba, investment in low labour intensive industries and the giveaway of our resources? Investment in forestry development is an expensive way to create jobs and it perpetuates the relatively unskilled labour force, but then that may have been his objective, because what better incentive could he offer than low wages to industries that wish to locate here?

I would not say that the application of this crude growth approach, which he is always advocating, has slowed down economic development in Manitoba, even though as I have pointed out capital expenditure has fallen in this province or did fall in this province between 1959 and 1966, nor would I say that when the now official Leader of the Opposition was Minister of Industry and Commerce did that crude growth policy contribute to a distortion of development in Manitoba. I would not say those things, Mr. Speaker. All I will do, Mr. Speaker, is quote a few statistics, and to do this I would like to choose a yardstick which is one of the most favourite yardsticks used by the proponents of crude growth. I would like to look at population growth and migration for the years during which the Conservatives formed the government of this province.

The rate of population growth in Manitoba for each year from 1951 to 1956 was 1.9 percent. In a later period between 1966 and 1969 that population growth dropped to 0.59 percent. That is the record of the Conservative administration; that is the result of crude growth theory and its application here. I would not say that these statistics tell the story of the impact of the crude growth ideas in this province. I will just say that population declined from 8.4 percent growth rate in 1956-61 to 1.76 percent for the total three year period, 1966-69. Population growth went down generally in Manitoba during the years of the Conservative administration, but I would not say that they were the cause of that, Mr. Speaker.

Now let us look at the distortion in the development which is reflected by population migration figures in this province. The natural increase in the population of Manitoba was 29,500 in that three-year period from 1966-69; the increase in the population in Winnipeg

(MR. TURNBULL, cont'd)...itself was some 25,000. The out-migration from the rural areas during that time was 23 1/2 thousand people. Winnipeg grew and the rural areas were depopulated, and my honourable friends across the way who were from the country areas, they know that the rural areas were depopulated during those years; they know that goods and services provided in these country areas are declining because there was a lack of demand, because the farmer is moving off the land, and I would like to say that this rural depopulation was not checked by the previous administration. They had no idea how to stop it; they had no idea of how to stimulate and decentralize industrial development in the rural areas, in those areas lying outside of the Winnipeg area.

These population changes show two patterns developing: first, that the rural areas are becoming ever more sparsely populated; and second, that the urban Winnipeg area accounts for whatever growth has occurred in Manitoba. The present administration cannot quickly and significantly alter these trends. It can - and I think the Throne Speech has indicated this - undertake policies which maximize opportunities for all those people whether they live in the rural areas or in the Winnipeg area proper.

The government has taken two approaches to the problem of regional disparity. First, to sustain farm income; and second, to increase off-farm employment in the rural areas. In rural farm areas, the overwhelming decline in farm income has decreased purchasing power and lessened the demand for goods and services. The government proposes to put \$4 million into the pockets of the taxpayers on the farm - \$4 million which in turn, Mr. Speaker, will multiply through the rural economy and will raise, to a certain extent anyway, the level of demand for goods and services in rural centres. And the honourable members opposite know that that will happen.

Now the Member from River Heights, who again is not in his seat -- (Interjection)-- No lollipops anymore, eh?--may not realize, because he is a relatively wealthy man, that those who have low incomes tend to spend any assistance that they receive and the result of that expenditure means an increase for the goods and services in the rural centres.

The introduction of running water and sewage systems to rural homes will also raise the demand for labour. In other words, those programs which the Opposition chooses to disparage, not only improve the living conditions of thousands of rural people but do create jobs. The development of off-farm opportunities in rural areas can result in several government programs. Essential to the creation of such opportunities are improved management skills and the provision of investment in operating capital. A management program has already been undertaken. Investment moneys will be made available for use in disadvantaged communities, and in those communities local people, local residents will have the opportunity of serving on the board of an Economic Development Fund which is to be created for the assistance of those who are living in regionally disadvantaged areas, and that board, by providing funds and by providing a wide range of investment opportunities for those living in rural areas, will tend to increase the skill and experience of those living in the rural areas, and that in turn will create ever greater opportunities.

At the same time the composition and jurisdiction of the rural development corporations is under review. The purpose of this review, as I understand it, is to develop these organizations into representative and more effective tools for regional development. These then are some instruments which the government hopes to use in encouraging development in areas outside of Winnipeg and in increasing both the level of income and the demand for services in rural areas.

In the Winnipeg urban area though, the problem is somewhat different. Here the problem is not one of depopulation and a decline in the demand for services, the problem rather is the increasing population, population that increases as people move in from the cities outside Winnipeg. Winnipeg has now reached the size where it may be possible for it to achieve self-sustaining growth. There was much less need within the Winnipeg urban area to stimulate economic development than there is in the rural area. The need in Winnipeg is to create a structure for orderly and balanced development. Here again a crude growth approach is inappropriate, for development that allows people to benefit not only from economic improvement but also from the amenities of urban life requires a structure that is adequate to the task. As with the introduction of any new structure, there are those who would oppose it, certainly in the urban area there are those, particularly in the suburban communities, who see in the reorganized urban structure a threat to their particular

(MR. TURNBULL, cont'd).....interests. Opponents of this urban scheme though should realize that Winnipeg, all of the Winnipeg area is on the verge of great development. The urban area needs a governmental structure which is simple yet effective in dealing with the multiplicity of urban problems. What system has been proven better in Canada than the one which makes the Executive Council responsible to the elected body. That is the system of responsible government as it has developed in Canada, as it developed before in Great Britain and which is used in all the provinces and in the Federal Government. It is a system which has worked in this country and I think it is a system that can bring effective leadership and effective administration to those who will be governing the people that reside in the Winnipeg urban area.

The government plans for regional development and the reduction of regional economic disparity are based on a desire to maintain a way of life which many Manitobans find silly. The government plans for urban reorganization promise an exciting future which should outweigh any apprehension and fear of change. I think that the new form of government in the urban area could create here an image of progressive government and of a willingness to incorporate progressive ideas which in themselves could bring greater development in this urban area. It could attract people from abroad, people from Canada who would come here to see how an urban area could be governed and should be governed, and will see the adequate structure which has been created to harness the resources of the people and the resources of the community for the achievement of a better and more equitable way of life.

The government program for regional development and for urban reorganization are better than any crude growth approach proposed by the Leader of the Opposition. The plans of the government show a measured and certain desire for progress guided by the people who live in the local areas, who live on the farms in the rural centres and in Winnipeg itself, and I think with the structure for the urban reorganization and the incentives that will be provided in the rural areas, we can see in Manitoba, hopefully, not a decline in capital expenditure as occurred in the past, not a decline in rural population as occurred in the past, but an increase in capital expenditure and an increase in population which will mean, in my opinion, that the government policies will have been effective.

I cannot, Mr. Speaker, in reviewing the proposals of the mover of the sub-amendment, regard his suggestion as a serious program for the improvement of the economic condition in Manitoba. I think that the proposals made by the government in its Throne Speech show a regard for the rural citizens and a consideration of their needs, and I think it is high time that these people in rural areas receive the attention of the government. I cannot, Mr. Speaker, support the sub-amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. BEARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is usually known as Liberals day today but I'm going to be away tomorrow and I am sure that they won't mind me speaking on the Throne Speech today. In fact, I'm going away on very special government business - I'm going to be the judge of the beauty contest at Churchill and I think that probably it will be a finer day than here in the House, and I do hope I make a finer judge than I am a politician, and I suppose that will help.

I would like to congratulate the First Minister though at this time. He has come out of the by-elections with two wins. He must have had good candidates and I think it speaks well for his personal popularity.

I then of course would like to also congratulate our new Leader of the Opposition. I think we have got to have one on this side that can act as the spear to look at the different policies that government have to bring forward to us. Certainly yesterday I felt that he had a good start with a good speech on development of the province itself. Certainly there was a lot of meat for all of us to digest. But again before I get into what I feel are the important things in my part of the province, I would like to also congratulate the Liberals on the election of Mr. Asper as their leader. I know the man quite well and anybody that comes from Neepawa has got to be good, so I am sure that we'll hear more and more from him and the Liberals as the days go by and the campaigns ...

MR. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Where are you from Gordon?

MR. BEARD: Where all good people come from. Certainly too the Press has taken a great deal of criticism during the campaign, the heat of the campaign, and I suppose government gets a little thin-skinned at that time. I know when I sat on the government side,

(MR. BEARD, cont'd).....we always felt that if the news media didn't go along exactly with what we said we thought they were wrong, they were against us, and I believe that generally the media are willing to print it as they see it and usually they are far more neutral in their feelings than we are as politicians, because we make a statement and we feel that everybody else should agree with us and just because they don't doesn't mean that they are wrong. But I wouldn't leave this without saying to the news media that they can be wrong also.

The Throne Speech debate historically is a good place to get rid of our hang-ups and to bring down our blood pressures I suppose. It doesn't do very much for government but at least the backbenchers have a chance to speak their mind. Before we get into it, I would like to congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, in your appointment to your office. I'm sure you'll do a good job. You've made a good start and the people in this House, I'm sure, will respect you and the thoughts that go into being the referee in this House.

I respect in general the government's approach to overcoming some of our northern problems. Since my political and personal objectives are for the betterment of the north, I will be supporting the Throne Speech. The Northern Task Force has been objective in its programming, and under the able Chairmanship of our Northern Affairs Commissioner, I believe that we are going to see more and more action from the task force. I look to the day when all northern communities in fact will feel the impact of northern policies. Certainly the people of Churchill are excited over the Federal Government's decision to recognize its fiscal responsibility. Ten million dollars is not too high a price for the Provincial Government and the Federal Government to pay for the development of Port Churchill. I personally maintain that this investment will eventually pay a handsome return to both levels of government.

I just noticed a little while ago that somebody in the Conservative ranks said that it wasn't surprising that I would support Provincial Government, this Provincial Government. This is the Member for Swan River--we now know who he was. But I say that the development of Churchill is long overdue, and if the Member for Swan River recalls when his leader went up to Churchill and said "not a cent for that Port," along with the Minister for Northern Affairs, I remembered that and I wouldn't be blowing my horn too much about these things. Now that the University of Canada North has been given its blessing by the Federal Government, I am sure that Churchill's dreams now will come true.

While I have indicated that I will support the Throne Speech because of the government's recognition of the north, I do not necessarily agree to all of the northern policies nor of the timing. I am disappointed over this government's refusal to establish a department of northern affairs and northern development. I believe that it's long overdue. They have recognized the need to create a Department of Urban Affairs. Why should they lose their imagination when they turn their eyes to the north. A new department need not cost money. All we want to do is eliminate duplication and make sure that northerners become the experts on the north. Money allocated to the departments of government for northern development, along with the required personnel, should be all under one roof. There are too many mistakes, costly mistakes made with money allocated for northern use.

A department of northern affairs should have a road policy acceptable to the area. At present the Winter Roads Program is most unfair. Government have a 50-50 working basis with a transportation company to build this road each year, and this literally eliminates any competitive bids for freight tenders. Thus it allows the company to ask for excessive rates. Every community in southern Manitoba has a road connecting it with a provincial and national road system, while in the north only a few of the communities have this road connection. I believe that in southern Manitoba it seems that it is a necessity to have a road and to have it paved and to have it upgraded, and I wonder where the priorities are when we look at places that do not have roads. I think it should start with the basis of a good road system for northern Manitoba.

1971 and still no concentrated effort by government to establish a proper 24 hour communication system for northern communities. 1971 and still no health program equivalent to that in southern communities. We do not have universal Medicare in Manitoba when we look at what is going on in the north. 1971 and it can still cost up to \$1.10 a mile to leave home and still no air policy for the north. One hand of government does not seem to know what the other hand has in mind as far as development in the north. Today, government services are still far behind the needs of the people, still behind the needs of industry and businessmen.

(MR. BEARD, cont'd)... The north still suffers from long years of neglect, neglect that, granted, started before this government came to office. It will take years of pressure to gain equality.

This is not the cry of a greedy north but rather a strike against the greedy south who have always made sure of its needs before it spends money in the north. Examples of neglect are in the fields of health, welfare, education, communications, hydro and all the other services that government is responsible for. Even today the government adds a water and sewer program for every farmer but nothing in mind for the whole large communities in the north that do not have a water and sewer program. The north, with its own finances and proper guidance, will become even more productive than in the past. Today I stand convinced that northern Manitoba has returned more through taxation, etc., than it has received under government services. For the north, tomorrow is today. The north does not have to rely on yesterday's performance. Its future is both today and the many tomorrows that will come. Northern towns will continue to grow for many generations while southern towns will continue to disappear.

No one will deny that our north is where the action is. It represents our country's future but only if government has the courage to accept the fiscal responsibility. This government, Mr. Speaker, loves to talk about equality and taxation and ability to pay and the fair treatment for all, and now as we get into the Department of Finance I wish the Minister was here, but I'm sure he will get the message. Is it right to tax people on the same basis of income when the cost of living is 25 percent higher? Should the person pay the same tax on his income when his loaf of bread is 45 to 50 cents? Should the fisherman pay the same income tax when he gets the same price as the southern fisherman for his catch, while having to pay for the flying of hundreds of miles to get it to the central buying area? Should the northern industry and businessmen be called upon constantly to pay higher wages to see it snatched away by government departments of finance through unfair income tax policies as out-dated as the horse and buggy years? Unlike southern parts of the province, wages are invitingly high but the wage earner soon finds his pocket as empty as before, when he lived in the south. The province can make a major step forward by refunding northern people the 39 percent share of income tax that is refunded to the Provincial Government. This would equalize the northern dollar with the southern dollar.

This government has spoken about cancelling the five percent tax on working men's clothes and on their tools. Are they going to do it? Are they going to also cancel the five percent on teenage clothing? Both of these are important items in the north where the dollar shrinks in value when compared to the rest of Canada.

Should the reservation areas have to pay tax such as sales tax and gasoline tax, etc., when they do not share in the modern amenities of this country? The Indian and Metis people have a long way to come to approach our standard of living. No amount of assistance can be considered sufficient until the end result is achieved. We have a long road to travel before we establish equality in this province. Now that the northern curtain has been raised, we must collectively accept our responsibilities if we are to hope for unity within our province; and Mr. Speaker, I don't want you to feel as if we are never satisfied. We are happy with the assistance that we are getting but we can't be satisfied until the job is finished, and it will take some years to do but we hopefully will have somebody in this House agitating and asking for the things that are necessary in the north. And we must agree that some of these people, through their northern community councils, through Indian Brotherhood and through the Metis Federation, have spoken but I think the same song has to be sung over and over again until everything is brought about so that each person in this community of Manitoba will have the same services rather than as we have today.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gladstone.

MR. JAMES R. FERGUSON (Gladstone): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, Mr. Speaker, my congratulations won't be quite as flowery as some of the other fellows have been but they nonetheless will be just as sincere. I wish to congratulate you on your appointment. I am sure that you will be at all times fair and exercise good judgment, as you have done in the previous periods in the House. I would like also to congratulate the mover and the seconder, the Member from Logan and the Member from Gimli, for a job well done, and I would also like to say at this time, Mr. Speaker, that I don't know whether the members got it at the time, that our leader was out in conference with the leader the First Minister,

(MR. FERGUSON, cont'd).....consequently when the Member for Osborne was carrying on at great length, this was where he was. It wasn't an affront to him.

Mr. Speaker, the problems in my area are agricultural - I come from an agricultural constituency - and at this time of the year the farmers in my area are beginning to stir around a little bit and hope that this will be one of the better seasons for them. The agricultural situation is tough. We have a Federal Government that has an avowed program of putting three out of four farmers out of business. I don't think they will have to have the program. It's well on the way now and it's what will happen to the land that seems to be the big problem at the moment. We hear a lot of talk of viable units and our own Manitoba Agricultural Credit Corporation. Now when the young farmers go, I have gone with a couple to obtain loans, and the time when possibly they require \$10,000 or something like this they are forced into a much higher lending bracket, and in many cases I don't think that they have any way of ever bailing themselves out. What the answer would be to this I don't know, but I expect that this is setting up what are called viable units, and I can't see--if I was a young farmer today starting out on one of these loans I think I'd be looking for a job, not a loan that would put me in debt for the rest of my life.

Now the Speech from Throne; as I said, there's some encouraging legislation for the agricultural community. However, it does leave a lot to be desired. Manitoba, I think, has never had a better opportunity of getting out now and projecting ourselves. We have a terrific potential, I believe, in the feed grain industry. We have absolutely no salesmen handling our business for us. We have one sales agency in Canada called Ex-Can which is a combination of the three pool elevators. This organization is short of capital, operating capital, hasn't been able to get into the selling business, and I feel that possibly if some of the programs and some of the advances that have been given were given to this Canadian company that it would give quite a thrust to the selling of our grains in our grain position.

Now, I see only one clause in the Throne Speech, Mr. Speaker, that has to do with marketing and that is "increased activity in developing and strengthening new markets for agricultural produce, particularly the position of milk producers," and this, I would think, would be a very faltering step at best. The majority of the rural people aren't looking to government for hundred dollar handouts or three hundred dollar grants for sewer and water, although they are much appreciated. I think that still a program of government, of trying to establish markets for our produce, getting us back into production, would be a lot more beneficial in the long term.

I am a farmer representing a farm constituency, as I have said, and I find it awfully hard to believe at a time when we are told time and again that two thirds of the world is going to be hungry that we should be cutting back on our production. Our neighbours to the south, the American, seem to be able to move into markets, take them away from us, and at the present time they are busy on another build-up on practically all farm commodities. I feel that our greatest thrust could be in livestock. This is an area where there is the least interference from government, the supervision and handling. It is estimated that our cattle population will have to be doubled, practically, by 1980. However, the deciding factor again will have to be the market value, or market of our produce. The markets that are open to us today basically are Japan and the United States. Actually Canada today is on probably an importing basis on beef and we are not entering this field as strongly, but if we are to multiply our herds, and which we have a build-up going on now, I feel we will have to get into other markets and Japan, as I say, the United States will open up.

Now, it is interesting to note that at a recent international meeting of all the beef trade Canada never had a representation there. All our competition was there - Australia, New Zealand, Argentine, Mexico, etc., and as producers we must work for a gradual increase but I think that it should be done within the lines that were stressed by the livestock producers last spring when they approached all caucus members, that it goes up on a gradual scale, possibly a seven, ten percent, something along this line. We see what happens when a forty percent influx of hogs hit our markets and it was a disaster to say the least.

Now, that has covered a bit of the agriculture. I also believe that if we are going to establish a herd or a flock of this size in our livestock industry that we will have to have a constant, reliable supply of feed grains. We are busy in the process now of destroying some of our elevator system through movement and tearing them down and I feel that this is one area that should be looked at, that possibly these elevators should be put up for tenders

(MR. FERGUSON, cont'd).....They belong to private companies but before they are moved I think that possibly the people, in the case of Co-op Elevators, that are supposed to own equity in them, should have the opportunity of saying whether they stay where they are or having a tender on them or whatever the case may be.

In looking at the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources and his flood forecast presented yesterday, I think we are quite safe in saying that there will be no flood there this year.--(Interjection)--No, I am quite sure, Mr. Minister. The snowfall is unusually light. I realize that last year the government, put to heavy expenditure that was involved through the flood damage in Manitoba, possibly weren't in a position to do too much towards preventing this from happening again, but we now, I think, are going to have a clear year; we are not going to have the repair, the heavy expenditure that we did have, and I would hope that something will be done towards some repair, some prevention on the Whitemud watershed. I think that this should start on the east side of the Riding Mountain. I think there is a program there now whereby the province is purchasing back land along the borders of the park. I am not sure to what extent this is involved but I think that possibly this should be expanded as much as it possibly can be, as this is the major fault, I think, of a flooding - or one of the major ones.

It is also of particular concern to my constituency that our provincial roads, the maintenance on them has been cut a third and, according to the reeves and councillors, there is just no way that these roads can be kept up. In many cases the machines are being rented from the municipalities, others are government supplies, and I would hope that the Minister of Highways will once more expand to the full capacity that these highways require. I see by the Throne Speech that "a program of construction and reconstruction of Manitoba's highways is a tool for economic development and the safety of the travelling public." So possibly this situation will be rectified.

Another thing that is particularly bothering the people of the rural - as well as of the urban, I am sure - is the high cost of education and what we can do to control it. I don't feel that we are getting fair value for our dollar. I don't think there is any particular spot that you could put the finger on. I am sure that everyone is making an effort, possibly in streamlining some of the programs or possibly watching some of the capital expenditures on our schools. They seem to be a little bit more than is required. Many of them are more like palaces than they are houses of education, from what I have seen of them. I believe that--(Interjection)--Well, that is a fairly good explanation. The assumption that everyone is entitled to a free education I believe also is a noble theory, and quite justifiable, but where are we going to draw the line? Our primary and our secondary education seems to be growing but not to the extent that our university is. And I would like to quote an article here written by Tom Saunders quoting Mr. Foldemeier. It is his view that society should continue to bear the full cost of elementary and secondary education but that once the basic investment has been made, society's commitment to pay the cost of education should largely come to an end. Students today claim that higher education is a right rather than a privilege. Mr. Foldemeier's view would be that of course it is a right - but a right for which they, as the beneficiaries, must pay. The present situation he calls a classic example of a privilege without responsibility and of prolonged and unhealthy dependence. If students could borrow against their future incomes through what the Z.....panel calls an educational opportunity bank, both real and psychological dependence on adults could be appreciably reduced. Such a step would reduce costs in at least two ways. It would eliminate all but serious students, and students who did enroll would in their own interest put pressure on the administration to keep costs down. I think that this is something that in my opinion would deserve some looking at, for we have been educating a class of people who to a great degree have been leaving our province, and I think that if we are not able to receive a portion of this money back from the Federal Government that the people that are being educated should pay part of it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring another little thing up. Our premier at many times here in this House has expressed his admiration for Sweden and a Swedish Socialist dream, also the ability-to-pay principle. I believe that we have had a pretty good example of what happens with the ability-to-pay principle when it's applied for too long. Great Britain possibly is one, and an editorial in a recent Free Press, which I think I would like to read into the record too, Mr. Speaker. "The Swedish Socialist dream collapsed last week when 30,000 civil servants were locked out by government. Doctors, dentists and local

(MR. FERGUSON, cont'd).....government officials went on strike. Railways ground to a halt. Electricity and gas workers organized sudden stoppages that disrupted supplies at peak hours. Inflation is rampant, and to fight it and pay for the mounting costs of the government's "cradle to grave" services, the government has introduced a 17.65 percent sales tax on all goods and services and an extra 10 percent tax on gasoline, electric power, wines and spirits. The government has also doubled the employers' payroll tax, a device aimed at eliminating featherbedding and making companies more efficient. This in turn has infuriated the unions which demand wage increases to offset the new taxes and it has lost Mr. P.....a lot of sympathy in the business community which, until 1969, were.....of the Social Democrats. Indeed polarization has come to Sweden. The radicals within Mr. P.....party and outside it demand more equalization and more levelling down, while outside it the great mass of Swedes are fed up with taxation that kills all incentive. People retire early because it is not worthwhile to continue working, for after taxes their take-home pay is little more than retirement pay."

I would wonder, Mr. Speaker, if possibly our present government, if in power too long in Manitoba, might not be leading the people of Manitoba down the same path. Thank you.

. . . . Continued on next page . . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member from Brandon West.

MR. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West): Thank you, Mr. Deputy Speaker. I had intended in rising at this time on the sub-amendment as presented by the Honourable Member for Portage la Prairie to express to the Member from Kildonan my congratulations on his preferment as Speaker of this House, and I would through you, Mr. Deputy Speaker, if you would, convey those congratulations to him and assure him that in these deliberations I know we share his aim in the conducting of the affairs of this House in a manner that would be efficient, expedient and with dignity.

I would also like at this time to commend the members from Logan and Gimli on their having been chosen by their side to move and second the adoption of the Speech from the Throne. We might also indicate our approval of the appointments of the new party whip, the Member from Radisson, and the caucus chairman, the Member from St. George.

I would also congratulate those members of the Treasury Bench opposite who have been given additional responsibilities for this, the third session of the 29th Legislature, to assure them of our approval of these appointments, and to specifically commend the elevation of the Member from Elmwood to his portfolio and to the Minister of Mines and Resources for his additional responsibilities. I think he, in addition to having assumed the responsibility of environmental control, has now perhaps the longest title of any of the members of the bench.

Mr. Speaker, it's customary at this stage in the debate to permit members to dwell on the achievements and the problems of their own constituencies. As one member of the fourth estate described it, to examine in detail the flora and fauna of his part of Manitoba. I don't propose to do that, Mr. Speaker, but I think there are certain events and certain achievements that we should properly recognize at this time and there is one that I think we have so far not mentioned in this Assembly which is of interest and pride to every Manitoban, and I refer of course to the great distinction which has been brought to this province and to Canada by the performance of the Don Duguid rink from the Granite Club in Winnipeg who have perhaps brought greater distinction than any other single event in the past few months to our province and to Canada by winning for the second time the World Curling Championship - Don Duguid; his third, Mr. Hunter; Mr. Pettapiece second; and Brian Wood, the lead. I think these names properly should be read into the record for this great achievement and this distinction which has been brought to our province. I think we all had a sense of pride in this accomplishment.

Mr. Speaker, in the Brandon community we have two constituencies, both urban-rural in character and both with their special distinctions and one or two special problems. There has been a remarkably good relationship between the rural residents and the urban constituents in Brandon West. They have enjoyed the general and combined activities which go in a constituency in the cultural and sporting events, but there is a problem which now arises which may well put this kind of co-operative effort to a test. I refer to the problem of urban jurisdiction in its search for a greater share of the industrial tax revenue of the community, and in seeking this greater share there is a feeling in the urban jurisdiction that annexation of properties contiguous to the city boundaries would be the proper solution. This kind of solution is not, I think, at the present time popular with those municipalities who adjoin the City of Brandon and it is for this reason that we await with some concern the report of the Brandon Boundaries Commission which we are assured by the Minister of Municipal Affairs will soon be tabled. It is after consideration of this report that we will have an opportunity to express our further opinions and to make our positions known.

Mr. Speaker, there are perhaps three notable achievements which relate to the Brandon community that I would like to bring to your attention. They are not necessarily in the order of importance, but it is not too often that a single community can boast of having two Manitoba championship curling rinks. We are very proud in Brandon of the performance and the achievements of the Manitoba Ladies Curling Champions, the Brandon Curling Club rink of Mabel Mitchell, Mildred Murray, Ev Bird and June Clark, who represented the province with great distinction, after having won the Manitoba Championship, in the Canadian Championships which were held in St. John's, Newfoundland.

A second achievement and in the same vein, that of the Manitoba School Boy Curling Championships, the fine rink from the Vincent Massey High School in Brandon skipped by Murray Nye, Brian Fowler, Grant McPhail and Greg Winter. These young high school boys won the Manitoba Championship and proceeded to the Canadian Championship in Kamloops, British Columbia, and were unsuccessful in winning that event but came very close and

(MR. MCGILL cont'd.) represented our province with great distinction.

Mr. Speaker, the third event is one that I think is not so parochial in nature perhaps and is of interest to every Manitoban and certainly to every member in this Assembly. It is the first performance of the Manitoba Winter Fair held in Brandon, the first such fair to be held under Her Majesty's distinguished patronage. The Royal Manitoba Winter Fair is important because it serves in a very real way to reflect the health or otherwise of our primary industry in Manitoba - agriculture. I want to bring this to your attention, Mr. Speaker, and to the members; but particularly to the Minister of Agriculture because I understand he was prevented from attending by some plumbing problems in the constituency of Ste. Rose.

It was unfortunate that the Minister of Agriculture could not have been there because this was indeed a tremendous show. I would like the Minister to know that there were 338, approximately, horses entered in the Royal Manitoba Winter Fair, '88 heavy horses and a most impressive display of six-horse hitches. There were 11 six-horse hitches entered in the show and 10 of these were judged and performed in the main ring. Now lest it be thought that these were all welfare cases, I should tell you that one of the six-horse hitches was unable to show because it was required to do work in the Pilot Mound district as a result of a heavy snow. So heavy horses are still being used in rural Manitoba but it was indeed impressive to see this display of six-horse teams in the show ring at Brandon. Mr. Speaker, while the quiet of the early spring evening in Ste. Rose was being shattered by the roar of many toilets being figuratively flushed by the Minister of Agriculture and his colleagues on the platforms of that constituency, the main ring in the show of the Royal Winter Fair resounded to the symphony of these great heavy horse teams and the tremendous display that was put on.

Two hundred and fifty light horses were entered in this show, Mr. Speaker, and this is indicative of the growth of what the Fair president, Reg. Forbes, describes as the growing equestrian culture in Manitoba. There were 48 entries in the dressage competition, a European class and competition that has been in our part of the world and of interest for perhaps less than 10 years, but it was significant to see 48 entries in the dressage competition.

The other classes were well represented in cattle, sheep and swine, but the Minister of Agriculture would also be very interested to know that the steer classes were judged this year for the first time on a new basis - and this is perhaps a first for Manitoba and also possibly in Canada - they were judged on the combined marks on the hoof and with the carcasses dressed. The first and second selections were made on the hoof by the judges in each steer class. These animals were slaughtered and then the meat was judged for quality and the final places being established by a combined mark in quality on the hoof and quality in the dressed condition.

This year, for the second time, the Royal Manitoba Winter Fair was held in temporary circumstances and in temporary quarters but it will, hopefully, next year be held in the larger and much more spacious quarters of the new Keystone Centre which is now being developed and under construction. In the New Keystone Centre there will be adequate space for the increased exhibits which will undoubtedly come and for the great additional number of spectators who would like to see this excellent show, and we hope that next year there will be no interference which will prevent the Minister of Agriculture from attending the Royal Manitoba Winter Fair.

Mr. Speaker, the Throne Speech, as a document descriptive of the objectives of the present government in improving the lot of Manitobans, is to me a great disappointment. Much of it can be described as political chest thumping. Statements which conceivably do relate to new programs are generously interspersed with "point with pride" paragraphs that I feel could more properly be used in Manitoba tourist brochures. Nothing really new is proposed to deal on a provincial, an effective provincial basis with our problems of agricultural surpluses except to continue to press for federal intervention, and in the interim to offer token welfare payments. The generalities which the government describes as its efforts to overcome agricultural products marketing problems are remarkably similar to those which were previously put forward by this government.

It was disappointing, too, to read into the Speech from the Throne a notable lack of progress which this government has made since the last session in the promotion of programs of physical fitness in the Province of Manitoba. My colleague from Fort Garry, in the debate on the Speech from the Throne last year, brought this forcibly to the attention of the members opposite, and now we are told that what has been done is to reconstitute the Manitoba Advisory

(MR. MCGILL, cont'd).....Council on fitness and amateur sport.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, the government is missing an important point at this stage in the development of the population of our province. It would appear that there is a general interest and need for some direction from the provincial government in activities and sporting events that would provide a means of improving the physical fitness at all age levels. It is difficult to understand how the government can overlook a feeling which I feel is now quite obvious, that people are ready to accept, with some kind of direction, programs which would lead to community activities - the establishment of hiking clubs, jogging clubs, cycling, and perhaps a single man with some dedication and organizational ability in this respect could do a great deal in this province in a positive way to bring about an elevation in the general level of physical fitness.

Perhaps this is a positive thrust in which to approach the rising problem of the non-medical use of drugs in our society. I think that it is an excellent way in which to begin to attract the interest and activities of people at all ages and particularly the young, a program which could involve and use many of the existing facilities, many of those facilities which are now used by members opposite, the YMCA's, the athletic clubs that we have in our province. This, Mr. Speaker, appears to be an area in which much could be done, much could be done effectively to improve the standards of health in the Province of Manitoba.

I suggest it would not be unrealistic to offer as an incentive a premium refund to those who do not require hospital and medicare services for a full 12 months period. Rather than considering deterrent fees, let us consider what might be done in a positive way to reward those people who have achieved standards of health that reduce the expenditures required by this government.

Mr. Speaker, the government professes to be the champion of the ordinary man, the little guy. What about the little guy in business? What about the small businessman? Why is this government forgetting about this vital part of the Manitoba economy? Why is this government not only forgetting the heart of the Manitoba business economy but is actively engaged in destroying a good segment of it by its activities in the automobile insurance field? Why is there no program for incentives, no program of incentives for the small business in our community?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, would the speaker submit to a question?

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, if the Honourable Member from Brandon East would care to submit a question I should be very pleased to receive it at the conclusion of my remarks, and I would hope that he could restrain himself for the next few minutes. Now that the Minister of Industry and Commerce has identified himself and his interest in my remarks, let me direct this to his portfolio. He has made many enthusiastic statements in respect to the number of small business loans which are being applied for and the alacrity with which his department is dealing with these small loans as a means of assisting small business. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that the very fact that there are a great number of small businesses applying for loans is an indication of the general malaise which now exists in this sector of our economy and that small loans are not a cure but merely a symptom of what is now affecting this segment.

Mr. Speaker, the government now admits that it has the highest personal corporate income taxes in Canada. We were aware of it before, Manitobans were aware of it, but now since the Federal income tax has distributed its T1 short form everybody in Manitoba is now advised, everybody in Canada is now advised that Manitoba has indeed the highest income taxes that now exist.

MR. GREEN: It took you a long time to find out. We announced it; it's in the Budget.

MR. MCGILL: This is the month that every Manitoban is now acutely aware as he directs his energies to the calculations which must be made before April 30th.

The government argues that the outward migration from Manitoba is not excessive in comparison with other provinces. I suggest to you that it is a serious problem, but more serious perhaps is the effect which the publicity now given to our province in respect to income tax levels is having upon people who might be at this time considering the possibility of coming to our province. We will never fully evaluate what is happening in this area. It's undoubtedly true that many people are being deterred from any ideas which they might have had in this respect.

(MR. MCGILL, cont'd) . . .

Mr. Speaker, my concluding remarks would be devoted to an assessment of the government's notice of intent in the field of mineral exploration. We are told that our government will venture into the field of searching for viable Manitoba resources, either on its own or in partnership with other exploration companies. The First Minister has suggested in subsequent explanations that he will use as his model the Pan Arctic Oils Limited, Crown Corporation as it is described, and that presumably the activities in Manitoba will carry along in these lines. My reservations about the direction in which the government is going in this field would be somewhat alleviated by this assurance from the First Minister if in fact he means that this will be the model, because I think it would be a wise direction to go for Manitoba in its initial ventures to attract and invite the partnership of private interests, private industry with know-how and experience in the field of mineral exploration. The Federal Government has wisely kept its total interest in Pan Arctic Oils Limited I believe to 45%, leaving effective control of the operation with the private sector of the economy and relying upon the private sector for the executive officers and the main direction of the corporation. If members opposite are moving in this direction, I think there is less likelihood of serious losses being suffered by the province because it is a field in which experience and know-how will be of great value.

As has already been pointed out, the possibility of profit in this field are attractive, but the cost of the kind of exploration activity that is necessary, particularly in oil, is also one that bears considerable—one that must be regarded with considerable interest. I would hope that the Government of Manitoba would approach this kind of activity with great care. I cannot help but feel that again, and we have said this in respect to other projections of the Government of Manitoba into the economy of the province, that it is essentially the proper function of government to regulate in this field and essentially the proper function of the private sector to operate. How it is possible for the government to be at one and the same time the regulator and the operator is to me a conflict that is likely to produce most unfavourable results and to be a deterrent to the further entering into the Province of Manitoba of other countries having similar aims and objects.

Mr. Speaker, I have no further comments to make in respect to the Speech from the Throne except to summarize my reservations and my disappointments. It sounds very much to me like a document that is anxious to bring some recognition to the government of performances which it has completed in the past and is speaking of its programs for the future in a very guarded and careful way. I regret the failure to offer anything constructive in the field of provincial programs in physical fitness, to help the small businessman in his problems other than to offer him loans in his present deep problem, and to fail to in any way reduce the difficult position which our very high income taxes now place this province in the attraction of industry and its people. Thank you.

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

MR. EVANS: The last speaker expressed an interest, Mr. Speaker, in the welfare and well-being of the small businessman. Would he not agree that the establishment of an entirely new division in the Manitoba Development Corporation devoted to the making of small loans, the bulk of which or at least half of which will be made in area out of

MR. SPEAKER: Is the Minister speaking to the question or asking a question?

MR. EVANS: I'm asking a question with a preface, Mr. Speaker. Would not the previous speaker agree that the establishment of this Small Loans Division indicates a significant measure of concern of this government with the promotion of the welfare of the small businessman?

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, in reply to the question of the Honourable Member from Brandon East, I would say that the setting up of a Small Loans Division for small businesses in Manitoba indicates that we're really in trouble.

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

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Churchill, that debate be adjourned.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, before you put the question, if there are no other speakers who are wishing to speak or who would be wanting to speak tonight, we could accept the Member for Rhineland's adjournment, but it would mean, I think, that we would

(MR. GREEN, cont'd).....have exhausted the Order Paper, so I would wonder whether there is anybody who, if they're not ready to speak now, wants to speak tonight, in which case we'd come back at 8:00 o'clock.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, there will be no speakers from our side tonight.

MR. GREEN: Well I would suggest that the question be put and we will have the evening off.

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

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture, that the House do now adjourn.

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