

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
2:30 o'clock, Tuesday, May 11, 1971

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

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

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

Before we proceed, I should like to direct the attention of the honourable members to the Gallery where there are 69 students, Grade 9 standing, of the Isaac Newton High School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Ferens, Mr. Zilkie and Mr. Nyrich. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Minister of Consumer Affairs.

Also in the gallery are 20 members of the Royal Canadian Legion, Prince Edward Branch No. 81. The members are under the direction of Mrs. Fairclough and are from my constituency of Kildonan. On behalf of all the honourable members of the Legislative Assembly, I welcome you here today.

REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debates. On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface. The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Mr. Speaker, the report that is before us has to deal with the professional associations. This is certainly not a new matter by now because we have had committees sitting on this matter for the last three or four years, and I can well recall when it was first urged by the Member for St. John's at that time when he was on this side of the House that such a study be made and, as a result, we found in latter years that bills were held up, were not proceeded with until this committee would have completed its work, and that the new legislation would then comply with whatever was brought in by the committee and adopted by this House.

The first report of such that we have was March 8, 1968, and I would like to read one paragraph of that particular report and I am stating: "The committee agreed that a study be undertaken dealing with the purpose of the Act of incorporation with respect to the public and personal protection, standards of education requirements, training, licensing, disciplining and appeal procedure; also comparison study and research on matters of monopoly provisions, fees and damages." So this is a wide range given to that particular committee, and, as far as I know, the committee is still charged with the same obligations and the report that we have before us at this time recommends that the committee be reconstituted and that it proceed further with its activity. But in the meantime, Mr. Speaker, time is going by and I feel that more progress should have been made by now. Is it because the committee is not meeting often enough or is it because of other reports that they are waiting for? Reports were submitted to the committee by Mr. O'Sullivan and I also note that the McRuer Report on the Royal Commission in Ontario inquiring into the civil rights in Ontario, parts of that report have been considered by the committee, but I feel that by now something should have come out in form so that this House could be adopting it.

The matters referred to the committee are wide in range and certainly I feel that probably we should even add some things to it, because this House most likely will be considering the matter of teachers having the right to strike. Certainly this was a decision that the Teachers Society made and most likely they will be requesting the government to act on this, and I would like to know what the committee setting up professional associations or guidelines would recommend in this case. In my opinion, professional associations should be self-disciplining, self-policing, and these are powers that should be conferred on professionals, but are we willing to give this power to the Teachers Society? And then, do they consider themselves as real professionals? Because, in my opinion, they still consider themselves as labour and union-oriented, because if they ask for the right to strike, this, in my opinion, leads me to believe that they really are not a profession. So -- well, here again, we know that the doctors and the lawyers have a fee schedule. Just the other day there was a report in the papers where the doctors are negotiating a new fee schedule, and no doubt for higher pay.

(MR. FROESE cont'd) The lawyers in this province certainly have fee schedules for certain types of work. -- (Interjection) -- "There you go, doctors and lawyers," by the Member for St. Boniface. But these are the people that are considered to be on the gravy train, that are making the top wages in this province as in other provinces. -- (Interjection)-- I'm -- if they do a good job I think they should be entitled to a good pay, but I think at the same time that there should be some way of weeding out those that do not produce and are not doing a good job, and if the teachers are going to be a profession, I think the obligation should rest on them to make sure that they also will be self-disciplining and that they will see to it that all teachers in the profession will be doing a good job or working diligently and be able to do the job they are set out to do.

So, Mr. Speaker, I feel that this committee should probably look into the matter I have just raised in connection with the professions and professionals having the right to strike. I feel that this should not be so but I would certainly like to get the committee to study this and bring in a recommendation in that connection when they make their report. Further, I certainly would like to see the matter speeded up and that something concrete be brought in at an early date.

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

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Radisson. The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM (Birtle-Russell): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, yesterday we had the Report of the Municipal Affairs Committee and today we have the Report of the Agricultural Committee, and Mr. Speaker, I must confess that some of the expressions that I expressed in this House yesterday with regard to the Municipal Affairs Committee, I must confess I have some similar views on the Report of the Agricultural Committee.

We notice, Sir, that in the Agricultural Committee they were basically given three main topics to study. The first one was the farmer-dealer relationships and company-dealer relationships which have a bearing upon the sale and the use of farm machinery and repair parts in Manitoba. The second point, the committee was instructed to hold hearings, to provide farmers, farm organizations and other interested organizations and individuals an opportunity to present their views on the recommendations of the federal Task Force on Agriculture, and finally, to provide a forum for interested organizations and individuals to present their views on the problems and the opportunities for rural adjustment and development.

Mr. Speaker, the committee held many hearings throughout the province. They are all listed. I think they had five meetings in Winnipeg and they visited various communities throughout the province and they visited in Dauphin twice. Now, Dauphin has always been recognized as one of the agricultural centers throughout the province that has a very important contribution to make to agriculture, and it may be that it was the point in the province that did warrant a second visit by this committee. However, if such was the case, I am very pleased that Dauphin had that opportunity. However, it may be for some other reason, Mr. Speaker, that they went to Dauphin on the second visit and I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the possibility could have been that the Minister of Tourism and Recreation did not fulfil his duties of adequately informing the people of the first visit by the committee and, as a result of poor attendance at that meeting, they went back a second time. I'm not too sure that those are the conditions that existed at that time or not, but it is possible, Mr. Speaker, that I'm not too far off base in that assumption.

The first thing that impressed me, Mr. Speaker, with the visit of this committee was the point that while no doubt they dealt with the farmer-dealer relationships and some of the aspects of the farm machinery and equipment business, that their report does not add anything too significant in that particular field. I can think of many aspects in that field that could have been recommended by this committee and were not. One of the foremost of these is the desirability by farmers to have many allied equipment lines on a common basis, such as hydraulic couplings and that, which would simplify and make more versatile the use of farm equipment and the interchange of farm equipment from one farm to another. I see nothing of that in the report but, be that as it may, we will have the problems of farmer-dealer and company-dealer relationships with us for many years yet as the farm machinery industry is at the present time not a healthy industry and I don't know if government intervention in that field will in any great measure improve the relationship that presently exists.

The second point, Mr. Speaker, deals with the instructions to hold hearings to provide farmers, farm organizations and other interested organizations and individuals, an opportunity

(MR. GRAHAM cont'd) to present their views on the recommendations of the federal Task Force on Agriculture. Mr. Speaker, I humbly submit that there was also a second motive in this committee at this time, and I would have to say, Sir, that it is my belief that the purpose of this committee was really simply an educational one - educational in the sense that it provided a vehicle for members of the back bench on the opposite side to ramble around the country in a vain attempt to garner some understanding of the problems of rural life. It may not be kind but it is very close to the truth.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard agricultural speeches in this Chamber from such members as the Member for Winnipeg Centre, and it is my humble opinion, Sir, that if such speeches are an indication of the agricultural knowledge of members of the opposite side, then this committee should be meeting every day in fact, if it's to be an educational committee. However, Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that education of the members of the committee was the prime interest in the structuring of this committee. It is my opinion, Sir, that the reverse was in fact the intent. It is my opinion, Sir, that the real intent was to enable the members of the back bench to present their political ideologies to the farmers of this province in a vain attempt to indoctrinate them with the philosophy of the NDP party.

However, Mr. Speaker, before you call me back to the subject matter of this, I fully intend to stay within the guidelines set out and I believe, Sir, that the provision of a forum such as was recommended to this committee just so people could listen and vent their spleen more or less, does not in essence contribute anything to the improvement of the agricultural situation here in the Province of Manitoba. When they're dealing with the recommendations of the federal Task Force, Mr. Speaker, may I quote from a newspaper article in today's paper.

A MEMBER: What paper?

MR. GRAHAM: This is from the Winnipeg Tribune and it was also in the Winnipeg Free Press, where a provincial plan, a new farm pensions plan was proposed, and this comes with the dateline from Edmonton and I would like to read in part, part of the news article where it says, "One Alberta farmer said Manitoba is dedicated to preserving the family farm mainly for political reasons. Manitoba has taken the view that the family farm, no matter how uneconomical, must be maintained. Of course, this is designed to catch votes for that province's New Democratic Party in the rural areas of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, the implication of that, I think, is far more detrimental to the agricultural situation that exists today than first glance will indicate. It has always been my belief, Sir, that the prime purpose of government is to serve the people rather than to have the people servants of the government. Mr. Speaker, those of us on this side have expressed this concern on numerous occasions but when we find this expression outside this province being expressed in other provinces, then I think it's time that we considered it more seriously. It's not just enough to hold hearings, as this committee did, throughout the province to give the farmers the opportunity, as they say, to indicate their problems, but we have the members out on a political foray trying in their best efforts to influence the farmer towards their political party - and there is nothing basically wrong with that, provided they do it on their own time, but, Mr. Speaker, there's other things that I would suggest is equally as important and that is that they listen to what the farmers want.

I would suggest, Sir, that this committee did not do that. We have recommendations of this committee which spell out fairly concisely the recommendations that the marketing of hogs produced in Manitoba through the Manitoba Hog Marketing Commission be made compulsory; that hogs shipped from other provinces for slaughter in Manitoba be channeled through the Manitoba Hog Marketing Commission; that the Manitoba Hog Marketing Commission take steps to register all hog producers in Manitoba and that procedures be established to change the Hog Marketing Commission to a Hog Marketing Board elected by the producers. Mr. Speaker, it's my humble opinion, Sir, that the expressed views of this committee are quite different from those of the hog producers of the Province of Manitoba. I represent the people of Birtle-Russell. Mr. Speaker, in my area there is a hog producers' association and to my knowledge, Sir, there is not one member of that hog producers' association that endorses the principle that is outlined in this report. They have made their expressions known that they are quite concerned with the system of marketing through the Hog Marketing Commission and the possible loss of weight through shrinkage that is inherent to the marketing of hogs in my particular area by the Hog Marketing Commission. Those growers expressed their views in no uncertain terms that they would prefer to market their hogs in a manner which would ensure they would be slaughtered the same day that they were delivered. The Hog Marketing

(MR. GRAHAM cont'd) Commission cannot give them that assurance and anyone that has any knowledge of the shipment and then the trans-shipment of livestock without adequate feed and water, knows full well the amount of loss that the farmer would incur.

The members of this committee, I think, especially the members on the other side of the House, may not be familiar with those problems; they may not even know how the Hog Marketing Commission act and they, I don't believe, are familiar with the problems that exist in areas west of Brandon where hogs consigned to the Hog Marketing Commission are shipped to Brandon, and if they can reach the packing houses in Brandon the same day, that is fine, but sometimes they are not sold there the same day and are shipped the next day to Winnipeg. The resultant loss to the producer is considerable and I do not believe that this committee considered that at all or they would not have recommended that the marketing be made compulsory through the Hog Marketing Commission.

In areas surrounding the Greater Winnipeg area, I don't believe the problem is quite the same. But the Minister has never indicated, to my knowledge at least, that there would be compensation paid to producers who, through no fault of their own, incurred additional losses by shrinkage through the actions of the Hog Marketing Board. -- (Interjection) -- They're not talking four percent. These producers are talking seven, nine and ten percent. -- (Interjection) -- Well, with the price of the hogs depressed at the present time, the amount in dollars is not as significant as it would be if the price of hogs was holding up. However, we find that the supply management concept in the production of hogs as espoused by the Hog Marketing Commission is not acceptable in the hog trade.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to refer you to the presentation, the 1971 presentation to the Prime Minister and Members of Parliament by the Canadian Federation of Agriculture, and in doing so, Mr. Speaker, I would like to also point out that the Canadian Federation of Agriculture is primarily or predominantly eastern interests, but even with eastern Canadians involved in it - and I would like to quote from page 3 of that report where it says that: "the more rigorous supply management towards which the dairy and poultry industry are moving but which hog producers are not contemplating."

Mr. Speaker, compulsion in any shape or form, I suggest, is not in the best interests of the people that it is intended to serve, and I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that certain aspects of this report do not meet with the support of members of the farm industry and also with some members at least, on this side of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. J.R. (Bud) BOYCE (Winnipeg Centre): Mr. Speaker, just a few brief comments on the Agricultural Committee Report. As an urban member, I found it a very worthwhile exercise. It was a wonderful opportunity to get out into the province and be with some of the rural members. In fact I, for one, wish to thank some of the rural members for their hospitality that they showed some of us city members in their particular constituencies. I think particularly the Member for Morris and the Member of Portage la Prairie (who isn't here at the moment) went out of their way to make the -- the Member for LaVerendrye also -- (Interjection) -- Well, I'm certainly glad that I share with the Member for Lakeside that rural hospitality is something to be experienced and I'm glad that that hasn't changed. There are a few other things that I wish had changed in the rural community, but when the Member from Birtle-Russell, Mr. Chairman, accuses us of - I think his words were something like "ramble around the country trying to understand the rural problems," - well, if he's referring to this particular member of that committee I plead guilty, because that's in my view exactly what this committee was all about, that we were rambling around the province trying to understand the rural problems. And when he says that we were trying to, oh, indoctrinate people in the rural community, I think this is just a manifestation of his misunderstanding of many things, that we did enter into a dialogue with the farmers.

Perhaps heretofore committees have gone out and sat in some stoic fashion, and people came before them and presented briefs and they went their merry way and they had this feeling that, well, they did what they could, but I for one think that this is not the way to carry out a meaningful dialogue. And a couple of questions that I asked the rural farmers, as, you know, how do we get more to you than two cents in a loaf of bread? I asked them how do we get more to you out of the \$80.00 a bushel of corn brings when it is pressed into corn flakes? These are the types of things that I wanted answers to because, as an urban member, I think the day has long gone that we can look at problems in isolation. I think I mentioned during one of the meetings that we are so locked together in today's society that if somebody

(MR. BOYCE cont'd) steps on somebody's toes in the farms we get a headache in the city, and of course when you think of the rapid rate of urbanization which is another problem, this is one of the manifestations of the types of headaches that we can get.

But one of the things that I think the Member for Birtle-Russell had in mind when he said that we were trying to inculcate them with some type of political philosophy, at one of the particular meetings, Mr. Chairman, I demonstrated the corporate link-up between, oh, I think it's Brazilian Light and Power, and at the particular time I had this information I think they owned 46.7 percent of Labatt's, and this particular conglomerate owns 100 percent of Ogilvie's, and it's this particular conglomerate that was going to raise 100 pigs or sows; they were going to brood 400 pigs or something, or 500 pigs a year or piglets a year - the figures are all mixed up. But these particular figures weren't, Mr. Speaker, and I asked the farmers in the rural community if they were aware of some of the corporate link-ups and if they could sincerely believe that Brazilian Light and Power, through 46.7 percent of Labatt's, and Labatt's and the rest of the people in this conglomerate were interested in only raising a token number of brood sows in the Province of Manitoba. And the farmers, of course, haven't got access to this type of information for some reason or other. Whether the press is remiss or whether T. V. is remiss, or whether the educational system is remiss, I know not, but the farmers had no idea of this sort of link-up that any profit that's made in the Province of Manitoba, 46.7 percent of it goes to Brazil.

Now I lose track of it there, because maybe it goes around through the Swiss banks back into somebody's Manitoba pocket. But I asked the farmers if they were aware of this, and I asked the farmers, also, if it was not true that all that they were interested in was making a fair return on their investment and a reasonable return for their labour, and there was no disagreement. I didn't ask them whether they belonged to the NDP or whether they were Conservative or anything else, but there was no disagreement among the farmers that this is what they wanted. They wanted a fair return on their investment, their capital investment, and a fair return for their labour, and if systems could be devised to do this they wouldn't need subsidies, and this is what their long-range goals were: a fair return in this so-called "just society." I asked the farmers what their reaction was to a Task Force Report which said on page 9 - not on page 99 or not as a conclusion to a report - but said on page 9 in terms such as: "Of course, we're ignoring the consideration of wheat as a natural resource." Not that they had taken this as an alternative, not as if they had taken this and followed it through their whole train of research and then for various and sundry reasons came to the conclusion that they should ignore it, on page 9 they out-of-hand rejected this.

Now there's one thing that I agreed with the Member for Morris in many aspects, when he refers to "in some ways wheat being king" and the types of programs that we should evolve to take care of our wheat selling in western Canada; and, Mr. Speaker, many of the farmers agreed that a Task Force Report which out-of-hand on page 9 completely ignored a whole area of economic and political thought, wasn't worth very much.

Now, I hadn't planned on contributing to the debate today but when the Member for Birtle-Russell accused us of rambling around the country trying to understand the rural problems, I just couldn't sit in my seat, Mr. Speaker, and once again I wish to plead guilty to this charge and, if I have my way, we will have more of it, not only in agriculture but perhaps in other areas so that the people of the Province of Manitoba can get at their politicians when they're sitting down together and they have to sit down and answer the questions that are posed to them, because, once again, heretofore the systems of communications that our ancestors and even us today have relied on don't seem to be working, so that perhaps if we do ramble around the country and try and understand the problems of people, this Legislature can be a more effective instrument in truly building a just society.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, I was not a member of the committee and for that reason hadn't intended to speak on this, but I'm compelled to Mr. Speaker, because of the repeated references being made by members opposite, not only the last speaker but indeed by the First Minister and by his Minister of Agriculture more particularly, that for the first time in history a government in Manitoba is carrying on a dialogue with its farmers, and what utter patent nonsense, Mr. Speaker! My goodness, how do you think or how do you suspect such worthwhile farm health organizations as the Insurance Corporation was born, the Credit Corporation which they take so much delight in telling how well it's working was born? How do you think the Hog Marketing Commission was born? I wasn't around, but

(MR. ENNS cont'd) members here remember the part played by the late Harry Shewman and members of that entire Legislature at that time; the discussions, the decisions that were made; the antagonisms that were aroused between the various farm organizations at that time; the amount of soul-searching that went into the eventual birth of the voluntary Hog Marketing Commission; and we keep hearing this talk about "for the first time in 100 years Manitoba farmers are hearing from their government." Mr. Speaker, if you ask anybody in the public galleries today -- and there are many days they would think that's all we talk about is the farmers of Manitoba in this Legislature, and I want to assure you that there's nothing wrong with talking about the problems of the farmers of this Province of Manitoba. They are, in my judgment, by far the backbone of this province and will continue to be so. Just because, Mr. Speaker, that it was an eye-opening adventure on the part of most members of this Agricultural Committee, constituted as it is by a majority of the NDP, who find it indeed enlightening to find that there is hospitality in rural Manitoba. . . .

MR. J. WALLY MCKENZIE (Roblin): It always has been there.

MR. ENNS: It always has been there, nurtured by Progressive-Conservative and Liberal governments of the past; and I would hope that they don't change that.

So, Mr. Speaker, it's -- you know, not having the advantage of speaking with respect to the insight of having sat on the committee itself, although I suppose I could speak with as much authority as the chairman of that committee, the Social Community Development Officer who hails from The Pas who chairs the Agricultural Committee -- and attended one meeting, I believe -- and spoke on this matter, I suppose in that sense I could speak with the same kind of authority, but I only choose to rise for a few minutes, Mr. Speaker, to refute, at least before this carries on too long or too ridiculously, the suggestion that we now have government that knows and understands how to talk to farmers. That's nonsense, Mr. Speaker; the farmers of Manitoba know that's nonsense, and I think that should be underlined in this debate.

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

MR. MCKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Fort Garry, that debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for The Pas. The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West): Mr. Speaker, I have a few comments to make in connection with the report of the Standing Committee on Municipal Affairs, inspired chiefly by the contribution of the Minister of Municipal Affairs yesterday in this matter and his comments particularly on the subject matter of Bill 102, The Beverage Container Refund Act, which was just one of five bills referred to this committee for consideration and report during the interim period between sessions.

The Minister said that he agreed with my colleague from Birtle-Russell, that this was a matter in which action was necessary and he was aware now of some additional information and some action legislatively that had been taken in other provinces to control this problem, this particular part of the total litter problem in our province. He mentioned in Saskatchewan that a bill had been recently introduced and passed -- it's Bill No. 66; I don't think he referred to it by number, but containing essentially the same thrust as Bill 102 but having some additional explanations and containing the fines and so forth that would be applied to people who failed to return containers, and fines and so forth that would apply to industry where they failed to carry out their part of the program in seeing that containers are returned and either re-used or recycled.

But I found it difficult to really accept the Minister's concern for action in this connection, when it was, in fact, his amendment back in July of last year that started Bill 102 on its road to oblivion. He proposed an amendment that the bill be not now read a second time but that it be referred to the Standing Committee on Municipal Affairs and given additional consideration, which was, of course, really to assign it to whatever we use for litter in a legislature. But during the hearings that were held -- and I think the Municipal Affairs Committee met on nine different days -- there were many briefs received. I think in total 63 briefs or submissions were made to this committee on a variety of subjects, but 21 of those briefs were made on the subject matter of Bill 102. This indicated that a lot of people in the province were as concerned as we were when we introduced this legislation.

Now, of the 21 briefs, some supported the bill as it was originally constituted; others supported it in principle but suggested amendments; but the 21 briefs had this in common, that

(MR. MCGILL cont'd) they all thought that there was a serious problem and something should be done as quickly as possible. So the Standing Committee decided that it should travel about the province and receive and listen to the people, and this was done with advance advertising, and we received many comments, many requests for action. But the result and the decision taken by the committee in its final report was that no action would be taken, even though every one of the 21 briefs suggested that action should of some kind be taken; whether it be to implement the bill as it then stood or to amend it, action was needed; and the government decided that no action should be taken.

The Minister said that there was only one case in which there was a split between the Opposition and the Government and he thought this was in the matter of the Tax Deferral Act. Well, I suggest that there was also a split on the decision of committee in respect of the treatment of the subject matter of Bill 102, and that we were very much in favour of proceeding with this legislation as quickly as possible.

In retrospect, Mr. Speaker, the hearings of the committee, I am now forced to believe, were really an exercise in political posturing; that it was intended to appear to the people of Manitoba that the government was taking its government to the people and asking them to speak to the government and they would listen. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the people did speak but that the government really didn't listen to what they had to say.

These hearings outside of Winnipeg were conducted at quite a bit of expense, and I attended them. I attended all of them, because I felt that this was a real attempt to get a feeling of as many people as possible on what the government should do. I'm not so sure that the script had already perhaps been written before the meetings were held. I wasn't aware of this. I'm beginning to think that this might have happened. I know that the chairman of the committee was unable or did not attend many of the meetings - perhaps he realized that it wasn't quite as important as I thought it was. The reasons he gave for not attending perhaps could have been given by any one of the members who were part of this committee, but many of them did feel that it was important to listen to the people.

So I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that what has happened as the result of the hard work of this committee over the period between sessions, is something less than could have been expected by the people of Manitoba. This was an expensive exercise in taking government to the people to listen, and really the curious anomaly in the whole situation is that here is a government that says, "Let's listen to people. Let's hear what they have to say and we will go to them" But Mr. Speaker, when the people come to the government and say, "We want to talk to you," they lock the doors and they say, "I'm sorry, you're not in the script; we can't listen to you." Mr. Speaker, we should look into this matter pretty seriously.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Matthews.

MR. WALLY JOHANNSON (St. Matthews): Mr. Speaker, would the member submit to a question? When he was referring to the Chairman being absent from a great many meetings, was he referring to myself? I was elected the Chairman of the committee.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, I was referring to the Member from The Pas who presented the report for the committee.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Winnipeg Centre.

MR. BOYCE: Well, it seems to be my day today, Mr. Speaker. With reference to the Report of the Municipal Affairs Committee, I regret that I couldn't have been in full attendance at this particular group's meetings because I was vitally interested in it. In fact, this is one of the reasons why I went to Greece last summer and I've asked the Clerk to distribute a little sheet of paper that I have. I tried various and sundry means of communicating with my colleagues.

Now, when the Member for Brandon West refers to Bill 102, I share with him his concern about non-returnable bottles and litter and the rest of the pollution problem, but I was one of the ones, Mr. Speaker, who had suggested that perhaps this wasn't the time to use such approaches as the banning of the bottle or the raising of the deposit to some exorbitant fee, but rather we should look at the total problem, and I think this is true of the whole human environment that we live in. Whether it's litter or municipal affairs or agricultural affairs, we have to develop - here he goes again - an ecological approach to the problems facing human settlements.

But let me just address a few of my remarks to the problem of solid waste disposal of which glass is but one small portion. I, for one, am of the opinion that I think we have to work out a logistical system for the disposal of solid wastes, hazardous and toxic materials for the whole province, and I think the technology is available; I think the technicians are available;

(MR. BOYCE cont'd) and I have been suggesting to my colleagues that we should proceed in a particular direction and that we start with those things that we have realized have been a problem for a number of years - and one of them is obsolete and derelict vehicles, and I hope something can be done in the very near future with reference to this. But if we are going to solve the litter problem, I would like to use this as epitomizing a type of approach that should be used when we're solving many of the problems that we're facing today. I think that all will admit that no-one likes to see glass bottles tossed around the countryside; that they're dangerous and they're placed there primarily by people who are inconsiderate. If we take a look at our educational system, perhaps we should have some type of an inculcating process centered around our educational system which will bring the message home in a meaningful way through our younger people so that they grow up with a different attitude.

I remember when I was a young lad that I used to see signs on Main Street: "\$50.00 Fine for Spitting on the Sidewalk." It may be still there but I haven't seen one for quite some time. But why I bring that up is I think that generations of people who used to chew tobacco and spit it hazardingly about are no longer with us. Perhaps people still do spit on the sidewalk but people over the years have been inculcated with an idea that it is unsanitary, it's unsightly, and they just don't spit on the sidewalk by and large.

So I have been in conversation with the Minister of Education and I have suggested that we should give consideration to replacing the old idea of Arbour Day with a Litter Day; that, as a regular program, we should give consideration to the turning loose of students from school one day of the year so that they can clean up the litter, and in this way they'll be actively involved and from this experience perhaps they'll grow up to be more responsible as far as the environment is concerned.

Mr. Speaker, when we talk about municipal affairs I really don't know how the Department of Municipal Affairs has functioned over the years, but it seems to me, from my short time in the House, that by and large it has been an assistance office to the smaller suburban and rural municipality, and I think that, in my view, that this should be reassessed; that no longer, once again, as I said a few minutes ago when I was addressing a few remarks to the agricultural report, no longer can we look at these things in isolation and perhaps the time has come that when we talk about municipal affairs or urban affairs that we're not just talking about one part of the province vis-a-vis another - rural Manitoba versus the City of Winnipeg - and I think that this whole attitude has to change and things which will help people change this attitude should be implemented. I myself think personally of the City of Winnipeg as nothing but an urban system for the people of the province; that the people of the province have just as much right to the facilities of Winnipeg as any resident of the City of Winnipeg, and this is -- (Interjection) -- Well, I always get a charge out of the Member for Lakeside. He can sure draw them in from way out in left field. He's so far out in left field most of the time I wonder why he isn't over here.

But in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I think, as I've suggested before, that we have to develop attitudes and philosophies and programs and systems analyses that are meaningful to the people, that we can develop systems which will demonstrate in meaningful ways that Winnipeg is but a system for the total province of Manitoba.

I see in the Throne Speech that there is consideration being given to a statistical bill, that I hope that these services which will be performed by the government will be readily accessible to all people of the province, and I for one would certainly support the movement in this direction so that in regions -- I'm not advocating at this particular moment the concept of regional government but I think that the information, the services, the programs have to be put outside of the City of Winnipeg. I said a couple of years ago that in my view perhaps Winnipeg was large enough and that we should actually support programs and procedures which would encourage people to stay in the rural communities, stay in Portage and Brandon and Dauphin and Swan River, and that we should actually have some dialogue, some discussion about the rural communities which are viable, which can become urban systems for their immediate area, and that the time to start this, in my view, Mr. Speaker, is in the immediate future.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I wish to make my comments now. I'll be very brief and I see no reason to delay the report of the committee but, as one of the members of this committee, I certainly wish to take this opportunity now and say a few things.

I feel the committee did accomplish something. I feel that we made a considerable

(MR. PATRICK cont'd) amount of progress, because of some twelve items that we were given to deal with, I believe at least eight probably received unanimous support from all members, from all sides of the House on this committee, so I would agree that there has been a tremendous amount of progress made.

I really sympathize with the Honourable Member for Brandon West because of his particular interest in Bill 102, The Beverage Container Refund Act, and I would have liked to see the government take some action - I hope they will this session or the committee will get down to work and deal with it, because it is a very important item and I think the Member for Brandon should be congratulated for bringing this issue before this House last session.

The same with Bill No. 148, the Municipal Tax Deferral Act, which did not receive unanimous support, and I am at the present time not agreeing with the Minister of Municipal Affairs with his course of action. I believe that the assessment procedures on the urban fringe of Winnipeg, or parts in Manitoba such as Brandon and other areas, are out of control and it seems to me the assessors have made up their mind to ignore the productivity or the land use or the land's ability to support taxes but have assessed according to market value or to relative streets and highways, and I think this is unfortunate. Bill 148 to me, the way I understand it, in time - maybe not in the first few years but in time - would probably act more like an Expropriation Act instead of probably giving the proper relief or measure that it should to the people on the fringe areas.

Now I agree with the Minister, he can put a proviso or a condition that this be only given to a bona fide farmer or to a bona fide gardener or somebody who would have his assessment based on productivity instead of the market value; it doesn't necessarily have to be someone who's acting like a land bank or a land speculator; and I'm sure that perhaps the Minister will, and I hope that he will, reconsider his point in respect of Bill 148, because the way it was in its present form last year it was not acceptable to this side of the House and I would be the first one to say that I couldn't support it, so I know there was no agreement on 148.

On many of the other points I think there was a considerable amount of progress made and I would say at this time that the members of the committee, all members of the committee were most conscientious and were doing their work in a very proper manner, and I think a committee of the House can accomplish much more at times than either the government or any Minister on his own, because I can only go back a few years when the late Mr. Steinkopf was a chairman of one of the committees that dealt with the new Highway Traffic Act, with highway safety and corridors or safety corridors in the city, and at that time I think the Committee, the members of the Whole House, accomplished a tremendous amount of progress in the field of highway safety, in the field of driver training, in the field of crosswalk corridors in the City of Winnipeg, and since that time I could advise the members of the House that there has been an improvement made in the way of crosswalks in this city, so I feel that the committee can make a tremendous amount of progress.

The other point that I would just ask the Minister at this time: I know that the committee did report that the Minister will convene a technical committee to include experts from groups that made submission to discuss related variations, areas of applications in respect to the National Building Code, and, in my opinion, I think the National Building Code of Canada is the only existing code that the other provinces would accept and have any chance, or has any chance of universal acceptance right across Canada. It has been accepted now in the province of Ontario. I believe the province of Alberta has accepted, or if it has not accepted it's in the process of accepting it, so I would like to see either this technical committee be appointed soon, or will it be appointed to deal, not only with the National Building Code, the inspection of it, but also to deal with the Supplement No. 5, provisions dealing with the handicapped people.

Mr. Speaker, I know that the National Building Code, there will be a problem of policing it, but this is an area that perhaps the outlying municipalities would be given some powers to police it and this is an area that the Minister with his technical committee will have to deal with. But I would like to hear from the Minister: will he proceed to appoint this technical committee and what will happen?

So, Mr. Speaker, these are just a few of the points that I wanted to raise at the present time. There was one other point that I will raise that I believe was before a committee - I'm not certain - but that's to do with the Lake Pinawa Cottage Owners' Association in respect to assessment and taxation by the municipality of Lac du Bonnet - and this has been before this House for the last ten years and I believe it is a point that the Minister will have to give it serious consideration - because the cottage owners in the Lac du Bonnet municipality, not only

(MR. PATRICK cont'd) that they're assessed their usual tax or fee, they're also taxed for education tax or school tax, and I know that they have been before the House requesting assistance from almost every MLA, which is the legislation which is completely different than what it is in the Whiteshell area.

I know that the people that have cottages in the Lac du Bonnet area are only summer residents. They're there for two months or three months of the year. They do not send their children to schools in the Lac du Bonnet school division or in that area, and I think there is a real beef that these people have and I think the government must come to grips with it. If they want to assess the education tax, then this is fine, as long as they assess it for two months or four months of the year instead of the whole year. I believe there are some 350 cottage owners and, in my opinion, I believe that they do have a proper concern and a proper beef and I feel that the Minister would at least try to deal with this problem. It may not be the Minister of Municipal Affairs, it may be the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, but I think it is an area that we have to again look at and come to grips with it, to the best advantage to the government and to the cottage owners as well.

These are just a few of the points that I wanted to make at the present time and I hope that the Minister will be able to tell us re appointing of the committees to deal with the issues that have not been dealt with, what is his attitude and what will happen to Bill No. 102; is the government prepared to bring in legislation or is the Minister going to reconstitute the committee to deal with it immediately; and what will take place? I feel, Mr. Speaker, that the committee did make progress and if the Minister is prepared to reappoint the committee and to deal with the points that have not been dealt with, I think that more progress can be made.

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

MR. L. R. (Bud) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Swan River, that debate be adjourned.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Notices of Motion, Introduction of Bills; Orders of the Day. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q. C. (Leader of the Opposition)(River Heights): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the First Minister. I wonder whether he can advise the House whether he has advised the Minister of Transportation not to make his public apology as requested by the judge in Court of Queen's Bench.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The question is out of order. The Honourable Minister of Health and Social Development.

HON. RENE E. TOUPIN (Minister of Health and Social Development)(Springfield): Mr. Speaker, I took a question as notice a few weeks ago by the Honourable Member for Fort Rouge pertaining to the over-expenditure of the Department of Health and Social Development. I would like to advise the members of this House that the over-expenditure for the year 1970-71 is \$3.2 million. The amount spent in excess of originally voted funds was \$10.3 million; revenue received in excess of originally budgeted revenue was \$7.1 million; a net over-expenditure of \$3.2 million and not \$25 or \$30 million.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. GORDON W. BEARD (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, as long as they're tossing around millions of dollars, I just wondered whether the government were following any policy in respect to marine insurance, extending marine insurance in the Churchill area? I do understand now that Mr. Jamieson will not be sending his agents up.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. EDWARD SCHREYER (Premier)(Rossmere): Well, Mr. Speaker, if the Honourable Member for Churchill is recommending that the Crown in the right of the province look into the feasibility of marine insurance underwriting, I think that we would be prepared to look at it closely. Seriously, Mr. Speaker, I can advise my honourable friend that my colleague the Minister of Industry and Commerce was to arrange to discuss this very matter with the federal Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce, the Honourable Mr. Pepin. I don't know if any meeting has taken place as yet but I'll consult with my colleague and reply in more detail.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Honourable Minister of Tourism and Recreation. Is the Minister considering making grants to municipalities so they can hire students to act as recreational directors during the summer holidays?

HON. PETER BURTONIAK (Minister of Tourism, Recreation, and Cultural Affairs) (Dauphin): On that question, Mr. Speaker, I could only say that we are prepared to make grants in the usual manner, as has been in the past, to the various municipalities, as the honourable member I'm sure is well aware of, but I'm not in a position to say either yes or no to your question at the moment.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct my question to the First Minister and ask him if he has requested the assistance of either the Saskatchewan or the Alberta government, or both, in the presentation of their case before the Supreme Court on May 31st.

HON. A. H. MACKLING, Q. C. (Attorney-General)(St. James): Mr. Speaker, since my department is involved in the preparation for the appearances, I wish to advise the House that, pursuant to directions, notices have been served on all Attorneys-General and the Attorney-General for Canada, and it's my understanding that there will be representation by others than strictly the Province of Manitoba and the egg producers, but I don't believe that we are in a position to join with the other provinces inasmuch as we are in the unfortunate position of having to support the vires of our proposed legislation, and I wouldn't encourage others of the provinces to support that position because we hope that the Supreme Court will not accept the argument we advance, but rather will uphold the Court of Appeal's view that the proposed legislation is ultra vires of the province.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Education. I wonder if the Minister of Education could confirm or deny whether or not he has received a brief from and promised support to a new community school as a pilot project sponsored by Mrs. Una Decter, Professor Wayne Neilson and Mrs. Sidney Green.

HON. SAUL A. MILLER (Minister of Youth and Education)(Seven Oaks): Firstly, the names mentioned I think are incorrect. Secondly, a submission was made and a brief presented, for, as a matter of information, the matter will be taken to the City of Winnipeg School Division where it will be presented and where any action, if any, will be taken.

MR. ENNS: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, just a clarification of the last part of the question. Was any promise made by the Provincial Government for financial support?

MR. MILLER: Mr. Speaker, the Provincial Government will only work through the school division.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a further question to the Attorney-General. I would like to ask him if the Minister could confirm whether or not he has requested a stay of proceedings in the case of a corporation in which a member of the Legislature is either a shareholder or a director.

MR. MACKLING: Crown attorneys, Mr. Speaker, in this province, from time to time do enter stays of proceedings and when they do that they don't telephone me or ask my advice. Ordinarily these proceedings are taken without reference to me. I can only speak of my own personal knowledge that no request has been made to me by anyone in this House or outside of it, for me to consider the stay of proceedings against anyone in connection with any matter that my honourable friend may suggest.

MR. JORGENSEN: Could the Minister indicate whether or not such a stay of proceedings, with or without his personal signature, has been suggested?

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, it's not possible for me to know from hour to hour what decisions are being taken by my Crown Attorneys or who the alleged shareholders are, of what company, or anything else. If the honourable gentleman will make specific charges, I will endeavour to make specific inquiries to give him specific answers, but I, of my own personal knowledge, am not aware of such and I don't believe such to be the case.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. GABRIEL GIRARD (Emerson): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Youth and Education. Should the said plan to develop a community college or community school, questioned a little while ago, become a reality, will this mean that provincial

(MR. GIRARD cont'd) funds will be expended for this project other than capital expenditures?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Hypothetical question. The honourable member knows that. The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs. I believe it was on April 21st a question was asked of the Honourable Minister regarding the name of the firm or agency that was hired to promote the Auto Insurance Plan. Is the Minister prepared to name that party today?

HON. HOWARD R. PAWLEY (Minister of Municipal Affairs)(Selkirk): I indicated to the honourable member on that day that it was James Lovick and Company.

MR. McKENZIE: Would the Minister care to advise the House the amount of budget that he has allocated for the advertising program of this compulsory scheme?

MR. PAWLEY: Well, I would take that question as something which I would expect would be discussed during the estimates.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for The Pas -- Swan River, I'm sorry.

MR. JAMES H. BILTON (Swan River): I regret you confused me with The Pas, Mr. Speaker. Never let that happen. I wonder, Sir, if I may, through you, direct a question to the Minister of Health and Welfare? Will the Minister advise the House as to whether or not the \$3 million deficit that he has just announced included the \$10,000 welfare payments to strikers and non-strikers paid by the City of Flin Flon during the month of April?

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, the assistance given to people in need in Flin Flon, if it was actually allocated to welfare recipients in the month of April, are not included in the figure that I have presented to this House of \$3.2 million because the end of the fiscal year of the Department of Health and Social Development and all other departments of this provincial government ends on the 31st of March, 1971.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is to either the First Minister or the Minister of Municipal Affairs. I wonder whether he could confirm whether negotiations are taking place between the province and the Federal Government to provide interest rate rebates to house rentals, house purchases.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, the question arises out of the announcement that was in the press the last few days by the Honourable Mr. Andras in Ottawa, indicating that such a rebate system will be offered to the provinces. To this date there has been no personal communication to me from the federal Minister. Upon receiving that communication we will certainly take the proposal under serious consideration.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, I wonder whether he can indicate whether he's aware that the Province of Quebec has such an arrangement now?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs, but I should like to say the honourable gentleman is asking a question which does not pertain to this House. If the Honourable Minister wishes to answer, he may. No answer. The Honourable Member for Roblin.

MR. McKENZIE: Mr. Speaker, I have a question of the Honourable Minister on the same subject matter. I'm wondering if he could advise the House if on the loans that have been approved by Ottawa, if the Roblin housing project, low rental housing project, was included in that allocation of funds.

MR. PAWLEY: I would have to take that question as notice, Mr. Speaker.

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 First Minister. In view of the fact that the Province of Saskatchewan is again accepting tenders for North American cars or vehicles, is it the intention of this government to do likewise for this province?

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, that subject was discussed at the last meeting of prairie premiers. I'm not aware offhand that the conditions or circumstances have changed from the time at which this discussion took place and a certain policy intent was arrived at. Therefore, I'm a little surprised to hear of the information contained in the honourable member's question and therefore will have to take it as notice.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address my question to the Honourable the Minister who is Commissioner of Railways. Has the government considered, or is the

(MR. FROESE cont'd) government considering extending the railway from Gypsumville to Thompson or to the railway leading to Churchill?

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour and Railway Commissioner)(Transcona): Mr. Speaker, the Government of Manitoba is not in the railway business.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Chairman, I direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Transportation. Can he indicate to the House when he is leaving for Japan?

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

MR. BURTONIAK: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to table the Annual Report of the Department of Tourism and Recreation for the Province of Manitoba for the fiscal year 1969-70.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce. He's not in his seat; perhaps I can put this question to the First Minister. Would the First Minister confirm or deny, has the government made a loan through its agency, Manitoba Development Corporation, to Western Flyer Coach just recently?

MR. SCHREYER: I'm unable to confirm, Mr. Speaker, unable to confirm without taking it as notice first. I believe there have been some discussions.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. GIRARD: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the Honourable Minister of Youth and Education when approximately will the forms, the order forms from the Manitoba Textbook Bureau be prepared and sent out to the schools? And secondly, will those forms include the audio-visual software?

MR. MILLER: I'll have to take that question as notice.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the First Minister. I wonder whether he can now indicate when the Air Canada Policy Committee will be called in session?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I'm advised that a report is expected shortly from the Federal Government and when that is received, which I understand will be some time around mid May, then we'll be in a better position to indicate whether or not this committee will be revitalized.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

ORDERS OF THE DAY - MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

MR. SPEAKER: Orders for Return. Adjourned debate of the Honourable Member for Charleswood. The Honourable Member for Logan.

MR. WILLIAM JENKINS (Logan): Mr. Speaker, I adjourned this debate on behalf of the Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I indicated when the Honourable Member for Charleswood proposed this motion some time ago, that we were prepared to accept it but there was a caveat placed to the effect, Mr. Speaker, that some of the questions we will not have the precise answers to. We can certainly answer No. 1, the number of unemployed in Manitoba, and attempt to answer No. 2, the jobs created in the public sector since March 31st of last year. It would be rather difficult for us to give any more than an educated estimate on the item 3. Four is very difficult to answer except by estimate, and 5, the number of student summer jobs required, 1971, would only be speculative; and then the out-migration from Manitoba since March 31st, 1970, I believe that we will be able to obtain the general figures in respect of that, so if my honourable friend would agree with me, we will endeavour to give the answers to his question as fully as possible but some we may not be able to do any other than estimate.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I intend to debate this Order. I appreciate the information that the Honourable Minister has given me. I think he will agree with me today that unemployment is our number one problem. - (Interjection) -- Excuse me. The Minister of Labour does not agree that unemployment is not the number one problem. Well I believe, Mr. Speaker, that unemployment is the number one problem, and I believe that the manner in which the Minister of Labour provided, or explained the ability of the government to be able to present the information requested, is indicative of the lack of planning and the lack of meaningful information that the government has, to make realistic judgments of what they should or

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd) should not be doing.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Labour can sit there and he can interject as much as he wants and try to indicate to this side that it's the lowest unemployment rate. The reality of the situation is that I do not think that they have any basis in which they can judge what the job requirements are for the next year. It's my belief, Mr. Speaker, that they do not have any meaningful information, statistical information, in which any reasonable judgment can be made of what the requirements for job formation should be within this next fiscal year, and the Order for Return is based on the fiscal year as opposed to the calendar year, and how could a government expect to plan its future in terms of the economy and in terms of the input that government must provide, without knowing the specifics of population movement, without knowing the specifics of employment and the projections for unemployment, and the projections for job formation both in the urban and rural areas? And I mention the urban and rural areas because it's my intention, the few moments that I will be debating this, to talk about the rural areas, because in effect a great deal of the problem with respect to the formation of jobs is the fact that within the rural areas there is not sufficient job formation and, as a result, we have the depopulation that occurs in the rural areas, with the shifting to the urban areas, particularly to Greater Winnipeg, and with a situation where there is high unemployment and lack of jobs; ultimately the result - movement outside the province.

Now, we've always had a problem with out-migration from this province, but, as I've indicated before, we have never had a problem of out-migration during periods of hard times in the country, because it stands to reason the people can't find jobs in other areas because there is high unemployment. In those periods of times when the economy is moving and when jobs are available elsewhere, we can understand why people move from Manitoba to other areas if there are higher paying jobs, so that what has to be considered is, in fact, the problem of the number of jobs, the problem of the out-migration today, and the problem of attempting to try and develop a program that would be a proper program for the next fiscal year, for this coming fiscal year.

Now, the government's information will probably be meaningless, the government's information will probably be their educated estimate, but the problem is they haven't educated themselves as to how to go about making that kind of estimate, and this of course is our difficulty. The Minister of Labour is self-satisfied; we have the lowest unemployment, and he thinks that's good enough. The First Minister announces at the Standing Committee on Economic Development and in the House, "We have generated public works programs that have created jobs." And I don't have to repeat the statistics again which indicate the proportion of jobs in the public sector in this province. There would be approximately 35,000 to 50,000 who would be included in the 50 in the public sector, 35,000 to 50,000 made up of those people who are either employed by government or in the Crown corporations that government operates both federally and provincially, and approximately another 300,000 to 325,000, who in fact are employed in the private sector or are self-employed. Now, in this respect, Mr. Speaker, the proportion is approximately 90 - 10, and therefore the argument suggested that government, by its public works program, is creating sufficient jobs does not take into consideration the necessity for long-term job formation in this province, nor does it take into consideration the problems of our rural areas, nor does it take into consideration the depopulation that's occurring in the rural areas.

The Minister of Industry and Commerce is not here but it's interesting to suggest that at one time he suggested, in trying to question me, "Give me a rural development program. How do you do it?" Those are basically the words that he used. And it is exactly in this area that I want to talk for the few moments on this particular Order, because if we examine the Order and if the information is supplied in the way in which I expect, if it was accurate it would be supplied, we would find that we do not have in the areas outside of the urban area of Greater Winnipeg, sufficient development to be able to provide job opportunities for our young people in the areas where they have been brought up, in the areas where they have been educated, and in the areas they would want to live. And this means, Mr. Speaker, that the thrust of any economic development program at this particular time has to zero in, not just on economic development throughout the province generally, but on a specific program of rural development.

It was interesting for me to hear the Member from Winnipeg Centre talk about the Committee on Agriculture and his opportunity that he had to be able to talk to people and to learn and to be able to create a just society. Well, Mr. Speaker, I think there is another opportunity for the members on the opposite side to go into another committee and to start going

(MR. SPIVAK, cont'd.) through the province and to start to talk to the Regional Development Corporations and the people involved in those corporations, to start to try and determine how very real and how very serious the problem of job formation is in their areas, because all they can see is the prospect of losing people continuously because they are going to move to the urban areas in the hope of being able to find a job, and unless there are sufficient job formations in the urban areas they're going to move out of the province. And that's the prospect for our people in this province in the 1970's, and I suggest that in the year and a half of its government program, with all the rhetoric, with all the language, with all the attempt to try and suggest that they're doing so much, they have failed, they continue to fail, and they will continue to fail because of certain basic false assumptions.

Their false assumption is that the rural development, rural areas are not capable of economic development. Their false assumption is that the profit motive in itself is a bad thing and that private initiative should not be encouraged. But the reality is, Mr. Speaker, that without rural development and without the attempt to develop the jobs in the rural areas and an attempt to decentralize the kind of economic activity that is developing in this province, without the attempt to be able to balance the economic development, we are not going to succeed in creating or developing the jobs that are required for this year, for next year, for the year after, and regardless of what kind of public works programs the government are going to inject and regardless of the attempt that they make to inject — (Interjection) -- No, I'm not against, but I can suggest to the Honourable Minister Without Portfolio, I said at the time of the meeting of the Standing Committee on Economic Development that it wasn't enough; I said as well that it ignores the private sector, but I said as well that the economic theorists, who in fact are responsible for the formation of your government policy, are incorrect in believing that the cyclical period that we're going through can simply be handled by just the injection of public money and a public works program. That's not good enough, because what it ignores is the reality that in the area outside of Greater Winnipeg there is not sufficient job formation that has to occur and there has to be a determined and a real effort to utilize every possible means to ensure that that kind of development occurs, and that means striking out in new ways, in new programs and in new activities.

There are people unemployed and those people can be trained, and any program that is going to be developed is going to have to take into consideration that those people have to be trained as they were in Minnedosa in Agra-Steel and other areas, and I could go on and on and on. This is a program the government has to develop which is a full program and if there is a failure on the part of the present government, the failure is: (a) not to develop the program; and (b) not to be prepared to acknowledge that there is much more to be done and to at least start the kind of dialogue that the Member for Winnipeg Centre suggested in agriculture with respect to all those in the rural areas who are capable of offering contribution to the thinking and to assist in the helping of shaping of new programs; and, of course, the very obvious thing is that we have a vehicle in the Standing Committee on Economic Development and that vehicle should have been used. It hasn't been. And that vehicle should have been used to have given us the opportunity to have met with the Regional Development Corporations and the people who have been working as the professionals to be able to understand their problems, to be able to try and strike that balance that has to occur between development in the urban areas and in the rural areas.

If we talk about the urban area - and the Minister of Industry and Commerce is not here - but I would suggest that if we were to ask how much communication he really had with the Industrial Development Board, how much communication he really had with those groups who are interested in commercial and business activity in this province, you would find very little. Because the government is slow; the government is slow; they are confused; they do not have information, sufficient information to make the kind of judgments that have to be made, and they go on floundering from one month to the next month hoping that economic conditions will improve - and we all do - blaming the Federal Government for our situation, and also knowing that they have at least the tool of government to be able to inject, by doing that, be able to inject some money which will create in a temporary way public works programs to be able to minimize the over-all effect of unemployment.

Now, along with expenditure reform and welfare reform, the Progressive-Conservative Party considers one of the top priority items is that of rural development, and let's go over what the purposes of rural development are, the maintenance of what we consider is a necessary

(MR. SPIVAK, cont'd.) social balance between the smaller and larger communities of Manitoba. Now, we know the larger communities possess certain advantages. They include, first of all, better chances for employment, wider range of available goods and services, greater choices of certain types of recreation and especially entertainment; but smaller communities themselves possess distinct advantages, including less congestion and less pollution - and the Minister of Industry and Commerce is always concerned about pollution - better access to certain types of outdoor recreation facilities and greater opportunity for direct citizens' participation in municipal government, and once we have our uni-city plan . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I think the honourable gentleman is straying very far from this Order for Return in respect to unemployment figures. I can realize that there's some latitude necessary but certainly not all the way into recreation.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, it's my intention to present to the House a rural development program which will deal with economic development in the rural areas, which will in fact be a program that should be utilized to create jobs in Manitoba. I've indicated before that there is a problem. The problem area exists between the recognition of the requirements of a rural area and the requirements of our urban areas, and the remarks that I've made so far and I hope to continue to make, are relevant to this Order for Return. The Minister of Labour has indicated an educated estimate of what he thinks those figures will be. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that I have an educated estimate that in effect with other rural development programs you're not going to be able to develop the job formations that are required in this province in the next few years, so therefore with all due respect, Sir, I would like to continue because my remarks are relevant to the specific order.

It is my belief that citizens of this province should be able to have their own choice in the type of environment in which they want to live, and so long as there are not sufficient job opportunities in rural Manitoba, our citizens are not going to be able to live in rural Manitoba. Now, the freedom of choice between urban and rural life is based on hard, economic realities which deprive many of the citizens of our rural area from being able to live there, and had we had the opportunity for the Standing Committee to have journeyed throughout Manitoba, you would have found a lament of the people in rural Manitoba - the fact that there are not sufficient job opportunities for them to remain there, and the fact that their children are leaving, and the fact that the children are leaving the province because of this fact. So therefore we think that there should be a thorough re-examination of both the government agricultural and economic policies, many of which have artificially stimulated the urban drift of our population.

Now, the second purpose of rural development is the creation of what we would consider would be an improved economic balance between urban and rural areas, and that's basically what the Member from Winnipeg Centre said. He suggested to us that in fact there has to be a balance, and he was happy in the fact that there was some recognition by him and others, as a result of this opportunity that was given to them, to understand the necessity of development programs because he indicated, as many others have indicated in this House, that the program appears to be shifted towards the urban areas.

Now we recognize that the rural areas may not have as large a labour pool and may not have as easy access to the service industries, but it nevertheless may possess certain economic advantages. First, it has lower land costs; second, it does have less pollution and less congestion and it has easier access to natural resources, and simply more elbow room to grow. So it has some distinct advantages. Now to advance rural development on purely economic grounds, it's easy for five reasons. First, industrial decentralization is in fact the wave of the future in North America. There is a great tendency now for industrial decentralization, because the combined effects of congestion, pollution, the high costs and high taxes of the urban areas, have led to spontaneous industrial decentralization in many of the more industrialized and heavily populated areas, and since a certain degree of industrialized decentralization is inevitable anyway, we believe this tendency should be encouraged and directed as part of a comprehensive rural development policy.

Now, Mr. Speaker, Manitoba's manufacturing sector is mainly composed of relatively small firms, approximately some 1,500. We believe that specialized manufacturing by highly productive small to medium-sized firms is often ideally suited to rural location, and the problem, Mr. Speaker, is how to get them there; and how you get them there comes from a plan which spells out the details and the incentives to get them there, and the incentives are not just the kind of grants that have to be given. The incentives are the manner in which the labour pool is to be trained so that the skills available are given. It's the matter of negotiations that have

(MR. SPIVAK, cont'd.) to take place in terms of the transportation costs in getting the raw materials there and getting the finished goods to market. It's the manner in which the opportunity is given for the expansion, the development of land, the plant arrangements. All of these things come in a total package, that are required.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we I think recognize - and I think the government recognizes - that the key to Manitoba's economic future lies in exports, and the secret of exports depends entirely on our productivity and transportation, our productivity to be able to provide the lowest cost of our goods to be able to be competitive in the markets in which you are going to sell, and transportation to be able to get easy access to our markets and be able to deliver them at a cost which will allow us to be competitive so that our exports will grow. Now government has traditionally played a role in ensuring the availability of adequate transportation services and now must increase those efforts, especially in our rural areas. We have no rural transportation program that I am aware of. We have no rural program which deals in any effective way with the ability of being able to have adequate transportation with minimum cost to the growth centres and to those areas which are likely to develop and which are identified and recognized. In recent years, government has been able to assist smaller businesses and they have encouraged greater specialization and higher productivity, but those programs must be expanded and directed more to the rural areas.

The fourth reason for rural development is to ease the growth pressures of our larger urban areas, and I have to make mention of the Member from Winnipeg Centre's remarks when he indicated and he talked about the problem of the farmer with respect to his cost, to his cost of a loaf of bread. As our urban areas begin to grow and as urban costs rise, and as taxes go up as a result of the costs of trying to solve the basic problems in the urban area for urban renewal, for housing, for the additional services and transportation requirements that exist, taxes go up.

As taxes go up, the urban worker must demand more for his goods. As he demands more for his goods, the cost of the goods that he manufactures must cost more to the farmer, and the rural area must therefore pay more and their problem is that their price is controlled, their margin of profit is therefore lowered, and the pressure on them is greater. So, if we are going to be realistic about our problems in Manitoba, we should start to recognize that it is in our interest to decentralize; it's in our interest to lower costs in our urban area, because if those costs are not lowered, the increased demand that has to come from those workers who must pay higher costs as a result of the taxation that takes place, must be passed on in the price ultimately, in the finished form of the goods that are bought by the people in the rural area. So in a real effect, Mr. Speaker, it is in our interest, in this province and in Canada, it is in our interest to encourage the kind of development that will realistically recognize that the drawing together of the urban area in itself is not necessarily, which is the characteristic of our North American society today, is not in the best interests of our province, it's not in the best interests of Canada, and in the long run will cost our taxpayers more and will have the over-all effect of having the depopulation take place in our rural areas.

. . . Continued on next page

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd.)

A truly meaningful rural development policy could cost many millions of dollars, but Mr. Speaker, I listened to the figures that the honourable members opposite have spent in the last year, and we haven't dealt with them fully, and I suggest to you that in the millions that have been spent here, there and everywhere, wherever an election promise was made or not, the truth of the matter is this: that the millions of dollars should have been spent in a rural development program that would have had the effect of creating the job formations in the rural areas. It would save more money by encouraging a better distribution of economic opportunities and growth pressures throughout the province. For this reason, the rural development provides a necessary complement to agricultural policy, and out of this would create and develop the kind of jobs that are required in our rural areas.

It does so in two ways. Insofar as rural industry is economically linked to agriculture, for example, food processing or farm implement production, these are favorable, reciprocal effects between agriculture and industry right within the province. Rural industry can provide employment to many rural families and therefore stabilize rural income.

Let me suggest what I mean by rural economic development. Essentially, I see a comprehensive long-term effort to stimulate economic activity in rural areas through inter-related programs in the following areas: First, improved provisions of government services to rural areas. The principle which should be followed is that every citizen of this province should possess the right of equal access to government services. In terms of economic development, especially in relatively underdeveloped areas where the process of job formation could be more difficult, transportation and education are the most critical, but the future plans for provision of all government services should be governed by the principle of equal access.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I can relate case after case, when I was Minister of Industry and Commerce, where in fact the lack of essential government services, the lack of the kind of sophisticated services was a deterrent to the development of a specific project in rural Manitoba and of a specific project in Manitoba, and I can cite examples if I have to. I can cite examples of situations where there were changes made because ultimately, when the management team who were involved found the location of where they were going to be working, they recognized that they had difficulty in getting the kind of skills that they required in the management level to be able to handle the situation. Now, we have to recognize, therefore, that we must do something more positive than what we're doing now and that these kind of essential government services must be provided. A government truly interested in rural economic development must promote a balanced decentralization of economic activities; therefore its activities in rural areas should not be confined to providing infrastructures such as roads and schools. Government is Manitoba's largest service industry and there's plenty of scope for streamlining and decentralizing muscle-bound government activities. There is no reason why elements of the operation of Crown corporations and the administration of government departments could not, in this age of rapid communication, be more evenly distributed throughout the province.

The second program area is especially concentrated on the growth of rural industry. Rural industrial growth should be based not only on large projects such as the Uranium Enrichment Plant, which is of great significance and would be of great significance to northern Manitoba, but more importantly in the creation of strong, regional, dispersed economic industries which will give it an economic base composed of relatively small firms which have traditionally characterized Manitoba's economy. In this respect I must say that it is my belief that if we try to forecast what will take place in Manitoba, given such a policy, we must recognize that what we are still talking about is small base companies, but the small base companies can provide the job opportunities; if they're identified and tied to the resource base, they can provide opportunities for the community. And all we'd have to do is talk about Morden Canneries to recognize what we're talking about. Morden Canneries will provide 50, 60 jobs; it will keep 57 farmers supplying it. If in fact there is expansion in its market opportunities, it will expand even further.

A MEMBER: How about Winkler? How about Winkler? -- (Interjection) --

MR. SPIVAK: Hear, hear, and I could say that of a number of other private concerns, and if I want the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources - but I said both Crown corporations and private concerns.

Well, the only problem about the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources saying "Hear,

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd.) hear" is that I don't see any kind of rural development policy coming forward except the takeover of one company. Beyond that I see nothing. I understand that there's going to be an Act talking about a change in the Regional Development Corporations. I know as well that the members on the opposite side are very apprehensive because the members who make up the Regional Development Corporations are people that don't see eye to eye with them, because they're not happy to see a government continue on with a program that suggests that they are in fact concerned about the human condition and concerned about the development of an economic activity in which everyone will prosper and ignoring the reality that in their particular situation very little is happening, their people are leaving, and a job formation is not occurring. -- (Interjection) -- Did he see eye to eye with me? I would think that they probably did, yes.

A program . . . rural industrial policy must be designed, and here are the specifics of this program. First we have to discover, define and take proper advantage of the natural human and locational economic advantages of rural communities, and this must be worked out in a dialogue with the Regional Development Corporations. We have to introduce new specialized and productive technology into these communities. We have to provide an adequate level of government services; for instance, to create industrial parks in many of our rural communities and to extend technical and marketing assistance to rural communities. A resource audit covering human, physical, industrial and recreational resources should be taken in every one of Manitoba's regions. The results of such surveys should form the basis of government industrial development policy, the aims of which -- (Interjection) -- I beg your pardon? No, as a matter of fact, this is not contained in the TED Report. -- (Interjection) -- Yes, this is essentially something new. The aims of which should also be to create balanced patterns of growth throughout the province and to reinforce the natural productive advantage which many of our rural communities possess.

I would say to the Attorney-General, that if he or the Minister of Industry and Commerce or the First Minister or others would read the TED Report and would implement even what they said, that we would be far better off than we are now. And if the Attorney-General who lives in St. James would do what the Member for Winnipeg Centre did, and start to tour the province and to talk to the people who are involved in economic development and who are concerned about what's happening to their rural way of living, then you will find that what the gentlemen and the honourable members opposite have been saying for the last year and a half is true.

The third program is taxation. The burdens imposed by taxation are borne almost as heavily on the rural area as they are by the urban industry and because of this fact, some measures of a meaning and lasting tax reform is required to stimulate economic activity in both the rural and urban Manitoba. It is at this point, Mr. Speaker, that I have to discuss the intimate relationship between the two most serious problems: over-taxation today in Manitoba and underdevelopment.

Manitoba's current tax system is characterized by obsolete conceptions and excessive rates. The highest rates in Canada and they are discouraging and will continue to discourage development in this province and they are going to continue to discourage development in our rural areas. At the same time, Manitoba's economy requires immediate measures to stimulate investment, in both the urban and in the rural areas, immediate measures to increase output, immediate measures to increase productivity and immediate measures to boost exports. Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that none of these programs are happening now. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that the government is both passive and neglectful in connection with this specific priority, because this relates to the specific problem of job formation in our province. They are happy and content that the public works programs that they have introduced have had the effect of cutting down a percentage of the unemployment figures. They seem satisfied on that. But in the long term, measured with the out-migration that occurs today, they are in fact not recognizing the reality that as time goes on, as the greater number of people come into the labour force because of our educational system, and as a result of the number that will be increasing because of the increased population coming into our labour force that in effect we are not going to have enough jobs, and in effect there is going to be a depopulation occurring in this province, and in the rural areas itself.

I have advocated a switch to the value added tax in Manitoba; it's one concept. I suggest to you that taxation is a part of this. I suggest taxation is a means within which you can create the kind of economic development. Now I do not know what the Honourable Minister of Finance

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd.) will say in his budget, and I'll look forward to that. No doubt we are going to have a discussion on the problem of the economy at that time. But let me suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that the government does not have an economic development plan. The government does not have a rural development program. The government does not have any significant programs that take into consideration the real increased need for growth of exports in this province. The government does not have a transportation plan - and that's because they have no Minister of Transportation. They have a Minister of Highways, and I've said this before, they have a Minister who's a Railway Commissioner, who answers, you know, answer whatever questions have to be asked in this House but who is not in any way dealing with matters in connection with what was intended when a Minister of Transportation was established; because the Minister of Transportation was to be a minister who was to recognize, the Minister of Transportation -- (Interjection) -- I'm not repeating the same thing, the Minister of Transportation was to be a person who had a recognition of the economic facts of Manitoba and was determined to use transportation as a means to develop the economy in this province. You have a Minister of Transportation today who's nothing but a Minister of Highways; that's what he sees his function as, and as a matter of fact, the other responsibilities of air and rail had to be taken away from him because it taxed his capability.

You have a Minister of Industry and Commerce who's responsible for air matters and who in this matter as in all others, seems satisfied with the status quo and seems to think that it's not necessary to do very much other than stand up in the House when asked a question and recite some economic theory that he recited when he was lecturing in the university several years ago. And that's not good enough. Mr. Speaker, through you to the members on the opposite side, I say to you, it's not good enough because the people in rural Manitoba are angry, the people in rural Manitoba do not have any faith that there will be any kind of program that will come forward in the future. They are apprehensive about the general tone and attitude of the government with respect to the Regional Development Corporation. They are apprehensive about the continued loss, the loss of their people - it's not gloom and doom. I must tell you, it's not gloom and doom. I'll be very happy, Mr. Speaker, to hear from the members on the opposite side in the last year and a half about rural development. I want them to tell us all the things that are happening in rural development. I want them to tell us of the major industries that have occurred. I want them to tell us of the small industries that have occurred. -- (Interjection) -- Let me say this to the Attorney-General: Anything that happened in Manitoba in your administration came as a direct result of the eleven years in which the Progressive Conservative government was responsible for the economy. Let me tell you - I, for one, am not going to stand here as I have had to before, and listen to you gloating about the economic activities of which you have contributed nothing. The Minister of Industry has contributed nothing. I want to tell you that you think you can talk this way now, you get out in the rural areas and you tell them how great your program is, you tell them what you are doing to keep people, the young people in their areas, you tell them the kind of jobs that are going to be created so people can live in the place where they have been born; and after you have told them that you can shout all -- (Interjection) -- Yes, I can tell you what we did. I can tell you what I did, I can tell you what our government did and I will say to you, we are going to have an opportunity for them to judge your development . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. I wonder if the member would direct his remarks to the Chair.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I'm enjoying this too much. -- (Interjection) -- that's why I'm enjoying it. Mr. Speaker, I'll close with this one remark. The Minister of Mines and Natural Resources suggested I'm not speaking about the resolution. I'll talk about the resolution. I do not believe that the government is capable of presenting any meaningful information of what jobs are required in the next fiscal year. I don't think they know. I don't even think they know how to find out and I don't think that they have any planning in this connection. That's No. 1. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that unless there is a rural development program there will continue to be, at a time when there is unemployment in the country, out-migration from this province, because essentially there is not sufficient jobs being created in the rural areas. I'm not again denying that out-migration has not occurred; as a matter of fact, the highest out-migration has occurred when conditions have been excellent in the country; and that's understandable because there are jobs provided throughout Canada which have attracted our people, particularly those who had limited education and who found that they could get a higher pay in

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd.) other areas, because of the rate of the economy, no question, and because of the industrial mix that occurred in Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, let me tell the Minister of Labour - you know, I have listened to him for 16, 17 years - I have listened to him for a few years, he's been in the House for 16 or 17 years. I understand from the few years that I have been, that he's made the same speeches over the 16, 17 years - and there are some of those on the other side who think that I have, but let me say this to you - I'm not even interested in the Minister of Labour's opinions, because he knows nothing of what he's talking about. I want to tell you something, you know it's about time we recognized that in this area, he can stand up and pontificate all he wants. He knows nothing about the development of the economy; he knows nothing about the development of jobs and he knows nothing about the development in rural Manitoba; and if he thinks he does, let him go out and tell them about it and let him try and bluff his way there as he tries to do it here.

I am suggesting to you, Mr. Speaker, that there will not be a proper job formation developed in this province, you are not going to be able to create enough jobs for our people, you are going to continue to have out-migration unless there is a rural development policy, and I'll await with interest to see that come forward. And I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that the rural development policy will not come forward just as an economic development plan did not come forward, although it was promised, promised by many other people on the other side that we are going to present it, it will not come. Because, Mr. Speaker, the government waffles, waffles, -- (Interjection) -- No, no, it waffles, waffles between its legitimate concern for the human condition and between its apprehension of the private sector, and because it distrusts the private sector and because it continually distrusts working with those people who have the capability within the private sector to create and develop the jobs, because it waffles in this dilemma that they're in, they do not recognize that they can accomplish more good in this province by working, by talking and creating the kind of dialogue that the Member from Winnipeg Centre had suggested should be created, by creating that dialogue with those people in the rural area and the urban area that can in fact make things happen. I suggest, Mr. Speaker, and I suggest this to you, to the government, that if the time has come it is now, that the Standing Committee on Economic Development start to go through this province and to start to talk to community after community in the rural areas, to hear from them, to hear from them their position, to understand their lament and to recognize that out of this there has to be evolved something straight forward; but in the meantime I suggest that the positions and policies I have mentioned are part and parcel of a program that could be implemented now and there are programs that could be started, and I'll mention one. I'll mention the Pembilier dam.

The Pembilier dam cost several million dollars. By the time the government wakes up to the reality of the situation, the Pembilier dam will have been lost. Because what will have taken place, Mr. Speaker, is that in the United States the water will be diverted to supply the missiles in Grand Forks - in North Dakota and South Dakota at least. That's what's going to happen. I'm not getting away from the point; I'm going to relate this. By the time the government wakes up to the action that they should have been taking, they will find that the water that they were going to use for the dam, will have in fact been diverted for the missile sites in North Dakota and South Dakota. That's what's happening right now. But let's talk about the Pembilier dam -- (Interjection) -- Oh yes, it is happening now. Let's talk about the Pembilier dam. The Pembilier dam is important to one region in our province, to the southwestern region of Manitoba. It would provide opportunities not only for our farmers in terms of the products that they may grow, but I can tell you that it will provide tremendous opportunities in a food processing industry in this province, because I know from the experience that I have had and from the reports that I've looked at that in effect, given that opportunity we will be able to have the kind of food processing which will not be a little cannery in Morden but will be of the major kind which will be able to utilize the raw products produced by our farming community; but unless that takes place, the rural area in southwest Manitoba is left to what is has been in the past.

Now that's a program, that costs millions of dollars, but somebody has to start setting priorities in terms of rural development and somebody has to start spelling this out and somebody has to indicate that at least in a period of time there will be staging of certain things. At the present time the government has no policy and until they develop that kind of policy to take care of one half of the province, until they start to develop the kind of policy that will create those kind of opportunities, then there will not be sufficient job formation and we'll be

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd.) . . . asking next year and the year after for the kind of figures that will show the lack of policy, the necessity for people to leave this province because there are not sufficient job opportunities and for the continual movement from our rural areas to urban areas, if there's jobs, and if not, out of Manitoba.

MR. SPEAKER: The Minister Without Portfolio.

HON. RUSSELL DOERN (Minister Without Portfolio) (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, I want to make a few comments in regard to that lengthy discourse for the past hour by the Leader of the Official Opposition. I must say, Mr. Speaker, I find it very confusing to follow some of the logic. I thought at first, that it was a debate on an inquiry as to the number of unemployed people and the number of jobs; it turned from that into a discourse on the need for more rural economic development and wound up really in a kind of an election type of speech which my honourable friend I'm sure has given so many times before that it comes rather automatically.

I think his theories though were really quite simplistic because if one understands the intent of the Honourable Leader of the Official Opposition's comments, he really seemed to indicate, in effect, that he believed that the government policy should have as its first priority, rural development or, by implication, that the monies invested by the government and all the energies of the government should be in the rural sector and not in the urban sector. He outlined his views in this area and I think he put his finger on what I think is essential dilemma of the provincial economy and that is the difficulty of balanced growth and the problem of investment in terms of the Metropolitan Winnipeg area in particular, some of the growth centres, and some of the areas of the province which are suffering from problems of agriculture and related activities. Because, Mr. Speaker, I think that if a hard-headed businessman, whom my honourable friend presumably is, if a hard-headed businessman was attempting to decide on economic grounds alone where to make his investments, he would conclude I think very quickly, on first appearance at any rate, that he would get the greatest return for his dollar in the urban centres and that when he starts to take his investments and puts them into areas that do not have the markets, that do not have in some cases the skills, that do not have some of the amenities which attract and retain people, then although there are natural advantages to industries locating outside of larger centres, there are also all sorts of disadvantages.

The Leader of the Official Opposition pointed out lower land costs, pointed out pollution-free environments, and so on, but he didn't really tackle the problem which was how do you weigh the advantages of going outside Metropolitan Winnipeg against the disadvantages of getting outside of the markets, of the centres which often contain most of the skills and of the amenities which will allow you to attract and retain employees; particularly the kind of people that my honourable friend is most concerned with, namely the people who are at the management and professional levels. It's very difficult, Mr. Speaker, for us to train medical people, doctors and nurses and so on go out into certain areas of the province I think for that very reason. This is faced by most industries.

The other problem of course is if we don't do anything about it, if we simply allow the natural trend of Manitoba to take place, on one hand people are first of all leaving. The young people leave for the larger towns and in many cases Metropolitan Winnipeg and then we have a corresponding loss which then goes from the Metropolitan Winnipeg area to the cities of Western Canada and the Toronto and Montreal markets. So there is nothing new there, Mr. Speaker. In short, I just think that the moral of the story that was put to us this afternoon at some length was "decentralize" and I wouldn't want to argue in favour of the opposite which would be to centralize, but I would simply point out that a policy of decentralization has its costs and I think the Leader of the Official Opposition in his exuberance has ignored those costs and has failed to recognize them.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable the Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I couldn't help but be concerned to address a few remarks after having heard that very erudite and impassioned oratory on the part of the Leader of the Opposition. It forced me to divert my attention from what otherwise would be very interesting reading and listen intently to the very earnest remarks of the Honourable Leader.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that obviously these were the very well-planned words of someone who had reread his speeches in respect to the TED Report and made some slight revisions as were necessary and I would have thought, Mr. Speaker, that this was a gentleman who was advocating a very robust and vigorous dynamic that obviously was a major departure

(MR. MACKLING cont'd.) from anything that we had seen in this province before. But the fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that the honourable gentleman who spoke as Leader of the Opposition had had his opportunity in office to exercise the talents which he now suggests ought to be exercised, to manifest the dynamic growth regionally that he sponsors so enthusiastically.

But let's look at the record, Mr. Speaker. The fact of the matter is that this government has been in office approximately two years, short a couple of months, 22 months now. The fact of the matter is that the honourable gentleman who spoke was part of an administration that had been in office for an extensive period of time, my recollection is approximately 11 years. And he was the Minister of Industry and Commerce charged with the responsibility of beating the drum and registering the dynamic that was his and his opportunity from one part of this province to the other. But what was the result, Mr. Speaker? When we came into office one would have expected to find a fully fleshed and dynamic planning authority to -- (Interjection) -- There was? Well, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, one would have thought that there would have been a plan for the growth of Manitoba, a plan for growth centres in Manitoba, a plan to kindle and quicken with all the catalytic private enterprise or governmental enterprise that was available through all the expertise that the honourable gentleman must have prepared for, to quicken the dynamic of this province industrially so that the growth in this province would be a sustained one. But what did we find, Mr. Speaker? We found some empty files, some empty filing cabinets, we found a planning and priorities sub-committee of Cabinet in name only -- (Interjection) -- TED Report. Well we found the TED Report. Even the Honourable Leader of the Opposition won't accept everything that's in the TED Report. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that there was no plan available for this dynamic growth that the Leader of the Opposition says now we should do after having been in office for approximately 22 months. The fact of the matter is that they had the opportunity. One would have expected that coming into office that there would be plans, that there would be programs which a new administration could pick up, analyze and continue. But that wasn't the case. What was the case, Mr. . . . ?

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Chairman . . .

MR. MACKLING: Oh they had a program -- they left something. Many of the cabinets were empty and I suppose if there were plans for the growth of Manitoba they went out with some of the truck files that went out earlier. But the fact of the matter is that they did leave some. They left us some industrial projects. They left us The Pas -- (Interjection) -- That's right. And they left us the catalogue of industries that the MDC had been sponsoring including Simplot and others. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that although that administration, the Conservative administration, had been in office a long time, they didn't do anything for Churchill, Manitoba; they didn't do anything for that vision of the north that their federal leader used to eulogize so often, that dream was a nightmare to them obviously because they didn't produce anything of a concrete plan to assist that community, and the fact of the matter is . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I would suggest the honourable gentlemen that are interested in debating this point would wait until I recognize them. The Honourable the Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, it was only after this administration came into office that the people in that area that had been eulogized by previous Conservative spokesmen in the past, now have an opportunity to see regional development at work, because we have undertaken the responsibility to put something behind the admonitions that we have, that there ought to be reasonable regional development in Manitoba. -- (Interjection) -- Well where, where? You can hear the parrots, Mr. Speaker.

The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, there has been more growth in the City of Brandon, in 20 months -- (Interjection) -- Well you see they don't like it, Mr. Speaker, so their reaction shows the truth of what I'm saying. There has been more growth, more growth in the City of Brandon in the 20 months that we've been in office than the 20 years of former Liberal and Tory administrations. There was a whole region of Manitoba that had suffered and languished under administrations that said they cared but didn't do a thing for that area of the province, and that's fact. -- (Interjection) -- Yes, yes. Even the mayor . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I realize honourable gentlemen are getting a little steamed up but I do not have any way of curtailing the hot vapors except by the honourable gentlemen themselves. The Honourable the Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I realize the sensitivity and the nervous condition of the Leader of the Opposition in his reactions, in his reactions to — (Interjection) — Yes. In his reactions to his speech, because the falsity of his speech is shown by the fact that that administration for which he had the very important position of Minister of Industry and Commerce made a lot of drumming sounds and led a lot of parades to a lot of fancy eulogies about the province but produced nothing for the regions of Manitoba that were desperately in need of the jobs that now he admonishes this administration to furnish. And those are facts.

The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that we've had to face crisis after crisis in response to the failure of the previous administration to plan and the fact that they used crude growth techniques, jobs at any cost regardless of the ultimate social cost, and this is the response that we've had to make, a cleaning-up operation, to try and sort out all of the maze of problems that that administration left from an economic point of view in this province. That's the fact of the matter, Mr. Speaker. We are faced with a potential flooding at South Indian Lake; we're faced with a maze of — (Interjection) — That's right. A maze of contractual obligation in respect to the exploitation of timber resources in the north, and so it has been from case to case. The fact of the matter is that we have moved pragmatically, we've demonstrated a willingness to step in regionally — the Minister of Industry and Commerce isn't here, Mr. Speaker, but we heard him indicate — what about private enterprise in Morden? And the Honourable Member from Rhineland is concerned about this. Here was a cannery that was making money, functioning fine, good private enterprise. What happened to this private enterprise? Well apparently, apparently the directors, apparently the directors — (Interjection) — Maybe my honourable friend would like to make a speech, I'll sit down and . . .

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. MACKLING: He wants to ask a question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ENNS: No, I'm making a speech.

MR. MACKLING: Oh, I'm not through.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. Does the honourable gentleman wish to ask a question? The Honourable the Attorney-General has the floor, I haven't hear him yield.

MR. MACKLING: Well, Mr. Speaker, it seems that the Honourable Member from Lakeside is making good speeches from his seat and I think that they should be recorded but — (Interjection) — Well I think he makes better speeches when he's sitting, Mr. Speaker, than when he's standing. But the fact of the matter is that here was a noble private enterprise that was flourishing but it deliberately withered on the vine because the directors in some other part of Canada thought it would meet their shareholders best interests if that cannery was closed up. So the fact of the matter is this government, this government had to move to re-establish that plant and is doing so as a Crown operation. Now there is another crisis — (Interjection) — No, no, no. No, that's a crisis — (Interjection) — Pardon me?

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I wonder if the Honourable the Attorney-General would address the Chair and then he wouldn't have the interruption he's getting. The Honourable the Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, the interruptions I will ignore. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Chairman, that as a result of the consistently concerned policy of this administration to seek and to retain industry in regional areas, to seek further industry for regional areas that we have manifest a program of genuine concern to growth in other areas than Metropolitan Winnipeg.

For example, no one, no one will fault, Mr. Speaker, the dedicated concern that was manifest in trying to maintain the establishment of the fish processing in Selkirk, Manitoba. It was an untiring effort on the part of this government which didn't succeed but the fact of the matter is that as a result of our efforts we have seen regional growth, we've seen an expansion of industrial activity in the Gimli area, notwithstanding the withdrawal, notwithstanding the withdrawal of the Federal Government through its own planning from that area. We've seen wineries develop — and why did the wineries develop? The wineries developed because they're concerned that there's going to be a Crown interest in wineries and in that way we lever the private enterprise corporations to finally bestir themselves and move. So as a result we've got wineries in Gimli and we've got a winery in Morris.

The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that no matter how much the Leader of the Opposition snickers, sneers and gesticulates in interruption of what I said — and I might say, Mr. Speaker, that the interruptions that I've received, the rudeness, the absolute disinterest

(MR. MACKLING cont'd.) that's manifest by the Opposition reflects their sensitivity. I admit that I participated in a little healthy repartée with the Honourable Leader of the Opposition but it was nothing compared to the reaction that has been demonstrated on the other side of this House to my few brief remarks, and that's indicative of their sensitivity; because although they talk a great deal about what ought to be done, they had the opportunity, they didn't exercise it, they left office without any plans or programs, now they're finding new ideas, new techniques. It's like the Honourable Leader of the Opposition. I don't know why he wasn't able in his years in office to do something but he keeps saying that there's all sorts of people in boards and commissions and all over the place and these are boards and commissions that he maintained as the Minister of the government that are now redundant and should be wiped out. And let's hope, let's hope, Mr. Speaker, that he's going to come forward with particularization and specialization as to the specific boards and commission they created that are redundant today. Mr. Speaker, I rose to my feet to indicate the hollowness, the falsity and the sham of the argument that we have received this afternoon by the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise more as a result of sheer puzzlement as to what's going on in the Chamber this afternoon than anything else. Because, Mr. Speaker, and I'll address my remarks solely to you and if the others wish to listen that's fine. And I suspect that this is going to happen on other occasions in the future because I want to tell you something, Mr. Speaker. My leader is going to continue making the kind of speech that he just made. It's a speech that he has made before to some extent; it contains some damn good advice in it and the reaction is predictable, is predictable from the other side, you know, to cover up any inclination to listen, to cover up any inclination to offer an alternative program for the nothingness that is happening on that side. They do what? They've set up the St. James roadrunner to run a little bit of flak for this kind of performance, and that really puzzles me because, you know, I can understand the Minister of Industry and Commerce rising but he's not in the Chamber. All that was called for is to listen or not to listen to my Leader's speech this afternoon, you know, and proceed with the business of the House. But no, the government

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I realize there's been a lot of latitude in this debate in regards to this Order for Return but I fail to see where the honourable gentlemen is contributing to the point that we have before us. The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Well, Mr. Speaker, I want to be very correct and abide with the rules and certainly we are talking in essence of the Report, job formations, the importance of the rural development with respect to this major concern to the whole province, and I want to assure you, Mr. Speaker, that my remarks will be ever so much to the point, certainly to the point that the Attorney-General's remarks were, just past. And if I should in any way deviate from that I would certainly expect you to correct me on this particular problem that I may err into from time to time.

But I want to suggest to you the Honourable Attorney-General, the Member for St. James, suggests that the remarks made by my leader in this respect were not good value, because nothing was accomplished in the past ten years and reports are thrown around in this Chamber. The COMEF report set out the guidelines for the development of the sixties in this province, and they were to a major extent lived up to. The TED Report set out the guidelines for the development of this province in the seventies and they would have to a great extent in my judgment been carried through and lived up to by the administration that was then in power. Now if this administration chooses to ignore it, that's their prerogative, but what my leader is saying, what he is saying in his speech and what he is saying on this motion before us, is let us hear something from them as to what they are doing. And you know the Attorney-General talks about sensitivity. We have no reason to be sensitive about anything. You know we're not responsible for carrying out the industrial development of this province at this time, we are not responsible for carrying out the rural development of this province at this time. They are -- (Interjection) -- Well that's the question that I would be in error if I got into that debate, Mr. Speaker, I want to keep to the motion before us. The motion is jobs, the number of unemployment and what we should be doing about it and my leader's remarks were specific to that motion and being helpful in the role of Her Majesty's loyal opposition in providing some answers as to what should be done in this respect, what should be done. But I think, Sir, it's indicative, it's indicative of the fact that if they have to use this occasion to rear back at us

(MR. ENNS cont'd.) the way they did in response to the speech by my leader, then this can only be explained by the fact that their granary is empty of ideas and thoughts on the subject of rural development. We know for a fact that they have nothing to show for it although we are prepared to wait. We know that it doesn't happen overnight.

They speak about a plan for development or the lack of a plan that we left them. We suggest to you that there were plans, there were movements and there was action. In fact, much of the action that's taken place the last 20 months is attributable to that kind of far thinking work that was done by the past administration. All what we are worrying about is that we are not seeing that kind of thinking, that kind of action taking place, to ensure that something takes place, particularly in rural Manitoba, for the next four or five years; and I want to suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that the contribution that the Attorney-General just made to that kind of economic planning, wholly reinforces that belief that we already have on this side.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, some years ago I sat in the seat which is now occupied by the Member for Assiniboia and at that time there was an amendment to the rules put by the then Attorney-General, who sat in the same place where the Attorney-General is sitting now. The amendment was to the effect that Orders of Return would not be debated daily. We used to debate these things every day and it got to the point, and I think it was about the CFI time, that we found that much of the days were spent in debating Orders for Return and the then Attorney-General said - I'm trying to recall his words as best I can - he said that Orders for Return are really Private Members' time, it's really them making their position and therefore we should move Orders for Return to Private Members' day. They would maintain the same role of precedence that they had, in that an Order for Return after all takes precedence over every resolution, takes precedence over bills, takes precedence over all of the business, and the suggestion of the government was that we would take the Orders for Return, move them to Private Members' day, and debate them.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I hope the honourable gentleman is speaking to a point of procedure and not to the question. His remarks aren't to the question at the moment. I have no objection to him speaking to a point of procedure. The Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I believe that I am speaking directly to the Order for Return. It's true, I'm making introductory remarks, Mr. Speaker, but surely the style of the delivery of an address is not going to begin to be declared out of order in this House. I think that one of the things that makes a Chamber a worthwhile place is that you have different manners of presentation, and all I'm trying to do - and Mr. Speaker, I believe that I have some interest of members on both sides - is to introduce how we get to this debate today.

At that time, when I was on that side of the House, I said that if the rule of the Attorney-General was acceded to, we would not be having any debate on private members' resolutions. Mr. Speaker, if you want to go to Hansard, I made an absolute prediction that there would be no debate on private members' resolutions, because what would happen, since Orders for Return took precedence, is that if a person wishes to make a speech and his resolution stood away down the order paper, he could very easily take precedence by inserting an Order for Return and then regardless of whether he wanted the information or not he could make this speech. I remember the Member for Lakeside, whom all of us learned to love in this House, he said, do you say that members of the Legislature would do a thing like that? And I said, "You're damn right they'll do a thing like that." And the Member for River Heights, on two occasions -- first of all, we are now at 5 after 5, we have not debated a private member's resolution, we have not come off the first Order for Return, the first Order for Return, and the Member for River Heights told us on the previous occasion that really he filed this Order for Return, not for the purpose of getting information, but really he wanted to demonstrate that the government was really not sincere when they talked about open government, that the information that he requested was secondary, that he was using the Order for Return for the purpose, for the purpose -- (Interjection) --

MR. SPEAKER: Point of order.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Matter of privilege.

MR. SPIVAK: Well the Minister has made representation of what I had said, and also . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. That is not a matter of privilege in this House. There

(MR. SPEAKER cont'd.) is no point of privilege in that manner. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPIVAK: I believe Mr. Speaker recognized me. -- (Interjection) -- Well I'll tell the Honourable Deputy House Leader that I'll wait for the Speaker to give me his instructions. Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources made reference to an Order for Return that I filed and on a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, I have filed no such Order for Return.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

MR. GREEN: . . . the honourable member filed it. The honourable member in speaking to the Order for Return said that he was speaking to it not for the purpose of getting information, and I don't want to be hung up on words, the interpretation that I received and that he did give -- (Interjection) -- well I'm now talking about the interpretation that I received. The remarks are covered in Hansard and they're there for all to see. You needn't say whether or not you said them; people can look at them. That's right I don't have to quote Hansard, I'll say what -- the impression that you gave to me.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Would the honourable gentleman address his remarks to the Chair?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, the Member for River Heights definitely got up and anybody who can read, can read Hansard, anybody who can think will understand what it says, and he said, Mr. Speaker, and I am giving my interpretation of his remarks whether he likes it or not, he said that the purpose of his speech, the purpose of his speech, the purpose of the order, was to demonstrate not that we wanted the material but to demonstrate that really the government was not sincere about open government. He then proceeded to give what I recall to be a roughly 40-minute address, not on demanding what he asked for in the Order for Return, he fairly conceded that we shouldn't give him the information, but in conceding it, he said that this showed the non sincere position of the government with regard to open government. That was, as I understood his speech.

He got up today, and today is a little shorter, we don't have to start recalling whether or not he said these things, he got up today and he said, really the government doesn't have this information, that he knows that the government doesn't know how many people are unemployed, that he knows that we don't know how many jobs there are. And, Mr. Speaker, knowing as he says that he knows, that this information is not available or suggesting that we don't have it, he then proceeded to say that he is speaking on this Order for Return to show that we don't really have an economic development plan, and that has been the stage of the debate since then. He started off on the debate concerning an Order for Return, which he acknowledges that we don't have the information for, then proceeds to debate in favour of that Order for Return, which he acknowledges we don't have the information for, ostensibly so that if it's carried, he will get the information which we don't have. He proceeds to debate for 40 minutes on that subject and, -- (Interjection) -- Well, Mr. Speaker, he says "so what".

I am merely indicating, Mr. Speaker, that the members who are debating on these Orders for Return are not using the debate on an Order for Return for the purpose of eliciting information. Look, I'm not even criticising; I'm merely saying that it's so, I am merely saying that it is so. That the members who have debated on this Order for Return are not interested in seeking the information, know that they cannot receive the information, are using the Order for Return to debate general principles, which they have debated on numerous occasions before, and they are having a difficult time -- "so what," the honourable member says "so what". I am merely indicating, Mr. Speaker, what I think my honourable friend is doing and if he says "so what" my answer -- I didn't say it was wrong -- Mr. Speaker, why is it that my honourable friend can't hear another presentation of the position. You say "so what" and I say to all of the speeches that you have made on the same subject from the first day that you've had to sit on the opposition side, "so what" "so what"; but what is the answer to that?

I am merely indicating that the honourable member has chosen an Order for Return to repeat his speech which he has had difficulty making a point of with the government. I think that it would be difficult to make the point that he is making and I sympathize with him, and I think that if he repeated it a thousand times it would be difficult for him to make the point; because, Mr. Speaker, the fact is that the things that he is saying are first of all not true from the point of view of him putting them as a member of the Opposition, and what is more important, -- (Interjection) -- that's right "so what" -- and what is more important, is that

(MR. GREEN cont'd.) . . . you have to measure things in accordance with their credibility and their possibility of performance and the member is in the inescapable position of having to measure his now words with his actions for three years as Member of Industry and Commerce of that government.

Now let's take some of the points that he has - you know the honourable member has said we don't listen to the Regional Development Corporation, we don't listen to this, we don't listen to that; the Member for Lakeside said the people of Manitoba have to be listened to; the Member for River Heights has listened to what everybody has told him of the people that he talks about, the business community, the Regional Development Corporation, the Fish Processors, other people of special interest groups, but he will not accept the one decision that is important: the decision that was made in Ste. Rose and the decision that was made in St. Vital, less than a month ago. The honourable member waves his hands, waves his hands in a gesticulation that these people don't count and these people are not to be listened to, and, Mr. Speaker, I think that that is the difference.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. I'm sure the honourable gentlemen will all get an opportunity to get into the debate. The Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources.

MR. GREEN: The Honourable Member for River Heights waves his hands in a gesticulation that these things don't count, and I agree, I agree that the position over on that side is that really the votes of the electorate don't count. What counts are what important people say. We had an example of it when the former Minister of Industry and Commerce held that portfolio. What was his biggest public relations program? What was the big thing that he did for Manitoba development? You know what he did? He had Mr. Rothschild speaking at the Capital Theatre, that was the big thing. He had hundreds of businessmen with booklets over at the Capital Theatre attending to hear Mr. Rothschild speak, because Mr. Rothschild is a wealthy man and therefore ipso facto by the logic of the Member for River Heights, if you have Mr. Rothschild in Manitoba, some of that wealth will rub off and all of the poor people in Manitoba will be able to bask in the glory of Mr. Rothschild. That was his program.

There was a big dinner at which Mr. Rothschild and everybody else ate well. That was his program. He talked about the TED Commission report as if that was an economic development plan. First of all, he knows that it was not an economic development plan. It was "Targets for Economic Development." It was predictions as to what had to happen in certain areas in order to deal with Manitoba growth, between a period stated as a commencement and a period ending at a conclusion. What is one of the most important things in that economic development program? Because the people from TED were not entirely wrong, they were not entirely right either, but they were not entirely wrong, and they recognized that the most important area - and I don't mean this to degrade any other area - they recognized that the most important area, the most important economic area, the most important area population-wise, was the city of Winnipeg where over half the people in the Province of Manitoba live. The most important recommendation that TED made with regard to the most important economic and population area in Manitoba, which I presume would be in the member's mind No. 1 on the Hit Parade as to an economic program and a plan for Manitoba, was that Greater Winnipeg should be amalgamated and they came out clear with no equivocation, with no modification, with no qualification that there should be an amalgamation of Greater Winnipeg.

Mr. Speaker, if the honourable member really felt that TED was such a beautiful plan for the Province of Manitoba - and let's remember that this involves half of that area, over half of that area, over half of it economically, over half of it populationwise - and this was in the nature, Mr. Speaker, and I'm not using words from the report, of a prerequisite to any real development in the urban area of Manitoba. It called for the -- (Interjection) -- No, I agree, I'm not using those words -- but it called for the amalgamation of government of Greater Winnipeg. Mr. Speaker, he says after a conference. I tell you that this is what it calls for. But, when this government, which he says has no plan, when this government made as part of its plan, the reorganization of municipal government in Greater Winnipeg, something that previous governments have looked at and tried to wrestle with for years and years and years, and when we for the first time came out with a program -- which by the way is looked upon as favourable by most of the economic groups in our society, most of the groups that he says are important, that count for economic development, and they come out and comment favourably upon it -- what was the great forward thinking planning response of the Leader of

(MR. GREEN cont'd.) the Opposition? That we should appoint a commission to study whether this in fact is a good thing. That was his big response in terms of a program for economic development. But I don't blame him, Mr. Speaker, because Opposition is in a posture, and let's face it, we don't have to fool around, the objective of the Leader of the Opposition, above all objectives, No. 1 priority, not economic development plan, not taxation, not rural economy, nothing else - No. 1 objective, get rid of the government. Isn't that correct? He says only two-thirds. I say that that is his No. 1 objective. I say that I accept this as his No. 1 objective. But I say, Mr. Speaker, that then everything he says and every speech he makes and every action he takes, let us remember that it is not designed to create a favourable climate for Manitoba -- and I'm not saying that that's what it should be, because I think that it's our responsibility to do that and I accept it and I think we do it very well -- that his No. 1 objective in all the speeches that he makes, and everything that he says about an economic development plan, including his about face on what should happen in Greater Winnipeg, is predicated on the fact that if he says that this is a good program it defeats his No. 1 objective, and that is to get rid of the government; and therefore everything that he says, let us face the facts, is predicated upon first we defeat the government, then everything I said about these questions can be re-looked at - well, Mr. Speaker, you know -- (Interjection) -- Mr. Speaker, I haven't even

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I haven't even criticized it. I have said that this is the fact, that the honourable member has a duty to do that, that the honourable member wishes to do that, but that when we guide and judge his remarks let us remember that those are what his remarks are directed to, so that when he has to take a rather peculiar posture with regard to something that we know here he would have sustained because of his love of the Targets for Economic Development report, we know that he stands in a peculiar position, as many of us do from time to time, and I repeat, I'm not criticizing it, that he has to say that it's not so good, because No. 1 objective is to get rid of the government.

What is something else, Mr. Speaker, something that the honourable member spent a great deal of attention; I'll come to in a moment because he repeated, he repeated again, Mr. Speaker, that Manitoba, and he claims we have no plan, and I suggest that we do have, has the highest rate of taxation in Canada. Well, Mr. Speaker, let's really take that remark. The honourable member knows that that is not true. Mr. Speaker, is a five percent sales tax higher than a seven percent sales tax? Is a five percent sales tax higher than an eight percent sales tax? Because if it is not higher then at least the honourable member will have to agree that insofar as sales tax is concerned Manitoba has less of a sales tax than Nova Scotia; Manitoba has less of a sales tax than New Brunswick; Manitoba has less of a sales tax than the Province of Quebec. So when he is talking about the highest rate, let us deal with what he is talking about. We know that he can't be talking about sales tax and he hasn't specified, but we know that in the case of sales tax at least he is wrong, dead wrong, unequivocally wrong, he can't argue himself out of that position. He's coming to corporation and income tax. All right. So why - if that's what you were talking about, you know, if that's what you were talking about, which I will concede - why did the honourable member not get up and say, as the fact is, because we expect facts from the honourable member, except that he's going to make every speech designed on No. 1 priority, get rid of the government. He didn't get up and say, he didn't get up and say - I know he doesn't like this, he didn't get - well, Mr. Speaker, the remarks are in Hansard. The member said that Manitoba has the highest rate of taxation in Canada. He did not say, he did not say that they have the highest rate of corporate and personal income taxation, he didn't. Mr. Speaker, I was here in the House, I listened very carefully, he said the highest rate of taxation in the country. If he was talking about corporate and personal income tax, why did he not say corporate. . . ? Do you know why? Do you want to know why? You haven't told me why. I'll tell you why, Mr. Speaker. Because he knew that if he had to specify - this is his problem - he knew if he had to specify, the government might look better than he wanted it to look. If he had to specify, he had to say, well it's not the highest sales tax because they have a seven percent sales tax in Nova Scotia; they have an eight percent sales tax in Quebec, so they don't have the highest sales tax in the country. Mr. Speaker, he knew if he had to specify premium taxes, he knew if he had to specify premium taxes that he would have to say that Ontario pays roughly \$200 in Medicare premiums and Manitoba pays - no, I'm talking about strictly the doctors' part - he knows that

(MR. GREEN cont'd.) they pay roughly \$200 or in or about that figure, and that we pay \$13.20 a year, so he would have to say, and it would not make us look very bad and that's why he didn't specify, he would have to say that in Ontario the rate of premium taxes insofar as Medicare is concerned is roughly 17 times, 1700 percent of the Manitoba rate. So he didn't say, Mr. Speaker, that in terms of premium taxes that Manitoba has the highest rate, he said taxes; and he wants the people of this province to believe - and fortunately the people of the province have got more sense than the honourable member gives them credit for - he wants the people of the province to believe that there's only one type of tax, look at that one and you will see the Province of Manitoba is the highest.

I want to tell the honourable member something, I want to tell the Member for River Heights something, that if we could, if we could conceivably do it and reduce all of the other taxes to nothing, conceivably - and I'm not saying that we could do it - and have everything collected on an ability-to-pay income tax and therefore we had more taxes than the Province of Manitoba collected on the basis of ability to pay than any other province in the country, that would not make me feel bad, that would make me feel proud to be a member of this government that would be able to accomplish that type of thing. And I say that I am proud that this government uses this form of taxation to collect more revenue than any other province in this country. I am not the least bit, I am not the least bit sensitive about it. And if my honourable friend thinks that he can overcome that trump, which I call a trump and he can do what he likes with it, if he thinks he can overcome that and undo the government -- which is after all his No. 1 priority and I don't criticize that, I say if I was in his seat that would be my No. 1 -- I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that I would devise better arguments to undo the government, but it would still be my No. 1 priority, I agree; that if the Member for River Heights was sitting in these benches, that Mr. Speaker, I would consider it my patriotic duty and my No. 1 mission in life would be to throw him out. I make no criticism of that at all. And I say to you that I hope - Mr. Speaker, I don't know, we can't judge ourselves - but I hope that I would be able to formulate better arguments and I wouldn't, Mr. Speaker, at least I hope I wouldn't, I would not try to deceive, I would try to tell the truth. And I say that the honourable member does try to deceive, that when the honourable member says that the Province of Manitoba has the -- (Interjection) -- we're 28 minutes after four, Mr. Speaker . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Five.

MR. GREEN: After five. I have indicated, you know, and we're going to have rules changes tonight, I hope that what I argued for four years ago in Opposition will be accepted by all of the members of the House; that after the debate on the Rules Committee is finished and we have a recommendation, that there will be no debate when the government provides for an Order for Return, that we will not have again a Private Members' afternoon -- (Interjection) -- Oh, you don't even know about that change . . . Well, you're going to be very disappointed because it's going to hurt you, that's right. The suggested change, Mr. Speaker, is that when the government says that it will fulfill an Order, there will be no debate; there would have been no debate on this Order. Mind you, I think that would have left us in a worse position because every time the Member for River Heights gets up to debate it's points for this side of the House so I don't mind. But the fact is that I hope that for self-preservation, and I again give you political advice, let's have a sensible rule with regard to Orders for Return.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The hour being 5:30, I'll be leaving the Chair to return at 8:00 o'clock.