

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA
2:30 o'clock, Thursday, April 11, 1968

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee proceed. Before we proceed, we have several schools up in the gallery visiting us today. We have 65 students of Grade 8 standing of the Provencher School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Fouasse, Mr. McCarthy and Brother Provencher. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Member for St. Boniface. And we also have 40 students of Grade 11 standing of the Dakota College. These students are under the direction of Mr. Lohrenz, Mr. Hurlburt and Mrs. Drain. This school apparently is located in two constituencies represented by the Honourable Member for Radisson and the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. We have 35 students of Grade 11 standing of the Warren Collegiate. These students are under the direction of Mr. Johannson. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture and Highways. And we have 25 students 3 to 5 standing of the Golden Stream School. These students are under the direction of Mrs. Lewis. This school is located in the constituency of the Member for Gladstone. On behalf of Mr. Speaker, and all Members of the Legislative Assembly, I welcome you all here this afternoon.

The Minister of Industry and Commerce.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Chairman, reference has been made to the problems of Portage la Prairie and designation, and as some members are aware, but not all, I'll just refer to the fact that there was a meeting held just in the past few weeks of representatives from the Town of Portage la Prairie and representatives from the Department of Industry and Commerce, the Deputy Minister, the Director of Regional Development with the Federal Minister of Industry and his representatives, in connection with the criteria for designation and in connection with the application of that criteria. I may say that from the information that was supplied to me, it would indicate that there is some reason to believe this matter will be seriously examined by the department and in fact a change in the application of the criteria in connection with the Portage la Prairie area may take place.

There have been two developments in connection with the whole program of designation in Canada that I think must be considered both by the government and by the Federal Government. One has already been referred to by the Member from Hamiota, although I think he misunderstands its application, and this is the Ontario Equalization of Industry Opportunity Program which in fact applies a provincial government program of designation to those areas in Ontario that are not designated. The Member from Hamiota is incorrect. The majority of Ontario is not included in the designated area. The program of Ontario, and a program introduced in Quebec just in the last month, is a program to fill the gaps that exist in the federal application of the designated program and those areas that they do not include.

There is some evidence to believe that the Department of Industry and Commerce -- the Department of Industry -- the Federal Department of Industry is examining the whole program -- the whole ADA program -- the whole designated program, and that at the end of this year or the beginning of next year there will in fact be amendments to the program which will have possibly great significance in its application in our area.

I think that I have already referred to the fact that there are 52 firms in Manitoba that had received some contribution from the Area Development Agency. I think that some of the statistics may be of interest to the members and I should like to refer to them. The total amount of investment, that is not the total amount of the federal investment but the total amount of investment caused as a result or to a certain extent as a result of the assistance provided under the ADA program, is \$50,660,000, and the total number of employees in manufacturing would be represented at 1,348. Of the total amount of investment that has taken place in which there has been Federal Government assistance through the ADA program in Canada, Manitoba would have achieved, of the total amount of investment, 6.1 percent of the projects in Canada.

The Honourable Member from Hamiota referred to the Manitoba Development Fund and the Manitoba Export Corporation, and if I may, I would like to answer his question in the following way. The Manitoba Development Fund acts as a manager for the Manitoba Export Corporation. This includes the banking and accounting of any funds accruing to the Export Corporation from fees charged by the corporation or from profits made by the Corporation on its trading activities. The Manitoba Development Fund provides to the Export Corporation an export officer who is seconded full time to the Export Corporation. For these services the Export

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd)... Corporation pays \$15,000 per year to the Manitoba Development Fund. This \$15,000 is provided to the Export Corporation in the form of a grant from the department's appropriations. I believe that this has been explained in the past to the Members and this is not something that the members of this House are unaware, but of course there are some, as the honourable member from Hamiota and myself, who are sitting in this House for the first time.

The Honourable Member from Seven Oaks made reference to certain statistical errors, or what would be apparent statistical errors in a variety of documents that have been furnished by the department and various representations that have been made either by myself or other representatives of the department or government. May I say that the information is supplied from the Dominion Bureau of Statistics and the Dominion Bureau of Statistics is constantly revising its method of calculations and the items that are included and not included, and that the variations that he was concerned with and that he referred to are variations that came about as a result of the information supplied from the Dominion Bureau of Statistics and in turn was changed, and that while it may appear facetious on my part, notwithstanding the inaccuracies as they appeared in the information, all the information furnished at any given time by the department was correct.

Now reference has been made by several of the speakers to the problem of population. There was particular reference to the immigration program by the Honourable Member from Seven Oaks. I think it's important that there be a clear understanding of what is taking place not only in Manitoba but in Canada. Last year seven provinces in Canada lost population as a result of inter-provincial migration. The year before, eight provinces lost population and the year before that eight provinces lost population. Now lest there be any misunderstanding of this, let me try and explain it as simply as I can. If you disregard any gains by births over deaths, if you disregard immigration, seven provinces in Canada lost population as a result of more movement out of the provinces than into the provinces inter-provincially; and in 1966, eight; and in 1965, eight provinces as well. Three provinces last year that gained were Ontario, B.C. and Alberta, and the previous years it was Ontario and British Columbia.

Now the significance of this is to point out that we are not unique in losing population, and that any suggestion here that this is something that is peculiar to Manitoba is incorrect and any conclusion that attempts to be drawn from this is also incorrect if it is not related to the national situation. We know that we are part of a midwestern part of the North American continent and we know that the movement of populations historically in the midwest applies here as well. But the important thing for Manitoba in the year 1967 was that if you consider immigration and if you took out migration, and you considered births and you considered deaths - and I might say that in 1967 our births over deaths were almost equal to what they were in 1966 - the irrefutable fact is that Manitoba's population climbed by 9,000 which was an increase of 750 per month.

Now I may say that I was delighted to have the Honourable Member from Seven Oaks read a portion of the brief that was presented before the parliamentary committee dealing with the White Paper on immigration. I may say that I am very happy with that brief and I think that the members of the Department of Industry and Commerce who assisted in that brief deserve a great deal of credit, because there's no doubt in my mind that a number of changes that took place in the application or in the introduction of the legislation and changes coming from the White Paper are directly attributable to the work and to the contribution made in that brief.

Our main objection to the White Paper was the fact that in it, and it expressed it almost in these words, it suggested that Canada was no longer a country of land and forest to be settled by someone with a strong back or venturesome spirit. It was our feeling that we require in Manitoba at this moment in our history, with the expansion that is now taking place and with what they contemplate in expansion in the years to come, that we require people, and we require the same kind of people that were in fact the ones who settled the west and built this province.

Our other objection was the fact that in reality by the application of the skill and educational requirements, the Federal Government were asking a higher education of immigrants, a higher education from them than that of the average Canadian. We suggested that there be a national policy that would be flexible, that would take into consideration the needs of each region and the demands of each region because they would vary, and that in setting up a national policy it must be one which will be expansionistic in mind and not discriminatory, and it would

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd)...in fact substitute the adaptability and the ability of the immigrant to be able to enter into Canada and to be able to work and live rather than having education and skill simply as a criteria which we considered to be a false criteria. Certainly one of the criterias to be considered, but not the main criteria. And I'm very happy in that sense to point out that the White Paper has now been changed, that in the application of the White Paper has now been changed into regulations and legislation and that the point system now operating by the Federal Government in connection with the immigration coming into Canada takes to a large extent into consideration the recommendations that were made by the department in its brief.

Now the Honourable Member from Hamiota - and I'm sorry I do not have this in order, I thought I did - referred to the question of site locations and made particular reference to the distillery in Gimli and some suggestion or some innuendo that the government was responsible for its location or the location of any industry. Let me inform him that we provide services to industry that are interested in coming into this province and we leave the choice and selection up to them. I may say that in connection with the distillery in Gimli, which was the one that he referred to particularly, that there were fourteen specific requirements that had to be met in connection with the site location and the water provisions. And I might say that we were in competition in Manitoba, not in Gimli but in Manitoba, with another province. It's very fortunate that the government offices were that informed that we could quickly supply the information that was required and gave them the information which would indicate the potential sites where the requirements that they specified could in fact be met. Gimli was not the only one, but nevertheless the choice was theirs, and I think that we can be happy that they've come to Manitoba. Our concern was not to locate it in Gimli, our concern was to locate it in Manitoba, and we were, as I say, in competition with another province where another site was in fact located, where in fact tenders had been called for that specific location.

Reference has been made to the billboards in the "Spirit of '70" program in Winnipeg and in the country, and so there will not be any misunderstanding, I would suggest to all of you that you understand that we have received what I consider a tremendous and enthusiastic response from the people of Manitoba in the business community. They, themselves -- Manitoba's Growing to Beat '70. -- (Interjection) -- Well, I'm only aware -- that was volunteered by them. I can only tell you so that you will be aware that the majority of billboards that are being shown in this province have been volunteered by the company. But they are being offered free, as a number of other things that are being handled in this province in connection with the program which have been the volunteer efforts by business concerns who really are filled with the Spirit of '70, who really want this province to grow, and who have faith enough to believe that it will grow.

MR. MOLGAT: In spite of the government.

MR. SPIVAK: Because of the government. The Honourable Member from Hamiota and the Honourable Member from Rhineland referred to the community data sheets, and I must say that if the Honourable Member for Rhineland was not aware that these sheets were available, this is an error. Certainly the sheets are available to him and they can be obtained. These sheets constantly have to be changed because municipal officers change every year, and although there was a reference to the fact - I believe the Town of Rivers - that the sheet was outdated, I may say that I have the Town of Rivers sheet and it's as of January, 1967, but in effect they are being changed and they are changed at the beginning of the year with the new personnel that take over, or changed as a result of elections and changed in the municipal administration. But they are maintained and they are attempted to try and bring them up to date and to keep them up to date for the simple reason that they are constantly used, and we do in fact use them for enquiries that are in fact asked for of the department.

Now the Honourable Member from Rhineland referred to something and I think it is important that this matter be explained so that the committee will understand this fully. This had to do with what he suggested was a reduced cost of running the department, and I would like to if I may at this time explain the estimates so that there will be a full understanding by this House. In order to understand what has taken place in the budget in terms of the estimates of the department, you must reduce on both sides \$1 million because the \$1 million in the first item in the vote that took place last year dealt with an item which was grossed, which took into consideration in the in-plant training program the monies that were received from both the manufacturers and from the Federal Government. This does not exist today and the

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd)...amount of money on the other side is netted. So therefore in order to understand the estimates correctly of the department \$1 million must be substituted in either side. This would then show an increase in the department budget of \$590,000, and if I may I would like to explain where this is arrived at so you will have this better understanding of the estimates and in turn may ask any of the questions that you would want of it.

MR. MOLGAT: Added or subtracted?

MR. SPIVAK: No, added. -- (Interjection) -- No, no, no, added on only the one side. In order to be able to compare last year's estimate with this year's estimate, \$1 million must be taken off one side and \$1 million off the other, which would show \$2,612,000 compared to three million -- I'm sorry, excuse me. I'm in error in this. Take \$1 million off the one side which compares \$2,600,000 to \$3,203,000, which is an increase \$590,000. I'm sorry. One was grossed and one was netted. The \$590,000 is made up in the following way: Increases in cost of running the departments themselves, that is increments, etc., of \$70,000; increase because of the expansion of department programs - the two programs are the Regional Development Budget and the new contribution to the Regional Development Corporation - and that increase is \$85,000; the Immigration program of \$235,000, increased because of the cost of two commissions, the TED Commission and the Northern Transportation Commission, and that amount is \$125,000; an increase in the Information Service of \$75,000 which would make \$590,000.

Now reference was made by the Honourable Member from Rhineland to the business development vote and he referred to advertising, publicity and industrial development training, and he said it showed \$833,500. Of course the great bulk of that is industrial training, and for his information and the information of the House, in that item the budget for advertising, and that is the budget of the department of Industry and Commerce, is \$200,000.

The Honourable Member from Rhineland made reference to the Northern Transportation Commission, and I may say that we hope that the Commission will complete its hearings and will be able to report before the end of the year.

The Honourable Member from Rhineland made reference to Greb Shoes, and as I already indicated, I would suggest that he read the other paper and read the other article where the president of the company indicated that he is not withdrawing from Winnipeg.

Reference was made to the Air Canada Overhaul base and as an air center, and I think that in answer to that I may simply say, as most of the members of the House are aware, that the Federal-Provincial working party, which was struck off in the fall of this year when the Minister of Transport was present before the National Transportation Committee, has been working. There was a period of time, and understandably so, when a number of items of the Federal Government were sort of held in abeyance pending a certain event that took place last week and for that reason there has been a delay in connection with the activities, but there is every evidence to indicate that the commitment of the Minister that the working party would become involved and ride herd until the information was supplied, so that the commitments of the Prime Minister would be lived up to, is taking place.

The Honourable Member from Rhineland referred to \$31,000 for hospitality and presentations that is shown in the budget. May I indicate to him that the government does have a hospitality committee. It is set up for the purpose of considering and recommending requests to the government for banquets and similar forms of hospitality and other presentation, particularly the presentation of the Order of the Buffalo Hunt. The Committee consists of Mr. Derrick Bedson, the Clerk of the Executive Council; Mr. Prud'homme, the Deputy Provincial Secretary; Mr. Blicq, the Assistant Deputy Minister of Industry and Commerce; and Mr. Guy Moore, the Deputy Minister of Tourism and Recreation.

I'd like to read him a list of the organizations who received this sum of money of \$30,000 last year, so that he will have some idea of the type of organizations who receive it and on what basis. The Association of Canadian Travellers, Canadian Council of Christians and Jews, Boy Scouts, the 1967 Western Canadian Fencing Championship, Canadian Ethnic Press Federation, the Baptist Youth Fellowship Annual Convention, the Institute of Internal Auditors, the Royal Life Saving Society, The Canadian Ladies' Curling Championship, the Farm and Industrial Equipment Institute - and this was a national convention as far as I know, the Mid-Canada Dog Shows, the Pan American Paraplegic Games, the Canadian Women's Press Club, Kiwanis Western Canadian District, the Annual Meeting Committee of the Girl Guides of Canada, Manitoba Softball Association, Canadian Centennial Grand Masters Chess Tournament of 1967, the Canadian Bridge Federation, the Dominion Curling Association, the International Highway 281

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd)...Convention, and the Conference of International Affairs.

The Member for Rhineland - and it was sort of insinuated by the Member from Hamiota - suggested that nothing is really happening in the economic life of this province. The other night I had occasion to produce statistics which I believe indicate that there is a momentum in our economic life, that the momentum is gaining strength, and that in fact if we become optimistic and if in fact we all try to help this province, that this province will continue to grow. And because there has been reference made to this before in connection with this House, I think it would be most appropriate for me to indicate to the honourable members that I consider that the work that was done by the former Minister of Industry and Commerce who is now our Provincial Treasurer, and of the Government, have been responsible in the main for what is taking place in our economic life today. I suggest to the Honourable Member for Rhineland, and others, that if it hadn't been for the leadership, the exuberance, the direction and the initiative of the former Premier and the former Minister of Industry and Commerce and other members of the government to do the things that were necessary, to try and create the kind of climate in our business life and to be able to expand our industrial activity and to attract industrial activity, that much of this would not have occurred, and I think great credit - and I believe this most sincerely - is owing to both of them.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, in rising for the first time to take part in the consideration of the estimates for the Department of Industry and Commerce, I think first of all we should express our deep appreciation of the exuberance of the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce. I think Manitoba is rather unique in having a Minister who is so jovial, who has considered various propositions and methodology to enhance the well-being of our province and the more he has become associated with it the more he believes it himself, and I think we should not fault him for that but rather possibly fault his colleagues for not sharing in his exuberance.

My honourable friend the Minister of Industry and Commerce is wont to criticize those of us on this side of the House who now and again look at some of the gobbledygook that was handed out, and he attributes that to us because we haven't got faith in Manitoba, that we are not apparently concerned with the development of Manitoba.

Well I suppose, Mr. Chairman, a lot of this is true, because I don't see any signs on the other side of the table there as we have on this side of suggesting that Manitoba is growing to beat '70. I don't think I can see on the other side of the House any drummer boy buttons. -- (Interjection) -- I said I don't think I can see -- have you got one? You have one; that's fine. --(Interjection) -- I beg your pardon? --(Interjection) -- I think it's a proper thing to do too, because after all, why have a lone single drum beater? The Minister of Industry and Commerce apparently doesn't even wear one of his own badges.

It's a lovely day today, Mr. Chairman, and it being a lovely day I though I'd just take a tour around the parking lot, particularly the parking lot where the Ministers' cars are, and see how much they are beating the drum for Manitoba. At a conference that took place not so very long ago, at great expense, all of those of us who were privileged to be there received a beautiful briefcase filled with interesting data and material, and included in the kit were a number of "Beat the Drum for Manitoba" stickers. So as I say, Mr. Chairman, it being a lovely day, and thinking that at least the Cabinet Ministers of Manitoba should beat the drum along with the head drum beater, would have on their cars the stickers which were contained in our kit. Do you know what, Mr. Chairman? I don't think that there was one car of all of the Ministers' cars, including I believe the Minister of Industry and Commerce and the First Minister, that had a "Beat the Drum for Manitoba" sticker on it.

MR. SPIVAK: You're wrong.

MR. PAULLEY: I'm wrong? Do you have one on yours?

MR. SPIVAK: Yes, I do.

MR. PAULLEY: Well your car must have been one of those that were away. So you see I would suggest that in the process of spending some considerable amount of the taxpayers' money on propaganda for the development of Manitoba in the '70s - and certainly we require it first of all in the '60s and we are not getting it - that maybe the Ministers of the Crown should start using some of the gimmicks dreamed up and concocted by the Minister of Industry and Commerce.

It might be that he's one of these other Ministers though across the way there that doesn't have too much influence on the hierarchy or the higher echelons in government that

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd). They allow him to stand up here and tell us about all that he is doing to beat '70 without them even feeling that they have a part in beating '70. And I guess that's their privilege, Mr. Chairman, but I would suggest to my honourable friend, the Minister of Industry and Commerce, that before he chastises those on this side because we may have some constructive criticism to offer to him, that he look inside of his own house first to see what is being done in this great crusade, in the "Spirit of the '70s." Discussions in the House have disclosed of course that the spirit of the '60s has been lost on the government; maybe there is hope in the '70s; and I suggest that the Minister of Industry and Commerce should use his sweet persuasive approaches on his own first.

So much for the hokey-pokey, or whatever it is you call it, that we have been fed on many instance so far. You know, Mr. Chairman, this even rubbed off the other day to the Minister of the Treasury. I was really fascinated that the Minister of the Treasury, of all people, would be continually swallowing the line that emanates from the Department of Industry and Commerce, but of course maybe he has carried it with him from the days when he was the Minister of Industry and Commerce, because we find on Page 8 of the Address of the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer statements such as this relating to the improvement population-wise in Manitoba in 1970. My honourable friend says, "Two marked improvements were apparent in 1967. There were signs" - and the Minister of Industry almost repeated this today - "There were signs of a reduction in the rate of net interprovincial migration. That is, the number of people leaving Manitoba dropped," -- it didn't say incidentally, Mr. Chairman, by how many, but just the number of people leaving Manitoba dropped -- "while there was a sharp increase in the number of immigrants coming to Manitoba from abroad." Now what does this all mean? I suggest it doesn't mean very much. And then my honourable friend the Provincial Treasurer goes on to say, "As a result of this, our population has grown more solidly over the past year. If these favourable trends continue, we may look forward over the coming year to further improvement in population experience for the Province."

But, Mr. Chairman, what are the actual facts? My friend the Minister of Industry and Commerce tells us that there were some seven or eight thousand new immigrants coming into the province. I believe that's the figure that he used. The net gain in population, according to "Time and Tide" publication - which I believe is used by the government when it suits their purpose at least - a publication called "Trade and Commerce" printed here in Winnipeg states that the net population increase from January, 1967 to January, 1968 - the year - would be somewhere in the neighborhood of 7,600 people.

My honourable friend the Minister of Industry and Commerce sort of indicated this was wrong. I think it is too in accordance with the figures that we were presented with by the Minister of the Treasury the other day on the presentation of his budget, because the "Time and Tide" says in Manitoba we have 966,600 of a population; the Minister of the Treasury only recognized 966,000, so possibly there is. Maybe it is wrong. But it's not wrong that my honourable friend the Minister of Industry and Commerce does claim some seven or eight thousand immigrants. But within that period of the year, Mr. Chairman, according to this publication, our net natural growth population was 9,856, and if we add this to the amount of immigrants that came into Manitoba, being 8,000, we should have then had total immigration plus natural births somewhere in the neighborhood of 17 or 18 thousand increase in our population as against seven. So what does this mean? It actually means that about 10,000 Manitobans left our province in the same period of time that my honourable friends, both the Treasurer and the Minister of Industry and Commerce, said we were making headway.

Now to be fair to my friend the Minister of Industry and Commerce, he said we are not unique - we are not unique in this. Well possibly he is right, that we are not unique, that seven out of the ten provinces of Canada, if I recall what he said correctly, have this same problem. Then for goodness sakes don't brag about it. Don't clutter up all of your literature, don't clutter up the budget speech to try and bamboozle the people into thinking that we are making progress. This is what my major complaint is. Let's face up to facts; let's face up to the fact that in Manitoba, because of a lack of industrial development and resource development, that not withstanding we are having a number of immigrants come into Manitoba, we are still losing native-born Manitobans or those who have been here for awhile.

Mr. Chairman, the unfortunate part about it, the unfortunate part about our loss is the fact that invariably they are those who we have trained within our educational and vocational institutions and this is what I fault the Minister for. I'm glad that this is the land of my birth,

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd)...the province of my birth, and I do not try to belittle Manitoba, but I don't think that we're going to be able to sell Manitoba either to Manitobans or to those outside of Manitoba through the media that is being used at the present time. -- (Interjection) -- Oh, you pay taxes wherever you go. Some places more than others, I admit. Even in that province that used to be a progressive province to the west of us, I noted the other day that there was some considerable increases in taxes, particularly to the agricultural segment of the economy that people give so much lip-service to assisting. So you have to pay taxes no matter where you go.

But I say though, to the Minister, for heaven's sakes, cut out the guff in your department; let's get down to facts. Another document - another document that we got from my honourable friend the Minister of Industry and Commerce back at the beginning of the year or the end of last year is 'Investment Opportunities in Manitoba, Canada'. Heavens to Betsy, Mr. Chairman, I went back over some documents that I was pleased to receive when the Honourable Member for Lakeside was first Minister in this House, and by jiminy Christmas if these aren't almost word for word for the stuff that we got then. -- (Interjection) -- Well, it's practically the same source - the same source, I would suggest - Arthur D. Little across the line in the United States still doing the propaganda foundation for Manitoba, and we claim, or the Minister of Education claims the advancements that are being made in the field of education for Manitobans. Progress for Manitoba? Combination vegetable-canning-freezing plant, hosiery, glass containers. How, Mr. Chairman, how many times have we read about the desirability of utilizing our silica sands for glass containers in Manitoba? Now I can only go back - I can only go back around about 15 or 16 years, but I bet it was even discussed at that particular time. Carpet manufacturing, and so on - vinyl flooring - they're nice. You could pick pie out of the sky in many areas, but if you're not doing anything about it, forget about it! Give our Manitoba boys an opportunity and our Manitoba girls an opportunity to use of their skills and their talents in this field, without the likes of the Arthur D. Littles or Dalton Camps, then you'll be doing something for Manitoba.

So I say, Mr. Chairman, that I don't want to take any longer time of the committee at this time but I do want to repeat what I have said on a couple of occasions. For heaven's name, cut the malarkey and the other aspects --(Interjection) -- yes, it's awfully hard sometimes, Mr. Chairman, I'm sure as members will appreciate, to be able to hold the line descriptive-wise when one -- (Interjection) -- the hogwash, yes. I guess that is parliamentary; that can be accepted. There's another few that I have in my mind that I don't think would be acceptable and I'm sure these are what the Minister of the Treasury were referring to, and they could be well aptly applied to -- (Interjection) -- So I say to my honourable friend, yes, I agree with you that we have to sell Manitoba; it's a great province that needs to be sold. It has been sold down the river so often now, it's about time we really sold it for the people of Manitoba instead of "agin" them.

So I say cut out the malarkey and the baloney - I think that's parliamentary - sell what you are trying to do first of all to your colleagues in your Cabinet. Get all of them to put placards up around their homes and in their cars and on their lapels, but I think more basically in their hearts, and maybe your position will be enhanced and maybe some of the things you give the appearance - and I'm not suggesting only an appearance - of trying to achieve, will rub off. But unless you can sell it first of all over there, you're not going to sell it outside.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to stand up and speak after each speaker, but there's one point I think that's worthy of mention here. I really wonder who's more jovial, the Leader of the New Democratic Party or myself. But there's one point that I think is important. It happened in the past year and I think it's pretty significant in connection with the words that he's used, and that's this. We are interested in seeing that our Manitoba is developed; we are interested in seeing that our Manitobans are able to take advantage of what we consider our opportunities; and one specific example that occurred, and one very good example, happens to be the distillery that is now being built in Minnedosa. It's a Manitoba company and it came about as a result of studies that were initiated by the department, including assistance and help from that great concern who happens to be a world organization, very knowledgeable, and who in fact made a contribution to our determination of its feasibility for a Manitoba corporation, Arthur D. Little, and we now have a national company coming into Manitoba, not Manitobans, but a national company who are building at Gimli and we have Manitobans who are themselves building in Minnedosa.

MR. PAULLEY: I acknowledge the point that my honourable friend made. I don't know, but I have a sneaking suspicion that we had very many people in Manitoba who could have told the Department of Industry how to produce the product that's going to be produced at Minnedosa and also at Gimli. But I notice though, I notice one thing though in connection with each of these industries, that in order to locate here in Manitoba they had to receive concessions at the local level before they would do it. I wonder if my honourable friend has any comment in that respect.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, they did not have to receive local concessions to stay here. In one case it was a matter - well in the case of the national company, yes. In the case of the Manitoba company, it was a referendum and the people decided, because if not, they would have located in another area in Manitoba.

MR. PAULLEY: This, Mr. Chairman, if I may substantiates what I say. They're not here in an era of free enterprise that you support but at the expense of the local taxpayer in order to locate here. Now then, Mr. Chairman, may I suggest to my friend the Minister of Industry and Commerce that they're not here because of any promotion of the Department of Industry and Commerce but because of a referendum that was held at the local level.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Chairman, I may inform the Leader of the New Democratic Party that I do not think that either company would have been in Manitoba without the effort of the Department of Industry and Commerce.

MR. RUSSELL DOERN (Elmwood): Mr. Speaker, one of the key points already mentioned by the Leader of the New Democratic Party is this question of our population. Apparently Canada's average during 1967 was 2.7 percent up whereas Manitoba's, according to the articles I have, was only up a third of one percent, which by comparison is only one-ninth of the national average from 963,000 to 966,000.

One of the important questions of course is who is leaving and who is coming in. I think the important point here is that the Minister seems to believe that we need to, in effect, populate the prairies and populate Manitoba with the same kind of people who did so in the turn of the century immigrations and in the immigration period after World War 1, but I beg to differ with him. He is attempting to convince the Federal Government, and was no doubt a force in encouraging the Minister of Immigration to revise and loosen their qualifications for entry, but at the same time you have all sorts of economic studies showing the reason that Canadians have a lower standard of living is because of the fact that we simply do not have equivalent educational qualifications to the Americans and consequently lack the skills. So the Minister proposes to raise our standard of living by bringing in, to a large extent, numbers of unskilled immigrants, and then of course we are also faced with the difficulty of putting our educational system to work to attempt to bring these people up to first the Canadian average, and then secondly beyond.

I'd like to deal just briefly with what the solution might be to this particular problem. I think the key to it is undoubtedly gearing our present educational system to our provincial need. I wonder whether or not the Minister himself works very closely with the Minister of Education, because it seems to me that this is the key, that we have to, to a certain extent, gear our educational system to our commercial, our industrial, our managerial needs and skills. This has to be carefully researched as to what particular skills we need, what our future prospects are, and then something in the educational system must take that into account. I wonder whether there is a very good liaison between the university and the business community. At least in some quarters it's felt that there's no liaison and that the two are separate and distinct.

Another way of course of keeping people here, etc., are to make the province a better place to live. I think the government has done very well on the cultural level and I think their record is excellent there but I think they need more in the recreational area in order to make this province a better place to live.

One thing I think we need in this province, and I'm surprised that the Minister hasn't done anything in this regard, I think is a merchandise mart. I've heard rumours over the past couple of years that private citizens were contemplating building a proper place where commercial people could display their wares and do business, but nothing has come of this. I think this is an essential ingredient in the kind of campaign that the Minister talks about. Perhaps something like this could be tied in with the Red River Exhibition. I don't know if that's the appropriate place, but if they're in a sort of partial promotion and trade area - we have many dozens of firms exhibiting there - maybe something on a permanent year-round basis could be worked out. Perhaps the Royal Alexandra Hotel which seems to be going to waste might be a

(MR. DOERN cont'd)...suitable location. So I'd like to know whether the Minister or his government is doing anything to promote a merchandise mart for Manitoba.

I'd also like to deal briefly at this point with the question of Westbank, because it seems to me that the Minister and the government allowed an important financial institution, the Bank of Western Canada, flounder, and as a result probably leave this province. I think it would have had, or could have had if it worked properly, considerable value. It might have stimulated development and in particular stimulated some competition among the financial institutions in this area. I think that many Manitobans, including myself, feel that our local financial institutions, for example the Great West Life Company, Investors Syndicate, the banks, in this area, which are the key parts of what we might call financial capitalism, are very conservative and that the development of the Bank of Western Canada, if it worked according to its original aims, may have shaken them up a bit. They may have helped the local business community and encouraged some imaginative development, and particularly, they might have invested in local industry which is not done to any great extent by our local financial institutions. They might have considered our own special requirements and needs.

The First Minister, replying to a question that I asked him a day or so again, admitted that there were negotiations between the government and Westbank, and I for one would like to know what happened. I'd like to know what they asked for and what assistance was offered to them. The First Minister suggested that this matter was under the jurisdiction of the courts and couldn't be discussed sub judice, but I don't think his comments or the Minister's comments could possibly affect the court proceedings. The Premier of Saskatchewan is talking a great deal about bringing the bank into his province. It appears to be a winding-up operation and one in which the government did not offer a helping hand. So we could have possibly had a western bank located in Winnipeg for western development it was allowed to fail. This may have been the only opportunity that we'll have in the next 25 years because I believe it was some period of time before a new bank was allowed to have a charter in Canada.

MR. CHAIRMAN: (a) -- passed; (b) -- passed; (c) --

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Chairman, before we leave the item of the Minister's salary and the related administration, I would like to say just a few words. I'm very modest when I get up to talk on matters of industrial development, Mr. Chairman, because, like you, I feel that if I have any particular knowledge it lies in a different field, one that you and I grew up in, and I have never acquired any specific knowledge in this area. But I have acquired a lot of experience in listening to promoters talk about what they're going to do for the economy of Manitoba and I have been listening through the years to the promises that have been made by my honourable friends in the government of this province and what they were going to do for Manitoba, and here we are after the 10 years and my dear friend, the Honourable the Minister occupying that position today, is still dealing in the realm of what's going to be done. Thank goodness he admits that a foundation has been laid and this superstructure is certainly going to be built now, according to him.

But what I want to know is what's been happening in all these years, and I will not use such emphatic terms as my honourable friend the Leader of the New Democratic Party because he seems to have the faculty of using these terms and getting away with them very well, and I hesitate to employ such terms but I do protest in the strongest terms that I can use against this continual and continuing beating the drum about the accomplishment of a government that is unable to show that there have been solid accomplishments. Now just because my honourable friend is guilty of intoxicating himself with the optimistic verbiage to which he has become accustomed by speaking at so many different gatherings doesn't mean that this constitutes a statistical basis on which he can establish any proof. His opinion, his enthusiasm, his undoubted efforts in this regard are commendable; no doubt about that. But where's the performance? Where is the performance? Now this isn't that I distrust my honourable friend the Minister. I certainly believe that he believes that he's going to be able to accomplish these things. But my honourable friend, his predecessor, who now sits in the position of Provincial Treasurer, was just as enthusiastic and just as sincere 10 years ago, and where are the accomplishments?

Now I of course would have to rank as a prejudiced witness because I've been critical of the attempts, the cost of the attempts, the bureaucracy that develops around the attempts, the increasing taxes that have been necessary because of the increase in manpower and expenditure all along the line. I would be a prejudiced witness, but I want to call in to witness for me this document which emanates from the government itself, or from its Economic Consultative Board,

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd)...and quote from it. Now surely this is an unbiased witness and surely they are the people to whom we should turn for an independent and well-informed report upon the government's performance.

Now it's true that the report is almost a year old now and I think we have not the new one - I wish we had it because if we had the fifth report we would be much more up-to-date - but we haven't got it so we have to go along with the one that we have, and my honourable friend the Minister can certainly say, "Ah ha, but great things have happened since that report was written." But this is the last report we have. This is the independent authority as far as we people on this side of the House are concerned, and if my honourable friend can really prove to us that certain things have happened that invalidates the conclusions that are reached here, then he's certainly at liberty to present that evidence too.

But in the meantime, I think it's only right that we should consider this report as at least one of the authoritative documents on which we should base our conclusions. This is the Fourth Annual Report of the Manitoba Economic Consultative Board. I'm sure my honourable friend has it before him so that he can check what I'm reading. I always feel like apologizing, Mr. Chairman, if I have to read from a document too lengthily, but it's necessary sometimes to read quite fully in order to escape the charge that we might be taking something out of context. I would like to just read this little part. I would like to just read from Page 9 and say, "This shift in emphasis can be explained by two factors: (1) Projections made at the beginning of the period underestimated the rate of job formation that had taken place between 1950 and 1960." Do you know what period that was? That was those horrible dark days just preceding the time that the government came into office here. And just imagine, we have now in the latest Economic Consultative Board report a statement that they underestimated what had been going on there.

Well now, it wouldn't be fair if I just read that little bit. You have to go back a ways and read more fully. So I will read from the beginning on Page 9, and I ask honourable members to remember that this is the government's own Economic Consultative Board. Here's the beginning of Page 9. I'm quoting. "In the early part of the current decade, considerable unemployment was in evidence in Manitoba and the major concern being expressed was one of finding a sufficient number of jobs to employ Manitoba's expanding labour force. Since that time we have seen unemployment rates reduced to the point where there are currently widespread labour shortages, and attention has shifted to finding an adequate number of workers to meet current demands and thereby permit continued expansion of the economy."

And then I come to this portion that I already read. "This shift in emphasis can be explained by two factors: (1.) Projections made at the beginning of the period underestimated the rate of job formation that had taken place between 1950 and 1960; and (2.)" -- Here's an answer to some of the discussions about population. Here's an authoritative answer. It's all very well for my honourable friend the Minister and my honourable friend the Leader of the New Democratic Party and me to engage in an argument about our interpretation of the population statistics, but here's somebody speaking who has the facility to make the proper kind of a study. And here I am quoting again. "(2.) Partly as a result of larger net out-migration, Manitoba's population and hence its labour force has not grown as rapidly as was earlier anticipated." It didn't grow the way my honourable friend said it was going to grow.

And here quoting again - because I want to be fair to my honourable friends and quote all the relevant part - "In addition, we have witnessed a relatively strong rate of job formation since 1961." And you can read in another part of this report which will show you that a great portion of that job formation is where, Mr. Chairman? In the government sector. That's where one of the big growths in job formation has occurred. So one thing that this establishes, if it establishes anything, in my view is that that period between 1950 and 1958, to quote the more usual time, wasn't as bad as my honourable friends were attempting to say it was. And in that connection, I ask my honourable friend who delights to tell about what's been happening lately, I ask him to explain to the House how would it be that in that period an organization such as International Nickel would come to this province without any financial inducements in the way of assistance to them to establish their plant; and on the other hand, would actually lend some money to the government of that day in order to proceed with the development of electrical facilities up north. So I would say that this is a comment regarding population in Manitoba that deserves some consideration, and the part that I quoted: "(2.) Partly as a result of larger net out-migration, Manitoba's population and hence its labour force has not grown as rapidly as

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd)...was earlier anticipated."

Now my honourable friend is inclined, and were I in his position I would be inclined to agree with him, to play down this question of population. He says this is not by any means the most important factor. He has given us quite a dissertation about that and of course it's not the only factor, but it's one of the factors that my honourable friends opposite, when they sat on this side of the House, and one of the main ones of them was my friend the Honourable Provincial Treasurer. -- (Interjection) -- Yes, yes, it was good. My honourable friend used to be excellent when he stood over here and he was just as good then at analyzing the many studies and reports and surveys that were taken as he is now, just as interested in them, and he used to prove -- well he almost proved it to my satisfaction that if they just had an opportunity of getting on the Treasury benches that this thing of the population lag in Manitoba would be cured. Well not overnight, perhaps he wasn't quite that optimistic, but certainly in a comparatively short time. That was an indicator, said my honourable friend, of a slow economy. We were falling behind the rest of Canada. We weren't living up to our potential. My honourable friend thought it was extremely important then. -- (Interjection) -- Oh yes, the main one. But not now, not now.

So I must go on to some other questions that are dealt with. These are not my opinions. I wish to goodness that I had the capacity and the information available that these folks have so that I could give you some opinions of my own. But I think in a discussion of this kind, it's much more valuable that we should turn to the people who have the background of knowledge and have the sources of information available to them and lots of money from my honourable friends to carry on their studies.

Now what do they say -- and I commend this to my honourable friend. I notice that he didn't have it with him, he had to get it sent in from above. Well now he should be reading this report. He should have it with him. It would do him good. And I must say for the people who wrote this report, they're fair-minded folks; they do try to let the government down as easily as possible; they do try to interpret the statistics as much in favour of my honourable friends as is possible. But after all, they're honest and honourable men and they can't do the impossible, and so they have to present unfavourable statistics to my honourable friends.

So we come to Page 22. My honourable friend who now has provided himself with a report can follow me - about the middle of the page - I'd like to put this on record from the report. After talking about the per capita personal income, giving a table on it, the report says this: "It is worthwhile to note, however, that Manitoba's position relative to Canada did not move upward during the past year years, despite two of the best years on record for Manitoba's agriculture. This serves to demonstrate that even during periods when all sectors of the provincial economy are performing reasonably well, it will require vigorous effort by all concerned to maintain Manitoba's position at or near the average for the national economy." And it did not move up, say our honourable friends, and that compared with Canada as a whole - and when they compare with Canada as a whole, you're taking into account Newfoundland, Prince Edward Island and Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, those maritime provinces that we would have been very very doubtful about including in the same category as ourselves a few years ago - and now when you take them all into account in Canada, "it will require vigorous effort by all concerned to maintain Manitoba's position at or near the average for the national economy."

Well, on Page 24, just on this matter of population, they return to it again on Page 25, just below the middle of the page, and I'm reading now from the report: "One of the most critical variables affecting these estimates is the level of net interprovincial migration. In the third annual report of the board, it was noted that there had been a close relationship between Manitoba's net out-migration" - net out-migration - "and the rate of national economic growth. During the periods of rapid national growth the rate of net out-migration from the province has tended to increase, and during periods of recession has tended to recline. For the past three-year period, levels of net out-migration have approximately counterbalanced the natural increase in our population, with the result that the population is now close to the same level as it was three years ago." Now my honourable friend will say that things have improved since that. Well, I would prefer to take the statement of the consultative board.

Skipping over to the bottom of Page 26, and I'm not skipping it in order to change the argument, but simply that I do not wish to read too much into the record." This evidence suggests that Manitoba's heavier out-migration is in response to higher wage levels in other areas, as well as to greater availability of jobs. During the recent period there has been an

(MR. CAMPBELL cont'd)...increase in the wage differential between Manitoba and the provinces in most direct competition with Manitoba for available manpower. As indicated in Table 2-4, this has been particularly noticeable with respect to Ontario and British Columbia, the two provinces which receive the majority of Manitoba's out-migration. During the same period Manitoba has been experiencing its heaviest net out-migration during the post-war period." How can my honourable friend dispute those statements?

Then, Mr. Chairman, I have two or three others marked here that I shall not take the time to read, but I would go -- incidentally, I don't know what Minister is responsible for this Manitoba Economic Consultative Board, I believe it's probably the First Minister, is it? His department? I would hope when I'm quoting them as an authority that their competence is not to be judged by the binding of this book, because did someone notice that you go over -- you read here to Page 96 and then you come immediately to Page 112 and you have to jump away over to the page facing 113 and you get 98 then, and you back up from there to 112. --(Interjection) -- It's not the same in yours. Well maybe my honourable friend thought that if they furnished me one like this that I wouldn't have sufficient assiduity to find the things that they say about this government, but ..

MR. EVANS: That would never deter you.

MR. CAMPBELL: No. No. Well that's the point. My honourable friend the Provincial Treasurer would know that he would have to do more than that in order to throw me off the trail of this government, but his honourable colleague who is now before the Committee doesn't know me so well and he might have made that mistake. You'll keep him informed, I'm sure. I hope that the Honourable the Minister, now that he has a copy, will find that his is properly bound and that he doesn't have to go to all that trouble because he ...

Then on Page 120. This is a study on government employment and the effect of the public sector. The conclusion is: "We have shown that the public sector has had a significant effect upon the growth of the Manitoba economy. While further analysis will be required to understand its full impact, the study to date suggests the need for efforts to promote the most effective use of manpower within the public sector," and that word "within" is emphasized in this report just as I have tried to emphasize it in reading. Within the public sector. "The board is aware that such efforts are becoming more and more a feature of any large public agency. This is an important and significant development. In addition, it would appear to be useful to examine more systematically the relationships between the benefits and costs of government programs, although one must recognize that there will be many difficulties encountered in arriving at definite conclusions." Examine more systematically the relationships between benefits and costs of government programs. Mr. Chairman, I think those are pregnant words.

I would just like to refer to the table on Page 134, the one on 135, and if I can properly interpret the statistics there -- and the comparison is between Manitoba and Canada, not Manitoba and some of the provinces that we were going to catch up to or surpass, but between Manitoba and Canada -- and if I properly analyze them, it means that in the field of personal income per person in Manitoba as compared to Canada, we have fallen further behind during the six years covered by this report from 1961 to 1966 inclusive, and I repeat that this is a comparison with all of Canada; not the wealthy provinces -- all of Canada, taking into account the Maritimes as well. Then on the next page it shows that in the value of retail trade between Manitoba and Canada we have not quite held our own, but the difference isn't so much.

Mr. Chairman, my point is simply that, as I read this report, which I consider to be more authoritative than the reams and reams of propaganda that we get from the Minister's department and from himself, that we simply have no cause to share in the enthusiasm that my honourable friend himself exudes. Now in his position he of course has to keep up this enthusiasm, but my honourable friend who preceded him did the same things, exactly the same type of things, for the whole period that he occupied this position. All of these things. When I see the Information Service tell us about the invasion of the heartland of the United States just south of us here, my honourable friend the former Minister did that some years ago. This is not new. When we see about the trips abroad, there may be more of them now -- I think there are -- but my honourable friend explored all of those situations as well, and the results have been found wanting. The development that was so urgently hoped for and so optimistically prophesied simply has not come, as I read the Economic Consultative Board's report.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Chairman, I would like to preface just a few remarks by simply saying to the Member from Lakeside that I'm one who has marvelled, as a new member to this House, at his demeanour, at the manner in which he has conducted himself in this House, at periods of brilliance that he has exhibited in the debates on different occasions, but I always have the feeling, and I have the feeling now, that one should look at him and apply the motto that Avis now use, "We Try Harder", because I have a real belief - and I do not mean this in any disrespect of being No. 2 rather than No. 1 - but I do have this feeling that he really does try harder, and he, in his attempt to try and explain his point of view, gives a feeling of sincerity that is not matched by any other honourable member on the opposite side in this House.

Now, I have listened for some time to what happened in the good old days and I think that there are certain credits and certain debits on the ledger side in connection with those days, but I would like to tell the Honourable Member from Lakeside that this is 1968 and my concern as a Minister of Industry and Commerce is for what is going to happen now and for what is going to happen in the future, and particularly in the next decade, the decade of the '70s. And in terms of trying to evolve a program, and in terms of trying to set a mood, I think it is very necessary to put things in their proper perspective and to try and put your best foot forward to try and encourage investment, to try and encourage competence within this province, and I think that this is correct and I believe that the government obviously thinks it's correct - it's supporting me - and I believe quite honestly that the people of Manitoba think that this is correct. Now I'm not concerned about what happened ten years ago. I do know that they had missions ten years ago and I may say - and I don't think the Honourable Member from Lakeside is aware - that I spoke in the hall in London, England that he had spoken in some ten years ago when he was in England. I don't know whether he was with a mission, I don't know whether he was by himself, but he spoke to the Confederation of British Industries, and I spoke in the exact hall that he did. But times have changed. Technological advance has changed. Approaches to industry have changed. And in this respect I think it is incumbent upon me and the department, just as it was incumbent upon him, to try and seek potential investors and new opportunities for the province.

I'm not going to read other chapters or other sections of the Manitoba Economic Consultative Board back to him. I think I can and I can prove my point. -- (Interjection) -- Yes, I think I can, but I would rather, if I may, repeat what I said the other night because I think this puts it very simply in its perspective. We have a challenge, and our challenge is to try and widen our economic base, and we're going to accomplish this in two ways. We are going to expand our existing industries and we're going to attract new industry, and we have results to prove this and we have statistics to prove this. And secondly, we are going to expand our economic base to greater productivity, and all the programs that I referred to and the message that I tried to convey was an attempt on the part of the government to create the climate and to offer the services to our Manitoba firms to be able to make the decisions that have to be made to do this, because as I pointed out and I think he's one that would agree with me, government can't do this alone. It's the individual entrepreneur and the businessman who is going to be responsible for change, and the only way in which we are going to be able to sustain in this province rising incomes, to be able to give our people the amenities of life, to be able to take care of the cost of living, will be through productivity and this is an economic fact that's recognized by almost every economist. So that in terms of our programs and in terms of our efforts, we are trying to achieve that objective.

Now these concerns that I've, in the various speeches, I've presented to this province and to others whom we try to bring to this province, to interest them in either expanding existing operations or in fact taking care of some new opportunities that we seek, he is concerned that I'm one who's creating a false enthusiasm about this area. Well, I'd like to read him yesterday's Winnipeg Tribune, and I'd like him to listen to this. It's an announcement of a new plant. "Preliminary work on a \$1-1/2 million automotive parts depot and zone sales office in Winnipeg started this week by Chrysler Canada Limited. The Winnipeg facility, involving a warehouse and office areas, will cover 100,000 square feet. It will be located at the corner of Keewatin Street and Burrows in the Inkster Industrial Park. Eventually the plant will employ 75,000 persons." And herein I'm quoting from the Vice President of the Parts' directors -- (Interjection) -- 75 persons, I'm sorry. I'm sorry. Wishful thinking on my part, wishful thinking on my part. But may I quote what the Vice President said: "Greater Winnipeg is one of the country's major markets with a growth rate well above the national average. Our new

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd.) depot will be geared to provide faster parts service for dealers and customers. The Winnipeg facility will be the parts supply centre of Chrysler dealers in Manitoba and northwestern Ontario. In addition, it will be headquarters of the Chrysler activities throughout the province. "

Let me repeat this: "Greater Winnipeg is one of the country's major markets with a growth rate well above the national average." This is not the Information Services. This is Chrysler Corporation of Canada.

MR. CAMPBELL: I was asking about the Economic Consultative Board. Now, would my honourable friend not agree that it's the most unbiased authority they'd get? And inclined to be favourable to the government. I'd like to say to my honourable friend that he reminds me that this is now 1968. Of course it's 1968 and I'm not looking back. I'm no more anxious to debate the question of the bleak period that preceded 1958 than he is. I was simply quoting their -- from the Economic Consultative Board. It was their statement, not mine, that I was reading there, and in case people think that once I did fall tremendously out of character and make a trip over to the Old Country, I think I should make an explanation, because I don't like folks to think that I was one who was going on these - what's the term - junkets. No.

The fact is that when Ron Turner was leaving our government, he came to me and he said: "I have one commitment outstanding that must be carried through and I am not able to carry it through because of having to move to my new position almost immediately, and that is that I have arranged with our Agent-General in London and a program is laid on that simply must go forward." And he said, "In this job, the only person . . ." and I know that although Ron and I were very close friends he was meaning that it was because of the prestige of the position that I was occupying at that time, not because of any merit that I had as a proponent for Manitoba's industrial advancement; but he said, "the only person who I could get to substitute for me without our Agent-General over there and the others who have helped us to arrange these programs, is yourself as Premier to go." And, what politicians often say, "against my better judgment" and at Ron's insistence, I agreed to make that trip, and it was one of the hardest ten days' work I ever did in my life, because Ron was a most energetic person and Murray Armstrong, who was our Agent-General, was a most energetic person, and they had laid on meeting after meeting after meeting, including several breakfasts, and it was tremendously hard work. I'm sure I didn't make anything like the impression in speaking at the Federated Bureau of Industry meeting in the hall over there that my honourable friend did when he went there, because I simply couldn't bubble over with the enthusiasm that he always does. But that's why I was there, and I tried to do the little bit that I could, and I was well briefed by the people that we had in the Department of Industry and Commerce at that time, and unless I completely messed up the material that they gave me I at least tried to carry out Ron's assignment. As far as -- (Interjection) -- as other people in that position and other ministerial posts have been before and since.

Now my honourable friend says that he wants it made very plain that the government can't do these things alone. You have to have industries; you have to have co-operation of the private sectors. Of course the government can't do it alone. My complaint is that the government tries to do too much. My complaint of my honourable friend's department is that it has expanded and still expands more than its accomplishments justify, and there comes a time in an area like the Province of Manitoba that has to export to live. There comes a time when you can get taxes up so high and costs up so high that you're a load on the back of the private sector that it simply can't carry. Now this is justified if it can be proven that it gets results, but nobody can prove that the Chrysler decision was made because of the work of my honourable friend's department. If we could prove that it was because of them, then we would have a better argument, but we can't prove it. My submission is that they would have been more likely to have come here if they had not known of the recent increase that there has been in taxes on commercial property; if they had not had to shoulder some of the other costs that have been imposed upon the Province of Manitoba in recent years. We're in an area where we can't carry too much additional costs and this is where I fear that government, in an endeavour to help these industries, can so overdo the promotion work that they accomplish completely the opposite result.

MR. SAUL MILLER (Seven Oaks): The Minister earlier today replied to some of the remarks I made the other night when he introduced the estimates, and again he seems to base his entire case and makes a stand on the matter of statistics. He just finished telling the Honourable

(MR. MILLER cont'd.) Member for Lakeside that the government has the statistics to prove the increases and they stand by it, and that the people of the province have confidence in the government and he has the confidence of the government based on these statistics; that these are valid and true. Now what better statistics, if you won't accept the Manitoba Economic Consultative Board, what better statistics than his own; the statistics that he publishes in the Annual Report of March 31st, 1967; and let's face it, this is the government speaking. We have to accept what they say. All of Manitoba has to believe what they read here; not just Manitoba, but investors who are thinking of coming here, and I imagine this was sent throughout the Chambers of Commerce all over Canada and the United States because this is supposed to be a picture of what's happening in Manitoba, and it's on statistics that our Minister makes his stand.

Well, the statistics, as he earlier admitted to me, really haven't much credence because they seem to change from year to year and he adjusts them always so they will look better this year than last year. And he claims it's not his fault - it's the Dominion Bureau of Statistics. Yet he uses that to build his case. In one year we are told that the employment in manufacturing in Canada was 45.4 million and because of that, the increase . . . 47.3 represents an increase and he's very proud of that. But the year before we were told that this increase was actually 49.4 so what they're doing, in order to look good this year, they doctor the figures from last year - somebody doctors the figures - and we come out with a different set of figures. So every year - and this goes back obviously for years - we look good. We look good because we've adjusted the figures from last year, the very figures that were very high to make us look good from the previous year, and so every year we have a new set of figures that makes us look good. In 1965 we were told that we had a value of industrial constructions - this is in millions of dollars - of 39.9, and that was a banner year and the Minister of Industry and Commerce at that time, the former Minister, I'm sure proclaimed - I wasn't in the House - but I'm sure proclaimed loudly that this represented a gigantic stride forward. And it was, if the figure was 39.9 and that's what he used in his Annual Report. Now we have the 1967 Annual Report, the latest one given to us, and the previous Minister's figures are now dropped from 39.9 to 28.7 - that's quite a dive - in order that the new figure of 34.5 which our present Minister claims, should show an increase of 19.9. It's a drop of 12-1/2. Next year, I suppose, the present claim of 34.5 million will be dropped to maybe 30 so that the new figure of 34.5 shall look like a gain.

In the retail trades, and it's a pretty good yardstick as a rule, the 1966 Annual Report says here: "The total value of retail trade in Manitoba, as in the case of factory shipments, for the first time exceeded the one billion dollar mark, a record of \$1,007,000,000." This is really quite an achievement. New book; new Minister; one year later: "During 1966, the total value of retail trade in Manitoba for the first time exceeded the one billion dollar mark, a record one billion, five hundred thousand. It dropped. They didn't even change the comma. You know, really. Re-word it. Do something with it. But if the Minister is going to stand here and say that statistics prove it, then he's proving nothing except that this is a beautiful juggling, or not so beautiful because it's very easy to spot.

Now while I'm on my feet, Mr. Chairman, the Minister in reply to some of the remarks I made the other night took exception to some of the remarks that I made with regard to immigration, and he said that I didn't quite understand what they were doing. He quoted the Economic Council of Canada and their attitude about the need for immigrants, and that perhaps there wasn't a need for immigrants any longer in the old sense, and he said he wanted to go back and get the type of immigrants representative of this phrase, and he used it today, "The strong back and the venturesome spirit," and he talks to the Member for Lakeside and says to the Member for Lakeside that he's behind the times! Where are you going to get these strong backs and venturesome spirits? This isn't the coolie days. You're not going over to Europe and getting the illiterates and the depressed and those who wanted to come to a new land because they were persecuted and wanted to get away and would work for anything - to lay the rail lines, to open up the west.

He talks to the Minister of being old-fashioned, of thinking in the past. Those days are gone. The people of Europe are as affluent as we are. The people of Europe can be induced to come here because when they're told they're going to get \$1.00, \$1.15 an hour, they don't quite comprehend how little a dollar's going to buy in Manitoba; they think it's a lot of money. But the truth of the matter is this, and it's said in every report, it's said by COMEF, by our

(MR. MILLER cont'd.) own Manitoba study, it's said by the Economic Council of Canada; if you want to develop the north country you've got to come up with some imaginative approaches, and the imaginative approaches that this government has is to simply show up the loss in our population which we are losing because they are lured away by better living conditions in other provinces, in our sister provinces; they're lured away from Manitoba, the ones that can least afford it, and we're shoring up this drain by trying to bring strong backs and venturesome spirits into Manitoba. Mr. Chairman, they may come to Manitoba initially, but these people are not stupid, they are not immobile. They'll come here; they'll spend a little while here; they'll take a look at what's doing in the rest of the country, and they'll depart the same way as they came.

MR. SPIVAK: Well, I'd like to just answer the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks, only because I would like to clarify his mixed-up thinking and some understanding of what I thought I clearly had indicated. The statistics that are brought forward by the department come from the Dominion Bureau of Statistics and there's a constant revision that takes place. There's no intention to mislead. . .

MR. MILLER: Then why use them?

MR. SPIVAK: It's very hard for us to understand and be able to publish statistics that will be changed six months after they're published. We don't know this in advance. It's very hard. But . . . -- (Interjection) -- Well, let me explain it. In the good old days they didn't use statistical information. It's very important that we use it now because judgment in planning for government comes from statistics, and you take the best information you have at the time. But in order to clarify this - and I wanted frankly to be able to allow others to participate in the debate - but in order to clarify this I would like to, in these items that have been mentioned, to clarify them once and for all for the record.

Let's talk about retail trade. In June of 1967, the Dominion Bureau Publication Retail Trade gave revised retail sales figures by provinces for the years 1961 to 1964. In 1967, the Dominion Bureau of Statistics revised the statistics that had been published and which governments had operated on from 1961 to 1964. This revision incorporated a change to the standard industrial classification whereby the following changes were effected. Restaurants, caterers, cocktail lounges, taverns and dressmakers moved from the retail to the service trade. Lumber and building material dealers, farm implement dealers, feed and seed stores, farm supply stores and harness shops moved from retail to wholesale. And automotive repair shops, radio and TV shops, jewellery repairs and engraving, bicycle repairs, moved from . . . service to the retail trade. As a result of these changes, revisions occur in the Manitoba's total retail trade picture, and the annual total for the year 1965 dropped from a value in excess of a billion dollars to a total of \$937,441,000. At the time the annual report for 1966 was prepared, these revisions had not been available. The revised figures of the Dominion Bureau of Statistics for the year 1961 to '66 are here, but I do not think it necessary to read it, other than to indicate that.

Now let me deal with construction. The Dominion Bureau of Statistics publishes an annual report entitled Construction in Canada. Contained in this report are annual value of constructions figures for the present year and two years historically by province. The construction values for the present year are estimated intention - that is, their estimate of what will happen. The previous year's historical is a preliminary figure, while the second year's historical gives the actual figure of construction performed. They are actually basically two years behind. In the 1966 annual report, the industrial construction value for 1965 was 39.9 million, and that was a preliminary figure which was subsequently revised by the Dominion Bureau of Statistics to an actual value of 28.7 million. This revised figure appears on the 1967 annual report, properly so. Well, we didn't have it available before that; no one knew this. In addition, the latest report indicates that the 1966 value of industrial construction was 34.5 million, another preliminary figure, and this figure again will be revised when the actual value of construction for 1966 becomes available from the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, which will be approximately in June of this year.

Now, with reference to manufacturing. Employment in the manufacturing industry is derived from the Dominion Bureau of Statistics employment section. It's based upon a survey of those establishments employing 15 or more persons. Establishments of fewer employed are estimated based on a sample survey. In 1966, the Bureau made an adjustment to their data to the 1960 standard industrial classification code. For Manitoba, the most significant

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd.) change occurred as a result of transferring railroad repair and maintenance shop from the manufacturing sector to the transportation sector. This resulted, for Canada as a whole, in a shift of approximately 16,000 people from the manufacturing industry. And so, therefore, the information that was supplied which was accurate at the time, showed the following increases in manufacturing: From 1961 to '62, from 42,500 to 42,800; to 1963, 44,000; to 1964, 46,700; to 1965, 49,400; and these are the statistics that were furnished. The revised statistics that have come as a result of this change show the following: For 1962, 40,300; for 1963, 41,400; for 1964, 43,500; for 1965, 45,400; for 1966, 47,300. Now these are the figures we operate, but the interesting thing is that they show a rise in each occasion, and they show the kind of percentage in increase that was reflected before in the other statistics which were furnished by the Dominion Bureau.

Now the Honourable Member from Seven Oaks obviously either did not read the brief that was presented to the sub-committee of the Federal Government in connection with the White Paper, or he did not read the White Paper. The words "a strong back and a venturesome spirit" are not my words. They're the words of the White Paper, and the fact of the matter is, that all we said is that Canada needs these kinds of people. And if he believes that Canada does not need people who have a strong back and a venturesome spirit, and who characterizes the people that built this province, then I'd like him to stand up and say so.

MR. JOHN P. TANCHAK (Emerson): Mr. Chairman, thank you. I've been trying to get up. I didn't intend to get into this debate because we've got some speakers here who really can express themselves much better than I do. But coming back to what the Honourable Minister has just said about the Honourable Member from Lakeside, he seemed to accuse him of living in the past. I don't think the honourable member's living in the past; he's living in the past, in the present and in the future, interested in all of those things. But, reading some of the Program Highlights and listening to the Honourable Minister of Industry here, it seems to me that he is living in neither age. To me, he strikes as a great dreamer, a dreamer in the age of tomorrow. I read in this market news, read some of the Program Highlights that were published on April 5th, quite similar to what we got in the Program Highlights, and I didn't get too much out of it; I didn't get too excited. But then when we come to this, reading it is one matter, but when the Honourable Minister got up and he ran through it in his own words, it sounded to me like the drums of a cheer leader. Ninety-nine percent of this we heard last year. There was nothing very new in it. It's at least a year old. And he is a dreamer, as I said. He's a man of vision, maybe another Diefenbaker, a man of vision who had visions but those visions were always in the clouds and they don't seem to come. And I have a reason for saying that.

Reading this Program Highlights for 1968, as we go through it we will notice that in here he refers mostly to tomorrow. If you look through the paper and check it there's no less than -- the word "will" appears in here no less than a hundred times, no less than a hundred times. It's always will, will, will, all the time. Isn't that dreaming? It is dreaming. Now, you take the first thirteen paragraphs in here, I think the word "will" is used 25 different times, and I'll just quote a few: "Will continue to be practical and direct. Will narrow the field." And then: "Opportunities in the Province of Manitoba will be continued." "The department will investigate." "We will continue our efforts." "Industry in the foreseeable future will be forecast." "Manitoba will be developed." It's always will, will, will, will. It's always something in the future. He doesn't give too much for the present. In the first paragraph, in the introductory paragraph, he's got four "wills". A dreamer -- dreaming all the time. So, he's just living or dreaming of tomorrow but I don't think there's very much action. There's an awful lot of different groups that are supposed to do this and do that, and he's boasting about it, but I do not think that there is really too much action in that.

Now, we know that there are other agencies, there are other groups of people in the Province of Manitoba as well as in the whole of Canada, who are trying to help us. They're trying to establish industry, new industry in the plains, in the prairies. We've got the Federal Government trying to establish that, by giving these incentive grants. Even the Minister of Industry is going through all kinds of motions and acrobatics trying to convince the people of the Province of Manitoba that there's a lot of action. And he really thinks he's doing something, very much. He's convinced himself but he can't convince us here and he can't convince the people of the Province of Manitoba.

People in the cities and people out in the rural areas are trying to attract industry to

(MR. TANCHAK cont'd.) their different towns and villages and cities. The Municipal Council is there offering incentives to encourage this industry. And what does the Ministry do here? As was mentioned by the Honourable the Leader of the New Democratic Party before, the other ministers do not seem to share the same excitement, share the same vision, because they don't even follow up with him. What does the government do and the rest of the ministers? The Government of Manitoba is pouring cold water on the industrial development here in the Province of Manitoba. And by that I mean that the government now, after telling the people for about ten years that they're going to shift the burden of taxation from the real property on to a wider base, they've reversed themselves and now the real property is being taxed to the hilt; 4.1 mills up this year on taxation. I do not think that's encouraging to industry very much.

I've got one concrete example. There was a party from Quebec who came and wanted to start a small industry, not a very big industry, in the village of Dominion City. They tried to get it; the Chamber of Commerce worked hard for it, trying to get the industry; and after the whole thing went through, what was the answer? He said, "I do not trust this government of the Province of Manitoba; I'm afraid of the taxes, the real property taxes," And that was before the 4.1 mill increase in taxes. It seems to me that the expressions of confidence - and the Minister seems to be very satisfied, if his satisfaction of accomplishments are correct, he seems to be happy and satisfied all the time - why is it that Manitoba is still lagging in industrial development behind most of the provinces in Canada? And that is what has been stated before.

Why is it, if the Minister created so many new jobs in the Province of Manitoba, why is the unemployment in the Province of Manitoba higher than the other prairie provinces? And that came out in the paper just lately, that our unemployment exceeds those of the other two prairie provinces. Why so? Why are we losing our skilled labor faster than most other provinces in Canada? There must be a reason for that. If the Minister of Industry is so confident, he should convene with the rest of his ministers and see if some of it wouldn't rub on to them. Maybe they might listen to him; they might open their ears.

As I said in my opening, the Minister is just a dreamer. I do not think he lives in the past. At least the Honourable Member from Lakeside has something to be proud of. We've got the greatest industry in Manitoba at the present time, the Thompson Mines, and it's still expanding, and many others that came. It's something to think about; something to be proud of. But the present Minister is dreaming, dreaming and dreaming in the clouds. The trouble with him is that he does not know how to translate these visions into realities; just dreams all the time. And I would say to him, quit dreaming; wake up; come down to earth; do not stay in the clouds; do something for the Province of Manitoba.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Honourable Member for Inkster.

MR. SIDNEY GREEN (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I'm going to follow up very shortly on the remarks that were made by the Honourable Member for Seven Oaks with regard to some of my honourable friend the Minister of Industry and Commerce's references to statistics, and I'm not going to belabour the issue. I think that the Minister answers the Member for Seven Oaks by indicating that statistics are subject to change and that they are not reliable, and I think that this is the point that was being made, that if they are not reliable then let us not place such a great deal of reliance on that, let us not talk about a gigantic move forward on the basis of statistics which we know is not reliable. I think that this is something that would probably stem naturally, quite naturally from the Minister's desire to present an enthusiastic front, and when he is doing that - and we know that this is his thinking, that one of the main attributes of prosperity is that you must think positive - and I think that this is probably one of the points that he's trying to sell the House. Well, at least let him reserve to us, at least, the position that thinking positively alone, and presenting statistics which we know are unreliable, may create a semblance of progress but may not really be indicative of anything at all.

I want to deal with the first page of his address which is contained on Page 848 in Hansard, in which he deals with gross provincial income as being \$2,800,000,000. I wonder just how much of this gross provincial income, the increase, relates really to an increased level of unreal wages, that is that the 2.8 billion is not going to buy anything more than the previous level of income purchased the previous year. The same with all of the other suggestions. The investment of capital, a magnitude of 65.8 as against 67.6 in 1967. Is that an investment of increased real wealth or does it really reflect an increase in prices? Right down the line - total investment for new capital assets, 950; up 10.6 percent. Couldn't that all be attributed

(MR. GREEN cont'd.) to price? How much of it is attributable to increased wealth in terms of tangible goods or services in the Province of Manitoba? None of these statistics are related to price. I would like the Minister to tell us how many -- how much for instance will the average wage purchase in real commodities this year as against last year. Is there a difference or are they the same? Because unless we're dealing with real commodities rather than with a price level, we don't have a meaningful picture as to what has happened.

I'd like to deal very briefly with one point which I think was made and underlined by the Minister in his address. "First of all", he said, "agriculture is still very important in the Province of Manitoba, and Manitoba accounted for 8.7 percent of all Canadian farm cash incomes. Manitoba agriculture is now producing more than it did 15 years ago with considerably lower input. Productivity per man employed has increased very substantially and the achievements are very considerable indeed." So he quite correctly points out that the productivity of the agricultural population has increased substantially and that this is something of course to be enthusiastic about.

And then on the next page - and I'll get to the point in a moment - he says, "In short, improvements in productivity are the essential means for real advances in living standards. There is no other way." Then he says: "Let me repeat that. In short, improvements in productivity are the essential means for real advances in living standards. There is no other way." Well, Mr. Speaker, I agree in part with those sentiments, and I think it's not a new concept. It was a concept that I remember reading about in Jonathan Swift's "Gulliver's Travels", where he says that the man who makes real progress is the man who can make two ears of corn grow where one grew before. And indeed I think it sounds right. It doesn't appear to the average person that you could have a great increase in productivity and that this increase would not find its way to improve the general well-being of the citizens in the community.

But let's go back to what happened in agriculture, because that's a perfect example. Why is it, Mr. Chairman, why is it that the productivity per man employed in agriculture has increased substantially, and why is it that the farm incomes have stayed relatively the same or have gone down? Isn't this the paradox of my honourable friend's position? And isn't the same true in other areas? Why is it that increased productivity in agriculture hasn't been matched with a decrease in the price of agricultural commodities, because this is what it's supposed to do. And isn't that the paradox and isn't that what my honourable friend never deals with? We could double the population. Instead of having one million people in Manitoba, we could have two million people in Manitoba. We could double the gross national product; we could double the amount of investment income; but if it results, as it has resulted in the United States, that instead of 300,000 people living on the poverty level we have double the amount of people living on the poverty level, then what has been achieved?

In what way have all these advances reflected themselves in increased living conditions which is what he is interested in? And in what way do any of his statistics show that any of his enthusiasm or any of his programs have reflected in an increased well-being to the citizen of Manitoba? How many more people are able to get a higher education? That's important. How many more people are able to have the benefit of the Manitoba Medical Services? That's important. How ever many more people are able to have the benefit of adequate housing? That's important. None of these things mean anything. If my learned friend could double the population and double the amount of investment income and still have that income not distributed to the people of the Province of Manitoba, I think he would think that by the statistics he's done a good job.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I think that the department has got to start thinking in terms of a different form of statistics, in a form of statistics that demonstrates that these things which he is talking about do indeed result in Manitobans having a better standard of living, and I don't think he makes any attempt to show this. He says it, but I don't think he can produce figures which would substantiate it, because even in the great United States they've never been able to do it. If my honourable friend could say that we had the population of the United States, 200 million people, and had the investment capital of the United States, and then had to get up and say, as did President John Kennedy, that in the United States 20 million people every day go to bed hungry, then what would he have achieved? Is that what he wants in Manitoba or is there something more important about increasing the economic level of activity? I don't think that his statistics reflect any achievement other than a bare statistic which he has already indicated as fairly meaningless.

(MR. GREEN cont'd.)

Now, Mr. Chairman, I don't intend to take up more of the committee's time on this particular subject. I would like the Minister to cogitate what I have said, try and find out what Manitoba is going to look like when there are two million people and how many of those people will then be living on the fringe of poverty. If he's going to double it, then he hasn't done anything.

I do wish to deal with one further aspect of the Honourable Minister's program, and this one, Mr. Chairman, I consider to be of major immediate importance, and that is the question, Mr. Chairman - and this is done in conjunction with the Federal Manpower Program - and that is the question of new people coming to the province to take jobs which have either been advertised or which the Minister has succeeded in luring them to by virtue of his energetic salesmanship in other countries.

Now, Mr. Chairman, over the past year and between sessions, there were numerous cases - and I am not personally acquainted with all of them but I am acquainted with some of them - of people who have come to Manitoba on the basis of our immigration program. And I hasten to say to the Chairman that I believe in a good immigration program, I believe that a country with the wealth of Canada has to provide for more immigrants to come to this country, and I believe that the immigrants who come to this country should have every opportunity of enjoying the kind of life and the kind of opportunity to bring up their children as my parents did when they came to this country. I am of immigrant parents and I hasten to say that I owe every opportunity that I've had to the fact that my parents immigrated to this country, and I would like that to continue. I think that there is great room for immigration to this country to partake in the wealth that is here.

On the other hand, Mr. Chairman, I am worried that sometimes in our enthusiasm to attract immigrant population to jobs here that we are not giving them a candid picture of what to expect. It always reminds me of the story that I heard about the old immigration days when they got immigrants to the country on the basis of glowing reports. One of these immigrants in the Ukraine had gone to America and then had come back, and his family and his associates said, "Why did you come back?" and he said, "Well, I went to America because the people here that told us about it said that in America the streets are paved with gold. When I got to America I found that it wasn't true, the streets were not paved with gold. The fact of the matter is that the streets were not paved at all, and what is worse, I was expected to pave them." I think that this is the kind of immigration problems that can be created when we are not candid with the people who are coming.

One case that attracted some attention, Mr. Chairman - and this I'm not going to be too critical of the department on it - it's the case of the immigrants who came from Italy to be employed in the garment industry in Winnipeg and they were told, not by this Minister, but they were told as a result of apparently errors in translation that they would be earning during training a rate of \$50 a week or something of that nature, and when they got here they were actually earning a lesser amount. I can't attribute that particular error to this Minister, but, Mr. Chairman, I think that these people were also misled in other respects.

First of all, I don't know that these people were acquainted with what one dollar an hour meant in terms of living in Canada. I further, Mr. Chairman, am not satisfied that these people were told all of the conditions under which they would receive \$1.00 an hour. For instance, in the industry concerned and at the time - the regulation has since been changed - but at the time that these immigrants were sold the program it was possible for them working within a piecework establishment to earn less than \$1.00 an hour, because the regulation was that if there were 15 people around the table and on a piecework rate a certain number of them - I think it's 80 percent - work at a rate that they could earn more than \$1.00 an hour, then the others were deemed to be working at the minimum wage even if they couldn't produce at that rate or didn't produce at that rate.

Now these are the type of things, Mr. Chairman, that I am worried about when we talk about this kind of program, and I'm also worried about it because I think that to some extent a pursuit of this type of a program is a subsidy to continued reduced wages. Now, Mr. Chairman, one thing that any of the classical economists would turn over in their grave, and these classical economists are the economists that my honourable friend would cite as being the great free enterprise economists, Adam Smith and John Stuart Mill and the others, to suggest that wages should be kept low by importing a group of lower standard of living workers would

(MR. GREEN cont'd.) cause them to certainly, as I've said before, turn over in their grave. What they said was that when an industry required workers, that the natural way of that industry attracting workers would be to increase wages and workers would then flow from other areas into the industry that he is talking about. And to do what my honourable friend is doing is to some extent, Mr. Chairman, subsidizing low wages and subsidizing it also at a price of the candid advice to these people as to what they can expect in Canada when they come at that rate.

Another case, Mr. Chairman, is one that I was personally involved in, but I think that it's relevant to the issues that we are here discussing. A man in England was employed as a tool and die maker. That's correct. The Honourable Minister of Labour knows of the case. He was employed as a tool and die maker, and a tool and die maker in England, or any tool and die maker, is acquainted with all of the aspects of making tools, including the machining of tools. He was employed by Bristol Aircraft to come to Canada, and they admit - there is no argument about this at all - that they called him here to work as a tool and die maker. When he got here, they put him at the post of a machinist, which a tool and die maker can do but which is not the most skilled area of the trade and which a machinist can do. If I can use an analogy that will explain to the members of the House what I'm talking about, it's like going to England and hiring a man as an architect and then calling him here and putting him to work at a draftsman's bench and never taking him off the draftsman's bench, that he continues to be employed as a draftsman.

This man came to work at the highest skill in the trade as a tool and die maker. He was put on a machine and he was employed as a machinist; he was working with machinists - only machinists. He stayed on. As he put it, he persevered for five or six months and then he left and went to work at another place where he was given a job as a tool and die maker. Would you believe it? The company sued him. The company sued him for the living allowance which they paid him and they were entitled to, because part of the deal was that if he didn't work with them for a year he was to give them back the two weeks living allowance that they gave him when he first came, which amounted to some \$319.00, or thereabouts - I can't remember the exact figures. They sued him for the \$319.00 on the basis that he broke his contract, and the company insisted, Mr. Chairman - it's a case which I argued before in court but it's now finished and I bring it here as a general problem, not as a court problem because I think it is a general problem - the company insisted that they had employed him as a tool and die maker, that they had not employed him as a machinist, that even though he was working as a machinist this was part of the tool and die making trade.

It went before the County Court Judge who said various things. First of all, he said that he couldn't see any difference between a tool and die maker and a machinist. I'm sure the same judge would see a great difference between a barrister and a solicitor, but he didn't see the difference in the two trades. He also said that even if he wasn't given a job as a tool and die maker, even if he was employed as a machinist, he was getting the same wages and therefore what was he squawking about. Therefore, the County Court Judge gave judgment against this man who came from England to work as a tool and die maker and wasn't given that job, the County Court Judge gave judgment to the company in the sum of some \$319.00 plus costs, plus his own lawyer, but apparently he didn't have as good a lawyer as he should have had because he didn't win, and that's the real measure of success.

Anyway, this came as quite a startling decision to myself, so it was appealed to the Manitoba Court of Appeal, and at the Manitoba Court of Appeal - and I ask the Minister to listen to this because I think it's important - the Manitoba Court of Appeal, the court unanimously found that the company had broken its contract. Unanimously. They each said that the man was not employed in the job that he was hired for when they went over to England to see him. But in view of the fact that the wages were the same, that there were no damages, they allowed the company's claim, which means -- and let's accept that then as the law. I disagree with it but that's the law under which people can be employed in England, can be lured from England to come to Canada. We can say to them: "You can come here. According to the Manitoba Court of Appeal's decision, you can come here. We'll offer you work as a tool and die maker; when you get here we'll put you on sweeping the floors but, provided the wages are the same, you can't do anything about it."

Now, these are two cases, Mr. Chairman. Since then, and before then, I've read numerous accounts of people who are either involved in law suits or have come here and are

April 11, 1968

(MR. GREEN cont'd.) going back as the result of some misunderstanding -- let's be generous -- some misunderstanding as between them and their employer or them and the Department of Manpower with regard to what they were supposed to get and what they did get. Now, Mr. Chairman, the point that I am making is this. I don't expect that my particular case should be found right or somebody else's should be found right. What I am saying is that there should be some procedure whereby these people can have their complaints dealt with other than through the courts; other than through being sued, or suing. That the department should have some influence with regard to the employers concerned, with regard to the employees concerned, and there should be a standard procedure whereby this person could do something about his particular case.

Now in the case that I've referred to, my client, he was sued by Bristol Aircraft. It's not as if Bristol Aircraft went to the Department of Manpower and said, "This man left us and we have a complaint." He was sued. He had to get a lawyer. He had to defend his case. And with all of that he lost. I mean it didn't help him a great deal; and it seems to me that where we are engaged in this type of program, where we have reason to expect that there may be difficulties and differences of opinion between the employer and the employee, that the department itself should be, as a matter of policy and as a matter of regular procedure, involved in solving some of these difficulties. Now I don't know whether the Minister indicates that there is a way, but I see that he is nodding his head so let's hear what he has to say.

MR. JOHNSTON: Mr. Chairman, I don't intend to devote my short contribution to the promissory note that the Minister has put before us, the 21 pages of what he hopes to do in 1968. I wish to bring up a few items of the past year under his stewardship, and to see if he can make some comment on them.

I would like to start off by mentioning the largest plant we have in the Portage la Prairie area, the Campbell Soup Company plant, and I believe many people may have noticed the press release they put out September 5th, 1967. This is a plant that spent in the past year \$3, 400, 000 for wages and supplies. Now, this was according to the Plant Manager, Mr. E.J. Corhonan. Employees received \$1, 300, 000 of the total that I've just mentioned; the remaining \$2, 100, 000 were spent in the surrounding Portage la Prairie area for ingredients, supplies, services necessary for the plant's operation, and so on. It mentions that the plant was built in 1960 and enlarged in 1965 and it produces canned soups for the western provinces of Canada.

Now, Mr. Chairman, my reason for mentioning this press release is this: that this company, along with many many other companies in Manitoba today - and I mention the Greb Shoe Company as one - are faced with a very serious problem. They're faced with a yearly increase in taxation that they had not planned upon when they came to Manitoba. They are competing outside of our province, in some cases in the international market, but in many cases these plants are competing in the interprovincial market across Canada. Now, the Minister has made great promises for next year and the remainder of the time he has there. He's made great promises about new programs and new developments. Nothing concrete, mind you, but they're ideas and they're dreams, as the Honourable from Emerson has mentioned.

Now I ask the Minister, what is he going to do about those firms that are caught in this sort of a squeeze when in the Budget Speech it comes out that there is really no increase in taxation but we all know that this was a flim flam job, that there is an increase in taxation and it's hitting these businesses and hitting them pretty hard. It's hitting them pretty hard. About two years ago this government put on a tax on all electrical usages. That hurt certain businesses, but after pressure from this side and the group on my left, this tax was taken off. Now I think that for the good of the businesses we have here, never mind the ones that we're giving away all sorts of concessions they get to come in, but the ones that we've got here. They've got a huge investment here. They employ hundreds and thousands of people, and they're faced with this and they're caught and they can't do anything about it. For the past four or five years, their cost of operation has gone up and a large percentage of the cost of their operation going up has been the increase in real estate taxes and the taxes on the products that they have to use.

Again, speaking about the area that I know best, the Portage area, I think about three years ago the Department of Industry and Commerce purchased the MacDonald air field, and at that time there were great glowing statements about this industrial park-to-be. I notice that there were ads in the Toronto newspapers extolling the virtues of the industrial park at MacDonald air field, and for some reason or another in the past year there's been no mention

(MR. JOHNSTON cont'd.) made of this proposition. As I understand it, and my figures could be wrong, but I was given to understand that the province had paid \$240,000 to the Crown Assets Corporation for the buildings and the site at MacDonald. Now, if we assume that the money market today is at least eight percent for anybody trying to borrow - eight to ten - this could be a \$20,000 a year upkeep, as far as interest goes, on the original investment. We've had the MacDonald air field now for, I believe three years, so perhaps we can mark in \$60,000 going to the original cost at \$240,000.00. Then there's the -- I was going to say the upkeep. I don't believe there has been any upkeep, but there is the matter of the caretaking facilities out there, where men are on duty all the time, and I suppose some of the utilities have to be kept up, which to say \$20,000 a year wouldn't be that out of the way, I would think. And if we say for three years, although I think it could be a little longer than three years, that's another \$60,000 for the last three years.

Then I have a news release, or a news report in my hand from the Portage Daily Graphic, and it says: "MacDonald pipeline to be relocated. Tenders for relocation of the water line connecting with the former MacDonald air station have been called by the Manitoba Highways Department. The tenders will close at 12:00 o'clock noon, Wednesday, April 17th. They call for the supply of all materials and the construction of a new 8-inch diameter portable water pipeline with all applicative works, approximately 4,265 feet long." Well, Mr. Chairman, I'm certainly not an expert on construction of this type, but at a minimum of \$10.00 a foot, that's around \$42,000 for the relocation of a pipeline. So if one were to add up the figures that I just quoted, they come pretty close to \$400,000.00. Now, this spring I had the occasion to go out to the MacDonald air field and I drove around and I looked, and the outward appearances are of nothing whatsoever happening, windows broken, the buildings falling into disrepair, and I would like the Minister to give us a comprehensive report of what is going on at MacDonald; what has it cost to date - are my figures wrong or are they underestimated or overestimated? And what is the future of this facility? Because I can recall at the time that it was purchased, the then Minister of Industry and Commerce had great hopes for this project.

I have here, again to come back to how the high taxes are affecting our existing businesses, a quotation from a newspaper and I'm sorry -- Sheldon Bowles is the author, so is that the Free Press? That's the Free Press. March, 1968, and the heading is: "Fanset to quit board." This is the Industrial Development Board of Greater Winnipeg. And I won't read a great deal out of the article but there's quite a discussion about how the 33 mill assessment affects industry. This is what, in part, he says: "It is an unfair tax. It is a discriminatory tax against industrial development and it will hurt development in the city. And now in quotation marks: "People come to look at our city and they want to know what the taxes are and then they don't come. They compare taxes here with other communities. They never say why they don't come but we are missing out on certain industries we hope to get. There can be no doubt that this tax has hurt us."

Now, Mr. Chairman, those remarks apply to the former rate of 33 mills not the present announced rate of the government which is 4.1 more, over a 10 percent increase. I also go on and Mr. Fanset is also concerned with the proportion of public buildings to private buildings being built. "Industry pays taxes and they don't send kids to school. Public buildings don't help any towards payment of taxes." And there's quite an article here. If the Minister hasn't seen it I'd like to -- he can have this copy if he wishes to make a study of what the problems are facing Winnipeg in that regard.

What did the Department of Industry and Commerce do when they found out that the Souris Creamery was in difficulty?

MRS. FORBES: They did an awful lot.

MR. JOHNSTON: Well then, I would like to hear it, because certain members of this House don't think they did a great deal. I would like to hear what the department did to help out an industry that was in trouble and needed some technical advice. So perhaps the Minister could tell us that. Perhaps the Minister of Urban Affairs, who seems to know a great deal about this, would like to get up and tell us.

MRS. FORBES: . . . surely do. It affects my part of the country, and the Minister of Agriculture did a lot too.

MR. JOHNSTON: Well, would you like to tell us now, the Honourable Minister. I'll take my seat while the Minister tells us what she did. -- (Interjection) -- Well, perhaps later. Another suggestion I have for the Minister of Industry and Commerce is that he prevail

(MR. JOHNSTON cont'd.) upon his colleagues in the Cabinet to try and keep some of the advertising in Manitoba that is presently going to firms located outside of Manitoba. I know he's very sensitive about this but there hasn't been any action to stop the out-flow of Canadian advertising dollars to firms without even an office in Manitoba, and of course I'm referring to Dalton Camp and Associates, where from the 1960 to 1967 period inclusive, they've received \$1,107,814.62 worth of advertising. So perhaps if he could put a little pressure on some of his mates in the Cabinet there to get some of that money stay here, that would certainly be a shot in the arm for the advertising industry in Manitoba.

Mr. Chairman, I have in my hand here a publication put out by the West Man Development Corporation and it's known as "West Man Topics." Now from what I've heard about this organization, they're certainly doing all they can for their part of the country, the Brandon area west and surrounding, and I'm glad to see an approach that they are taking that will certainly help industry come to small towns. I think the Industries Department of the Manitoba Government could take a leaf out of their practice and out of their book and do something about these problems which will make it much easier to bring in industry whether large or small.

On the back of their publication they have "Business Opportunities." The first four are requirements for small towns: Needed in Hamiota - a dentist. -- (Interjection) -- This must be out-of-date because the member for Hamiota tells me they have the dentist.

The next item is: Needed in Neepawa - a dentist. The third one is Minnedosa - and the Honourable Member for Minnedosa is not in his seat I see, the First Minister - Needed in Minnedosa - a dentist. The fourth item: Needed in Minnedosa - a doctor. I skip to the last item on the page: Needed in Neepawa - a veterinary surgeon. Now, Mr. Chairman, how can you expect industries to go to towns throughout Manitoba when the required services for employees are not first-class as they are in the larger cities such as Winnipeg and Brandon?

MR. MOLGAT: Is there no opening at Minnedosa for an undertaker?

MR. JOHNSTON: No, there's no opening for an undertaker in Minnedosa. Surely the Minister of Industry and Commerce could work with his colleague the Minister of Education and develop a program whereby we get more of the professional people needed in a small town. Now it may be idealistic to say this, that surely there are boys and girls in those communities and many other communities who if they were encouraged by scholarships - municipal, provincial scholarships - would be inclined to go back to their towns to practise after. It's pretty unreasonable to expect a city-oriented boy or girl to train for a doctor and then be asked to go to an environment to which they are not accustomed. So surely this is something that the Minister of Industry and Commerce can, in conjunction with the Minister of Education, work out a plan that will indirectly, indirectly it will help what he is trying to do and that is to put industries into towns across Manitoba.

Mr. Chairman, I'm sure the Honourable Minister would hardly expect me to sit down without making at least passing reference to the Manitoba Government Public Information Branch. I have in my hand two releases. One is dated November 17, 1967, and it refers to the sod-turning of the newest distillery in Manitoba, and the first sentence after the sub-heading is: "Sod has been turned on a \$4 million industry for the Province of Manitoba." Now I have in my hand a copy; not the original - it's only a photostatic copy of another News Release, and this one says: "Gimli-based distillery forecast economic surge," and the sub-heading says: "Ten million dollar complex is slated for spring start." Now to be quite honest I must say that on the second line it says, and I quote: "Plans of the House of Seagram to build a distillery and maturing facility near Gimli at a cost in excess of \$10 million have been hailed by the Industry and Commerce Minister, Honourable Sidney Spivak." Now, Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the Department of Industry and Commerce or the Information Branch has made a mistake, because I've never known them yet to under-state their case, and they say in the heading that it's a \$10 million complex but in all honesty in the second line it says "in excess of \$10 million."

I turn now to one of the Growing-to-Beat-Seventy ads that the Minister -- I don't know if this was free or not. He said we had a lot of free publicity, but this is an ad in the Tribune, January 17th. And one-half of the page is saying how proud we should be about the spirit of pride in Manitoba, and we should talk about what's going on and tell how the spirit is moving Manitoba with the development of our own northern vision. Now here's the point I make. It says: "Among the latest things we can talk about is \$40 million in chemical plants and \$16 million in distilleries. Why I've only added up through the two releases, \$14 million in

(MR. JOHNSTON cont'd.) distilleries -- are we missing a distillery? Or it's \$2 million. Or did you understate the cost of one of the distilleries? By the way, in looking at the same ad, I notice that there's a very very vague reference made to the developments in the North, and there's no actual dollars mentioned but it does say: "The northern vision is soon to yield the benefits of a multi-million-dollar mining and forest complex." Why don't they mention the hundred million dollar Churchill Forest Products operation? -- (Interjection) -- Well, you mentioned it before the election for months on end, so I'm sure that it must have been an oversight on the part of the Minister that he forgot that small item that we should be talking about.

MR. PETURSSON: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask a question about these news releases, whether it was through one of the releases that it was announced in the newspapers the same time as this information was announced, that a bootlegger in the neighborhood of Gimli had been arrested for distilling his own alcohol and he was fined \$1,000.00. Is this one way of killing off competition? Was any reference made to the origins of the company that is now building the distillery at Gimli?

MR. JOHNSTON: Perhaps the Minister will answer that question. I'm not competent to try to answer that.

Well, Mr. Chairman, I've just mentioned the \$100 million complex that the Churchill Forest Products operation was to be as announced by the Member for Wolseley - I see he is not in his seat - but perhaps the Honourable Member for Wolseley should help out the Minister of Industry and Commerce to explain why the soft-peddalling or the down-playing of what was to be quite a large and important complex in the north.

MR. CARROLL: The only people who are playing it down are on that side of the House.

MR. JOHNSTON: I have in my hand here -- perhaps the Honourable Minister of Welfare would like to take part at this time. I'd be willing to give way to him.

MR. CARROLL: I'll repeat some of the things your fellows have been saying in the north some time.

MR. JOHNSTON: Well, speaking about the north, Mr. Chairman, I have one more piece of literature to quote out of and then I'll let the eager Minister get back to his feet again, but this is a newsletter, this is a newsletter and I'm sorry but there's not a heading on it, but I presume it's from a lumberman's association by the mention of the wording, and I'll just quote News Item No. 8 -- they're numbered. It says: "No doubt you've read in the paper where Gordon Johnston, the Member for Portage la Prairie, asked in the House if it was true that Churchill Forest Industries (Manitoba) Limited had poured a yard of concrete into a muskeg on Sunday, December 31, 1967, just so they could advise the Provincial Government that they had commenced construction of their sawmill complex at The Pas on schedule. Mr. Johnston was not quite right. The concrete was poured on that date. It was not poured into a muskeg but they poured it. They poured a slab approximately 20 x 20 near the site and covered same with a tarpaulin that is still in the said condition."

So the Minister of Industry and Commerce, I know, has somehow placed the responsibility of talking about the Churchill Forest Products plant over on to his new colleague on his right, the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, and while he did his best to explain what he knew about this, I would think that the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce, who has been longer in the Cabinet and has been fairly closely associated with this, could perhaps tell us more about what is going on up there. For instance - and I know this will rile the Honourable Minister of Welfare no end - but I've been told that the government is negotiating to set up a pulp-cutting camp which they will guide and oversee, and sell pulp to Churchill Forest Products; and their talking price now is \$24, \$22, \$18 a cord on the landing or on the car. Now I haven't been told this but I would assume that Churchill Forest Products are going to turn around and resell this. Is this correct? I'd like to hear that. And if it is correct, I would like to know how much of this loan is going to support that part of the operation; how much of the \$3-1/2 million loan is going to support this part of the Churchill Forest Products operation. I find it unbelievable that taxpayers' dollars would be used in this method for a reselling operation, and I'd be very interested to hear from the Minister.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to, if I may, deal with the Honourable the Member for Portage la Prairie's questions and answer them as quickly as I can and get on to something which is probably more important, and that is the debate between the Honourable Member for Inkster and myself, because I think we're dealing in far more fundamental things when we talk in the terms that he did rather than some of the certainly legitimate questions that can be asked

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd.) by the Honourable Member for Portage, but whose comments I think are rather inappropriate.

First, with respect to the advertisement of the distillery. It was over \$10 million. We have been informed by the company that their costs in connection with this will be higher and that their investment will be greater, and so there's no discrepancy between the advertisement and the information that has been supplied. That's accurate; we're aware of it; that's not an error.

Reference was made to Souris Creamery, and I'd like to inform the honourable member that the department has been involved for some time in connection with the creamery, to offer its assistance, advice and guidance in connection with its financing, its management, its technical problems; that the member from Souris is here and is aware of this. The other honourable members including the Honourable Minister of Agriculture are aware of it and I can assure the Honourable Member from Portage that the members of the Department of Industry and Commerce have worked pretty diligently, and I would say even beyond the call of duty in that one sense, in that full sense, in their efforts to try and assist the creamery in its present difficulties.

With respect to MacDonald Airfield, I am simply going to indicate to you that there are in fact negotiations and considerations that are taking place within the department, and they're confidential, in connection with that facility, but I must say that one of the things that has been concerning us and one of the things that we have been working on which is important for the development of that area, is to try and correct, if we could, an anomaly that occurred in the Designated Area Program, whereby the designated area is approximately four miles from the facility, that is to say . . . The line for the designated area comes four miles from the facility and eliminates it, and we have requested of the Federal Government and we have been pressing in connection with this and we are hoping that there will possibly be some consideration given to it, that in fact it will be included within a designated area because it is so close, and the advantage of that would simply be that in the kind of major industrial development which the facility should be able to take, that the aided designation will assist in the costs of the equipment that will be required for such a facility.

With respect to the whole question of taxation, the matter has been dealt with by other departments and I am sure will be dealt in the debate on the Budget Speech. But it's interesting to note that the Honourable Member from Portage made reference to Campbell Soup and it's also interesting to note that as of this month Campbell is expanding its facilities by a new investment in Portage la Prairie notwithstanding the notice in connection with the taxes that he's referred to.

Now dealing with the items from the Honourable Member from Inkster, may I simply say this, that I think that there has been a tremendous attempt, a legitimate attempt and a very good one on the part of the Federal Department of Manpower and Immigration to create a new immigration program and to implement it to the best of its ability, recognizing all the problems that occurred in the past, and recognizing some factors that were responsible for causing misinformation, problems of settlement, adjustment problems that could have been avoided by an intelligent appraisal of what had to be done. And I say that in terms of the dealings of this department with the Federal Department of Manpower and Immigration, they have been most co-operative; they have been certainly willing to be flexible and they have indicated to us the immense problem that they've had to try and wield a new force of civil servants into this field to try and implement the program that they've been trying to carry out.

It's interesting to note that statistically - and this goes back to the Honourable Member from Elmwood for one of the remarks that he made - that statistically it would appear that the immigration program is going to be approximately one percent of the population of Canada, and that the statistics would indicate that this is a trend in terms of what will happen. We know that the flow in fact is controlled by the Federal Government and in effect that they can close it off or allow it to continue, not so much on any discriminatory practice, but in the manner in which the processing takes place at the point of processing for the immigrant. If they do not have enough staff or they have a limited staff, they can only process so much in a day, and this controls the flow that comes in.

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd).

Now, we were inexperienced in this province in the provincial immigration program and we've got quite a bit to learn. The Province of Ontario has had a very active immigration program since 1947. Their program has expanded and they, as a matter of fact, have approximately 30 people overseas, not stationed in the Province of Ontario but 30 people overseas in this field, who are assisting the provincial immigration program which in fact complements the Federal program. And they in turn do some of the processing, are allowed to do a portion of the processing up to the point of a medical examination, for the Federal Government and thus facilitate their activities.

Now the reason I say we're inexperienced is because we ourselves have had to be flexible and to view what has taken place to see what kind of changes should apply with respect toward the immigration program, and we recognized that there were going to be problems of adjustment. We recognized as well that it was important as a matter of policy to be candid insofar as the government information was concerned, to be accurate, and to in fact try and give the immigrant all the information that's required. We recognized as well that the Federal Government is continually informing immigrants with statistics and information, and that there's an upgrading that has to occur continually as conditions change. And we ourselves, I think we're the first province to accurately present statistics on cost of food, on housing, etc., and educational requirements for the immigrant. Others have presented it but not in a detailed way. And I must say that in preparing the brochure that we had, we had the advice and guidance of the Director of Immigration for the Federal Government of the United Kingdom, who happened to be visiting Canada and made a tour, and who gave us in a series of meetings the things that we should be concerned about in order to try and accurately present information. And he guided us, and the Federal Government in turn assisted us, and we think that we've developed pieces of literature that are as accurate as they can be, recognizing changes that have to occur at each period of time, at the same time not to misinform those who are coming here.

The problem from our point of view, and the real problem in this, is that the immigrant is interviewed by an immigration officer, who in a very short period of time must convey information to him, and who has information supplied from the various books of the Federal Government or any other kind of portfolio that he may have, and simply furnishes the information to the immigrant in a short interview of 15 or 20 minutes. And there's no doubt about it, at that time, with the immigrant, probably his wife and possibly his children, facing the immigrant counsellor, there's difficulty in trying to convey in a short period of time what really is happening in this country, or in any particular area in this province. So it has to come from the documents that are forwarded, that they will read. It has to come from the answers that are given to specific questions. It has to come from the dialogue that takes place. And there have been problems. I may say that, in a very real sense, I think that the problems in numbers - and I'm not saying that they're not very real to the person because I know that they are and we've dealt with them - but the problems in numbers, percentage-wise to what we've received in the past year, are very small, and I think we can be thankful for that, that the adjustments, it would appear to have occurred in a reasonable way.

But we're going to continue in the immigration program and we're going to require people in this province, and we're going to require people to take care of the expanding industrial activity that's occurring in this province, and we're going to therefore recognize that in the number that are going to come, we're going to have additional problems. Now, the vehicle -- and we recognize as a provincial government that we have a responsibility. We have situations that arise where either because of some co-operative effort, immigrants come here as a result of specific industries selecting or looking for immigrants, but in the main, the majority of immigrants who come to this province come as a result of some solicitation, maybe through our advertising program, but as a result of a direct interview with a Federal immigration officer. And they come here and they then are located in a specific industry. And there are bound to be troubles of adjustment, education, housing, problems with the industry itself. And we have a responsibility, notwithstanding the fact that it is a Federal Government prime responsibility, because they themselves brought them over. And what we're proposing in this, and reference was made in my notes, was the fact that we want to try and create a liaison with the Citizenship Council - and we have indicated that we are prepared to support them and we have met with them - whereby the immigrant will have a specific phone number, a location where he can go as soon as he gets into difficulty in his adjustments, whatever it may be, in his business activity; and that they in turn can lead him through the stages that have to occur in

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd)...order to explain his position specifically, and in turn in order to be able to know exactly what government response should take place - whether it be at the provincial or the federal level.

Now, obviously there are going to be a number of problems that cannot be dealt with by them, in terms of adjustment, that would require provincial co-operation and assistance, and our Immigration Branch is set up to service them. And this is what we hope will be the answer to the basic problem that he's mentioned. I must say that we have tried to do this, and I personally, along with the Deputy Minister and the Assistant Deputy Minister have met with a number of immigrants because we have a lot to learn in this and I'm not suggesting that we know all the answers and our program has to be flexible. But in the Citizenship Council program that I've mentioned, and it's on Page 19 of the notes, it's our feeling that we will create a vehicle to handle this. Now, this may not be the only vehicle - there may be others that may be required; but I must again point out the co-operative effort and the real interest on the part of the Federal people to try and carry through the programs.

There are cases, though, and they're bound to arise, where the immigrant will simply not - and it's not a question of adjustment - he will not be satisfied, either that he has been misled or unsatisfied with the way conditions are, and at a given point he takes his own course of action. Now these things are bound to happen; we can't control it. All we can do is try to do our best to facilitate it. All we can try and do is to be able to present to the Federal people who will be distributing the information, or in the advertising that we ourselves will be using, factual information. That's all.

With reference to the garment workers, there was an error, and you've referred to it. There's no point in going through that again. The error was an error of translation - there was never any intent. It was attempted to rectify it as best we can, and I think to a large extent it has. I may point out one interesting statistic which you probably are aware of, that of the immigrants that came over on this specific garment program - and this was before the point system arrived at in the Federal Government, and this was also before the White Paper was then changed and the new regulations and bill came forward - that the garment program was a pilot project, and one of the real interests in the Federal Government and ourselves at that time, aside from the question of the industry, was to try and see whether we could prove to the Federal Government that by creating the pilot project we could in fact bring people in here who had a lower skill and education than was required as the criteria, and that they in fact could adapt. And one of the real interesting features that have been worked out with the Federal Government representatives, including the Minister of Manpower and Immigration and his Deputy Minister - and I was present at these negotiations - was an attempt to try and see whether in a given kind of situation, if we were to deal in this kind of a situation, we could in fact lower their criteria and people could come in and they could be judged to have the adaptability and in fact could change, so that in fact the criteria that had been set up could be changed entirely. And lo and behold, in this period of time while this was happening, the criteria ... fact been changed. But the interesting thing to point out with reference to the garment workers, is that 50 percent of them are above the minimum wage right today, that have remained in the garment industry. And I think that this is indicative of the fact that they've had and proven that they've got the resourcefulness and the initiative and the capability in connection with this.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Chairman, the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce has raised a number of very interesting and controversial points that I'm sure that he would like to hear some comments on. Now I would like to suggest to the Honourable the House Leader or the Honourable the mover of the motion to so into Supply, that in view of the fact that we only have two minutes this afternoon, it might be a very appropriate time to rise for the weekend because I'm sure, Mr. Chairman, that within the two minutes that we have, we wouldn't have time to dissect or inwardly digest the last remarks of my honourable friend the Minister of Industry and Commerce. And again I say, what he has said within particularly the last two or three minutes is most controversial and is subject to a detailed analysis, in fact. So I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, if... Well, I have one minute in order to make my point, and no, we will not go overtime. I don't see the Speaker, Mr. Chairman. He may -- now I do see the Speaker, Mr. Chairman, and may I take the last 30 seconds that I have, due to the fact that this is one of those seasons in the calendar where there is an expression of goodwill to men, even though sometimes there are individuals that sort of excite that goodwill toward men, as the Honourable the Minister of Industry and Commerce, may I at least on

(MR. PAULLEY cont'd)...behalf of the New Democrats here wish to one and all a very pleasant long weekend, and may we get back here on Monday and enjoy once again the associations one with another, and at least for this weekend let us give to each other that spirit for which we observe this weekend of "Let us all reaffirm our faith in the brotherhood of man."

MR. LYON: Before the committee rises, I'm sure we would all agree that my honourable friend the Leader of the New Democratic Party is the best . . . roller in the House, and we would reciprocate his good wishes on Easter.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Committee rise. Call in the Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has considered certain resolutions, has requested me to report progress and begs leave to sit again.

IN SESSION

MR. J. DOUGLAS WATT (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Springfield that the report of the Committee be received.

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

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable the Provincial Treasurer, that the House do now adjourn.

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