

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA  
8:00 o'clock, Tuesday, August 26, 1969

ADJOURNED DEBATE - THRONE SPEECH

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Wolseley.

MR. CLAYDON: Mr. Speaker, before the supper hour adjournment I was speaking about assistance to isolated communities, and in particular I was speaking about a point called Rabbit Point or Princess Harbour on the eastern shores of Lake Winnipeg, which I told you is one of the most beautiful and picturesque ports on that lake. I am very happy to be able to say that I have been there on a number of occasions and I have enjoyed my visits tremendously. But I was at that time discussing the woodcutting in the area. The Indians receive \$7.00 a cord for cutting. They receive \$3.00 a cord for hauling, but they're required to pay \$1.00 per cord to the Provincial Government for stumpage, and at these rates the residents point out that it is not a profitable venture and that the haulage rate should be increased to \$4.50 per cord. There is a potential capacity of 2,700 cords in that little port. There is also the possibility of a lumber mill being established providing cutting rights could be obtained from the Manitoba Pulp and Paper Company and they have a local 5-man committee that was appointed by the residents to look after their local affairs. I would suggest that the government make contact with these people and include them as part of the north, when talking in terms of development.

I should hasten to point out that the deficiencies to which I have made reference have only recently come to my attention. As a matter of fact, since the 1st of August. Some are recent, some are of long standing. And in no way am I blaming, as I said before, past or present government. But there has been a lack of liaison with these communities and perhaps in most cases this is due to the poor communication facilities. A desirable project would be the construction of a highway that would open up that whole eastern shore of Lake Winnipeg. Admittedly it is a 50 mile link to Manigotagan and to Hole River, but along the way there could be found many beautiful spots and some wonderful fishing in areas such as Rice River.

I am very happy to see that the Member for Rupertsland is now in attendance because I feel that perhaps some of my remarks may be of general interest to him.

There are many other areas around the Lake that lend themselves as prime targets for development, and I do recognize there are many problems associated with this development but we should not forget the people who live in these isolated areas.

Hecla Island has been mentioned and there's a great need for a causeway connecting the island with the mainland. And for some years in the village of Hecla....

A MEMBER: Mr. Speaker, I just wonder whether there is a member sitting in here without a jacket on?

MR. CHERNIACK: .... member from Fort Rouge?

A MEMBER: I don't know what the constituency is, Mr. Speaker, but there's a member without....

MR. SPEAKER: There is a rule of the House which I believe prohibits being in this Chamber, or prohibits members of the House being in this Chamber without a jacket and tie, and until such time as the rule is changed, if the House should feel necessary to change it, then I'm bound to enforce it.

HON. AL. MACKLING (Attorney-General)(St. James): Mr. Speaker, I would like to suggest whether I might make a motion at this time that the rule be suspended in view of the temperature in this Chamber and the fact that we should be reasonable in our approach to how we are able to dress even in this Chamber and that we be allowed to remove our jackets. I so move.

MR. SPEAKER: I've heard no seconder for the motion, therefore would the Honourable Member for Wolseley continue.

MR. JAMES H. BILTON (Swan River): Mr. Speaker, if it will be of any assistance to you, Sir, it has always been the practice when the Speaker is in the Chair the members will remain fully dressed. When the House is in committee, Sir, this privilege has been extended that the honourable members could remove their coats. But so long as you are in the Chair, Sir, I think the rule should be maintained.

MR. SCHREYER: .... on this same point, Mr. Speaker, could you advise that this rule about propriety of dress while the Speaker is in the Chair, applies to the Press as well or does it just apply to members in the Chamber?

MR. SPEAKER: Well the Press is and it isn't part of the Legislative Chamber. The press

(MR. SPEAKER cont'd.) . . . gallery is a number of feet above where we are sitting here and there might be quite a difference in temperature between that over here and that up there. I only have one pair of eyes. In fact I cannot even see the press gallery.

MR. DONALD MALINOWSKI (Point Douglas): What shall I do? I am not wearing a tie.

MR. SPEAKER: May I suggest to the honourable members that rather than take up the time of debate during this evening's session that we for the time being adhere to the rules and let the honourable member continue. If there need be a way around it, well let's give that matter some thought in advance and come prepared to settle that issue, rather than interrupt someone's debate.

MR. CLAYDON: Mr. Speaker, I was about to say that in the village of Hecla there has existed a box factory for a number of years and although it is inactive I'm assured that the machinery is all there and perhaps it is not ultra modern machinery, but some of the residents have expressed an interest to me that if this factory could be reactivated, it could go into the production of grain doors, palates and the like, and I would suggest that this could be an area that could be explored.

MR. IAN TURNBULL (Osborne): Mr. Speaker, would the honourable member entertain a question?

MR. CLAYDON: I will answer a question when I'm finished. I went to Hnaua recently. I visited the fisheries training station in operation and I was impressed to witness the opportunity for trade advancement that is being offered to fishermen from all parts of the province. When I was there, there were two representatives from the Saskatchewan government in attendance and they indicated that the province of Saskatchewan anticipates entering this field of insistence, and while I recognize that this is a new development and that there are bound to be . . . troubles, I suggest that a closer liaison be established between the department and the personnel operating the station.

Only recently a fancy speedboat, and an electric start motor were shipped up for the use of the instructor in charge of the fishing operation. It is neither of the type or size which he would like to have for the work that he's required to do. It is a fancy plastic speedboat type. I believe the engine is well in excess of 100 h.p. and he tells me it would be of no use whatever to him if he had to attempt the rescue or towing in of another fishing boat that was in trouble. Somebody in the department just merely shipped up a bunch of desk lamps (that's the student type) dozens of them. They don't know what they were for, they were taken out of I believe another building here and just perhaps sent up there to get them out of the way. Kerosene was shipped up for the use of the outboard motors. Now I know the Honourable Minister of Transport will wonder what you will do with kerosene in an outboard engine. Policing is almost non-existent on the docks. At one time in contravention of federal laws to prohibit vehicles on docks unless they're picking up or discharging cargo, they were running at will on the docks and even one, a convertible car with four youths in it, they were riding on the dock drinking beer at the same time. Nobody seems to care. It is a great hazard to public safety on hot weekends when the public are using these docks and fishing from them to have these cars roaring up and down at anything from 5 to 30 miles an hour.

In Gimli there has been a tremendous improvement, particularly since the Pan American Games were held there. But there is a matter of safety for which I have great concern, and that is also the vehicular traffic on the dock and particularly on weekends such as the Icelandic Celebration where a number of vehicles were up and down the dock, motorcycles, bicycles, cars and trucks. Not only that, there seems to be a program of encouraging swimmers to swim in the harbour and at night they are swimming in the harbour at great danger to themselves. Operators of these larger boats cannot see them in the water. I brought this to the attention of the Mounted Police in Gimli and they tell me they are very short-handed and while I recognize that, I do think something should be done to see to the safety of the public in that area. I think the government should press for the topping of the south breakwater.

There is a great need in that harbour for additional space. The same in Winnipeg Beach. I think we should press for the completion of the harbour facilities in that area.

There is a great need for a marina at the mouth of the river. I don't know if you realize it, but in the Winnipeg district there is over 26,000 boats that have been registered. A number of these boats will go to the mouth of the river and find no place to tie up and when the lake is stormy it presents a real problem. There is tremendous congestion at the mouth of the river and although this has been talked about I know for years and years by not only the previous

(MR. CLAYDON cont'd.)... government but the one before that, nothing has been done.

MR. PAULLEY: The last one was really a washout.

MR. CLAYDON: There is a need for improvement in the radio telephone network on Lake Winnipeg. This is under the control of the Manitoba Telephone System almost entirely. I think in my view the terminal charge for marine use in the summer months should be discontinued because this is preventing people from making full use of the safety facilities.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. May I remind the honourable member he has five minutes remaining, of the time allotted him.

MR. CLAYDON: I will try to be very brief, Mr. Speaker, although I could speak on Lake Winnipeg for a week. But the terminal charge is a serious one on Lake Winnipeg. It is preventing these boats from making use of the safety facilities that could exist. Nobody objects to the terminal charge of \$1.05 plus tax, plus the toll line charge from Gimli to whatever point they call, but when asking for weather reports and return information such as that, they should not be required to pay this terminal charge for a 3 and a 4 month period. There is a great tendency for the operators of the radio equipped boats not to want to carry the Manitoba Telephone frequency for this reason, and I would suggest that if this charge was removed, that greater use will be made. And I would suggest that you change the radio call sign from Selkirk back to Gimli, because on Lake Winnipeg now we have the Lord Selkirk, the Lady Selkirk, Selkirk Silica Sand and a few more Selkirks, and in noisy radio conditions there is confusion. The transmitter is located at Gimli. I think they should go back to the use of the name Gimli and resolve the problem that exists with regard to the name.

Now Mr. Speaker, I could speak much longer. I probably will on the Estimates, because I'm not setting myself up as an authority, I have spent a lot of my lifetime on the lake. It is a beautiful lake, I do not like to see it abused and I'm very happy to say that through my presence on the lake, I have been directly responsible for the saving of lives. I don't look for this kind of operation. It is not the type I want, but I do believe there are safety measures that we should take; we should examine it now because it is a wonderful area and it is within easy reach of my constituents and all of those of Greater Winnipeg.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Osborne.

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Speaker, would the honourable member now entertain a question?

MR. CLAYDON: Certainly.

MR. TURNBULL: My question relates to the suggestion you made of reactivating the box factory which I believe is located on Hecla Island. Is that correct? I was wondering if you could give us a figure relating to the population, the adult population of Hecla Island, and I was wondering if you knew what the aspirations of the residents of Hecla Island were in relationship to this box factory. My impression is that they're more interested in tourist development which the previous government failed to develop there.

MR. CLAYDON: I'm very happy to answer that, Mr. Speaker. It's true that they would like to develop Hecla Island as a tourist attraction and I'm in full agreement with them. Nevertheless, some of the local residents inform me that this box factory could be the nucleus for retaining some of the people at Hecla who have left it and gone to seek employment elsewhere. They tell me that it could be reactivated and if it was, there would be development in the area to the benefit of all. And I'm told that the machinery is there for that purpose.

MR. DESJARDINS: I have a question, Mr. Speaker. May I ask a question of the honourable member that just spoke? Did I understand him correctly when he said that he is interested in measures to relieve the high cost of municipal taxation and that I was wrong in stating that last year he said that there was no undue hardship on the people of the municipality?

MR. CLAYDON: When I made reference to that remark I was speaking about the increases of school taxation over the eight year period. I was not talking about total municipal taxation, because if you will read the Hansard you will soon realize that I pointed out to you that the municipal portion of the tax bill is the one that has been escalating at a far greater rate than any other portion of it.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, then is he misquoted here in Hansard of last year on page 531, and I quote, "I think in this area that you must look at..." My question is, is he misquoted? Are you afraid to listen to this? And besides, Mr. Speaker, if the Leader of the Opposition wants to speak he should be in his seat. Would you want to come in your seat with the three fellows fighting for the leadership? Would you come in your seat?

MR. BILTON:... contribution to this debate.

MR. SPEAKER: Would the honourable member put his question?

MR. DESJARDINS: All right. My question: Were you misquoted last year when Hansard quotes you as saying that "I think in the area of taxation that you must look at not necessarily the mill rate but the actual amount of money that the real property taxpayer is called upon to pay, the actual money that he's called upon to pay and I can't honestly say that the taxpayer is being called upon to shoulder an excess burden as has been indicated in this House."

MR. CLAYDON: Mr. Speaker, I'm very happy to answer that question because if he would read the whole thing he would find out that I said this: (which is also part of the same discussion): "If any man can sit in this House and tell me after eight years an increase of \$7.78 on the school tax portion of his taxes is excessive I'd like to meet and discuss it with him." The point I was talking about was school taxes, not total municipal taxes. -- (Interjection) -- No, you took it out of context.

MR. CHERNIACK: Mr. Speaker, I want also, if I might, direct a question to the honourable member?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. CHERNIACK: Was he suggesting that - I have two questions but the first one - Was he suggesting that the government get involved in a box factory on Hecla Island?

MR. CLAYDON: I'm suggesting that it is perhaps a small industry that could be reactivated. I have not all of the details. I have had discussions with the people in the area and some indicate to me that it would be beneficial to them. I'm not suggesting that the government should necessarily go it on themselves but perhaps they could assist in getting it started.

MR. CHERNIACK: My second question, Mr. Speaker, my second question is related to what the honourable member was saying towards the end of his speech about the communications on Lake Winnipeg and other problems in relation thereto. I wonder if he could provide me with information, or the House if he has it now, as to what efforts he had made with the previous government to have this done and what his successes were so that I could see whether I could further prosecute the problem.

MR. CLAYDON: I'm not averse to answering that question because I had a great deal to do with it and as time goes on, great progress has been made. I have been very instrumental and perhaps was the sole person responsible for getting the frequency of 4160 as an inter-ship communication channel which we never had before. Now great progress has been made, but further progress can be made on the part of the Manitoba Telephone System. -- (Interjection) --

MR. CHERNIACK: Well, I can speak to him privately.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. The Honourable the Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, in addressing my remarks to you in this debate, I wish first of all to congratulate you on your election to this House as a New Democratic candidate. Your constituents first recognized your ability and integrity by re-electing you to this House. They did so knowing that your past record as an articulate advocate of social justice made you the logical person to continue to represent them in the constituency of Burrows. Not only therefore, Mr. Speaker, do I congratulate you, I congratulate your constituents and endorse my personal approval to that overwhelming vote of confidence you received in the last election. In the Speaker's Chair you wear the hat well and have already demonstrated your unquestioned ability to serve in the role you now occupy.

Although in principle, Mr. Speaker, I favour the establishment of an independent and permanent Speakership, I cannot deny the feeling of pride and genuine satisfaction at your presence in the Speaker's Chair.

I wish also, Mr. Speaker, to congratulate the Honourable Members for Osborne and St. George for the excellence of their speeches on the proposed motion for an Address to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor in answer to his Speech at the opening of the session. Their articulate and able introductions augur well, not only for their future contributions to this House, but also so far as this side of the House is concerned at least, has set the standard of debate at the highest level.

In deference to the extensive number of new members who, like myself, deem it a matter of personal priority to participate in the Throne Speech debate, I intend to be brief.

I represent "sunny" St. James, a part, in fact, by some deemed to be the best part of the City of St. James-Assiniboia. Sunny not merely because we have the finest weather in the province, but especially because that word characterizes the warmth and vitality of its citizens who are justifiably proud of their city. They take pride in the recognition that their city is a leader

(MR. MACKLING cont'd.)... in urban planning, financial structuring, industrial development, educational and recreational facilities and programs, to mention only a few. The City of St. James-Assiniboia has a reputation for excellence second to none. Our city has long been recognized as an innovator, but like all other cities, it has its moments of temporary frustration. I use the word "temporary" deliberately, since I hope that the present delay in the planned urban development of the former Brooklands area of St. James will be proceeded with despite the Federal Government's announced curtailment of federal spending in certain areas.

The St. James-Assiniboia scheme as planned is unique in its approach since its concept is the selective restoration, and where necessary only the removal of blighted housing, rather than the renewal of all homes in the scheme area. As such, it is in line with the latest concepts suggested in the Hellyer Report on Housing. In addition to being less expensive, it is far less disruptive and much more acceptable to the people affected. This government, I am confident, will do its utmost to persuade the Federal Government that its policy of recognition of regional disparity in the Metro Winnipeg area and suggested action to continue assistance in such areas, is not logically consistent with its announced curtailment of the St. James and Winnipeg schemes.

Before turning to the details of the amendment that is before us, I would like to pay tribute to the work of the former member for St. James, Douglas Stanes, whom I am certain will be remembered as a member who served his constituents to the best of his ability, which ability is reflected by his lengthy record of service in this House, latterly as party whip for the former government.

I wish to thank the Honourable Member for Assiniboia for his kind personal words of yesterday and wish to assure him that as this party indicated at its founding convention, we welcome liberally-minded persons. We are happy that we are a party that is receptive to new ideas and concepts, prepared to listen to constructive suggestions at any time, formally or informally brought to our attention. We shall endeavour to satisfy the requirements of a good, responsive government and will not frustrate constructive criticism. On the other hand, it is only just that I say to the Honourable Leader of the Opposition and his colleagues, we will not readily and quiescently accept utter nonsense, no matter how articulately gilded. A good opposition, as my honourable friends know, should present constructive criticism to ensure full debate of programs first introduced by the government. This session is a special one, even though called a regular session. Not only is it different in that it is a summer session, but the legislative program almost completely consists of measures introduced, perhaps for political window dressing only, by the former government whose dissolution of the last Legislature for political gain so badly backfired on them.

How in all truth can the Honourable Leader of the Opposition move such an obviously ridiculous amendment when none of the 60-odd Bills aborted by his dissolution of the last House dealt with any of the serious matters he now raises as omissions of a government barely in office for one month. I am tempted to use the words of another former Tory leader: "Why didn't you do it when?"

When Mr. Speaker, we moved into office, there was a natural backlog of administrative work in every department because the former administration had been on the hustings for a lengthy period of time. There was a considerable backlog, as only understandable, in administrative work to be cleared. And yet in that one month we prepared for this session; we selected priority legislation, legislation that had long been awaited by the people after having been tabled in this House by the previous administration. This by no means represents the program of the New Democratic Party in its fullest sense. I submit that the Honourable Leader of the Opposition is, like some of us on this side of the House, new to their responsibilities. I for one am prepared to be tolerant of honest mistakes, but I think that the people of Manitoba despise sham and will recognize the Throne Speech amendment as such. -- (Interjection) -- Yes, the farmers too.

Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that the members of Her Majesty's loyal opposition are testing. That's quite understandable because they're suffering - they're hurt and sore from the great fall. But we will be patient with them and we hope that they will come to understand us and realize that we have adopted a pragmatic approach not only to good government but we're prepared to wait for an Opposition to mature and materialize in constructive criticism.

I think, Mr. Speaker, the Opposition will come to realize that we will conserve our resources and jealously guard the right to demand the highest return for the tax dollar spent on any program. We will be liberal in our approach to the needy and those who suffer from

(MR. MACKLING cont'd.)... economic hardship over which they are powerless to overcome. Above all we shall strive to better the lot of all of our people and enrich their lives with the fullest share of the good life that ought to be available to all.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I wish to advise the members of this House that my department has under consideration a wide range of matters considered to be important to improve the administration of justice in this province and as quickly as possible in the full session of this Legislature in the new year they will be placed before you and I trust will receive constructive and deliberate criticism on the part of the Opposition.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. First of all I would like to congratulate you on your appointment as Speaker of this House. Certainly in the few days that I have been here, I can see that your job is not an easy one, but you have certainly shown in the short time you are a very worthy choice and very capable of doing a good job.

Mr. Speaker, it seems almost like old home week to be speaking after the Honourable Attorney-General. We have been very closely related to one another in another political field for the last six years and I assure you in that political field we had only one aim, which was St. James-Assiniboia, what was good for it was good for it, what wasn't, wasn't. Am I correct?

Mr. Speaker, I would also like to congratulate the mover and the seconder of the Speech from the Throne. The Honourable Member from Osborne mentioned that the urban area has got some problems and did give some suggestions on how these problems could be solved. And I agree with him, there are problems. His suggestions I agree with too, but I would like to say to him that they go much deeper and I'm sure that he would consider at any time discussing them because the Greater Winnipeg area does have problems and I agree with him and would like to discuss it with him.

There's only one thing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say. I have to be cautious of the Member from Osborne. He mentioned the people of his constituency and my mother-in-law is one of them and anybody who represents somebody's mother-in-law most men have to be cautious of.

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to congratulate the Honourable Member from St. George who seconded the Speech from the Throne and I commend him on his statements of what you might say is fighting for your constituency and asking for things to be done. I agree with him and I hope he continues, but I would like to say to him that 12 years ago when I had the opportunity to travel this country by road or most of Manitoba by road, I can remember having my car pulled through many of the roads by a tractor. I assure him there has been **much** upgrading in the last 11 years.

Mr. Speaker, the constituency of Sturgeon Creek is new. It is created by redistribution last year. It is part of the City of St. James-Assiniboia - sunny St. James-Assiniboia which the Attorney-General referred to. It has four members in this House representing it. The northern part of the St. James area is represented by the Member from Logan, which is the Brooklands area; the eastern section of the City of St. James-Assiniboia is represented by the Honourable Attorney-General; the western section of St. James-Assiniboia by the Honourable Member from Assiniboia; and right in the middle like a rose between two thorns, is Conservative Sturgeon Creek. -- (Interjection) -- It's my choice, Sir.

The constituency is bounded by the St. James Street on the east -- oh, I'm sorry, that's the Honourable Attorney-General's. It's bounded by Mount Royal on the East, it's bounded by Saskatchewan Avenue on the north, the Assiniboine River on the south and on the west the extreme part of Woodhaven on Portage Avenue and on the north side of Portage Avenue, Parkhill Street in the Assiniboia area. It takes its name from a creek that runs through it. The creek starts through Sturgeon Creek at the Saskatchewan area, runs down past the Grace Hospital, through the Sturgeon Creek Park, through the Woodhaven Park and on to the Assiniboine River.

Mr. Speaker, that creek is bounded on both sides by beautiful parks. One park there, the Woodhaven Park, and the Sturgeon Creek Park I'm sure most of you know it as you go by Grace Hospital, is probably one of the nicest and beautiful areas in the Winnipeg area - the Greater Winnipeg area. Mr. Speaker, there were 2,000 people in that park last Thursday night at our playground, St. James-Assiniboia playground windup, which is put on by our Recreational Department which is again, Mr. Speaker, ably chaired by the Honourable Attorney-General. But as I stood in that park I became very concerned about the beltway the Honourable Member from Assiniboia mentioned. The Metro Corporation has decided that there will be a beltway run right through this green beautiful area, darn near take the corner off the Grace Hospital, over

(MR. F. JOHNSTON cont'd.)...our wonderful aeroplane that we have sitting out there, and through the park and across the Assiniboine River. And Mr. Speaker, I say this in all sincerity the Provincial Government now has, and the Honourable Minister of Transport, has to make the decision as to whether this road will go there some time, and I'm not joking when I say this, if the decision is to put it there, there will be more people camping on this Legislative Building than you've ever seen. They will be from Sturgeon Creek, St. James-Assiniboia, and they will be from Greater Winnipeg and parts of Manitoba, because you would be spoiling one of the greenest areas, the nicest areas in this province.

Mr. Speaker, the constituency has two community clubs where we have much activity in our community clubs. We have access to the St. James Civic Centre. We have young people; we have retired people; we have middle-aged people. They are of all ethnic groups and classes. They are engineers, carpenters, office workers, anything you would like to mention, and I assure you they all mix together in that constituency in an atmosphere of what we feel is one of the nicest residential districts that there is.

We have the Kiwanis Senior Citizens Home which is probably classed as one of the best, which was supported by the previous government. The Salvation Army are building another one which is supported by the government - the previous government. The Grace Hospital - one of the most up-to-date in Western Canada - which was supported by the previous government, and I take note of the Member from St. Matthews' comments about Lions Manor, and it is one of the finest too, but also supported by the previous government and many others in Winnipeg.

Mr. Speaker, the City of St. James, as the Honourable Attorney-General has said, has been regarded as one of the best and most prosperous cities in this area and, in some cases, Manitoba and parts of North America. This didn't happen by accident. We happen to have in St. James the Civic Centre. We are building again under the direction of the Attorney-General another swimming pool. We will be building another library, another fire hall. We will be doing it without going to the market at all - we won't be selling debentures. We will do it out of our own funds. We have the tennis; we have wading pools. Other people have them too but we have them in St. James-Assiniboia and it is, as I say, not by accident.

Years ago we were kicked out of the Municipality of Assiniboia. We were the poor neighbours to the east; they didn't want to be bothered with us and all the roads and everything that had to be put in the area. But we struggled along - the City of St. James - through the years, and in the early '50s there were some far-sighted aldermen who decided that they would have to do something about this, and they went out and they sold a debenture for a million dollars, and with that money developed the one resource they had - land - and made it into an industrial area.

Now I would like to say here to all the members from Winnipeg, everybody in St. James-Assiniboia is quite aware that we are to the west of a very large city, and we are also quite aware that we have the airport, but by the same token they went ahead and did it and they attracted industry into the area. Private investment and industry brought more industry, the more industry that came the more people came to live in our area, and the area prospered. You know it's infinity. It starts industry, people, prosperity, industry, people, prosperity - it goes round and round and you can't stop it. -- (Interjection) -- We'll get to that, Sir. But the industry -- we used the money and the prosperity that we received from industry. We used it for creating an environment, a terrific environment for people to live in, and that's the only way you can do it. The Honourable Member from Winnipeg Centre stated environment. The Honourable Minister of Health and Welfare states environment. But you can't do it without money and I've heard the expression said in the House, a buck's a buck and you have to have the industry, the support of the industry. It's proved in the city of St. James-Assiniboia - 43 percent of the expenses are paid by industry tax dollars in the City of St. James-Assiniboia.

Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to answer questions but I also agree with everybody in this House that everybody does not have the same opportunity that we had, and I admitted we were beside Winnipeg, and I believe it is up to the province and places like Metro to help other people that need it, and I'm sure that you'll have no opposition from this side of the House when that happens.

Mr. Speaker, the previous government was doing the same thing and they were developing their resources - their great power resources to the north. And let's everybody be very clear on one fact: the only reason for the industrial base and the population in Ontario is the Great Niagara River. You can find it in any history and you can't deny that the powers that that river

(MR. F. JOHNSTON cont'd.)... produce is the reason for the industrial base. I assure you that the power that is so urgently required up there at the present time is going to bring all kinds of energy, and there's no other cheaper power than water power. -- (Interjection) -- Oh, I would say it can be proven.

The Honourable First Minister mentioned in Churchill that the port would be opened for another month and I think this is wonderful, but what he neglected to say - I was not there but I didn't read it in the reports - what he did neglect to say, that the way you get rid of the slush from the Port of Churchill is divert the Churchill River into the Nelson so the slush enters further down in the bay and keep the bay clear. That is stated in the Mauro Report. It's right there for everybody to read. It's very plain and obvious.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that we cannot forget our resources to the south - our great agricultural resources in Southern Manitoba. I assure you that this government -- pardon me, the previous government, and our leader has often said when he was Premier that agriculture should be raw material instead of an end use, and I assure you that can be done if you have the power to have the factory. It will create more jobs for people, and you all, or some of you, visited on Thursday a prime example of that in Gimli, where we ship our agricultural products out as an end product, and we use it here, and the people manufacture it here in this area. Mr. Speaker, there's no other way of doing it. The industry will come if you create the environment for the industry. After you have that, you can create an environment for people which is second to none and it's been proven, but you can't do it without having, as I said, the bucks.

Mr. Speaker, the suggestion of the Honourable First Minister of "15 percent what the hell" is a very strange one to me. I've been in business most of my life and sometimes you have to attract people so that they'll know what you have. Canada had an Expo. We spend thousands of dollars in Manitoba to attract people to this area, to our resources, for holidaying and what have you. There's nothing wrong with a trade show. There's nothing wrong with an investment to bring industry into this province - not one bit. And as the Honourable Member from Ste. Rose mentioned about the estate tax today, we have a competitive situation. If you're going to be in a business you've got to be competitive. We have other provinces looking for all kinds of industry and sometimes you have to cut the price to get the business. There's no way around it. And if you don't, the business will suffer and in this case the business is the province and the people will suffer. They're the employees of that business in this area.

Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to stay on my feet very much longer, in fact very shortly. I would only say that if you tax industry you'll lose it. If you tax these young people, executives, contractors, plumbers if you like, that are making \$8,000 a year - I'm in that part of the industry too - carpenters, everything - you'll lose them. You won't have those people. The only people you'll have left to tax are the people that are here now, and you'll lose them too. So how will you build an environment for people to come to? -- (Interjection) -- I'm afraid that we're not poor in this province. But anyway ....

MR. GREEN: Oh, no poor in this province.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: I didn't say....

MR. GREEN: That's interesting.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Well let's carry on. I'll answer any questions after. But I assure you, I assure you that don't scare people away. And the suggestion that the government should even be remotely in industry, in any way, shape or form, partnership or anything, is ridiculous.

MR. GREEN: What would you suggest?

A MEMBER: Talk to Wolseley.... A box factory.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: It has been proven that people don't even like to buy from a Crown corporation. They shy from it. And tell me one Crown corporation. Fine. Tell me one, any one of you. One Crown corporation that can compete internationally or nationally. -- (Interjection) -- Well, Manitoba Hydro. Well, I'm only saying that with television today the people of Manitoba want the styles. They want everything everybody else has and I sure wouldn't like to be sitting here selling my product in these four walls. Private industry will do for this province what should be done, Mr. Speaker, and I can only say to you this: it has been proven. We can't compare this province with any other area. Any other comparisons I've heard so far you could take those comparisons and put them in this province five or six times. You're dealing with a province that is massive. You have to have it go ahead and you can't, it's too big for this province or the government to do it. Private industry has to have the help of government which will create environment for the people. Thank you.

MR. PAULLEY: I wonder if my honourable friend would permit a question?

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Yes.

MR. PAULLEY: My honourable friend expresses a concern for private industry going out of Manitoba. Would my honourable friend not agree that in the last bond issue produced by my honourable friend the Minister of Finance, that we received the lowest bank rate of any province in the whole of the Dominion of Canada?

MR. F. JOHNSTON: I was going to say -- all right, it's a very good commentary. The interest rate of the City of St. James-Assiniboia is very good too. Mr. Speaker, I am not going to get into a bartering discussion with a man that's been here 17 years. I assure you that I respect his position and I will look up the answer and I will give it to him in the future. Thank you.

MR. PAULLEY: If I may, a supplementary question to my honourable friend is that I would suggest to him he does look at the record, because with this government he suggests is chasing industry out, we have received the lowest rate in Canada.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek will answer a question that I might put to him?

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Oh, yes, certainly.

MR. MACKLING: Will the honourable member advise what the decision of the former administration was in respect to the Inner Perimeter beltway, particularly the former Minister of Transport for the former government, of which party he's a member?

MR. F. JOHNSTON: There has been no decision made. I think the Honourable Attorney-General knows that. The Minister of Transport of the previous government has not even had an application from Metro to date, and I don't think the Minister of Transport has now. But he may receive one; he may have one now; but I assure you that the previous minister hadn't. I said "Metro" has decided, and it will be up to the provincial government to make the decision because they paid 50 percent of the highway costs in Metro Winnipeg.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, would the honourable member answer a question arising out of his answer?

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Yes.

MR. MACKLING: Is it not a fact, is it not a fact, honourable member, that the former administration was paying 50 percent of the costs of land acquisitions proceeded with by the Metropolitan Government with the tacit approval of the former administration?

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Yes, that is correct, Mr. Speaker. I'll answer that question. The decision was -- said definitely there was land acquisition along Sturgeon Road in the City of St. James-Assiniboia. The decision for the road had not been made. Metro was able to purchase that land at a price which was advantageous to buy it at that time, which they did do. And if it does go through, they will have the land. That's the reason it was purchased.

..... continued on next page

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Crescentwood.

MR. CY GONICK: Mr. Speaker, it's a great privilege for me to address this Assembly for the first time. In approaching the Chamber this evening I was approached by a constituent of mine who, in consideration of the fact -- knowing that this would be my first speech before this Assembly, told me that after all, I didn't have to be nervous because in this day and age it's much more dangerous entering a university classroom than it would be entering the Manitoba Legislature. However, after yesterday's performance and the attack upon my colleague from St. Boniface, I'm beginning to wonder. -- (Interjections) --

MR. DESJARDINS: Even yours. I've got enough for all of you. I'll borrow from him if you want some.

MR. GONICK: I know that there's been a considerable surprise over my victory in this election, and I know too that perhaps -- I hope I won't seem too laudatory of my own victory, but I know that many people thought that, with the exception of our own victory as a New Democratic Party, that my own personal victory came as a great shock to the opposition, the current opposition. But I do want to say that I'm very happy to report that Mr. Evans, the former Minister of Finance, was very gracious in defeat and, like myself, was a gentleman throughout the campaign. I also know that there is a great deal of speculation among the members opposite about my own thoughts for the nature of our society and the future direction that I believe our society should take, and I want to say to the members opposite and to the press that if you'll listen to me this evening I will clarify exactly what my views are about the nature of our society and about the future direction I wish it to take.

Before I begin, however, I'd like to join with many others and congratulate the Speaker on his election. I have not known him as a colleague in this House. However, I have known him as a personal friend and there's no question in my mind that he will, as he already has shown, conduct himself in a fair, equitable manner throughout.

I believe that Canada and Canadians are at a crossroad. There are many directions which we can take and I want to deal with three broad directions. I want to talk about the Communist direction, I want to talk about Capitalist direction, and I want to talk about Socialist direction.

Last week was the first anniversary of the invasion of Czechoslovakia. As many members may know, I was in Czechoslovakia last summer before the invasion, and while I was there I could not help but notice the joy with which people there were living their new-found freedom. There was a free press, a more controversial and livelier press than I've seen in North America. There was free assembly; there was a free spirit. I spoke to many young people. I spoke to publishers and professors like myself. Young and old were beginning to ask fundamental questions, questions about the future of their society, questions about the scope of individualism and self-determination in a Communist society. That newly-won freedom was crushed by the August invasion. It is only one of many recent indications that freedom in the Communist world remains an illusion despite the hopes of many that the worst days of Stalinism were over for ever.

Another indication that Soviet Communism was unwilling and unable to tolerate dissent is the plight of the artists and intellectuals described so vividly by the novelist Kuznetsov in one of the daily papers. A trend towards liberalism was broken in the spring of 1966 when the writers Andre Signovsky and Uri Darnjel were arrested under the charge of subverting Soviet authorities through their written work. Signovsky was given seven years at hard labour, Darnjel was given five. They are still serving their sentences and they have been joined by many others also found guilty of challenging the authority of the Communist Party.

I never believe that it is sufficient to condemn the Soviet Union without attempting to explain its failure. Condemning without explaining is a way of fools and knaves, of propagandists and hacks. It's no news to Socialists that the experience of so-called Socialism in the U.S.S.R. has smeared the Socialist tradition to the point that Socialism is a word that is despised throughout much of the western world. The socialism of the U.S.S.R. has nothing whatever to do with the socialism of Marx and the early socialist thinkers. How could the backward Russia of 1917 produce the free, independent and sharing individual that was Marx's vision of man under socialism? The function of socialism was not to carry out an industrial revolution; its function was to maximize not production but individuality, to liberate man from the kind of work that destroys his dignity and from the kind of society that enslaves him to the things of his own creation. Freedom. Independence. Individuality. These are the aims of

(MR. GONICK cont'd) . . . . socialist society.

But this presumes the highly industrialized, highly productive economy. In the Russia of 1917 these goals were no less than Utopia. The function of Communism in the modern world has been to provide a substitute for Capitalism in carrying through a massive industrial revolution in backward countries, for doing in a few decades what Capitalism took over two centuries. In this it has had remarkable though not universal success, but at what cost? Within the lifetime of one generation Communism has transformed Russia from a primitive economy to the rank of the second most powerful industrial nation in the world. But though living standards have gradually increased, the workers and peasants upon whose behalf the revolution was made still enjoy very little fruit of their own gigantic efforts, and though there has been some relaxation of political terror, there can be no forgetting the inhuman factory discipline and the slave labour camps that were used as instruments to transform a generation of uprooted barefoot muzhiks into highly-trained workers fully accustomed to the rhythm of a modern factory.

Party censorship and direction invaded every field of science, art and literature. It is still doing so today. Gross inequalities were permitted to spur on economic activity. They still exist today. Economic efficiency and production targets were made into mystiques. Marxism was made into a religion. Severe austerity and a paranoid leader made any form of public dissent intolerable. Even within the confines of the Communist Party all debate was stifled and all debate still remains stifled on any major issue of policy. It was once said of the Jesuits that, having failed to raise earth to Heaven, they dragged Heaven down to earth. Stalin and Stalinism, unable to raise the poverty-stricken and miserable Russia to Socialism, has dragged down Socialism to the level of Russian misery. Surely oppressive, bureaucratic and . . . Russia can offer no model for democratic socialism.

But if a Soviet Russia is an unacceptable and irrelevant model for us, what about the North American capitalist model? We are part of this model today. The question is whether we should remain within it or abandon it and seek a third model. About this time last year, Prime Minister Trudeau addressed students at Queen's University. This was one occasion when he was permitted to complete his remarks. He said something very significant. He said that in effect, by looking south, we could see ourselves one, two, three decades from now. He said that America provided a blueprint for what Canada would be like.

Now, many of us that grew up in the '40's and '50's in Canada accepted the American model. The U.S. had its problems but it seemed to be overcoming them. Whatever its faults, we thought that it was the most open, democratic, dynamic society in the world. We wanted to be more like them. But what has happened to the United States of America? What is happening in the United States of America? We find cities filled with fear, hate and violence. A story from the Associate Press tells us that thousands of Detroit housewives are taking instructions in how to handle firearms. In New York the school system closed down, literally stopped functioning for several months last year. Residents in Berkeley, California built a park on an abandoned lot. The National Guard put wire around the park. Thousands of residents in trying to defend the park from the police were maimed. Five hundred were sent to a camp which the San Francisco Chronicle, not by any means a left-wing periodical, called a concentration camp. Several residents were shot at and injured; a few were killed. The leaders of most of the black communities in America are now in jail or in exile.

These are not isolated incidents; they are every day incidents. We read about them in our daily press. Why are these things happening? Surely it's not because of evil men, though there's no shortage of these. It's because the American model has failed. Here is the wealthiest nation in the world that cannot satisfy the basic material needs of a large minority of its people. A system that has produced at one and the same time a grotesque affluence and a grotesque poverty, a people who have lost any sense of purpose except to maintain law and order at home and to force its own way abroad. The United States of America is in trouble because hundreds of thousands of young people reject the assumptions and values of the American system. The consensus which for so long has united the American people has now ended, and no nation is viable for long if a large minority of its people reject the foundations of its way of life. The state must then resort to terror to keep order, and if I am reading the news correctly I believe we may be seeing the beginning of that process.

The American way of life is being challenged because it can satisfy neither the material nor the spiritual needs of large numbers of people. It is a system based on competition, on

(MR. GONICK cont'd) . . . an invidious rivalry between men in which material wealth is a standard by which they compare each other's worth. The corporation around which the system is based is authoritarian by nature. Management is responsible to a few large owners or is self-perpetuating. It is in no sense responsible to its workers or to the general public, and the corporation molds other institutions in its own image. The university, for example, has the same authoritarian structure as the corporation. The main purpose has been distorted into one of producing graduates who can fit into the corporate world with its materialistic and bureaucratic values. Rebellion is centered at the university only because the university is the weakest link in the corporate system. Students are still inexperienced enough to take seriously the liberal rhetoric of democracy and justice and they are still independent and idealistic enough to try to convert the university from a competitive knowledge factory into a co-operative self-determining community. Basic material needs are not being met because economic growth takes the form of super consumptionism. Morning to night, day in and day out, advertising so influences our values as to create a craze for private goods and a hostility towards public goods.

John Kenneth Galbraith has demonstrated in his book *The New Industrial State* that advertising is not something that is peripheral to the economic system, something which can be controlled or limited. It is a basic instrument used by the giant corporation to plan its own production. It is a form that planning takes under corporate capitalism. But in fulfilling this function, it defines the content of economic growth by creating new wants which only the corporation can fulfill. More funds for schools, parks, recreation centers, low cost housing, libraries, the arts, more beautiful cities or simply more decent cities. Such expenditures are burdens because they take income away from the things we have learned to crave. The result can only be a narrow and unbalanced economic growth which makes it impossible to meet real needs, needs which accumulate and accelerate until they finally explode into the . . .

Canada's economic system is not very different from that of the United States. Largely dominated by branch plants of American corporations, it is really patterned after it. We have accepted the American model because until very recently most of us really believed that the United States was the best of all possible worlds. Now we can see that the American dream has become the American nightmare. We want to be part of that American dream. We have no wish to become part of the American nightmare.

The American model is best described as corporate capitalism. The American people will have to replace corporate capitalism if they are to end the violence and racism which its distorted priorities and its materialistic values have created. We will have to replace our Canadian version of corporate capitalism if we want to avoid the chaos that we are witnessing to the south of us. In its place, in my view, we must develop a socialist commonwealth which, through co-operative and public enterprise, will alone make possible a direct and participatory democracy within factories and offices, within universities and dwellings, in which responsibility for economic and social welfare may be assumed by representatives democratically chosen by the people affected. Surely the American example has demonstrated that we must create a society in which wealth is far more equally distributed, a society which will generate a different set of values emphasizing co-operation over competition, morality over materialism.

All this cannot be done overnight nor can it all be implemented within the jurisdiction of a single province. But much can be done. I believe that this Party was elected to office to begin the process of reshaping priorities, establishing new and imaginative programs to eliminate the poverty in our midst, creating an open government that will involve the public in the decision of government. This will require persistence, will, and internal strength. The alternative is Chicago and New York, Detroit and San Francisco. If we fail here we, this government, will have nobody to blame but ourselves.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, would the honourable member permit a question? I wonder if the honourable member would care to speculate on what might happen in Communist Socialist societies like China if authorities there permitted the freedom to dissent that is permitted in the great republic to the south of us.

MR. GONICK: Well, Mr. Speaker, apparently the Member for Fort Garry completely misread and misunderstood my remarks. I don't know how anyone could, after my remarks, believe that I was upholding the model of Soviet China or Soviet Russia for us to follow. I have no intention of doing so and I clearly made it explicit to all, except perhaps the Member from Fort Garry, that we must find a third model which does not exist anywhere except perhaps in

(MR. GONICK cont'd) . . . . certain parts of western Europe. The American model does not work. It's breaking down. America is disintegrating. The Soviet Russian model is totally irrelevant to our experience. I thought I made that very clear.

MR. SHERMAN: The honourable member did make the purport of his philosophy very clear, but that wasn't my question. My question was, whether he would care to speculate on what might happen in Socialist societies if the freedom to dissent that is permitted in United States were permitted there?

MR. GONICK: Do I have to answer that question? I think I described exactly what was happening in the Soviet Union today when certain artists and intellectuals have dissented from the regime. They are in jail, just as they are in America today. Those who dissent such as the leaders of most black organizations in America they're in jail or they're in exile. Exactly the same thing is happening in America today which has been happening to the Soviet Union over the past several decades.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSON (Morris): Mr. Speaker, I was very interested in his comments and I wonder if he could indicate just how many members of his party share his views?

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, would the honourable member permit a further question? He referred to the fear, hate and violence in the U. S. A. in the first half of his speech and I gather from it, or I would ask him does he attribute this more to the economic system than he does to the human factors involved in the make-up of the United States?

MR. GONICK: That's a very good question. My own view is that there is no way at all of separating the economic question of what motivates man and how one gets ahead in society and what obstacles are put before man in getting ahead in society and the human factor. I think they are totally related, interdependent. I think that if the economic conditions were one which would permit the large minority group of black to improve their position within American society, that I am certain that the degree of violence - certainly not all violence, but the degree of violence which are seen in America today would be far, far less. Perhaps it would be to the extent that it exists in Canada.

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

MR. MCKENZIE: Thank you Mr. Speaker. In the few short moments that are left before the vote, I would like to rise in support of the amendment by my leader. I was very interested in the remarks of the Honourable Member from Crescentwood, talking about the shock of the election. I don't think he knows the history of Roblin constituency where the New Democratic party and me have been historically involved in two real battles out there. We've been through the mill before, it was no shock to me I can assure you, because we've been through the mill politically there ever since I became a member of the legislature. So I am one that wasn't shocked, and if you look up the history of that great constituency you will find that we have battled on the hustings for some time.

I would Mr. Speaker, first of all, in haste rise and congratulate you on the elevation to your office. I would like to congratulate the Premier who I only met the other day - my first time. I understand he's married to his good wife who is a former constituent of mine and his father-in-law has a great history in my constituency, which will go down in the record for many, many years. But I congratulate him on his elevation to the premiership of this province and I wish him all the best and his caucus as well. And he can rest assured that Roblin constituency will support him with all the good legislation - that we are with you.

I would like to express my regrets to those that were defeated. It's always a bitter pill to swallow when you're defeated politically and it's unfortunate. I rather regretted the remarks of the Honourable House Leader the other night for he mentioned something regressing to the two women who graced this Chamber the last Session. I think it was uncalled for, the remark that he made, because this one, Thelma Forbes was the first Speaker of this -- lady Speaker -- first Cabinet Minister, had a record, and I don't think the record of Mrs. Morrison and her husband is one that should be -- the remarks I think were uncalled for. Well you can't find it in Hansard.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege, may I suggest to my honourable friend I have never been derogatory of the women who have graced this Chamber. As a matter of fact I suggest I would give preference to them over some who are speaking even at the present time on the other side of the House.

MR. MCKENZIE: The Honourable House Leader is entitled to his opinion but if he will

(MR. McKENZIE cont'd) . . . . recall the remarks when our fair lady was speaking, at that particular moment he made regressing remarks to two former ladies which I regretted very much. I think that it was uncalled for.

I would like to congratulate the mover and the seconder of the resolution to His Honour. I think these are going to be two outstanding members in our House and I'm sure their contribution to the debates will be very valuable in years to come.

I would also like to offer my congratulations to the staff who some call bureaucrats, but nevertheless we are able to get a lot of things done in my constituency and I do take my hat off to the civil service who don't always get the credit I think that's coming to them and they do a terrific job and I take my hat off to them.

Real quickly, I would like to pay my respects and those of my constituency to Mr. D. L. Campbell who I think gave me more guidance and more information in this Chamber than anybody. You'll find -- the newer members as you come in here you come unrehearsed, you're cold and you'll have some rough bumps along the way, but finally somebody will come and put a hand on your shoulder some day and tell you how to conduct yourself in this House. This man, Mr. Campbell, was one who was consistently doing this amongst new members of this House. He was a genuine and very true Manitoban and I suggest to all the new members in this House if you can model yourself after this man your record will be an enviable one.

Since the redistribution my constituency now is a huge constituency. From my village where I live to Camperville which is the extreme northeast corner is some 225 miles and I can assure you it's very difficult for one man to look after the problems and find out what the beat is on the huge constituencies that we have in rural Manitoba. I'll do my best, but I can assure any rural member that's involved in these redistributions it's becoming more and more difficult to look after the needs of our constituents. And here, you know the city seats you've got a what? Two square blocks, three square blocks, something like that. And here I have an area vast and -- (Interjection) -- well in comparison. But in the main, and we are now in a group of people from the former Ethelbert constituency which are entirely new to me. I'm getting acquainted with them, I have a large group of Metis people and Indian people now who are part of the constituency. And I can assure you, Mr. Premier, that my constituents are dedicated to work with these people and assist each and every one of them that are of Indian ancestry or those of Metis and do our best to see that we can upgrade their way of life and make them economically more sound than they have been in the past. These matters of concern are very difficult to resolve I assure you. But I do feel that we are meeting today some of those real concerns that haven't been even touched in the past. I congratulate the past government; I look forward to your guidance and I hope the Federal Government will continue to take a very serious look at some of the problems of these people who have a great history in our province.

In my constituency agriculture is the most important primary interest and for the most part has provided our economic base over the years. The record of these communities that I represent is a very enviable one in the field of agriculture, because if you trace their history in the past fifty years you'll find in the malting barley championship some ten contestants won the malting championship of western Canada. We have livestock herds that are the envy of all North America. But today unfortunately, Mr. Premier, we have a vast surplus of unsold grain and this has created very serious financial problems and my people besides having to share an overinflated dollar bill with government spending, taxes, my constituents are paying an all time high price for those goods and services which are a necessity of life in a rural community.

Unless some way is found to control these excessive costs and curtail the credit buying I very humbly submit that we face an economic disaster within the next 12 months. Already evidence is being tabulated that unemployment figures are going to soar among those secondary industries in St. James and in the outlying areas of this metropolitan area who provide those goods and services that are part of the economic unit of a farm. I'm talking about grain loaders, motors, farm machinery equipment, etc., etc. The farmer today is sort of a -- he's like on a monthly salary and I wonder how long he can meet the monthly bills for hydro, telephone, fuel, food, clothing, payments that are due at the end of the month, with nothing coming in, or do it on a four bushel quota. The Premier has indicated that the Provincial Government is not in a position to act on a massive enough scale to deal with the basic farm problems of western Canada, that is simply too low farm commodity prices, which is a quotation from his speech.

But the Minister of Agriculture, who sits over there, in 1968 said: "Manitoba doesn't

(MR. McKENZIE cont'd) . . . . . have enough marketing boards." Is this the answer, I ask you, Mr. Speaker? Do we need more marketing boards? Is this the answer to the problems in Manitoba today? Remember his remarks about the part-time Minister of Agriculture Mr. Speaker. Do you remember that one? Part-time Minister of Agriculture, and the great speeches that he made in this House about a part-time Minister of Agriculture. Do you remember him talking about a government that has failed to act? Last year, the year before - a government that has failed to act. Remember his two-price system and all the great debates and speeches that he made over there last year about the two-price system. -- (Interjection) -- We got it. We sure got it. And what's the result? I don't think I have to reflect on the House what the results are but I can assure you, now that we have the two-price system, the farmers in my constituency find they're short a lot of dollars that they would have had under the one-price system.

But I believe, Mr. Speaker, I really do believe that we can diversify the farming industry, as laid out in the TED Report, by creating an atmosphere for industry in rural Manitoba, and I'm talking about the midwest or the parkland area of this great province, and I will assure the First Minister now that he will find the fullest co-operation from me and from my constituency on all legislation which will aid full economic and the industrial development in the parkland area. But I am concerned, and my constituents are concerned, because the portfolio that the First Minister holds as Minister of Industry and Commerce is a very difficult and time-consuming portfolio. We had the reflection from his Minister of Agriculture talking, our Minister of Agriculture, a part-time Minister, and I wonder can this man carry the two portfolios. Has he got the ability to be the Minister of Industry and Commerce in this province and also be Premier? Or is he going to be spending half his time campaigning in British Columbia and maybe Ontario, or is he going to be a Minister of Industry and Commerce?

MR. PAULLEY: Oh there's a big difference in the ability.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member having asked the questions, would he like me to try to answer them?

MR. McKENZIE: Certainly.

MR. SCHREYER: I said before, Mr. Speaker, that it's the hope to be able to give the portfolio of Industry and Commerce to someone else early in the new year. This is still our hope and intention, and I can assure my honourable friend on the second question that it's not my intention to campaign outside of the province -- well, it's not my intention, period.

MR. McKENZIE: I thank the Honourable the First Minister for his remarks and I will try to remember and remind my constituents that he will in fact mend his ways and not go campaigning in other provinces such as was the experience the other night. But, Mr. Speaker, we are concerned with some of the statements that have been made in this House by the members of the party opposite, and I hope that the First Minister was very serious when he said that free enterprise should not express alarm about this government. I submit that the banks of this province, Mr. Speaker, must immediately offer and provide venture capital for my constituency if we are going to develop the parkland area, and I think the day has come when the banks of this province and other provinces must, instead of using the well secured high interest loans, find some venture capital, and I submit, Mr. Premier, if they would like to try it out, Roblin constituency is available for some venture capital and I challenge any of the banking institutions to try me out in Roblin and see what we can do out there -- including the MDF. There are other serious problems that must be tackled. I live -- I'm a storekeeper and . . .

MR. SPEAKER: It now being a half hour before adjournment on the seventh day of debate, in accordance with the rules of this House being subsection (3) of rule 33, I will now put the question on the amendment.

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

MR. WEIR: Ayes and nays, Mr. Speaker, please.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

A STANDING VOTE was taken, the result being as follows:

YEAS: Messrs. Bilton, Claydon, Craik, Einarson, Enns, Ferguson, Girard, Graham, Hardy, Henderson, F. Johnston, Jorgenson, McGill, McGregor, McKellar, McKenzie, Moug, Sherman, Spivak, Watt, Weir and Mrs. Trueman.

NAYS: Messrs. Allard, Barrow, Beard, Borowski, Boyce, Burtniak, Cherniack, Desjardins, Doern, Evans, Fox, Gonick, Gottfried, Green, Jenkins, Johannson, G. Johnston, McBryde, Mackling, Malinowski, Miller, Molgat, Patrick, Paulley, Pawley, Petursson, Schreyer, Shafransky, Turnbull, Uskiw and Uruski.

MR. CLERK: Yeas 22, Nays 31.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the amendment lost. Question on the motion.

MR. MCKENZIE: May I proceed, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, you may.

MR. PAULLEY: May I point out, if I may, Mr. Speaker, to my honourable friend he is now speaking on the main motion and not the amendment.

MR. MCKENZIE: I thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I thank the Honourable the House Leader. Before the vote, Mr. Speaker, I was trying to draw to the attention of the House, the membership, some of the problems of citizens of this great province who live 250 or 275 miles from this metropolitan area in which we live. I find, as a small town businessman, that the railways are using every trick in the book to abandon their lines. They're deliberately not fixing their railway equipment, they're not putting the ties in, and their facilities are starting to disintegrate as they prepare to abandon some of the lines of this great province. I submit very humbly, Mr. Speaker, that it is deliberate and it is inevitable that it is going to happen, but along the line why do businessmen such as me have to continually receive goods for resale in a horrible condition and sometimes two or three days late? I handle perishable goods in my store and it comes in, the crates are broken open, sometimes torn apart, half the goods are not there. The occasion happened the other day where my goods on a long week-end ended up in Yorkton. Is this a deliberate way that the transportation systems are trying to abandon this in the hope that I'll find another carrier, and I find --(Interjection) -- Right, right. I submit.

I wonder are our freight rates too high for us to attract industry in the area in which I reside? I wonder are we in parkland too far from this metropolitan area to attract an industry, a primary or a secondary industry? Are we too far from the university to attract industry in the parkland region? I submit very humbly, Mr. Speaker, that there was a chance of industry in my area two years ago, and that was the excuse that was finally given: too far from the university for those that were to head the industry for their students, and so they found another site. I humbly submit, Mr. Speaker, that we in the parkland region are serviced by one television station and it's not a Manitoba television station, it's a Saskatchewan television station. Would you know, Mr. Speaker, in the constituency that I represent most of the people have to wait up until 12:00 o'clock to see the news on television whereas the rest of Manitoba gets it at 11:00. I humbly submit, Mr. Speaker, is this a deterrent to industry arriving in the parkland region?

MR. CHERNIACK: Ask the man in front of you.

MR. MCKENZIE: Why did we have to wait five to seven years for a dentist to come to my constituency?

MR. PAULLEY: Because of the government . . .

MR. MCKENZIE: Why do we have to wait five to seven to ten years to find a lawyer in one of the ten fastest-growing towns in this province? -- (Interjections) -- They're all over there. They're all over there.

A MEMBER: Who wants those characters?

MR. MCKENZIE: No wonder we can't find -- but I humbly submit that there are grave problems in the parkland region of this province; whether it's the fact that we're too far from this metropolitan area or what is the reason I'm not sure, but I think if we follow the steps of the TED Commission and the Premier will give us the legislation and the guidance that we need, maybe we can solve a lot of these problems and create some new environment there for industry, and I'm waiting for his legislation and I can assure him that we will support all things that will help to develop that area.

In closing, I think I should draw to the attention, Mr. Speaker, some of the interesting things of Roblin constituency and I have on my desk here tonight the study of the Shellmouth Dam. I don't know if any of the members opposite or any of the members on this side of the House have had a chance to see this document, but this in fact is a reality now. The Shellmouth Dam is completed and the water is being backed up, and we have a body of water there in the not too distant future will be backed up into Kamsack, Saskatchewan, a body of water some 50 miles, and it's joined by the Asessippi Provincial Park, and you may wonder, Mr. Speaker, why I have been asking the Minister of Tourism and Recreation almost weekly what's going to happen to that park, and I still haven't got my answer unfortunately. A lot of people are concerned because the dam is completed and now the park is waiting for government direction. Are we going to have the Asessippi Provincial Park or are we not?

I would submit very humbly, Mr. Speaker, that in my constituency I did a survey this summer with the help of some newspaper people, that visitors appear to be flocking into the parkland area this summer according to a sample survey which was carried out by the Parkland Development Corporation whose office is in Dauphin. Car counters were stationed at three locations for four typical days in the middle of July, to determine the percentage of non-Manitoba cars to the total traffic flow. Parkland officials announced that one car in every five - now mind you, one car in every five - entering or leaving the region at the points surveyed, bore out-of-province licence plates, and there was a period of four days there where some 5,790 cars were counted in the area of the Parkland Development Corporation, and of these cars 5,790, 1,204 or 20 percent were non-Manitoba vehicles. At Bowsman on Highway No. 10 North, 144 of a total of 1,740 cars were American and another 313 were from other points in Canada. At McCreary on Highway No. 5 in the southeastern part of the region, 92 U.S. autos showed up and 197 non-Manitoba autos -- non-Canadian vehicles, were counted out of a total of 1,729. At Russell, Manitoba, at the junctions of Highway 83 and 4, 71 U.S. cars passed plus 497 non-Manitoba vehicles out of a total of 2,321.

So I think, Mr. Speaker, that these results show that Manitoba has a potential, and the parkland area which it is my honour to represent has a potential in the tourism and recreation field, and I would humbly submit that the Minister would give us the guidance and the direction that we need because we have the Shellmouth Dam, we have the Asessippi Provincial Park, we have the Duck Mountains, we have Mount Baldy, the highest point in Manitoba, 2,727 feet above sea level, a historic point. But the potential is in the constituency and I humbly submit to the Minister that if he will give us the guidance from himself and his department we can do much to attract tourists in Roblin constituency and will bring dollars into our pockets which we so badly need due to the agricultural disaster that we are facing.

The TED Report I think is about as good a guideline as we can follow in this particular field, and it indicates the tremendous potential that Manitoba would enjoy. We're talking of a year round resort in the Duck Mountain area, a year round resort in the Duck Mountains. And such a program I think, Mr. Speaker, could fully utilize the many natural attractions that are there already. In the Duck Mountains, because of its central location in this great province and because of its proximity to the travel arteries, and because of its natural features has a great future, but the programming has got to be motivated by this government and by the Minister. I humbly submit, Mr. Speaker, in closing, that if an all-out research effort is conducted, that the key to the full development of tourism and recreation in this province, and especially in the parkland region, will be a follow-up of the imaginative efforts that I hope will come from this government. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. SPIVAK: Were you going to ask a question or speak, Sir?

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, unless somebody else wishes to speak, I was going to move the adjournment but if the honourable member wishes . . .

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, as a matter of fact I stood, I think, first and I was going to ask you, Sir, to adjourn the debate in my name.

MR. GREEN: I don't know that my honourable friend stood first but we were both standing and I would ask you to recognize the person that you would have recognized. Unless the honourable member wishes to speak -- I am prepared to let him speak; if not, I wish to move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Labour, that debate be adjourned.

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

#### GOVERNMENT RESOLUTIONS

MR. PAULLEY: I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if you would now call the proposed resolution standing in the name of the Honourable the Attorney-General.

MR. SPEAKER: Proposed resolution. The Honourable the Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Agriculture,

WHEREAS section 7 of The Attorney-General's Act provides as follows:

"7. (1) The Attorney-General may, from time to time, notify the assembly of the progress being made in the preparation of any consolidation or revision of the statutes of the province being prepared under section 6; and the Assembly may, from time to time, appoint a Special

(MR. MACKLING cont'd) . . . Committee on Law Revision which may sit during recess after prorogation, and the Attorney-General shall be a member of the committee.

(2) If the Assembly is dissolved before a Special Committee on Law Revision has completed its work in respect of the consolidation and revisions of statutes, any similar committee appointed by the next succeeding Assembly shall continue the work of the committee so appointed and have like powers and authority.

(3) From time to time during the progress of the preparation of the consolidation and revision, or on the conclusion thereof, or both during the progress, and on the conclusion of the preparation, the Attorney-General may lay before the Special Committee, for its examination and approval, drafts of the statutes so consolidated and revised.";

AND WHEREAS the Twenty-Eighth Legislature, on the 24th day of May, 1968, appointed a Special Committee of the Legislature on Law Revision to examine and approve drafts of statutes consolidated or revised;

AND WHEREAS the committee examined two hundred and nineteen statutes which were approved, but a few statutes were still left to be reviewed by the committee;

AND WHEREAS it is deemed expedient that the Assembly appoint a Special Committee on Law Revision under the provisions of The Attorney-General's Act, which may sit during recess after prorogation, and the Attorney-General shall be a member of the committee;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that a Special Committee of the Legislature on Law Revision consisting of Honourable Mr. MACKLING, Attorney-General, Hon. Messrs. PAULLEY, PAWLEY, Messrs. ALLARD, JOHANNSON, MOLGAT, SPIVAK and WEIR be appointed to examine and approve drafts of statutes consolidated or revised;

AND THAT the Special Committee have power to sit during the present session and in recess after prorogation to examine and approve drafts of statutes consolidated or revised.

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

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Health and Social Services, that the House do now adjourn.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. G. JOHNSTON: Before the question is put, could the House Leader give us an indication of the program for tomorrow? I understand tomorrow afternoon the final vote on the Throne Speech will be held. Could he indicate what the program for the afternoon will be?

MR. PAULLEY: I believe, Mr. Speaker, it would be the inclination of the government to permit as full a possible debate for the remaining afternoon of the Speech from the Throne. There could conceivably be some debate on the matter that you have under advisement, Mr. Speaker, which may cut down on the time allotted to the debate on the message of His Honour. But the government is most anxious, in accordance with its democratic policies and program, to give to each and every member of the House an opportunity to be heard.

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