

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA  
8:00 o'clock, Monday, March 18, 1968

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

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, when the Fund insists on the traditional privilege of confidentiality, some of the members opposite try to imply that the government is trying to hide some nefarious practice from the people of Manitoba. There is nothing to hide. The Funds has been a success due...

MR. GREEN: I must rise on a point of privilege. I would like the Minister to indicate anybody's remarks that the Fund has been accused of nefarious practices. If anybody in this House...

MR. SPEAKER: Please, did I understand the Honourable Member for Inkster that he had a question of privilege?

MR. GREEN: Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: I didn't hear it.

MR. GREEN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm suggesting that the honourable member, by referring to the members who have spoken about the Fund - of which I am one - has suggested that we have accused the Fund of trying to hide nefarious practices, and I suggest that the Honourable the Minister find in any of my remarks any suggestion that this is the case.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry that the honourable member thought I was referring to him. I was referring to...

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, then perhaps the Honourable the Minister will identify the person to whom he is referring.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, the Fund has been a success...

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, I arise on a question of privilege. Mr. Speaker, the issue is crystal clear. If my honourable friend designates one person whom he was not accusing, he still leaves all the rest of us under the cloud of his accusations. Now, I agree with what has been stated earlier that my honourable friend must either name the person whom he accuses or he must withdraw.

MR. SPEAKER: I thank the Honourable Member for Lakeside for his comments and I await the decision of the Minister.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, nefarious is a subjective opinion on my part for what I believe has been the innuendo on the part of the...

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I wonder if the Honourable Minister, in view of what has been said and suggested, that it is inferred that members of the House, other than one, may be implicated, would he consider withdrawing his remarks in that regard.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, if the members opposite suggest that they've made no such innuendo then I withdraw the remark.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. SPIVAK: Now, Mr. Speaker, the success of the Fund has been due to the staff under the capable direction of Mr. Rex Grose and due also to the fact that it has been able to operate without interference or influence from government, and I must suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we have no intention to abandon the sound business practices and principles that have made the Manitoba Development Fund a potent instrument for improving the economic health of our province.

We have a responsibility to the people of Manitoba to see that the Fund operates efficiently, independently, and with total integrity, and we have discharged that responsibility. We have taken steps to increase the frequency and detail of the Manitoba Development Fund reports to this House and to the people of Manitoba. Common sense alone dictates that as the volume of the Fund's business is increased, as the economy of this province grows in size and diversity and complexity, the people of Manitoba shall be advised with reasonable frequency of that progress. They must be shown that despite what I consider the transparent and self-defeating attempts of some officials to infer otherwise, the Fund operates with integrity and practical effectiveness in the best interest of all Manitobans.

To achieve, this, Mr. Speaker, the Lieutenant Governor-in-Council has taken the following steps. The Fund shall prepare and submit quarterly to the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council a statement of its assets and liabilities which will be published in the next succeeding issue of the Manitoba Gazette. The Fund shall also have prepared quarterly and submitted to the

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd)... Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council a certificate from its solicitors confirming that the Fund's business activities have been conducted in strict accordance with the requirements of the Manitoba Development Fund Act. The Fund shall provide that the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council, every six months, shall be furnished on a confidential basis a list of the name of persons to whom it has made loans and the amounts of such loans for the previous six months. The Fund shall be required from time to time to provide special reports on specific loans respecting which queries have been made in the Legislature by members of the Legislature to satisfy the government that the Board of Directors of the Manitoba Development Fund are exercising a proper stewardship over its funds, both as to how they're expended and as to the policy involved in granting or refusing to grant loans, but such report shall be treated as confidential and shall not be made public. Further, if a borrower feels that he has not received a fair and objective hearing from the Manitoba Development Fund but does not wish to expose his private financial affairs to the political vagaries of some of the honourable members opposite, he may request in writing that the Fund officials review his case in private with his elected representative and Fund officials will do so immediately.

In accordance with this new practice by Order-in-Council, the Fund was requested to provide the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council details of every loan of the Fund which has been questioned in the House in the past. The Cabinet has examined in depth every one of these loans. The Cabinet has also enquired into the general operation of the Fund. We've satisfied ourselves and give full confirmation that the Manitoba Development Fund has fulfilled the role assigned to it and that investment loans have been ably and competently administered. It's our considered opinion, arrived at after reviewing the full facts, that the people of Manitoba have been well served by the Directors and staff of the Manitoba Development Fund.

I wish to assure the people of Manitoba that the government, while recognizing that it has a duty and responsibility to scrutinize the operations of the Fund, will never requisition information for the purpose of disclosing it to the public, and any borrower from the Fund can rest assured that his privacy will be respected in every case except when he himself consents to it being made public or takes steps himself to divulge it. I wish also to repeat that this obligation of privacy is exercised only on behalf of the borrower and not on behalf of the Fund.

The government recognizes that the privacy of any loan should not be risked whenever a political outcry is raised or unfounded claim is made, and that it pledges to preserve that privacy because it knows that no responsible businessman wants the details of his private business thrown open to the public or the secrets of his business converted into a political football in an arena in which he is ill-equipped to compete.

Any lack of faith of a borrower in the government to discharge this obligation would result in the expansion of our industry being frustrated in this province because the government lacked faith in its own conviction or lacked faith in its own credibility. And proof of the bad affects of violation of privacy of loans upon the promotion of industrial enterprise is confirmed by the fact that not one public borrowing agency in Canada permits the disclosure of such information. The government is satisfied with the operations of the Manitoba Development Fund and I'm anxious to have this placed on the record.

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

MR. SPIVAK: After, if you don't mind.

May I also say that the protection of the public investment is provided six-fold. Firstly, by selecting as Directors of the Board of the Manitoba Development Fund men of irreproachable integrity and sound business judgment who have devoted themselves to the active management of its functions. Secondly, by selecting as a General Manager and Chairman a full-time employee of the stature and experience of Mr. Rex Grose. Thirdly, by requiring a detailed annual report of its operations to be filed annually in this House. Fourthly, by having the operations of the Manitoba Development Fund audited annually by a reputable national firm of chartered accountants. Fifthly, the utilization of the services of a firm of solicitors to certify that the Fund's business activities have been in accordance with the requirements of the Manitoba Development Fund Act. And sixthly, the examination and scrutiny of the operations by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council itself.

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd)...

Mr. Speaker, this government believes devoutly in the concept of the Manitoba Development Fund. It is unashamedly proud of the way in which that concept has been implemented and administered. This government is proud, and I believe that the people of Manitoba are proud, that the business decisions of the Manitoba Development Fund have been made without government interference or influence. We wish only that all of the honourable members opposite would exercise the same sense of responsibility and restraint. We the government and the people of Manitoba have been patient - perhaps too patient - with those short-sighted critics who would jeopardize the economic advancement of this province and its people. We have taken all the reasonable and realistic steps to ensure that industrial development, because of its crucial importance to our economic well-being, be spared the frustrations and obstacles of petty politicking. We ask only that the honourable members opposite show the courage and wisdom to do the same.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Hamiota.

MR. PAULLEY: I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if the honourable member is going to speak, might I direct a question to the gentleman who has just taken his seat first?

MR. SPEAKER: I'm sure the Honourable Member for Hamiota would give you the opportunity of asking the question the Minister said he would answer. The Honourable Leader for the New Democratic Party.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder, in view of the statement of the Honourable Minister that the Cabinet has investigated into all aspects as he says of the operation of the Fund and received information, whether he would be prepared to have an independent review committee look into the same area - and I'm not suggesting by an independent review committee to look into it that they would disclose any matters of secrecy or confidentiality that should not come before this House - but I'm asking my honourable friend whether he would be prepared to accept an independent review committee to look into the matter that has been looked into by the non-independent or non-partial Cabinet.

MR. SPIVAK: Mr. Speaker, the Cabinet has exercised its responsibility under the terms of the Manitoba Development Act and, as I have indicated, is satisfied with the information that we have furnished you with.

MR. PAULLEY: I wonder if my honourable friend would answer my question.

MR. MOLGAT: Mr. Speaker, would the Minister permit another question? Did I understand him correctly to say that the Cabinet looked into all of those loans where questions had been brought up by members of this side of the House - is that correct?

MR. SPIVAK: The Cabinet examined the loans of various undertakings that have been questioned in this House in the past, yes.

MR. MOLGAT: Did the Cabinet investigate any other loans as well or just the ones that this side of the House had questioned?

MR. SPIVAK: The Cabinet examined questions that were raised in the House.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable Member for Hamiota.

MR. DAWSON: Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate you for continuing as our Speaker and I want to wish you continued health and success.

I want to convey my congratulations to the new First Minister and I want to extend my congratulations to the mover and seconder of the Throne Speech.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that much of Canada's past has been lived in the self-imposed climate of inferiority; 1967, which was our Centennial Year, snapped the shackles of self-doubt and timidity and replaced them with feelings of boldness and creativity. Centennial was Canada's most momentous year. Mr. Speaker, we of Manitoba partook to the fulness in that greatness. Our people can take pride in the burning desire and community spirit that realized the international success of our Pan Am Games and the other accomplishments around our province. At this time, I want to congratulate Mayor Stephen Juba of Winnipeg; Winnipeg Enterprises' Chairman, Harold Martin; and the Winnipeg Enterprises' Manager, Percy Downton; and not last or least, our Premier, Mr. Walter Weir, for the tremendous presentations they made to the Canadian Amateur Hockey Association, and were successful, and as we all know, they were successful in obtaining a portion of the World Championship Hockey Tournament for the City of Winnipeg.

In my own constituency, Mr. Speaker, I would like to mention some of the accomplishments that Centennial Year afforded to the various towns and villages in the constituency

(MR. DAWSON cont'd)... through the co-operation of the federal and provincial governments. In Strathclair, they undertook the project of putting waterworks in the rink and rest room; in Elphinstone, they installed washrooms in the skating rink, they built the children's playground and they built a centrally located town well. In Shoal Lake, they undertook the project of building a tremendous beach on the lake there. Oak River undertook a project to install artificial ice in their curling rink. The municipality of Hamiota and the Town of Hamiota combined their centennial projects and instituted a central community park. The Town of Rivers decided, in conjunction with the Agricultural Society, to fence the fair grounds and install ornamental gates. Daly, which is in the constituency of the First Minister but is dear to me, installed a beach on the shores of Lake Wakapala. Oakburn built a beautiful sports and recreation park, and Cardale built a tremendous enclosed skating rink.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that Manitobans for the first time realized the tremendous power and potential that they had at hand. The many options which we are faced with in human and natural resources require dynamic, imaginative and competent decisions if we're to take advantage of the amazing opportunities in Manitoba. I believe, Mr. Speaker, in the future, the spirit that ranged through Canada's Centennial Year must be the standard for Canadians and Manitobans, not the exception. Manitoba is entering a crucial period in its history. It's in a stage of revolutionary change which will require our community to keep abreast of rapid and immense transformations if it is to witness real progress. The government of the Province of Manitoba, the Roblin government, and now the new government which has all the appearances of being the same old thing, has been left behind by the movement of society. They're caught in the mood of let-down, caution, of retrenchment and of dangerous inaction. We see them in a time of going slow and of hanging on to the out-moded ideas. They have failed to use change beneficially and fasten the shape of our community by rational solutions to our problems. One need only point out the Throne Speech.

Mr. Speaker, we in this group will face up to the issues before us and will help to shape a bigger and better Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, the generation gap is destined to become a permanent feature of our society. In the minds of the Manitoba youth, our political institutions suffer from a relevance gap, thus there's been an increase in rise in political action outside this traditional political structures or else with extra social means such as drugs which is becoming a serious problem. The implications are very obvious. A lack of commitment to government structures by our young people means that the structure has no certainty of stability and of continuity. Youth is in the best position to be aware of and to attend to the demands and the problems of the new and ever-changing Manitoba society. It's imperative that their views and influence be brought to bear in all centers of decision-making, and I pose this question to those sitting in the back benches of the Conservative Government. What commitment has the government made to use the vitality, the enthusiasm, the strength, the brainpower of the young people of Manitoba? The answer is that they have done nothing. I need only point out that the Throne Speech did not mention our young people one single, solitary time. I need only point out the exodus from the province of much of our young talent, and it's talent which has been brought to flower in the schools of this province. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, I, as a Manitoba Liberal and a member of this caucus, will avail myself to the needs of the young people of Manitoba, and I would suggest three policies of priority to make the workings of this Assembly and other institutions like it relevant to the youth of the province. Firstly, I think that all high schools or all high school students should be offered, as part of their curriculum choice, a program of political standards or studies. A greater awareness of our national and provincial government structures will make this a group of quality citizens.

Secondly, I believe that the voting age should be lowered to 18. This is a positive step which the Liberal Party has brought forth in the past, yet the government has constantly frustrated our efforts, but I would note with interest that the Manitoba Government requires federal leadership and initiative before it is willing to institute voting for 18 years of age. As you recall, the former First Minister amended our resolution last year which in effect said that when the Federal Government institutes the voting age to 18 we'll do the same thing.

Thirdly, Mr. Speaker, I believe that this province requires a Department of Youth Affairs. I know what you will say - we already have a Department of Youth Affairs. But it is very inactive; we all know that. The creation of a Youth ministry will provide a direct

(MR. DAWSON cont'd)...line to the inner chambers of government. I would like to point out two important values of this department: 1) This step, which has its prototype in Alberta, would illustrate to Manitobans, and especially young Manitobans, that the government and the people have the fullest confidence in the ability of our young people. Secondly, and even more importantly, this Ministry would allow the young people to solve many of their own problems. I'm convinced that this is the only approach workable and acceptable to the majority group, and I have the confidence in their ability to act responsibly and constructively. I believe it's time we faced the facts that revolutionary changes in science and technology and new ideas have tossed us all into the same arena, where none of us can state that we have had too much experience. I think that Manitoba's young people can bring these attitudes in government, and I believe the present government desperately needs their confidence.

Mr. Speaker, in the lands of the north of the 53rd parallel, richness and prosperity await Manitoba. This statement of fact which was made by the former First Minister, is fast becoming, in the chambers of government, simple phraseology, empty talk. Apprehension and distress in government's inaction to exploit two-thirds of our province is rapidly turning to alarm and suspicion. These feelings of the Manitoba people are echoed in a constructive and worthy brief that was submitted to the Executive Council of the Legislature of the Province of Manitoba by the Flin Flon Game and Fish Association. It was entitled "Renewable Resources of Northern Manitoba; Their Orderly Development and Management." And let me quote what they say: "Our association has become apprehensive and alarmed at the lack of planning and foresight on the part of our government. The exploitation of renewal resources throughout Manitoba is being expanded in accordance with the recommendations outlined in the COMEF Report, but we submit, however, that this expansion in Northern Manitoba is being carried out without adequate advance research and planning."

Where is your long-term planning for northern economic growth and progress? I think that the government's regard for northern expansion as a priority is indicated by the fact that Sterling Lyon, the Honourable Sterling Lyon, the Commissioner of Northern Affairs, is in charge of two other major portfolios. They are that of the Attorney-General and that of Tourism and Recreation -- another part-timer, as someone has so adequately quoted. The product of this unlikely combination of portfolios is a Throne Speech which contributes to the discussion of northern expansion by a small reference to attempts at improving the local level of service in northern communities. It is, however, gratifying that the government has finally accepted the policy of the Liberal Party to extend No. 6 Highway to link Thompson more closely with the road patterns in the south. This step took two years of prodding and pushing by my colleagues in the Liberal caucus, and in particular by the Honourable Member for St. George, and of course there were screams of protest from the public about government inaction.

This lax approach to the northern development taken by the Roblin and now the Weir government must end. As a first step, I'd like to submit that the Department of Mines and Natural Resources and the office of the Commissioner of Northern Affairs should be combined; should be one department. Certainly the incorporation of one ministry would reduce the cost of administration and save the taxpayer valuable dollars spent on inefficiencies and waste. Also it would indicate to the people of Manitoba that the government has a real concern in northern development. This ministry would provide a rationality in the Resource Department and its approach in Manitoba. The first task of this new ministry, combined ministry I should say, would be to undertake a manifest long-term program for northern development based on a thorough study and research.

I'd like to highlight what I consider the important issues regarding the north with which the government has failed to deal. Establishing priorities for spending is axiomatic if the government is to function efficiently and economically, and if the taxpayer is to get the maximum value for his dollar. In my view, the growth, the expansion in the facilities at the Port of Churchill would be a tremendous undertaking if we could expand its role as a major maritime outlet. It would be, in my estimation, the high spending priority. Of course, this approach must be one of joint federal action. However, I think the leadership has to come from the province of Manitoba. No one will deny that the investment in Churchill will reap high returns for our entire people of Manitoba. Farmers would have easier access to export-import centers which will reduce transport costs and aid in

(MR. DAWSON cont'd)... alleviating the cost-price squeeze which we speak about every day. The Manitoba consumer will find foreign products easier to acquire in the marketplace, at a cheaper price. Primary and secondary exports in the province will receive an impetus because of more accessible export facilities at the Port of Churchill.

I would like to repeat some words that were spoken by the former First Minister: "To attract people to the new and growing northern communities," he said, "we must have such things as live television and adequate radio broadcasting, good municipal services, housing at reasonable prices," etc. He went on and on and on. What attempt has the Conservative Government made for developing communities in the north? What attempt have they made to provide the good things of life? Are they going to continue to pay lip service to the human issues in the north? I think they are. They're going to continue to blame Ottawa for everything as they have been doing since we heard the Throne Speech.

In the budget speech last year the Honourable Gurney Evans flatly stated, and let me quote: "Mineral production did not reach the high levels originally anticipated due to the shortages of labour at critical stages of production. The province is searching for workers regardless of the immigrants that are arriving through the efforts of the Minister of Industry and Commerce." Last Thursday, no reference - March 7th - no reference was made to the problems of labour and certainly no solutions were offered to the problem of high worker mobility in northern regions of the province, none whatsoever. If the government is not willing to show initiative and leadership in the exploitations of the northland, there are other segments of our community which will lead the way.

I note with pride that the University of Manitoba has accepted the challenge of the north and has instituted an inter-disciplinary study involving the co-operation of nineteen departments of their university to tackle squarely the problem of isolated areas. The study and nature and purpose of single enterprise communities in isolated areas undertakes to establish a long-range research program dealing directly with the two inter-related matters which are the heart of northern development. Firstly, there is the importance of increased resource development; and secondly the desirability of improved planning of human settlements in remote regions of our province.

There are some major problems to overcome and the study will attempt to solve these problems. They're going to touch on three different things. There is the problem of amassing the resource inventory. This will require an aggressive long-term exploration and surveying study. Secondly, there is the problem of attracting workers to new settlements in isolated areas, and third, there's the problem of acceptable standards of living. But the University of Manitoba are prepared to take on this study. Today's isolated single enterprise communities require the learning skills of mature workers who are accustomed to urban living and of young persons who have grown up and have been trained in urban centers. Manitobans, Mr. Speaker, are no longer satisfied with a life that deprives them of the comforts of a large urban center or larger rural centers. You're never going to get these people up north unless we can provide the good things of life, and I believe that workers should not be satisfied to go up to the north unless they can have the good things in life. There is sufficient learning in Manitoba to provide attractive living conditions and there is the learning to produce a controlled environment which would be acceptable to the life in the north.

The study of the university asks the question: What can be done to make the frontier living more acceptable to larger numbers of people? We must have the answer to this problem if Manitoba is to prosper, and I charge this government with the responsibility of aiding and assisting this study at the University of Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, in the Throne Speech the government stressed that incomes rose to record levels and economic expansion was substantial, yet no mention was made of half of our population who are in poverty, and who knows how many of our city people who live in that same web of poverty. No mention was made of the environment of unsatisfactory educational facilities, and there are many of them that exist today; inadequate medical care, and we have lots of that in the Province of Manitoba; poor housing, and there's lots of that in the Province of Manitoba; inadequate wages and levels, and we have lots of that in the Province of Manitoba.

It's obvious, Mr. Speaker, that Manitobans can no longer sustain a government that fails to be effective in dealing with major issues and that fails to heed the demands of the

(MR. DAWSON cont'd)...electorate. You'll say over there that it's easy for the opposition to criticize. What would they do if they were a government? How would they tackle the major problems of our society? My reply to you is that we as a Liberal Government would tackle the issues squarely and we'd provide a program, a long-term strategy for an attack on poverty carried out in line with economical and social development in the province. We'd not only aid federal programs but we'd use our own initiative through local programs, something this government fails to do all the time. Imagination is something this government hasn't illustrated. Inequality of opportunities has not lent itself to a single, simple solution. An effective attack on the poverty that exists in Manitoba must vary of course according to whether we are discussing the age of the children, people in productive age, families plagued by lack of employment opportunities, families in urban slums, in suburbs, in farm areas or in small towns.

There are, however, some general approaches that might be successful in eliminating more than one type of poverty. Economic growth and full employment must be a primary goal of this government, since if we fail to achieve the objective of adequate economic employment opportunities, programs of education and of health and training will be of small advantage. By far the most promising opportunities to expand employment, especially among the unskilled and semi-skilled, are in types of economic activity in which technological advances will not cause worker displacement. In addition, the goods and services which these activities, like the construction industry, would also be exceedingly helpful to the poor consumer. I believe that one of the things that we can do for the workers of the Province of Manitoba to help alleviate the poverty that exists here would be to increase the minimum wage to \$1.25 an hour, and we should proceed immediately with this program to increase the direct income of our workers.

Mr. Speaker, on July 1st, 1968, the Government of Manitoba must join the Medicare scheme. I'm amazed at those sitting on the opposite side. That government have the audacity to ask the people of Manitoba to maintain a health program that is costing us more than if we were to join the Medicare scheme. A government that says it wants to save money, a government that says it wants to curtail taxes, a government that says it wants to take the cost-price squeeze off the farmer, well I don't believe any of it. They want to maintain a health program that costs us more than Medicare, a medical program that doesn't provide the health services as fairly or as efficiently as the federal plan does. If the government would tell the people of Manitoba the true cost of Medicare to the individual or family, those who are satisfied with a private plan would soon change their minds when they saw that the provincial-federal plan would give them the same or better coverage at a lower cost than the present coverage that they're receiving. How will Manitobans feel towards this government when they learn that their tax dollars from Manitoba will be going out of the province to help pay the cost in other provinces.

Mr. Speaker, the government has given little information to the people of Manitoba about the scheme because they fear the people's reaction when they know that the costs are made public. This government, to me, wants to sit on their hands and do nothing. It's time for a change. More and more people are demanding that drastic action be taken by the federal and provincial municipal governments to reduce the severe burden of high and rising costs of our food products, etc., and I'm sure that all other Manitobans are wondering if we are receiving the maximum dollar for money spent on goods and services.

My concern grows into alarm, Mr. Speaker, when I read that the Batten Report on Consumer Problems and Inflation on the prairies alleges that certain groups were able to control prices. High prices is everyone's problem and there are those in the low income groups who are trapped in this dilemma of high prices and poverty, who are overwhelmed by the burden of high prices, unscrupulous sellers and uncontrolled high cost society. In addition, the price problem of the troubled low income consumer, there is for the people of little opportunity a pressing psychological disadvantage. As one commentator puts it, the poor have \$10,000 worth of desires, \$5,000 worth of needs and \$2,000 worth of income. I believe that it's time that the consumer has a safer market place in which he can act, where he is protected against unscrupulous seller practices, is guaranteed quality and value for his purchases, and where he's protected against all practices by those in the market that push prices to artificially and unjustified high prices and high debts.

The Federal Government has decided to mobilize to aid the consumer and especially the low income consumer. Mr. Speaker, I believe that we must join in their efforts by

(MR. DAWSON cont'd)... establishing some sort of ministry or Department of Consumer Affairs to deal with areas like consumer credit, installment buying, and the relationship between the retailer or storekeeper and the consumer, and to maintain a watchdog performance on our regional economy to co-ordinate activities with the Federal Government. A provincial ministry or some type of department of consumer affairs must be part of an overall long-term government attack on poverty. It's time we faced the war on prices on the market place. I would like to quote John Turner where he says that Judge Batten suggested that each prairie province might also set up a consumer section of government to work in co-operation with the federal department. She stressed the importance of transmitting information to the consumer, particularly through the mass media and private trade and farm groups. "The consumer is constantly encouraged to spend but not advised how best to spend it," she said to Mr. Turner, and Mr. Turner agreed with her and he said, "We're prepared to assist the provincial governments in establishing a department of consumer affairs."

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask what is the new government doing to help ease the tax burdens on the Manitobans? I believe they're doing nothing. They are spending money on inefficient administration; on bad, outdated and in some cases sporadic policies; and on self-glorification through propaganda. Let me highlight a few of the major misdemeanours of this government. Before I do that, I'd like to ask for a serious review of government administration divisions and practices to be undertaken immediately. I'd like to ask this question: Why is there a distinct health ministry and a distinct welfare ministry? Health and welfare are very much inter-related concerns, and if we are to develop an effective approach they have to be seen as one. You can't do anything else. Let's have a Department of Health and Welfare in this province. Health and welfare - what's the difference? Previously I mentioned the consolidation of the Department of Mines and Natural Resources with the Office of Northern Affairs. Let's take this step to more efficiency, more effective, less costly approach to different problems. Certainly something more is needed than the previous half-baked attitude of the government.

You know Mr. Weir, the new Premier of this province, is quite a paradox, a rural Premier who doesn't feel that the problems of agriculture are severe enough to warrant a full time agricultural minister. I notice this afternoon he was too busy to reply to a question put to him by the Honourable Member from St. George because he was on highways - he was only part-time - he'd done his work in the morning. Or perhaps if he faces another problem maybe the Premier doesn't like to think he has anyone sitting around him qualified to handle one of those top priority jobs. Aren't there some fellows in the back benches there that could be the Minister of Agriculture? I think there are. --(Interjection)-- At least four someone says. He doesn't want to name them. Without a doubt the so-called Throne Speech showed little awareness of these severe problems in rural Manitoba.

I've said in the speech that I favour the creation of two new departments, a Ministry of Youth and a Minister of Consumer Affairs, but not necessarily a minister to go in the Department of Consumer Affairs - I want to make that quite clear - but if such a position or ministry was established the taxpayers of Manitoba would certainly reap some benefits. I can hear the cries of the government now. Why all that unnecessary spending? No, gentlemen, I believe that the way of the Liberal Party is to develop long-term programs related to provincial productivity and the ability of the Manitoba taxpayer to pay them. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I believe it's time for a change.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the First Minister.

MR. WEIR: Mr. Speaker, as I rise to take part in the Throne Speech Debate I would like first of all to join the other members of the House who have expressed their good wishes to you, Sir, and to wish you many long years in your capacity as Speaker.

I would also like to respond to the many good wishes and kind words which have been offered to me during the last few days by my honourable friends the Leader of the Opposition, the Leader of the New Democratic Party and many others. I would like to assure all of my honourable friends that I share the attitude expressed by the Leader of the New Democratic Party when he reminded me that he would not allow his good wishes and kind regards to interfere with his responsibility as a member of this House. Well, Mr. Speaker, just as my honourable friend will force himself to criticize me and the policies of my colleagues and myself, so I will attempt to suppress my natural good humour and respond with reason to the criticisms which I hear.

I have followed the debate of the last few days with some interest, particular interest in the words of the Leader of the Opposition and the New Democratic Party, and I didn't find them much out of concert with the words of the last speaker, the member for Hamiota. In listening to them I couldn't help think of the many hours that I spent as a boy in an elevator at High Bluff with some screens with measured quantities of grain in them that you shook. Later on as time went on we got away from those screens and we got -- you know we had a mechanical shaker that separated the grain, turned with a crank. The purpose of that exercise, Mr. Speaker, was separation of the seeds from the wheat resulting in a calculation that showed up on a grain ticket called dockage. Now, Mr. Speaker, following the screening there remained so little seed in the comments of the gentlemen opposite that it's obvious to me that the samples we listened to did not originate on clean fertile fields.

I have concluded, Mr. Speaker, that the time has come to make clear to these gentlemen and to all members on the opposite benches something of the basic philosophies and circumstances which continue to guide the policy of this government. I shall -- (Interjection) -- I told you you had this to look forward to so I shall attempt to express something of our interests and concerns and something of our hopes and our plans for Manitoba for the future. Good government must always rest on honest and realistic appraisal of the situation in which a community finds itself, and I'm sure it comes as a surprise to the Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. LAURENT DESJARDINS (St. Boniface): Sure does if you're talking about your government.

MR. WEIR: We are a part of one of the richest and most rapidly growing nations in the world. More important, we are part of the freest nation in the world. We must take into consideration in appraising ourselves that we are part of a young nation, a nation whose growth has not yet begun to approach its potential, a nation where there are great opportunities for improvement in every field of endeavour. In a nation as young, as energetic, and as dynamic as Canada, there is no room for rigidity or inflexibility in the institution of government and community action. In a nation where growth is commonplace, change is not only inevitable it is desirable. We must act as dynamically as we think or the engines of economic growth will overpower the human values of our community. The challenge to government which must be learned from these facts is the challenge to lead and encourage growth and change in many spheres of human activity. We must look realistically and honestly at Manitoba. Manitoba is not the richest part of Canada - we all know that - but surely we all know equally well that Manitoba is not the poorest part of Canada because Manitoba is about at the Canadian average in economic wealth, and Mr. Speaker, surely none of us are so blinded by narrow parochial problems that we fail to recognize that the Canadian average is one of the highest in the world. I hope that none of us ever forget that if the wealthiest 10 percent of the peoples of the world were counted, that Manitobans would be among the first to be numbered.

Mr. Speaker, anyone who forgets these facts and attempts to design a policy will do a great disservice to the people of Manitoba. Our policies and programs must be based upon the knowledge that we are an affluent people, a wealthy community. We must also remind ourselves that we are not all equally wealthy. As in every part of the world, some of our citizens are underprivileged relative to others. Social justice, even in this wealthy community, requires constant attention. No nation is so wealthy, Mr. Speaker, perhaps no nation will ever be so wealthy that it will not contain citizens who live in relative poverty. One of the

(MR. WEIR cont'd.) . . . . . differences between a wealthy nation and a poor nation is that in a wealthy nation something can be done for the poor, and, Mr. Speaker, we have done much for those in Manitoba who are underprivileged. In the years ahead we will do much more.

No one can be long in public office without becoming aware of the number of pressing social needs. In Manitoba we have the problem of the Indian and Metis citizen whose culture appears to be in conflict with the rest of society and whose economic circumstances is typically poor. We have our share of the national housing problem. Although great strides have been made in the provision of health services and medical care, more remains to be done and there are other challenges.

All of the social improvements have two things in common. They require removal of the hardships suffered by some citizens and elimination of these hardships costs a great deal of money. The amount which we are spending to improve the lot of the less privileged citizens of this province must surely stagger the imagination of some of my friends on the opposite benches. If they will think back for only a moment, Mr. Speaker, to the days of the previous administration, they will realize that we are spending more on such problems than was spent at that time to meet all of the needs of Manitoba. For us on this side of the House the amounts which were spent ten years ago are irrelevant. Our problem is to strike a balance between needs on the one hand and tax resources on the other, and when we have found that balance, when we have discovered the amount of money at our disposal, we must then look to find a balance of priorities among the most pressing needs.

In selecting our priorities we must always keep two central facts in mind. We are a wealthy community and our wealth is growing. The more our economy expands the more resources we will have to meet such needs as housing, hospitals and so on. So taking a long view - and, Mr. Speaker, we must always take a long view, because we intend to be here a long time - so taking a long view we must not stint on monies allocated to investment for growth. We must provide the roads, the education and training, the investment credit, resources improvement, flood protection, and all of the other things which are necessary in an expanding economy. These essential needs must be kept in mind in setting our priorities and deciding how much money will be made available for community development and social services. A government which over-taxes can diminish economic growth. A government which does not invest for growth will face stagnant or diminishing tax revenues. If either of these alternatives are followed, it will only be a few years before services fall far behind services in other provinces. I would remind the members of the House, Mr. Speaker, that Manitoba started out behind the other provinces ten years ago. We've caught up; we'll keep pace; slowly but surely we'll move ahead of most of the other provinces. We will invest for our growth and we will return the fruits of that growth to meet social needs just as rapidly as we can.

An overriding requirement in every nation, Mr. Speaker, is self-preservation. Good government must always recognize this first requirement, the requirement to defend ourselves against those who would threaten us. There is a challenge to Canada's existence today and we must recognize it. Surely all members of this House would agree that Canada must remain united. We have only just begun to test our strength. We have only just begun to develop our potential. We have only just begun to enjoy the unique combination of wealth and freedom which Canada can offer to us. Constitutional discussions will be taking place during the next few months and the next few years. Manitoba will take an active part in those discussions. At home we will do what we can to continue our efforts to build a greater Canada. Important steps have already been taken. We must consolidate the gains we have made and perhaps more steps will be necessary. I am very much encouraged by the progress which has been made in these matters in the last few months. Agreement has at last been reached to subject to study and negotiation important matters which divide Canada. We now have agreements from the Federal Government and from all provinces to review the division of responsibility and the directly related question of fiscal responsibilities and fiscal resources.

Mr. Speaker, there is only one source for the money which governments must raise - the taxpayer. The same taxpayer must finance municipal, provincial and federal programs. At last we have agreement on a mechanism for reviewing and changing the responsibilities of the levels of government. We have a chance to give the taxpayer a break.

A second vitally important matter will be studied by the committees which are appointed: regional income disparities. Regional income disparities will be a major focus of the discussions which take place under the umbrella of constitutional reform. The important question

(MR. WEIR cont'd.)..... which I mentioned earlier, questions of differences of opportunity, and differences in economic opportunities, will be subjected to study and solutions will be proposed. We have great hopes for accomplishments which will come from the discussion on the Constitution. At this level we will press a point of view which we have already expressed. The central argument of that point of view is simply this. Serious differences in income are present in Canada; in particular the provinces east of the Ottawa River, have lower incomes than the rest of us. Where incomes are lower opportunities for individual citizens are lower. Much of the dissatisfaction which gives rise to support for radical solutions is based on nothing more than the greater poverty of the east compared with the relative wealth of the west.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, I urge all members of the House to look realistically at Manitoba. I remind all members of the House that we are markedly wealthier than five of the provinces of Canada, wealthier than about half of the people of Canada. It is true that economic circumstances in Manitoba must be improved; but it is also true that many statements that have been made in this House and other places complaining about the economic condition of Manitoba are seen as parochial whining by about one-half of the people of Canada, the half who have less than we do. The position of Manitoba is unique. By almost every measure we are about the national average. We can be the honest brokers, we can argue for good or economic justice in Canada and our counsel will be heeded. Ultimately we can seek narrow provincial advantage and ignore our responsibility as Canadians. The course which this government will choose, Mr. Speaker, is an honest course. We will continue to set our interests as Canadians above our interests as Manitobans. Without national unity we are nothing. We will continue to argue for greater economic justice in Canada and we will continue to oppose with every means at our command those policies which we believe are destructive.

Mr. Speaker, these are matters of most vital public importance. Constitutional reform is a boring and dull subject to many people. The abstract ideas of constitutional law and responsibility and the dull monotonous arithmetic of tax-sharing arrangements are matters that many would probably rather leave to the experts; but they are matters, Mr. Speaker, which will affect the daily lives of every Canadian for a long, long time. We must bring the total government expenditures under control; we must recognize the interests of the individual taxpayer and the corporate taxpayer. We must recognize that if we load the corporations too heavily with municipal taxes to pay for taxation and municipal services and if we add to that load another 53 percent of earnings as a federal tax, that the manufacturer must probably raise the price of what he sells. Perhaps he is selling a tractor to a farmer in Manitoba. The taxes a manufacturer pays are loaded into the tractor that the farmer buys. Then consider the farmer, Mr. Speaker, he too must pay a tax on his land and with rising land prices his assessment is rising rapidly. Perhaps he is paying only his fair share of the cost of roads and schools and other things of that nature but the cost of these services is rising, and in addition to higher taxes the farmer must then pay a higher price for his tractor and other things of that kind.

Foreign buyers of wheat buy where they can obtain quality at the best price, so do foreign buyers of cars, or nickel, or refrigerators or any other product which we presently produce for export or that we may hope to produce for export in the future. If we load our producers too heavily with taxes, we will no longer be competitive. Our export sales will suffer, our economy will not expand as quickly as it should and every Canadian will suffer in some way. Then, Mr. Speaker, we can think of the citizen as a consumer. When the price of goods rises his dollar does not go quite as far. If at the same time the economy is not expanding as fast as it should, his income will not rise as fast as it should either. If we over-tax we will hurt everyone, for every citizen is a consumer and every citizen depends upon producers. All of this is not to say that we should retrench. We are still competitive in foreign markets. Incomes have risen faster than prices for people in Manitoba during the last 20 years. We are still increasing our wealth, collectively and individually, but we cannot afford to relax our vigilance.

The other side of taxes is services. We are improving roads, and welfare programs and many other things. The services which we are providing are sound services; they are services which are needed. The problem is to make sure that the expansion in services does not bring such an expansion in cost that it will slow the growth of the economy.

It is very difficult, Mr. Speaker, in a federal nation to control the growth of taxes.

(MR. WEIR cont'd.) . . . . . There is no point in Manitoba struggling to maintain the present tax rate if the Federal Government is going to increase taxes without the recognition of the province's position. There is no point in any province pacing the growth of services if delays in spending by the province are matched by new taxes levied by the Federal Government to provide service in fields of lesser priority in that province. It is difficult to co-ordinate spending, Mr. Speaker, but it is absolutely necessary. The constitutional discussions will lead we hope to the control which is necessary. This is another of the reasons that we look with great hope to what has begun.

There are two particular areas which give us great concern at the present time; one is education, the other is health services. We are joined in our concern by members of the governments of all of the provinces. The costs of education are rising very rapidly. The amount of education which the individual needs today is much greater on the average than the amount that was needed just ten years ago. A few days ago, the Honourable William Davis, Minister of Education for Ontario, is quoted as saying: "The increasing cost of education combined with other government expenses could bankrupt the Province of Ontario within a few years unless new methods of finance were found to meet the growth in costs". Similar remarks have been made in some of the other provinces. Mr. Speaker, consider the comments of Mr. Davis. Ontario is the wealthiest province in Canada. Municipal taxes are higher in general in that province than in Manitoba, so are provincial taxes, and this year I understand they are budgeting for a deficit of almost one quarter of a billion dollars. Ontario believes that it is facing a crisis. If Ontario is facing a crisis in financing education, can Manitoba or the other provinces in Canada, who must remain competitive, be far behind.

The same day, the Honourable Gordon Grant, Minister of Health for Saskatchewan, described health costs in his province and I quote: "Frightening. In ten years' time our whole system could come tumbling down about us.". Again I must emphasize that the time has come to sort out our priorities in Manitoba and in Canada and to decide what is necessary and what is desirable.

One of the problems of a government, Mr. Speaker, is the problem of maintaining efficiency in the provision of services. This is a matter which requires constant attention and concern. The business of Manitoba is a huge business. Last year our gross expenditures were about \$350 million and this year they will be higher. Watching \$350 million turn into roads, education, social services and new school buildings and many other things requires a constant review if full value is to be earned for every dollar spent. This is one of the ways in which we can control the levels of taxation and the levels of spending. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that a healthy dose of self scrutiny can always be prescribed to any government, federal, provincial or municipal.

We are examining ourselves and testing our efficiency at the present time. A team under the supervision of my colleague, the Provincial Treasurer, has been at work for some months examining the operations of departments of government, looking for more efficient ways to produce the services that Manitobans need, looking for ways to save money and improve services. We are examining methods of budgeting and cost control. We are examining administrative procedures and systems of supervision. We are examining ways and testing one program against another to discover desirability and efficiency. Our examination is not yet complete. When we have completed this task we will make any changes believed necessary to improve our efficiency and to balance our needs with our resources. All of this is simply part of what I referred to earlier as good management. I would predict, Mr. Speaker, an interesting discussion at our next session of the Legislature when this scrutiny has been completed.

While encouraged by the continuing committee established by the Constitutional Conference at Ottawa, I have one real concern in the constitutional field - this being the attitude of the government of Canada to the existing Constitution. The most recent example is their announcement withdrawal from certain areas of the health field as related to Indian people, advising provincial jurisdictions by means of a letter from a regional officer of a change in government policy because of their unilateral reinterpretation of the constitution because this re-examination did not indicate federal responsibility. And I might indicate at the moment that I've had a reply to my telegram of the other day to the Prime Minister indicating that he would be having a report in a few days and would be in touch with me. But we have the letter, and it does create concern. There's been no discussions on this matter whatsoever at the ministerial level. They are really by this means changing the division of responsibility that has been

(MR. WEIR cont'd.) . . . . . accepted in this country for a hundred years. Greater co-operation between jurisdictions than this is required or constitutional change would be impossible. This is as well an example of the confusion of priorities which faces us today. The Federal Government appears to be cutting a few million dollars from its budget, they want to balance the books. The few million dollars that I speak of, Mr. Speaker, are the few million dollars that are necessary to pay the cost of providing medical care and other health services to that quarter of a million Canadians of Indian ancestry who have always been a Federal responsibility. The Federal Government has faced us with a brutal choice if they carry this through. We must let the Indian man, woman or child suffer, or if the worst came to the worst, death could be possible, or pay the bills ourselves. If we pay the bills, these will be new expenditures, new expenditures for Manitoba, a new precedent will be set. Welfare and education costs for these people could well follow. The Federal Government may opt out; they may save a few million dollars; but will the taxpayers save a few million dollars? Not on your life, Mr. Speaker. Not unless we were to deny the Indian people a standard of medical care, because the Provincial taxpayer, the same man, must pick up a new provincial tax to pay the cost of an abandoned Federal service. You will note, Mr. Speaker, that they took these steps, took these steps to balance their budget. That means that they have allowed other costs to grow and soak up the money which they should be using for this essential service. This is not efficiency, this is not cutting costs. The Federal Government would simply be ducking its responsibility, unilaterally amending the Constitution.

And let us look, Mr. Speaker, at the background of this little trick. This is the same Federal Government which says it has \$500 million to pay one-half of a Medicare scheme to cover 20 million Canadians. They haven't quite got the few millions that are necessary to cover the 250,000 people of Indian ancestry -- they've dug deep into all their pockets and they've hunted through the nooks and crannies of all the departments and they just can't find these few million dollars -- but they have \$500 million -- \$500 million, that's the figure that the Minister of Finance spoke about, \$500 million for a share of the Government of Canada for Medicare provided that the provinces in Canada could find the other \$500 million. Mr. Speaker, here is an area where I believe a little self scrutiny in Ottawa might be a good idea; a little self scrutiny in Ottawa might help the Manitoba taxpayer in this place. Ontario is facing a crisis in financing education. The Minister of Health in Saskatchewan has described the growth in cost of hospitalization and Medicare as frightening. The Federal Government can't find a few million dollars to pay the cost of medical services for Indian people, but they tell us, and presumably they expect us to believe, that they have \$500 million to pay half of the cost of the Medicare plan that they propose.

So, Mr. Speaker, this brings me to the subject of Medicare. Much has been said on the subject and there will be other opportunities to discuss it during the session. Let me state quite clearly at the outset that we are not opposed on this side of the House to medical care insurance. Our position hasn't changed; we still believe that every Manitoban, indeed every Canadian, should be able to obtain full medical insurance regardless of his income. Our views on this have not changed. But there have been events in the last few months which have shocked us. About a year ago, we discussed Medicare in this House and we passed a bill, Bill 68, a complementary bill to the federal bill that was passed in the House of Commons. At that time we were led to believe by the Federal Government that Medicare would cost about \$35 per capita, about \$35 million for all of Manitoba. We didn't particularly like the federal plan and we admitted it at the time. We had our reservations but we passed the Act, we passed the Act. We believed that all of the other provincial governments were proceeding in the same manner. Since that time, eight provinces have decided to defer Medicare. Why, Mr. Speaker? Why? Saskatchewan has their plan -- oh they've made some recent changes, they've made some recent changes, they have a utilization fee now and things of that nature -- but they have their plan that would qualify under the federal plan. It's said that B. C. is entering the federal plan. And that's what B. C. says; B. C. says they're entering the federal plan, that they have a plan and that it does qualify and please send the money. Well, this is a fairly normal approach for the province of B. C. in its negotiations with the Government of Canada but unless there are changes of interpretation, unless there are changes in the federal statute, I believe that B. C. will require significant changes in their plan to qualify. I'll be watching with interest to see if it does, because -- (Interjection) -- Yes, they have a plan; so has Alberta, so has Ontario. . . -- (Interjection) -- Well, yes we have but it's not as extensive as there is in those areas and our

(MR. WEIR cont'd.) . . . . revenues are not quite as extensive as they are in those provinces either. But it's still a wealthy province in spite of the fact that our revenues aren't as great as they are in the other provinces. But if I may continue. The thing that I believe will clobber the B. C. plan is the fact that the B. C. plan recognizes needs and the Prime Minister has stated that need can't apply. Now unless there is a change - and there may be a change in interpretation - if there's a change in interpretation of the Government of Canada to their statute or a change in the statute, I believe that most provinces in Canada, if not all of the provinces in Canada, would reconsider their positions.

When Bill No. 68 was presented to us last year we estimated the cost of \$35 million and we believed it to be accurate. We expected that there would be all provinces in Canada participating in the plan. We believed that the Government of Canada had an immovable position. We were not aware of the retirement of the Prime Minister, which was coming later in the year, and we were not aware of the varying positions which have since that time been taken by candidates for the leadership of the Liberal Party. Some of these positions are known and some of them are not known. We expected the plan to be portable. Now, Mr. Speaker, I'd have to ask you portable with whom? Portable with whom? Since that time also confusion in cost estimates has created general concern. The Federal Government quietly changed their Manitoba estimate from \$35 million to \$42 million. The Honourable Mitchell Sharp a few weeks later provided a new estimate of \$50 per capita or a half billion dollars for Canada, \$50,000,000 for Manitoba's share. Let me be quick to add that the Honourable Allan McEachen rejects that figure and that's all right except that they're not very consistent on it. Our research leads us to believe that Mr. Sharp is closest, that Mr. Sharp's figure is closer than the figure that Mr. McEachen has and indeed some possibility that the cost might even exceed the \$50 per capita.

The Government of Canada insists that it has a national universal portable plan even with one or maybe two provinces participating. They expect the other provinces to fall in notwithstanding the clause in the Federal Act that allows them to opt out of the program by 1972 or 1973 at the latest, again depending on an interpretation. The Government of Canada has refused to reply when we have requested a flat statement that no change will take place. Differences of policy showed up on the platform of the Liberal Party hopefuls, leadership hopefuls, before the Prime Minister put the clamps on. I don't object to him putting the clamps on; I would hope that some time before the day in April that the choices have to be made that the clamps will be taken off and that those people that have an opportunity to make a choice will be able to make a choice being able to understand it. But he did put the clamps on.

The members opposite ask about the penalty for Manitobans as a result of non-participation at the present time. In my view there will be little if any extra cost. I believe that the Government of Canada will realize its error. I do. I believe that they will realize their error after April 6th and that some changes will probably be forthcoming and make possible Medicare in co-operation with the provinces to complement provincial needs. If they don't, I believe that it's unconstitutional for the Government of Canada to tax Manitobans for a service outside their constitutional authority without Manitobans consent -- (Interjection) -- It had the consent, had the consent. Indeed with Manitobans not even being entitled to participate in the plan in Saskatchewan if they happen to be in there even though they would be paying part of the bill under those circumstances. However with the words that I hear from the other side I might indicate that I'm sure that further study would be required to confirm this position if indeed a test before the Courts was required. I believe it's unconstitutional. Whether that unconstitutionality would stand up before the Courts or not I'm not prepared to say at the moment but it would certainly make some interesting fun trying. But by the same token, by the same token, I don't believe that it will be necessary. I certainly hope that it won't be necessary even to check that fully into it.

MR. PAULLEY: Is there a special medical tax now in Canada?

MR. WEIR: Not without -- certainly not unless the provinces have consented to it. I'm sure there isn't.

MR. PAULLEY: On what are you going to base your legal battle?

MR. WEIR: We'll worry about that later.

MR. PAULLEY: I'll give you the . . . . .

MR. WEIR: I'm not going to waste my time too early. The only loss that could be experienced, the only loss that could be experienced would be the difference between the transfer

(MR. WEIR cont'd.) . . . . costs from the Government of Canada and the premium collections together, the difference between that figure and the total cost of medical treatment. And if Mr. Sharp's estimates are any place close, if they are any place close to being correct from being in the plan then the higher cost of being in the plan as opposed to our costs probably makes it cheaper in any event. It would wipe out any difference that there was in the transfer costs in that area. We would be hopeful that the Government of Canada will make some satisfactory changes to allow for the improved medical care insurance to be available to all Canadians. We hope this happens. We hope also for relative priority for financing expanded training facilities and training costs or providing a tax base to pay these costs, which go hand in hand with Medicare. They go hand in hand with Medicare. We must be able to provide professional and technical people capable of rendering the increased services that will be required when satisfactory insurance is available. We'd also like to encourage the Government of Canada to consider the priority of completing the hospitalization scheme to include mental hospitals, TB hospitals, a matter which they have been ignoring. It's a health service that fails to complete the hospitalization program in the provinces and has been that way for ten years and there's good question in our mind that this wouldn't have been a higher priority than the direction in which they have been moving. -- (Interjection) -- That's right. Under both Liberals and Conservatives, under both Liberals and Conservatives. No, No, I'm not . . . . .

A MEMBER: You mean both of them?

MR. WEIR: Sure. No holds barred there, Mr. Leader.

Well, in summary, Mr. Speaker, if I can just close with a very few words. -- (Interjection) -- No, no. If somebody wants to talk for a few minutes I don't mind them talking for a few minutes because if they don't talk now they'll talk after the vote; if they don't talk after the vote tonight they'll talk tomorrow so I've quit trying to play that game a long, long time ago.

In summary, Mr. Speaker, a very few words - the future of the Province of Manitoba: Growth - growth in agriculture, growth in industry, growth in income and services as fast as we can pay for them. Responsibility - responsibility in taxation, responsibility in spending, responsibility in planning. Reform - reform of the constitution, reform of fiscal arrangements, reform of constitutional responsibility and reform to end regional differences of income. Equality - equality of opportunity, equality in Manitoba, equality across Canada, a grand plan for national development, the continuation of planned growth in Manitoba.

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

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I just want to ask you a question. If I start now will I be able to continue after the vote? It would take me more than five minutes just to congratulate you, Mr. Speaker. If this is with the . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Well, I think that's very kind of the honourable gentleman but I wondered if we could deal with the - in view of the time and the hour - I wondered if we could deal with the amendment and there'll be opportunities for others to speak still on the Throne Speech when that has been taken care of. Unless someone wishes to speak for five minutes.

Are you ready for the question?

The proposed motion of the Honourable Leader of the Opposition in amendment to that motion of the Honourable Member for Virden.

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

MR. MOLGAT: The Ayes and nays, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

A standing vote was taken, the results being as follows:

YEAS: Messrs. Campbell, Cherniack, Clement, Dawson, Desjardins, Doern, Fox, Froese, Green, Guttormson, Hanuschak, Harris, Hillhouse, Johnston, Kawchuk, Miller, Molgat, Patrick, Pauley, Petursson, Shoemaker, Tanchak, Uskiw and Vielfaure.

NAYS: Messrs. Baizley, Beard, Bjornson, Carroll, Cowan, Craik, Einarson, Enns, Evans, Hamilton, Jeannotte, Johnson, Klym, Lissaman, Lyon, McGregor, McKellar, McKenzie, McLean, Masniuk, Roblin, Shewman, Spivak, Stanes, Steen, Watt, Weir, Witney, and Mesdames Forbes and Morrison.

MR. CLERK: Yeas, 24; nays, 30.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the amendment lost.

MR. SPEAKER: The adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Virden. The Honourable Member for St. Boniface.

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I wish to take part in this debate because I would like to make my position clear in a number of most important issues. But first of all, Sir, I'd like to congratulate you. You, even so early in the season -- in the, I was going to say season but in the Session you seem so fit and sharp. I'm sure that with a little bit of improvement in *La belle en Francaise* you probably will be our first permanent Speaker here in Manitoba. And I wouldn't be adverse to that, Mr. Speaker, because you are my favorite Speaker. Now I know that this is not saying much after the partisan speakers we've had in the past but I mean this. At least now it seems that we have a chance to discuss this in a non-partisan way. I think that this is --and who knows, now that the former Premier is no longer interested in Manitoba and is very seldom in the House and the Attorney-General is somewhat subdued, I might develop to be one of your favorite members, Mr. Speaker. I wish to congratulate -- I don't know if I should congratulate the Premier but mostly the new Premier, wish him all the luck and the courage in the world, because he has a very difficult job, a very difficult job ahead. It wasn't made any easier with the parting words of the former speaker who said, "Don't spend any more." Just like a drunken sailor spending everything and then say, "Don't do as I did, do as I say."

Now of course the new Premier is somewhat responsible for this. He must take the responsibility of the Cabinet, but at least he has the courage to turn a new leaf. I wish him well, and he knows of course that I and all the members on this side of the House are always anxious to assist him, to co-operate with him, especially when it is to the interest of the people of Manitoba.

Now the new Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, I also wish him well. He is a very intelligent and capable person and he should do well in his new post. He has proven himself to be quite astute. He has backed a winning horse and of course he received his due reward fairly soon, and I hope that he will remain astute while he is looking after the affairs of the people of Manitoba.

Also, the mover and seconder of the Throne Speech who had very little to work with and didn't do too badly at all. The old and the new member from Turtle Mountain also, I think that although there were great odds, a lot of people working against him, a lot of promises, that the people of Turtle Mountain realized that they could not do without Mr. Dow, that he had done a good job and did not let themselves be bribed. I think that this is a credit to the people of Turtle Mountain. Mind you, I understand that there were all kinds of rumors about the Conservative candidate. Either he was to become the next Minister of Agriculture or the government was going to take care of him and place him in a very independent non-partisan commission. Now I know that he won't be the Minister of Agriculture and the responsibility for the latter rests with the government of course.

Well, Sir, we are talking about making rules to speed up the session, to make the sessions more efficient, and Sir, speech after speech in this House, this session, have been made on the Federal Government. It seems to me that this is something we should look at and do it soon. I think that we should realize that we've been elected here in Manitoba and for Manitoba. Anyone that wants to go in federal politics should run in federal politics. It's very easy; this is their duty. Now, Sir, don't think that I won't like this because there'll be some criticism of the Liberal Party in Ottawa. You might even be surprised if in the not too distant future of hearing me criticize some of these actions also, so this doesn't worry me at all.

Nor if we have something as a province, if we have some beef with Ottawa, that's fine. If we have some beef with Ottawa, that's fine, but let'd do it in the right way. For instance, the Premier a few days ago sent a telegram to Ottawa. This is fine, that's the way to do it, or let us bring a resolution and criticize Ottawa and put everybody on the spot, make them vote. This is fine, but let's not bring this red herring when we have very weak -- the ministers that are weak, that don't know their own policy, let's not bring this thing of Federal Government, because this is certainly not honest. At least when we have the problem that we have here, the Indian and Metis and that is certainly not resolved, let's not take a full speech to discuss the problems the Federal Government have with the Indians. Let us worry about our own problems, and at least if we're going to borrow a speech from somebody let us quote him. I listened to the Honourable Minister of Welfare telling us

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd)... about this speech of the water in the old days and the contracts and so on, and then two days after I read it, the same words was said by an Indian chief around The Pas I think or somewhere around there. Let us quote him if you want to use his words, let us quote him. Either the Minister was using the speech of the Indian chief or the Indian chief was using the speech of my honourable friend. The only thing is the Indian chief spoke before my friend did. Well, let's not steal material at least.

Now the Medicare. In view of the fact that there is a resolution -- proposed resolution I should say on the Order Paper and that I am the mover of this resolution, I'll wait at that time, Mr. Speaker, to discuss Medicare.

In 1960 the Metro form of government was introduced here in Greater Winnipeg. At the time I opposed it. I felt that we had Transit Commission, Sanitary and Water District, Greater Winnipeg Planning Commission and so on, and I felt that all we had to do was probably create a few more commissions if the need was there, give them more power, make it compulsory for all the municipalities to belong, and I thought that we could progress thus. The government refused. This was fine; it was their responsibility. They gave birth to the Metro baby but then they abandoned this baby, Mr. Speaker. They appointed a chairman and they threw him to the wolves without any backing at any time. They were afraid of the popular Mayor of Winnipeg. Politically they couldn't battle with him, so they said to Bonnycastle, you're on your own, swim or sink. And the government members were the very ones that criticized that. I remember the member from Winnipeg Centre, I think, or the Member from St. Vital who had quite a few things to say against Metro, but no help at all. Therefore, in spite of all the work of the councillors, in spite of their good intentions, the Greater Winnipeg area hasn't been developed, hasn't progressed as well as it should have, and hasn't kept pace. It's been a real mix-up here for eight years. We've had criticism, bickering, duplication, lack of leadership and lack of co-operation.

Who tried to encourage Metro but members from this side of the House. It would have been quite easy during the 1962 election when Metro was at the lowest ebb, to say let us do away with Metro. We felt that this wouldn't be responsible. You couldn't go backwards at the time, so we asked that Metro be made stronger, may be.... We felt that this was being responsible. The government even since then hasn't done a thing - oh, excuse me - yes it has required Metro to do its dirty work such as collecting 20 percent of the capital cost of hospital construction here in Winnipeg for all the people of Manitoba. It's done things like this.

It's named also all kinds of commissions to study Metro, especially a commission that could start and not be quite finished before an election year. Then after the last election the government established a part-time commission, a truly partisan group. Most of them -- many of these people did not even have the confidence of the people of Manitoba, the citizens of Manitoba who had refused to elect them to office, to elect them as their representatives. This group was headed by a defeated Cabinet Minister who defied the former Premier and refused to consider his \$12,000 job a full-time job, although it was announced here in this House that this was a full-time job, a full-time position, a man who was placed in a position where there was conflict of interest, a man who informed the people of Manitoba not long ago that he hadn't done anything about Winnipeg and he didn't know when anything could be done. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, should the people of Manitoba have confidence in this kind of government? This is why I voted for the amendment which we just finished. I am voting -- I voted non-confidence in this government, especially in regards to what has not been done, I should say, in the Greater Winnipeg area here in Manitoba.

Mr. Speaker, but let me make it quite clear at this time there is no stick-handling on my part at all and although total amalgamation seems to be the answer, I will not accept any or all forms of total amalgamation. I will try to keep an open mind and have a good look at any bill or resolution that will come before us, and I believe there is one on the Order Paper now, but as a member who represents a large portion of the City of St. Boniface, I feel that I have some added responsibility.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, we are beginning to show some understanding, some inclination to promote national unity, and I will not accept any form of amalgamation that will destroy the little progress that we have made during these past years. For instance, I would want some guarantee that amalgamation will in no way interfere with school matters, with

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd)... education matters, that those will remain with the school boards for the administration and so on such as we have now. And also, I'm still willing to have a look at a two, three, four or more city system. I am presently inclined to think that in the field of taxing, the collection of taxes, water, transit, sanitation, mosquito control, zoning, planning and many more fields, total amalgamation might be the answer, and I ask for no special status for St. Boniface in these fields, providing of course we do proceed with total amalgamation.

But St. Boniface as a city can not, should not be allowed to disappear, Sir. It would be a tragedy indeed. St. Boniface must not only remain a living symbol for the people of St. Boniface, French people of St. Boniface, for French culture here in Manitoba and also all western Canada, it must be the peak in the French Canadian culture and bilingualism. I might say a western oasis for all the French Canadian people of this section. I believe that it is possible to have St. Boniface remain a true city within a large Winnipeg. Of course it would lose many of its powers, but it might gain others that might help promote and develop national unity. St. Boniface must retain its city hall, Sir, its mayor, its representatives that will look after the French element here in western Canada. I think that we must study the reports of the B & B Commission, receive the recommendation before we finalize any plans of amalgamation. But I believe that this can be done to the satisfaction of everyone, and I have some ideas on the subject, Sir, that I will be offering a little later on when the time is proper. But let it be quite clear, Sir, that I will not vote in favor of any specific resolution or bill on amalgamation if it does not provide for these safeguards that I consider to be so important. And this, Mr. Speaker, I do this not primarily because I'm French Canadian but because I consider myself a Canadian patriot and a Manitoba patriot. I think to make this a strong country, a united country, is to the interest of all the people of our province and of our country.

Now talking about Canadianism, we've had a good example of what we can accomplish when we're united. We were all behind EXPO 1967 and we're all so proud of this great achievement in Canadian history. Our Pan Am Games - when we talk about Pan Am Games and the success that we've had, we're also very proud of ourselves. And then last but not least, Winnipeg, the united front, everybody working together, we're given the 1970 World Hockey Championships.

Well, we should stand together once more, right now, and I think that we should be backing Vancouver's application for an NHL franchise. We should encourage, we should demand and even pressure, if need be, the NHL directors in accepting a franchise for Vancouver, especially --(Interjection)-- I beg your pardon? --(Interjection)-- commissioner? We're talking about a franchise - that's my next paragraph - we're talking about Vancouver and the NHL --(Interjection)-- especially Montreal and Toronto. We're not going to be kidded that a brewery shouldn't have anything to do with it unless Senator Molson is ready to sell his stock in the Montreal Canadiens. The NHL director owes it to Canada, to the large and smaller cities and to the municipalities who have made hockey our national game, and also who are developing many pro prospects for the NHL in other professional hockey leagues. They owe it to us, and Sir, I think that I would like to see the Premier of this province - I'm glad that he comes in at this time - move a resolution to be sent to the NHL director expressing our concern and wishes, and I'd like to see this resolution seconded jointly by the leaders of the other parties and of course approved unanimously by the members of this House. And I think that a copy of our resolution should go to the Government of Canada and the government of the other provinces asking them to get in line, to back us to keep this national game not just a joke, but to keep places like Vancouver who certainly deserve to be in the NHL. I think that we owe it to the rest of Canada; we owe it to Vancouver who have backed us in the past. Now I don't think that there's any legal action that we can take, but I am sure that if this province, especially joined with the different governments, would make a strong representation, I am sure that the directors would have no alternative but to listen to us and think Canadian.

While I am on the subject of sports, Sir, I would like to say a few words about the athletes who represented Canada at the Olympic Games. Nancy Green who was the flag bearer for the Canadian on opening day did us proud. She was a most colorful champion, very popular with all the people out there, and I could not see where we could get a better ambassador for Canada. I might say that the Canadian athletes were very colorful. I can

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd)...pass this around to some of the players -- I was thinking of you, George, when I said players -- some of the members here, the well known magazine "Penny Match" who give the gold medals to Canada for color. And I might say that we were always popular, starting with Nancy Green of course who was the most successful of our athletes, who was the best and is still leading in the world championship now, the best woman skier. She received a gold and a silver medal.

But, Sir, I would like to have a few words for our national hockey team because these people deserve it. They have been embarrassed in the past, they have been laughed at and ridiculed, and I don't think this is fair. Believe me, Sir, they were very good ambassadors of Canada also, on and off the ice. They did very well and it's not their fault if we live in a different world, a different system. The Russians are out and out professionals 12 months a year, so are the Czechs and probably the Finns, the Swedes and the Germans also. I don't think that we have to be ashamed when we have boys of the calibre of those that played on the national team going over and playing against these other nations and doing so well. I might say in the last game that they played against Russia they received a standing ovation from a capacity crowd in Grenoble because they never quit.

Maybe we can improve this but I would say that the sportscast arrangements will have to improve also. It's all right to criticize but let's have constructive criticism. Too many of the sports writers, sportscasters, especially from eastern Canada, have been too busy falling off the wagon and getting on the bandwagon just in case the Canadian team won. I might say to the credit of the local sportscasters that they were fair with the Canadian team, and I especially remember the dean of them all, Jack Wells, who died a bit with them after a loss and who was the best fan that they had. I certainly admired this man, watching him in Grenoble because he was always giving his team encouragement.

I think that the NHL have to quit kidding themselves that they're way superior to these teams. It's just my humble opinion, but I say that the Russian team could compete in the NHL right now. Give them a year to get used to this body checking and they'd be in the play-offs, and I'm not talking about the new league, I'm talking about the old league. If you want an example you have Marshall Johnson, a Canadian boy who played two games over the week-end in Minneapolis with the Minnesota North Stars and he did quite well. We were very proud of him. He's a very good player and I can tell you that there is many players his equal and maybe better, especially with the Russian teams. I think that we have to have more co-operation from everybody. A suggestion might be to have the Canadian team and the American team play in the Central Pro League. This would not be costly, no need for embarrassment for the NHL teams, and I think that this would be a step in the right direction.

Now there is a -- I don't know exactly how to bring this, Mr. Chairman, but before leaving sports, there was an accident that shocked the sports world a few months ago and I'm referring to the death of Billy Masterton, a boy that I knew quite well, a boy that played for me while I was handling the St. Boniface Canadian Hockey Team. The only thing I want to say about this, I think that here in Manitoba the government should seriously consider making it mandatory for all players playing in organized sports to wear a helmet. This business of he's not as colourful if you don't see his head and so on, I don't think that this is too important when you're talking about saving a boy's life or saving him from dangerous injury, and I think that this is something that we can -- we can't dictate to the NHL but we certainly can do something to protect our own kids here and we would be showing leadership in this, because if those boys wear those helmets up to junior they certainly won't take it off when they go pro, and in a few years if nothing is done at the NHL level, you'll see all the players in the NHL wearing helmets. This is done in football; we're accepting it. There's numbers on the football helmets, we recognize this, we live with this, and that certainly should be done in hockey also.

Now there is very little time. I don't know -- can you tell me how much time I have not only tonight but after this, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: I'd say about thirteen minutes.

MR. DESJARDINS: That's after tonight.

MR. SPEAKER: No, no.

MR. DESJARDINS: No. Well then, Sir, I think that I should use these few minutes

(MR. DESJARDINS cont'd)... to talk about -- I had other things to say but I was so surprised when the Minister of Industry and Commerce, so surprised at his gall and his arrogance when he stood up a few minutes ago and told us that if we dared criticize the Government of Manitoba we were criticizing the Province of Manitoba. What nonsense! He told us then that he was accused of selling Manitoba by using newspaper publicity and so on. Nobody accused him of that - nobody. We accused him and his Party of selling the Conservatives. If this - and he can use the same means if they find they're so good - selling himself, telling us where they're pouring coffee and so on. He's not going to kid the people of this House that this is selling Manitoba and that if we are against this we are against the people of Manitoba.

And then on this Manitoba Development Fund, what does he tell us? The government has looked into this; the government is satisfied; close the book, that's it. What arrogance! Why can't we have an independent committee of this House? They can be just as quiet as any member in the front bench. The people of Manitoba do not have any trust or faith in his Cabinet, not in this kind of Cabinet that - let me quote from one of the members of this Cabinet, this was the Provincial Secretary - he says, "Having dealt two cards, Mr. McLean pulled out a third. 'If you have a Conservative MLA,' he said, 'you will have a better entry into the department of the government and of having adequate consideration given to your problems. There is no question that a member on personal terms with the government can in a very real measure serve his constituents with more ease and more effectively than can a member of the opposite group'," said Mr. McLean. Do we have confidence in this kind of Cabinet?

MR. SPEAKER: I wonder if the honourable member would give us the source of his information that he's quoting from.

MR. DESJARDINS: Yes, certainly. Well indirectly, Mr. Shoemaker, but Free Press of March 19th, 1959, just before the election. Now, Mr. Speaker - now, Mr. Speaker, are we supposed, the people of Manitoba, to have confidence in this kind of government? They establish an unbiased Commission they tell us - a bunch of defeated candidates - and these are the people that run this province so we're told. But then the same Minister says in his own constituency, "Don't worry about those people in Winnipeg, I decide what's going to happen here in Dauphin, I do, nobody else."

MR. McLEAN: Take it easy now. Take it easy.

MR. DESJARDINS: Isn't that what you said? You said you and your buddies, in that little clique. You're not alone, you've got a clique. You've got a gang. You've got a gang and a clique, eh?

MR. McLEAN: You'd better quote me correctly.

MR. DESJARDINS: All right, I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, I'll phrase this differently. My clique and myself run the show in here.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I hesitate to interrupt the honourable gentleman. I see he's just really underway but he has ten minutes and as it is ten o'clock I wonder if we could leave it open.

MR. DESJARDINS: That's a very good idea.

MR. LYON: Mr. Speaker, before moving adjournment of the House, there has been a suggestion that all sides of the House would apparently be agreeable to tomorrow rather than being treated as private members day in the afternoon be treated as government day with the procedure after the Orders of the Day to move right into the Throne Speech, and if there is agreement on the other side to that suggestion which has emanated from that quarter, then the government is agreeable and we could adjourn with that understanding that we would meet tomorrow to continue with the Throne Speech debate.

MR. MOLGAT: It's agreeable with us, Mr. Speaker.

MR. PAULLEY: It's agreeable, Mr. Speaker. I think we should clarify one point. Instead of Orders for the Day, it's after we've dealt with any Orders for Return or Address for Papers and then into government business. Just a slight difference, but with that slight difference, if that's agreeable then we would agree to go into the Throne Speech.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I'm quite in agreement.

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 2:30 Tuesday afternoon.