

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Monday, April 12, 1971

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

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

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS

HON. A. H. MACKLING, Q.C., (Attorney-General) (St. James) introduced Bill No. 3, an Act to amend The Liquor Control Act, and Bill No. 15, The Lotteries Act. (Recommended by His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor.)

HON. SAUL A. MILLER (Minister of Youth & Education) (Seven Oaks) introduced Bill No. 13, an Act to amend The Public Schools Act (1). (Recommended by His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor.)

MR. MILLER introduced Bill No. 14, an Act to amend The Public Schools Act (2). (Recommended by His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor.)

HON. PETER BURTNIAK (Minister of Tourism, Recreation, and Cultural Affairs) (Dauphin) introduced Bill No. 6, an Act to amend The Department of Tourism and Recreation Act. (Recommended to the House by His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor.)

HON. SAUL CHERNIACK, Q.C., (Minister of Finance) (St. John's) introduced Bill No. 9, an Act respecting Local Government in Metropolitan Winnipeg. (Recommended to the House by His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor.)

MR. CHERNIACK introduced Bill No. 2, an Act to repeal The Succession Duty Act. (Recommended to the House by His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor.)

HON. HOWARD R. PAWLEY (Minister of Municipal Affairs) (Selkirk) introduced Bill No. 19, an Act to amend The Winter Employment Act. (Second reading Wednesday next.) (Recommended to the House by His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor.)

HON. LEONARD S. EVANS (Minister of Industry & Commerce) (Brandon East): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, I would like to table the Annual Report of the Manitoba Development Fund for the year ended March 31, 1970.

MR. SPEAKER: The Minister of Labour.

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour) (Transcona): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day, on your behalf I desire to table the Report of the Ombudsman for the period April 1st, 1970 to December 31st, 1970, and by way of explanation, Mr. Speaker, according to legislation you are responsible as the Speaker to table this report but I believe, according to tradition, Mr. Speaker cannot table the Report. And while I'm on my feet, Mr. Speaker, may I table the report, the 53rd Annual Report for the year ending December 31st, 1970, of the Civil Service Commission. Copies of both will be available.

MR. SPEAKER: The Minister of Health and Social Development.

HON. RENE E. TOUPIN (Minister of Health & Social Development) (Springfield): Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day I would like to table the Report of the Commission of Inquiry into Hospital Beds.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day. The Member for Assiniboia.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. STEVE PATRICK (Assiniboia): Mr. Speaker, I wish to direct my question to the Honourable Minister of Health and Social Services. I believe the Minister of Health and Social Services stated publicly that the government will have the use of the 620-bed hospital-- I'm referring to the Deer Lodge Hospital--by April 1st. I would like to know, perhaps he can tell us if the negotiations are still pending or have they been completed and the government has the use of the Deer Lodge Hospital?

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, we were hoping to have everything settled by the 1st of April, 1971, but we haven't. The negotiations are still under way and we're hopeful to make some use of Deer Lodge Hospital in the very near future.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Can the Minister tell the House, or has he done some preliminary work or studies on it, what will the cost be of renovating the hospital before it can be used as a general hospital?

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, this is exactly what we are negotiating now. We are hoping it won't cost the province that much.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. R. (BUD) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable the First Minister and ask him whether he can advise this House whether his government is planning, through the M. D. C. or a consortium or other means, to make a major purchase offer on the Maclean-Hunter Publishing Company.

HON. EDWARD SCHREYER (Premier) (Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Minister of Industry and Commerce is in a better position to reply to that question.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, there is a very simple and short answer, and the answer is no.

MR. SHERMAN: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, Could I ask the Minister of Industry and Commerce whether the government is planning to make such an offer on any major Canadian publishing house?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, as the honourable member knows full well this is a matter of policy.

MR. SHERMAN: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is the government through the M. D. C. engaged in setting up a consortium at the present time to make a major purchase offer in the Canadian publishing field?

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. SHERMAN: I didn't hear the Minister's reply, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for La Verendrye.

MR. LEONARD A. BARKMAN (La Verendrye): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct another question to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. How much money has this government advanced to the Lake Winnipeg navigation project, and if so how much stock or what percentage does this government own now?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, first of all I would distinguish between the government and the Crown corporation known as the Manitoba Development Corporation. The Lake Winnipeg Navigation Company, Limited received a loan from the former Manitoba Development Fund during the previous administration, that is prior to this government taking office. Last summer, I believe, we announced and it was public knowledge made public at that time, a small additional advance at that time for operating purposes. Since then there has been no renegotiation of any loan with the Lake Winnipeg Navigation Company, Limited.

MR. BARKMAN: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Then, if there was some amount, at least some amount bought, I wonder if the Minister could tell me when were these bought. Were they bought before the company went bankrupt and does this company intend to operate this year?

MR. EVANS: Well, Mr. Speaker, the financial arrangements last year resulted in the M. D. C. taking 25 percent equity in the company. At the present time, the company is in voluntary receivership and it's therefore in the hands of the receiver.

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Honourable First Minister. Has the Government of Manitoba committed itself to the formula for adopting the constitution which was proposed during the last provincial-federal convention?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, if the Honourable Member for Assiniboia means: has the province formally committed itself to a formula, the answer would be that we have not committed ourselves formally in the sense that the Legislature has not yet committed itself formally. However, there is a certain series of proposals relative to the patriation procedure and the amending formula which Manitoba in concert with the other provinces have accepted in a tentative way which will then be put before Executive Council and before the Legislature at the earliest appropriate time.

MR. PATRICK: A supplementary, to the First Minister again. The government's position will be tabled in the House and there will be an opportunity to debate this. Is this right?

MR. SCHREYER: Oh yes, of course, Mr. Speaker.

MR. PATRICK: Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. J. DOUGLAS WATT (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Minister of Finance, the same question that I directed a few days ago to the Minister of Agriculture. When will the cheques be issued to the members . . . the electorate of Ste. Rose, and at the same time will the dollar an acre be paid to the farmers of the Province of Manitoba generally?

MR. CHERNIACK: I'll give the same answer.

MR. WATT: A supplementary question, Mr. Chairman. What was the answer?

MR. CHERNIACK: I'm sure it's in Hansard.

MR. WATT: The question is when and how much.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. The Member for Churchill.

MR. GORDON W. BEARD (Churchill): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to address a question to the First Minister. I understand that he registered protest to the Federal Government on the sale of the naval base at Churchill to a group of businessmen in Edmonton. I wonder if he's received an answer to his telegram; and secondly, if successful will the naval base be retained for a campus in Churchill for the new University Canada North?

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, in answer to that question I suppose I should explain to honourable members that two events seemed to happen almost simultaneously in the past week or two, the first being that letters of patent were issued for the establishment of the university of the North, and that, I think, holds out some prospect for the possibility of having some facility at Churchill used as a component part of any university of the North--although that's a policy decision yet to be taken but it seems to hold out that prospect--and at the same time there was some word received that the federal Crown Assets Corporation, Crown Assets Disposal Corporation, was in the process of selling the former naval installation facility at Churchill which might very well lend itself to this university of the North and its requirements, and so a telex was sent to the appropriate federal authorities last Wednesday, I believe. I don't think that an answer has been received, at least I'm not aware of it as of 11:00 o'clock this morning. I'll be happy to advise the Honourable Member for Churchill when I do receive a response.

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Assiniboia.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Honourable Minister of Industry and Commerce. In the statement of claim when the government took over C.F.I., did any alleged deficiencies or default exist during the period when the government was making loan advances?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Chairman, I don't know whether I heard the member properly. Did he say when the government took over CFI? The government has not taken over CFI and the member should know that.

MR. PATRICK: Mr. Speaker, my question is, in the Statement of Claim, when the government made a Statement of Claim against the CFI - during the period that the government was advancing loans to CFI, was the CFI at that time or at any time when the loans were made, were they in default, or in arrears?

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, I suggest the honourable member read the Statement of Claim filed by the lawyers on behalf of the Manitoba Development Corporation.

ORDERS OF THE DAY - MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

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

MRS. INEZ TRUEMAN (Fort Rouge): Mr. Chairman, I move that an Order of the House do issue for a Return - seconded by the Member from Brandon West:

(1) What provincial funds are being applied to family planning programs in 1971?

(2) How much money is involved?

(3) In what types of programs is the money being spent?

(4) By what organizations?

(5) What requests for funds for family planning activities have been received by the provincial government?

(6) What organizations made these requests?

(7) Has any action been taken on the Indian and Metis Federation's recommendation that "the province implement a community health work program and . . . that family planning be intensified"?

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health and Social Development.

MR. TOUPIN: This order, Mr. Speaker, is not acceptable.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I move that that order be moved to Private Members' Day.

HON. SIDNEY GREEN, Q.C. (Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management) (Inkster): It's automatic. The rule for debate is that it goes to Private Members.

MR. HENRY J. EINARSON (Rock Lake): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Virden the following Order for Return:

THAT an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing the following information relative to the visit to Scandinavia by a ministerial delegation from the Department of Health and Social Development:

1. the countries and cities visited;
2. the purpose of the visit in each case;
3. the names of the persons who accompanied the Ministers; and
4. the responsibility of each of these persons during the trip;
5. the total expenditures for the duration of the trip on:
 - (a) Accommodation;
 - (b) food;
 - (c) transportation; and
 - (d) entertainment.

MR. SPEAKER put the question.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health & Social Development.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker. This Order for Return is accepted.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Morris.

MR. WARNER H. JORGENSEN (Morris): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I may ask the indulgence of this House to have this matter dropped from the Order Paper, since it's very similar to the one asked by my colleague from Fort Garry.

MR. SPEAKER: (Agreed) The Honourable Member for Pembina.

MR. GEORGE HENDERSON (Pembina): Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Virden, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing the following information relative to the operations of the Welfare Advisory Committee Appeal Board:

- (1) the number of appeals it heard;
- (2) the number of appeals it rejected;
- (3) the number of appeals in which its decisions resulted in increased welfare payments;
- (4) The remuneration paid to the Committee Chairman and to each of its members;
- (5) the number of members on the committee in 1968, in 1969, and in 1970.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Health and Social Development.

MR. TOUPIN: Mr. Speaker, this Order for Return is not acceptable in its present form. I would be happy to discuss this with the honourable member privately.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question?

MR. GREEN: I believe they want it to stand over for debate on Private Members' Day.

MR. SPEAKER: (Agreed) The Honourable Member for Charleswood.

MR. ARTHUR MOUG (Charleswood): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member for Gladstone, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing the following information:

1. The number of unemployed in Manitoba at March 31st, 1971.
2. The number of jobs created in the public sector of Manitoba since March 31st, 1970.
3. The number of jobs created in the private sector of Manitoba since March 31st, 1970.
4. The number of jobs required April 1st, 1971 to March 31st, 1972.
5. The number of student summer jobs required in 1971.
6. The out-migration from Manitoba since March 31st, 1970.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, this is a rather peculiar Order for Return in some respects in that some of the information is not available, but if it is agreeable with my honourable friend the Member for Charleswood, we would gladly accept the Order subject to whatever information is available on the number of questions posed by him; some as I indicated Mr. Speaker, are not available but gladly cooperate with my honourable friend.

MR. SPEAKER: Be moved to Private Members' Day? (Agreed) The Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney.

MR. JORGENSEN: Mr. Speaker, may I ask to have this matter stand, since the Honourable Member for Souris-Lansdowne is not here.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: I move, Mr. Speaker, seconded by the Honourable Member for Swan River, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing the following information:

1. A list of all the boards, commissions, committees, and agencies in existence as of July 15th, 1969;
2. A list of all the boards, commissions, committees, and agencies established by the Government of Manitoba since July 15th, 1969;
3. The names, addresses, and qualifications of the members presently serving on each of the boards, commissions, committees, and agencies appointed by the government;
4. The individual annual or other salaries, wages, allowances, expenses, etc., to each of these members;
5. The secretarial and other staff required by each of the boards, commissions, committees and agencies;
6. The total estimated cost of each of the aforementioned boards, commissions, committees, and agencies.

MR. SPEAKER presented the motion.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, I'm quite sure there's no problem in accepting this request. I hope that the Honourable Member for Fort Garry will accept a caveat to the effect that whatever information is reasonably available will be provided if certain aspects of the question require extensive research in order to get the information. I'm sure he wouldn't want to incur additional costs to the Crown by having yet another study in order to report on the studies.

MR. SHERMAN: No, I accept that caveat Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. WATT: Mr. Speaker, I move, seconded by the Member for Riel, that an Order of the House do issue for a Return showing the following information relative to the operation of the Manitoba Crop Insurance Corporation:

- (1) The number of farmers who were insured for hail pursuant to the provisions of the Manitoba Crop Insurance Corporation under the Act (1970);
- (2) The amount of money paid as premiums to the Manitoba Crop Insurance Corporation;
- (3) The number of hail insurance claimants;
- (4) The amount of money paid to claimants for hail insurance;
- (5) Total expense in writing hail insurance policies;
- (6) Total expense in adjusting claims from claimants.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable First Minister. The Honourable Minister of Labour.

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I adjourned this debate the other day to take a check at some of the past records dealing with the setting up of the establishment of this committee, and having done so I'm inclined on behalf of the government to indicate that we're prepared to allow this matter to go to a vote.

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

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I may now have the leave of the House to make substitutions of the members of the committee. I thought that I would have to delay until the motion itself was adopted before asking for this privilege, and so Mr. Speaker I request of the House the privilege, by leave, of making substitutions of two members of the committee.

Then, Mr. Speaker, I would move, seconded by the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources that the names of the Honourable Attorney-General and the Honourable Member for Logan be deleted from the proposed special committees appointed to report on a list of members comprising the Standing Committee of members of committees, and that the names of the Honourable Minister of Mines and Natural Resources and the Honourable Member for Radisson be substituted therefor.

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

MR. PAULLEY: Mr. Speaker. May I now have consent that the committee now established would meet tomorrow morning at 10:00 a.m. in the office of the First Minister? (Agreed)

THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

MR. SPEAKER: Adjourned debate on the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for Logan, The Honourable Member for River Heights, the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIDNEY SPIVAK, Q. C. (Leader of the Opposition)(River Heights): Mr. Speaker, I would be remiss at the outset if I did not take note of some of the changes I see opposite me, not the least of which is your absence from those ranks, Sir. The authority of your new office is great and its importance to all of Manitoba is also great, and I assure you once again of our every support to you in the fulfilling of the responsibilities of your office. I should like to also take note of the fine presentation and speeches given by my honourable friend the Member for Logan in proposing the motion, and I listened with interest to the words of the Honourable the Member for Gimli in seconding the motion.

I would be remiss, too, Mr. Speaker, if I failed properly to greet my friends opposite. I note that your worthy predecessor in that chair now labours in the Executive Council. He's absent today but I wish him well.

There has been another addition to the Executive Council who is also absent; my friend the Honourable Member for Elmwood, who joined the Cabinet recently. And a good appointment. Although there aren't enough portfolios to go around, the government did have office space, it had an extra car and every Cabinet needs at least one swinger. And in response to the rumor that the Honourable the Minister without portfolio has in fact braved the disapproval of his colleagues by becoming an entrepreneur, I reply with a newer but more convincing rumor that he's in fact merely conducting a study prior to a government take-over of dancing and discotheques. I have no doubt that given my honourable friend's proven mental agility he will have no difficulty in establishing that these things too are best conducted by the state. I also know that he has followed the example of another noted Canadian political swinger in deserting his former bachelor state, and I have no doubt that he will succeed in this endeavour as he has in all others he has undertaken.

And my friend the Honourable Minister of Labour. I note from the Throne Speech that under my friend's capable guidance Manitoba is enjoying a state of relatively industrial calm, and I'd like to congratulate him on successfully carrying on a tradition that is fully 25 years old in Manitoba. Of course the Minister has already made his first major address to this House in the guise of an answer in the Thursday question period. He's always good listening and has always been creative. On Thursday last he used a remarkable number of words to describe his own inaction with regard to the strike in Flin Flon.

The Honourable the Attorney-General has been taking part in some highly publicized legal work of late, no doubt to keep his practice in good shape against the day when he returns to private life. Also, I'd like to compliment the Attorney-General for his contribution to what is loosely described as open government in Manitoba. Since last we met I understand that he has attended at least one meeting with his constituents and that meeting was marked by a refreshingly open and candid expression of opinion. And I hope that he may have many more such meetings in the coming year.

And I see the Honourable the Minister of Health and Social Development, who has received permission from his Deputy Minister to be with us today. He is, of course, the best Executive Assistant any Deputy has ever had. Now, the welfare empire doesn't always run very well but at least the Minister can draw satisfaction from the very large number of his friends and political associates he has gathered around him and the effective solution he has created to their own particular income problems. Indeed I understand that the increased purchasing power being injected into our economy through salaries at the senior level of the Minister's Department has already created more jobs than the more highly publicized Yum-Yum Campaign. And that is a fact that is too little known, Mr. Speaker. Too many people in Manitoba believe that the Yum-Yum Campaign has been the government's only economic development program. Lest the weight of his office bear too heavily on the Minister of Health and Social Development, I understand there is a rumour to the effect that the Premier, with the permission of his colleagues, of course, is considering appointing the Minister to head a new Department of Travel and Recreation, and of course my friend the Minister of Yum-Yum. The Minister has assured us that his Yum-Yum Campaign will create 500 jobs in Manitoba. Now that's the only economic projection the Minister has ever offered us but it's reassuring, and the Minister is now a true captain of industry. Not satisfied with being superintendent of a sawmill, he has become the captain of his own very ship. And starting with an era in dry dock procedures, I hear that he is busily proving that government can so run a business and he's found time from all his onerous

(Mr. Spivak cont'd.) duties to formulate his very own solution to unemployment in Manitoba -- out migration. Let them be unemployed somewhere else, says the Minister - and of course he's right. I don't know why previous governments never realized the advantage of having so many of our young people leaving Manitoba every year.

And the Minister of Municipal Affairs, chiefly known for his fearless championing of government monopoly auto insurance and for the scrupulous fairness of his public hearings. The Minister has won now, and his precious insurance plan will soon be a reality. He looks a little glum. He looks a little glum but that's understandable; not having the insurance plan to worry about will leave a void in his life. But the Minister can draw comfort, Mr. Speaker, from the knowledge that the void in his life is nowhere near as great as the void he has created in the lives of 1,167 families in Manitoba, and the Minister will continue to draw his salary, Mr. Speaker, while those others have no such comfort.

And the Honourable the Minister of Transportation -- what can one say? Not only the Minister but his entire department is more or less sub judice most of the time. We all know that the Minister took time off from his legal adventures with his friend the Attorney-General to carry out an investigation into the security of the building here. Now, there's a rumour that he plans to use all that investigating experience in a general investigation of his department; and I agree with the Minister. You can't be too careful. Why, if in a moment of carelessness the Minister were to relax and trust his civil servants, he might even find that they were honest, capable people who are almost as concerned about this province as he is himself, and then he'd have to find a new hobby. And there's another rumour about the Minister, Mr. Speaker, about a change in his portfolio. Because of the time, study and comment he has devoted to our legal system they say he is to become our Attorney-General. It is said that, although not himself a lawyer, the Minister has more firsthand experience with the courts than the rest of the Cabinet combined, and we can be sure that he would be at least as zealous as our current Attorney-General in protecting our legal institutions.

And the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources. Now that's not right any more, Mr. Speaker. I understand that my honourable friend wanted to call himself Captain Marvel but that his colleagues made him settle for Minister of Mines, Resources and Environmental Management. But what's in a name, Mr. Speaker? The Honourable Minister has been strangely silent of late. No speeches. It is said that he has decided to communicate all his thoughts by letters to the press from now on. It's said he gets more attention that way. Now there's been some criticism of the Minister, Mr. Speaker. His name has been used to frighten children in Ste. Rose without much effect. But there's been criticism of him for writing that letter. Someone has suggested that in a well ordered government Ministers just don't do that sort of thing. But that criticism is not justified, Mr. Speaker. All the Minister was trying to do with the extraordinary bit of correspondence was to establish just who was in charge of this government, and that's something we've all been trying to do for 20 months now. But the Minister has made it easy for all of us. All we have to do is watch for a bill on aid to separate schools. I understand that the odds are currently running at three to two against the Minister. Apparently a lot of people in Manitoba still think that a Premier ought to be in charge of his government.

And I see the Minister of Tourism - it's been suggested that he's a little too radical for this Cabinet but he's been holding him back admirably well and he is to be congratulated for his zeal.

And the Minister of Youth and Education. He is a moderate enough man. He is so moderate that the Member for Crescentwood felt it was necessary to plant a spy in his Minister's office. And how that spy's report must gall his patron. In whole weeks in the Minister's office there will be not one frenzied outburst. No doubt the Minister's colleagues will in time convince him that his faith and reason and sanity is misplaced. And the Minister has a huge job, but 20 months of association with all his colleagues in the Executive Council has no doubt given him enough graphic examples of the inadequacy of the education in this province to fire zeal even in his moderate soul.

And the Honourable Minister of Agriculture. I understand that he's been spending all his time trying to show his friend the Attorney-General which came first, the chicken or the egg. But he has his place in Manitoba history. Now he will be remembered and revered through the ages as the father of the Sam Can program.

And finally, Mr. Speaker, my good friend, the Honourable the Minister of Finance. He has another title now but until he came along we always assumed that Finance was the most

(Mr. Spivak, cont'd.) important portfolio. He doesn't worry much about it, though like his colleagues he knows that all governments have to do is spend money, so lately he's been letting finance take care of itself. His recent activities have consisted of a set of little sermons on the advantages of the biggest possible city government. His utterances on this subject have borne something of the Messianic flavour of our mutual forefathers, something of their zeal. But alas he has misread our history. The ancient prophets strived to lead the people out of the wilderness. My honourable friend is leading us into the wilderness. Our forefathers were wiser and more convincing.

But the Minister has added to our political knowledge, Mr. Speaker; he has developed a new technique that we all may use and I'd like to call it the Cherniack test. It's an instant way of telling whether or not gatherings are representative. The way it works, and no doubt the Minister will explain it more clearly, is that if a group agrees with the Minister then it is representative, if it fails to agree then it has surely been manipulated by the forces of evil. And therein lies the Minister's strength, Mr. Speaker. His strength is as ten because his heart is pure, never a single doubt, never a question but only righteousness unbounded, and we all look forward breathlessly to having the benefit of the Minister's moral teachings during our deliberations here.

I'd like to report to the House one more rumour that I've heard. I understand that the government as a reward for journalistic excellence and impartiality has decided to hire the Winnipeg Free Press to print Hansard from now on, and since Hansard are sometimes dull reading I understand that the publisher of the Free Press has undertaken to rewrite them all before publication so that we can all find out what we really meant. Now I confess that I do not know how all these rumours got started but it has been suggested that they have been occasional inadvertent leaks from high places in this government.

It is also proper I think, Mr. Speaker, for me to acknowledge the presence in the gallery of the ladies and gentlemen of the media and I should note an unusual undertaking that the members of our press gallery have made to the politicians of this province. The chairman of their group has written to us as politicians assuring us that the media will quote us properly if we can find the wit to say things properly. While this division of labour is not new it does attack one of the oldest and lately one of the most popular weapons in the political arsenal but I for one am willing to give it a try.

And I greet my friend the First Minister. It's up to him, Mr. Speaker, and it is to him at least, that I will address much of my speech this afternoon. The First Minister is an amiable man as we all know, and as the recent by-elections have proven he is the man that many in Manitoba want to lead us, but he has not led us yet. The two by-election victories like the 1969 election are personal victories for the First Minister. They have given him sufficient majority to control this House, Mr. Speaker, within the rules, but who will give the First Minister sufficient will to control his colleagues? Who will give him sufficient strength to lead his government? There has been much comment, Mr. Speaker, on the First Minister's public disagreement with his colleagues on the question of aid to separate schools. The First Minister has dismissed the whole matter very lightly - a mere misunderstanding he tells us, a minor difference of opinion. Now that may be so. Perhaps the Minister did reply rather hastily to his Leader. Perhaps on the other hand the First Minister did speak out of turn as his colleagues have suggested and I don't know which is true. But I do know that a group of people in Manitoba who believe that for some 80 years they have been the victims of an injustice, had their hopes raised by the First Minister and now they do not know where they stand. And I know that many Manitobans are wondering: can the First Minister speak on behalf of the government; does he have the power to keep his word; are the commitments he makes binding on the government or are they subject to veto unless all of his colleagues agree or must they perhaps be ratified at a meeting of the dues-paying members of the First Minister's political party. Those questions, Mr. Speaker, cut to the very bone of our system of government. The Premier has a mandate from the people of Manitoba to provide leadership. He has claimed that he is determined that government must be responsive, open and humane. To date he has not provided that kind of leadership and we do not have that kind of government. The First Minister claims his government is open. He claims it is responsive. Well I ask him to consider: is not an open government a government that makes information available to the people; is not a responsive government a government that exceeds to the responsible requests and questions of the people? And if these things are true, Mr. Speaker, if that is indeed the essence of open government

(Mr. Spivak, cont'd.) then I would ask my friend if his government is really either. Does he seriously suggest that the gaggle of irresponsible-unlightened and conflicting opinion that his Ministers utter is information? If so, which one are we to believe? Do we believe the Minister of Health and Social Development or the Minister of Transportation? They have both given us a great deal of information on welfare. Do we believe the First Minister or the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources? They have both given us information on aid to separate schools. Do we believe the First Minister or the Minister of Transportation? They have both made us promises about taxation. Is that what the First Minister means when he speaks of open government? And does the First Minister seriously suggest that the public hearings his colleagues have presided over, public hearings where ministers of his government felt free to ignore at best but more often to dismiss and disparage the legitimate questions and doubts of the people of Manitoba, does he suggest this is responsive government?

The First Minister had one other word inserted in the Throne Speech, and that word was "humane". His government has felt it necessary to expropriate the livings of many Manitobans and they have made no provision for realistic compensation. Is that what the First Minister meant by "humane"? But the First Minister justifies that. He says that he refuses to consult with those who have a vested interest in the things his government is doing. I ask him if the statement is anything more than a trite and dangerous slogan. I ask him if that statement does not more properly belong in some political attic and I remind him that the insurance agents his government has dispossessed were not rich people. They were not the fat cats that the myth of his party have hated. They were average people. They earned middle income. When the Premier says he will not consult with those who have vested interests, does he not mean then those who are most affected by what his government intends to do will not be allowed to speak? Does he not mean that those who will suffer the heaviest and most crushing losses because of his government action will not be allowed to speak in their own defense? And I would say to him, Mr. Speaker, that no government has the right to decide that because what they are planning to do affects my destiny and the destiny of my family I shall therefore not be heard. But that is what the First Minister has said and that is what his government has done, and he calls that "humane".

I fear my greeting to the First Minister is less cheerful than my remarks to his colleagues but that is because in the final analysis the failure of this government is his failure and the pretense of this government is his too. But unless I appear to be anything but positive towards my friend I have one clear and positive suggestion for him. His government has expropriated the livings of those Manitobans who sold insurance. The government had the authority. But in Manitoba we have seen fit to appoint an ombudsman to protect our people against the arbitrary action of the many government boards and commissions. Can we not see fit to appoint an independent body to protect our citizens against the arbitrary economic expropriation of government? I urge my friend to prepare legislation to appoint such a body so that we have an independent forum that will award fair compensation to those other groups who will be subject to economic expropriation.

Mr. Speaker, in this complex world the actions of government are hugely important to every citizen. Each of our lives is now deeply affected by the attitudes and the actions of the people who govern. And I speak now to the First Minister. The idea of government as a potential threat is alien to our people. Government should not be used to turn citizen against citizen, group against group. Protect our people from the unleashing of demagoguery and allow no further attacks upon our most sacred institution such as the courts. Should you fail to restrain yourself and your colleagues government will indeed become in your own words, and I quote your words, "a suspicious extra force" instead of the force for good that it must be. And that threat, Mr. Speaker, and that force will be the only things this government has created; the government that calls itself responsive and open and humane.

Mr. Speaker, Throne Speeches by their nature cannot be considered as blueprints for future government action. They should never be confused with detailed programs. They can do nothing more than state those matters which the government of the day considers to be of central and urgent importance to the welfare of the province. A Throne Speech constitutes in a very general way a statement of intent by the government. The actual value or meaning of any particular Throne Speech must be evaluated within the context of the state of the province at the time and within the context of the proven nature and behavior of the government in office, and that nature and that behavior cannot be measured by legislation alone. The laws the government makes are important, but no more important than three other elements.

(Mr. Spivak, cont'd.)

The first of these is the administration of the laws that already exist, laws the government itself has passed and laws it has inherited. Much of the process of government consists of the administration of such laws, and between elections, Mr. Speaker, nothing stands between the weak and the strong in our society but our laws and the men who administer them. So it is fair and necessary to ask, is their administration of our laws fair; is it honest; is it effective; is it impartial and is it humane. The answers to these questions lead us to another essential element of government, its character and the character of the men who make it up. Are the men of high character; are they motivated by public concern or are they excited by the mere exercise of power; are they capable, competent men, or are they bunglers, however well meaning.

The final crucial element of government is finance. Governments have no money of their own. Provinces can create no money. Government must work with the money of our citizens. Money collected fairly or unfairly, there are real and strict limits on the government's capacity to spend and on its capacity to borrow, for government spends the income of its citizens and borrows against the credit of its citizens. And so we must ask, does government spend too much or too little; does it spend wisely; does it tax fairly; and above all, can all of its announced intentions be achieved within the financial limitations of our province.

These are the elements of government that will allow us to evaluate this Speech from the Throne. We must consider the legislative proposals it contains, we must consider the administrative record of this government, we must consider the character of this government as displayed and we must consider the vital question of finance. And having adopted the framework, Mr. Speaker, we must make clear our criteria for judging this Throne Speech, this statement of government intent. It is the same criteria that we will apply to each of the elements of government in succession, and those criteria are very simple. Will it benefit the people of this province? Will it assure that those who need our help will be helped? Will it enhance the dignity and the liberty of our citizens? Will it be fair to all concerned? Those are the very simple questions, Mr. Speaker, and in their answers lies the answer to one other question. Is this government meeting its responsibility to the people of this province? And those questions, Mr. Speaker, will form the basis of our approach to all the government's action in this House. It is with those questions that we will evaluate their legislation, their estimates and their budgets. In my speech today, I will not attempt to deal with all the aspects of the government's record or programs, but rather I will deal with only a few aspects that I believe are indicative of the nature and behavior of this government.

Mr. Speaker, for twenty months this government has given no indication that it had set any priorities for legislation, for spending, for any aspect of government. Who would have believed that a monopoly government auto insurance or a hasty plan for urban reorganization would have been the first priorities of an NDP government, the first priorities of a government of the party of Woodsworth and Heaps. But in this Throne Speech, for the first time, the government has acknowledged some of the real gut issues facing Manitoba. In this Throne Speech they have made their first gestures of concern for raising our per capita income; they have made their first formal mention of an income security program; and they'd even gone so far as to pay at least lip service to the need for economic development. But lip service and passing mention will not be enough, Mr. Speaker. Manitoba must share fully in the real growth of Canada. Increases in per capita income in our province must reflect fully our real contribution to the national growth. The rise in our standards of living must keep pace with the rises in standards of living across Canada.

But figures about per capita income can be misleading. For instance, a loss of population through people leaving Manitoba to go to other provinces will tend to keep the figures high. We can be certain that without economic growth we can have no real increases in our per capita income in this province. Our central economic objective must be an increase in the real incomes of our people. In simple terms, more money and the greater freedom that more money brings for every person in Manitoba. We know that worker income is directly related to productivity. Higher production will contribute to a higher standard of living by assuring us of the capacity for higher real earnings. We must have larger stocks of those consumer and capital goods. Through these we can realize an improvement in working and living conditions throughout this province. Our productivity is largely related to market considerations. New markets can be penetrated by an aggressive business community, but we cannot hope to have that kind of business community in our present climate of excessive tax rates,

(Mr. Spivak, cont'd.) government fear of the profit motive, government confusion in priorities, and with my friend the Minister of Yum-Yum presiding over a department of inertia rather than a Department of Industry and Commerce.

On paper there will always be a rise in per capita income - inflation will take care of that - but we will not raise the per capita income of our people, the real income of our people significantly unless we move aggressively to solve our agricultural problem, to attract new investment, to expand our existing industries and to develop our natural resources, and we cannot do this without an economic development plan and without leadership.

The Throne Speech on income security -- the Throne Speech speaks at least of income security and welfare reform. I want the First Minister and the members of the Cabinet and the caucus opposite to know that we will support the concept of income security for Manitobans. I want to make that clear. We will support the concept of income security for Manitobans. We recognize that the most desirable way for a person to acquire an income is through gainful employment, but we will assist the government in every way in formulating a welfare system that will lead to spending to alleviate the need for all those groups in our province who cannot make it and who have failed to share in our prosperity. Now if the government is committed to making real reforms in our welfare system and hopes only to recover some cost from Ottawa, then we are with them; but I would warn the government not to trifle with the hopes and expectations of Manitobans, not to promise in high sounding phrases what they will not deliver. If the government means only to study, to meet and haggle with the Liberals in Ottawa and then to blame the federal government for their own lack of action, then we will give them no peace in this House.

There are many aspects of welfare reform that are within our own competence in Manitoba. There are groups of our fellow Manitobans whose need is too urgent to wait on long and possible fruitless negotiations with Ottawa. I note from the speech that the government is expanding care facilities for our senior citizens. We support this, but what of our senior citizens living in the community? If the government is serious about reforming its welfare system, about assuring some form of income security of Manitobans, well let them start with an income supplement for our senior citizens. This is within the power of the province. With some intelligent revisions of priorities in government spending, it is within our economic means. It requires no negotiations with the Liberals in Ottawa, and our older neighbors are in need now.

There are only five ways I know to pay for increased social reform; either you increase the provincial debt, you increase provincial taxes, you have the application and the contributory principle, you reform government expenditures, or the increased revenues that come from economic growth from a wider tax base. Now increases in taxes or debts in Manitoba's current economic circumstances would be intolerable. The contributing principle is evidently not acceptable to my friends opposite, and I would suggest that the only available sources of finance for social reform are to increase revenue through economic growth and to reform present government spending. We will not have the economic growth unless we have a society where private initiative is encouraged and rewarded, and we will not reform government spending unless we are prepared seriously to pare costs to eliminate redundant programs.

In a final analysis, Mr. Speaker, we question the government's real ability to undertake reform. We do not doubt their ability to prepare legislation nor do we question their sincerity. They want economic security for everyone. Who doesn't? But can they administer the laws; can they finance the programs. Our new Age of Majority Act, a good piece of legislation brought in by this government, now threatens to throw a huge new load on our welfare rolls. Eighteen year old students unemployed for the summer may flock to our municipal offices. If this is the government's intent, then well and good, but where is the money to meet the new costs? If it is not the government's intent, then where is there any evidence of their ability to administer our laws. One way or the other, Mr. Speaker, either in finance or in administration, we have government incompetence. And that leads us to the next and crucial question, where is the money to come from, money for the programs launched and the programs mooted; money for the school tax rebates or whatever they're to be called; money for special welfare supplements; money for expanded education; and even if we're to believe it, money for a guaranteed annual income.

Mr. Speaker, these programs, policies and promises are real if, and only if, this government has a real strategy for economic growth, a strategy that will produce the resources necessary to pay for the promised bonanzas. If the government wants more resources, let it look to its own patterns of spending and let it undertake a real strategy for economic development. A strategy for economic development must consist of several parts. The parts do

(Mr. Spivak, cont'd.) not change much with changes in political philosophy because they are the established rules of an economic system of which Manitoba is only a small part.

First, we require capital for investment in productive capacity - in factories, in farms, in power lines, in roads, in shops and machines. In Canada this investment has usually come from the retained earnings of business and from the savings borrowed by businessmen and by farmers. Some capital has been imported from other countries, but usually from the United States. The high levels of taxation introduced by this government have reduced the retained earnings of business and have reduced private savings. Thus two sources of investment are diminished. These higher taxes, together with the threat if not the reality of government competition, discourage our fellow Canadians from outside Manitoba from investing in this province, and now we have the threat of even higher taxes next year, a threat made clear by the Minister of Transportation recently.

. Continued on next page

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd.)

And finally, the ambiguous and ambivalent attitude of the government towards American investment makes the prospect of capital from that source less and less likely. The second component essential for economic development is the encouragement of technological advance. Technological advance expands the output of manpower and makes higher wages possible. But what is the government doing in this field. Have they a single program? Is there any hope that they will soon come forward with such programs? The third component of growth is the intangible element, the climate or the attitude towards business or entrepreneurial activity.

Now under their new thrust for growth, will the government begin to place the elements necessary for growth ahead of all other activities? Will their patterns of spending be changed to provide roads so that new areas of Manitoba may gain in the future advantage of economic expansion? Now a small businessman may adopt wrong priorities. He may decide to rob the till to buy a colored television set because a colored television set would be nice, or he may forego the colored television set and instead invest in a new machine that will help his business grow. We can easily forecast which set of priorities will lead to a business success, and we can as easily forecast the effect of government attitude towards growth.

Mr. Speaker, for twenty months this government has been robbing the till and now they promise more of the same. They have been buying frills and trips to Sweden and Yum Yum campaigns instead of roads and Hydro projects. At the same time they are taxing away retained earnings, taxing away personal savings, discouraging investment from Canadian sources by high taxes, frightening away foreign capital with wild and immoderate statements, and they have reduced industrial promotional efforts to the level of embarrassing absurdity in the . . . Yum Yum affair.

Some 300,000 Manitobans live in our agricultural communities. About half of them live on farms; the other half have occupations generally related to agriculture. These citizens have many problems; high and rising farm costs, low and falling farm prices, and a crucial need for economic diversification. And what does this government propose to do to meet these problems. Well, they're talking. The government is talking about improving orderly marketing systems. They are talking about talking to the federal government about talking about grain prices and grain marketing. Having attempted to cooperate with the other western provinces and with the Maritimes to improve proposed federal marketing legislation, have they attempted in any way to lower farm costs? No, they have not done a thing, except that the Minister of Agriculture has promised all farmers \$8.50 a month, and for a few of them maybe a subsidized toilet if he can get the money from the federal government to pay for it. The hard fact is that nothing of consequence has been done. This government has no farm policy; they have no rural policy; and in the past twenty months they have taken no steps to improve the lots of the farmer and improve the lives of the residents of the towns and villages of Manitoba.

And what about our resources? Manitoba's natural resources by any standard are under-developed. We have forests on the east side of Lake Winnipeg and northward to Island Lake that are valuable, uncapped and uncommitted. We have mineral wealth as yet unexplored. We have a potential fishery resource in our northern lakes. And what is being done to foster the development of these resources? Well, the government passed a piece of legislation called the Natural Resources Development Act. It allows the government to develop the resources directly, but the government has not used it. It lies on the statute books as a threat to development. It discourages private investment, it discourages private initiative, and it has not been used to create income for Manitobans. The law, the policies and the attitude of this government are discouraging optimum resource development, and they do nothing to raise per capita income or the gross income and they do nothing to redistribute that income except to increase the tax load a little on rich and poor alike in order to redistribute a little of our wealth to the ever growing group of party faithful that are appointed daily to our civil service.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in closing I'd like to offer to this House what I think is an excellent example of the nature of this government in its dealings with people. In the Throne Speech the government announced its benign intentions for our native people. More jobs they say, and more opportunity, but do their actions lend evidence to this announcement? Some 7,000 people, almost all of them Indian-Metis, live in abject poverty on the east side of Lake Winnipeg. Among them are more than 2,000 employable people. Among them are no more than 300 jobs of even a semi-permanent nature. At one time these Manitobans relied on fishing Lake

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd.) Winnipeg, but fishing is closed now and they are left with nothing. They live on welfare, rabbits, and contaminated fish from Lake Winnipeg. They live in the communities of Berens River, Little Grand Rapids, Manigotogan and others like it.

The government has been asked, in fact begged to undertake a resource development program in the area to provide these people with the opportunity to earn an income. There could be a national park in that area. The federal government is all ready to proceed with it. There could be a forestry development program to produce sawed timber and pulp chips. On the northeast side of Lake Winnipeg there are magnificent dunes and beaches suitable for recreational development. The area is highly mineralized and holds promise of mine development, but no development can take place unless the government builds a road to make the resources accessible. The region needs private capital to develop mines, forestry and recreation. The government does nothing. It has listened to the pleas of the local people with cool indifference. It says it will study the situation. It allocates no money for roads and it discourages the private sector from investing in forests and mines, recreational and mining exploration through vague threats of government investment in these industries and it passes legislation to make these threats real. And so the people continue to live on welfare and rabbits and contaminated fish and capital stays in Toronto and New York and entrepreneurs look to Alberta, B.C. and Ontario and many of our most enterprising citizens consider leaving the province.

Mr. Speaker, that is an example of the First Minister's responsive, open and humane government. It is an example of the kind of situation that was not and is not as urgent as auto insurance if we are to judge from the actions of our friends opposite. Mr. Speaker, the intent expressed in the Throne Speech was summed up by the Winnipeg Tribune in its headline "NDP Pledges Increase in Manitoba Incomes". Well what weight shall we put to that pledge? What credence can be given to this government's promises? Well let us look at the four elements of government we spoke of earlier with respect to the question of higher incomes. Let's deal with legislation. Little in the Speech from the Throne is constructive, some that is destructive. I can think of last year's natural resources development act and this year's proposal concerning mining. Their administration of our laws has been characterized by bungling, inactivity, interspersed with occasional sabotage of public confidence and their attitude--well this government is so lacking in leadership and so disorganized that it has no one attitude. It has shown inaction, complacency, inconsistency and an unwillingness to listen to the poor, the economically weak and the powerless; a profound suspicion of the private sector, an obvious attempt by some ministers to discourage private activity, a consistent lack of candor and above all confusion. And in finance we find no evidence that this government has priorities for its spending, no evidence that it has financial capacity to carry out its vast but vague undertakings. It shows no understanding of even the simplest aspects of government finance. Only the Minister of Transport seems to be even the least bit concerned about finance and he forecasts for next year higher taxes.

I'm disappointed, Mr. Speaker, in the Throne Speech's reference to taxation. Beyond the proper use of the Foundation System and a promise of some technical adjustments in the Municipal Assessment Act and the Municipal Tax Deferral Act, I find the speech bare in a specific comment. These two minor references are not a policy, Mr. Speaker; the only intimation of the government's policy comes towards the end of the speech when they reaffirm their general support for the Benson White Paper. To claim to support the farmers and to claim to love small business and then to support the set of tax proposals is simply inconsistent. Even the federal Minister, Mr. Speaker, whose imagination gave rise to the White Paper in the first place has decided that it is indefensible. The inevitable dulling of incentive that would follow from this policy, the limitations of the economic choices open to our citizens, these things are not tolerable to our people.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by the Honourable Member from Morris, that the motion be amended by adding to it the following words: "But this House regrets (a) the Speech from the Throne offers no means or assurance of implementation of adequate programs for the development of our economy or for the realization of real gains in the income and prosperity of our people; (b) that the speech contains no indication of the excessive levels of taxation in our province will be adjusted to levels comparable with our sister provinces; (c) that the speech displays no determination to curb the obsolete and excessive patterns of spending of the government; and (d) that the government's commitment

(MR. SPIVAK cont'd)to welfare reform and to income security is equivocal; the requirements for proper programs to assist those in our society who cannot make it on their own is urgent but there is no evidence that the government has either the financial resources or the clear intent to implement such programs.

MR. SPEAKER put the question?

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

MR. GORDON E. JOHNSTON (Portage la Prairie): Mr. Speaker, if no one else wishes to speak I would like to adjourn the motion. Otherwise . . . seconded by the Member for Assiniboia. But this is if no one else wishes to speak.

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

MR. GREEN: Mr. Speaker, I believe that it is the will of the House that we not move to any order of business. I also believe that it is the will of the House that we forego private members' resolutions during the period of the Throne Speech debate, and if I'm correctly interpreting the will, which I presume I am by the nodding heads opposite, I would move, seconded by the Honourable the Minister of Labour, 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.