

THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF MANITOBA

2:30 o'clock, Tuesday, March 21, 1972

Opening Prayer by Mr. Speaker.

INTRODUCTION OF GUESTS

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed I should like to direct the attention of the Honourable Members to the gallery where we have 14 students taking an upgrading course at the King Edward the Second School. These students are under the direction of Mrs. Krucik. This school is located in the constituency of the Honourable Minister of Education.

We also have 60 students of Grade Five standing from the Polson School. These students are under the direction of Mr. Mason, Mrs. Lacroix and Misses Leskiw and Wilson. This school is located in my own constituency of Kildonan.

On behalf of all the Honourable Members of the Legislative Assembly I welcome you here today.

Presenting Petitions; Reading and Receiving Petitions; Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees; Ministerial Statements. The Honourable the Attorney-General.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS

HON. A. H. MACKLING, Q. C. (Attorney-General and Minister of Consumer, Corporate and Internal Services) (St. James): Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the Annual Report of the Department of Consumer, Corporate and Internal Services.

MR. SPEAKER: Any further reports or ministerial statements?

Notices of Motion; Introduction of Bills; Oral Questions.

ORAL QUESTION PERIOD

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. L. R. (BUD) SHERMAN (Fort Garry): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Minister of Industry and Commerce. I'd like to ask him whether the pamphlet "Manitoba Incentives to Industry" is still available to those interested in such incentives in the province on request?

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

HON. LEONARD S. EVANS (Minister of Industry and Commerce) (Brandon East): Mr. Speaker, I'll take the question as notice.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Birtle-Russell.

MR. HARRY E. GRAHAM (Birtle-Russell): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Minister of Municipal Affairs or the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources and Environmental Control. Could the Minister indicate to the House if the monies approved for the provincial job office program for old age pensioners home improvements has been totally allocated and if not, what percentage is still available for grants to be processed?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. HOWARD R. PAWLEY (Minister of Municipal Affairs and Commissioner of Northern Affairs) (Selkirk): I think that's a logical question for an Order for Return.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Honourable the First Minister. I would ask him if he is in receipt of a letter from the Prime Minister of Canada in the past few days having to do with outlining proposed details of the family income security package?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

HON. EDWARD SCHREYER (Premier) (Rossmere): Mr. Speaker, affirmative.

MR. SHERMAN: A supplementary, thank you, Mr. Speaker, to the Honourable the First Minister. Can he advise the House when the details of that proposition will be divulged to this House?

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, as soon as they are completely comprehensible.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. EDWARD MCGILL (Brandon West): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Could he tell the House at this time his target date for the removal of the head office of Autopac from Winnipeg to Brandon?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. PAWLEY: Mr. Speaker, it will be announced at the appropriate time.

MR. MCGILL: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Could the Minister indicate whether there is space allocated in the about to be completed provincial building at Brandon for the head office of Autopac?

MR. PAWLEY: Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. JACOB M. FROESE (Rhineland): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable the Minister in charge of utilities, --(Interjection)-- Hydro. Oh, I wasn't sure who the Minister was. The question is: have any negotiations taken place and has Manitoba Hydro negotiated a deal with the City Hydro in supplying its electrical energy?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, is the honourable member -- if the honourable member is referring to the negotiations relative to the supply of power itself or negotiations relative to possible restructuring of the organizations.

MR. FROESE: The question was whether a new block had been purchased, a new block of power had been purchased by City Hydro? And if that's not the case, is the restructuring going on, will there be a change?

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, in a sense there are two parts to that. The first part being that City Hydro has had a 20-year agreement with the Crown with respect to water rentals on the Winnipeg River. The second part is that with respect to the sale of blocks of power by Manitoba Hydro to City Hydro, negotiations are still continuing.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for LaVerendrye.

MR. LEONARD A. BARKMAN (La Verendrye): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask a question from the Minister of Agriculture. I understand 1,000 hogs have been researched for a certain project and I wonder if the Minister could tell us how the University of Manitoba project of having a pork chop on the hoof is coming.

HON. SAMUEL USKIW (Minister of Agriculture) (Lac du Bonnet): Mr. Speaker, I'd be pleased if the honourable member would acquaint me with the details of this project. I'm not familiar with them.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Souris-Killarney.

MR. EARL MCKELLAR (Souris-Killarney): Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Agriculture. Has the Conservation Act passed two years ago been proclaimed?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: I'm not sure but I believe it has, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. HARRY J. ENNS (Lakeside): Mr. Speaker, I direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Education. The Minister undoubtedly is aware of a long-standing boundary dispute in the Lakeshore School Division. Can the Minister tell me whether or not he has referred the subject matter to a board of reference? I'm referring specifically to the situation at Oak Point and Lundar. I believe the Member for St. Matthews was present at a meeting where virtually 100 percent petition of the residents of Oak Point requested the transfer of Oak Point to the Lundar district.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Education.

HON. BEN HANUSCHAK (Minister of Education) (Burrows): No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ENNS: A supplementary question just for further clarification. What did the Minister mean by his answer, that he is not referring it to a board of reference or that no decision has been made?

MR. HANUSCHAK: Mr. Speaker, I believe I answered the question put to me by the honourable member.

MR. ENNS: Well a supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Then on behalf of the residents of Oak Point who have waited some two, three years for this answer, can the Minister indicate when he intends to refer this boundary dispute to a board of reference as set out in the Education Act?

MR. HANUSCHAK: When the need will arise, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, the Honourable Member from Riel asked a question on March 17th -- I'm sorry I guess he just left his seat -- asked a question on what resource studies or other studies are being undertaken on Opachuanau Lake and Opachuanau Lake for

(MR. EVANS cont'd) the advice of members of this House, is located at the southwest end of Southern Indian Lake and is within the area under review by the Lake Winnipeg, Churchill and Nelson Rivers Study Board. This board will be undertaking various studies throughout this study area over the next three years and will be considering all resource implications, hydro developments in the study area including Apachuanau Lake.

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

MR. J. DOUGLAS WATT (Arthur): Mr. Speaker, I have a question I'd like to direct to the Minister of Agriculture, a supplementary question to that proposed to him, or asked of him a few moments ago. The Minister has said, Mr. Speaker, that he doesn't know if the Conservation Act has been proclaimed or not. Is it true that he has been dodging the issue insofar as the . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order please. I believe if the honourable member will take a look at the reference sheet I issued to every member yesterday the way he's prefacing his question is out of order. If he wishes to restate his question I'll recognize him again. The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. WATT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I'll rephrase the question. Is it true that the Minister is dodging . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Order please. I asked the honourable member to rephrase his question. If he persists, I have no alternative. The Honourable Member for Arthur.

MR. WATT: Is this my second supplementary question? May I ask the Minister has there been representation from any conservation districts in the province to his office that he has ignored?

MR. USKIW: Not that I'm aware of, Mr. Speaker. I don't recall ignoring any representations.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, last week the Honourable Member for Lakeside asked whether updating could be given on the flood forecast relative to the Red River Valley. I'd like to advise the honourable member that such a report should be available to this House by Monday next.

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

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, the other day the Honourable Member from Thompson asked a question with respect to the flight dispatching jobs of Air Canada in Winnipeg being shifted elsewhere in Canada. I can inform members of the House that I had a telephone conversation this morning with Mr. Eve Pratt, Chairman of the Board and Chief Executive Officer of Air Canada and I would like to report briefly on the situation with regard to Air Canada's assistant flight dispatchers in Winnipeg, because it is the position of assistant flight dispatcher specifically which is involved. I'm advised that as part of the reorganization in 1970 that Air Canada established a system operations control branch and in making the decision the airline decided to focus its flight dispatch activities in Toronto and in Vancouver and as a result in November of 1970 Air Canada transferred its flight dispatchers previously employed in Winnipeg. Five assistant flight dispatchers were retained here with their functions being mainly clerical in nature, and I do recall in looking at the files, Mr. Speaker, that this was the subject of some correspondence between myself and the President of Air Canada, Mr. Baldwin, back in 1970. As a result of experience obtained since November of 1970 Air Canada has reached the conclusion, according to Mr. Pratt, that functions being performed by the assistant flight dispatchers could be transferred to the telecommunications group in Winnipeg without an increase in personnel. So two of the five Winnipeg assistant flight dispatchers have already been on vacancies at other Air Canada stations and as the others bid on vacancies the functions performed by the assistant flight dispatchers will be taken on by the telecommunications group.

I would inform members of the House that during the recent visit of Air Canada executives to Winnipeg, including Mr. Pratt, that we did receive assurance that the company's over-all employment level in Winnipeg would not decline, and as you know we have had many discussions with this Crown corporation on the possibilities of increasing the corporation's direct and indirect work in Winnipeg. Mr. Pratt assured me again this morning that the total level of Air Canada employment in Winnipeg was on the increase so that while the five assistant flight dispatchers are leaving Winnipeg, Air Canada, I have been advised, has centralized its North American air freight billings here and as a result of this in the last two years there

(MR. EVANS cont'd) has been a net addition of 45 personnel to the Air Canada corporation. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. JOSEPH P. BOROWSKI (Thompson): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Tourism and Cultural Affairs. Is his Department going to take any action against the dirty film that's going to be shown on Thursday which has been banned elsewhere in Canada?

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

HON. LAURENT L. DESJARDINS (Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Cultural Affairs) (St. Boniface): Mr. Speaker, I haven't the faintest idea what the honourable member -- which film the honourable member is . . . I wish the members would refrain from advertising any of these obscene films. Mr. Chairman, this is something if he wants to bring it to my attention I'll ask the Censor Board if they've seen it.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I deliberately avoided naming the film. I won't because I don't want to give them publicity. I will tell the . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. This is the question period, not a time for statements. The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. GORDON W. BEARD (Churchill): I'd like to direct a question to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. On his information that he gave a few minutes ago on the study that was going on - South Indian and Lake Winnipeg - was that the \$2 million federal-provincial study that he referred to. I'm sorry I didn't catch the first part of his statement.

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

MR. EVANS: I don't believe so, Mr. Chairman. This is the study that will be undertaken by what is referred to as the Lake Winnipeg, Churchill and Nelson Rivers Study Board.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Rhineland.

MR. FROESE: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to direct a question to the Honourable the Minister of Agriculture. Has the Minister received in recent days any briefing from the Federal Minister of Agriculture in connection with crop insurance and, if so, could he enlarge on the statement that appears in the press that extended coverage will be provided to farmers without payment?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Agriculture.

MR. USKIW: I'm not aware of the press story as I haven't read the newspaper this morning so I don't really know what the honourable member is referring to, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Thompson.

MR. BOROWSKI: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Tourism and Recreation. I wonder if he could inform the House if it's his intention since taking over the department to enforce the age restriction laws that are in effect in Manitoba against theatres who allow children under 18 to go into theatres when in fact the law says under those rules of restriction that they must not go in.

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

MR. DESJARDINS: Mr. Speaker, I am sure that all laws should be enforced and I might take this occasion to tell my honourable colleague that there will be something -- a change in the Act probably at this session.

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

MR. DONALD W. CRAIK (Riel): Mr. Speaker, my question I think is to the First Minister. Traditionally there's been a list filed in this House of the salaries of the chairmen of boards, commissions and also deputy ministers. Will that list be filed this year or will it be necessary for us to file an Order for Return for this information?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, there are a number of comments that can be made in reply to that question. First of all, it is correct to say that it is in the Public Accounts of this province that the salaries of all those public servants whose salaries are in excess of \$7,500 per year are shown.

Second point: it is questionable whether it is a tradition or custom or practice of this House to circulate any other document with respect to salaries. I would refer to my colleague, the House Leader who is more familiar with the practices of this House, than either myself or the member for Riel in that respect.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour.

HON. RUSSELL PAULLEY (Minister of Labour and Railway Commissioner) (Transcona): I might say, Mr. Speaker, as indicated by the First Minister, Public Accounts to give this information. There was a request some years ago, Mr. Speaker, I believe by the former premier of Manitoba, Mr. D. L. Campbell, that when we went into Estimates, there was a list of the deputy ministers provided for each department at that particular time. I'll check back over the records, Mr. Speaker, for my honourable friend, but it wasn't customary as I understand it, or recall it, let me put it that way, for that to be tabled or given other than at the time of the consideration of the individual departments.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Riel.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, might I ask a question then - by the answer does this imply that the government is not willing to give the salaries for the current year, because the posted salaries are at least a year old. The ones we have now are '70-71. We have nothing on '71-72.

MR. PAULLEY: I believe, Mr. Speaker, had my honourable friend been listening to what I said, he would have had the answer that there was this convenience given, and then of course, Mr. Speaker, as honourable members should know, if they don't, that when the estimates of a department are under consideration, if the question is raised, the answer is given in respect of the deputy minister, so on.

MR. CRAIK: Mr. Speaker, I might first of all say thanks for the editorial. I was listening very well and I read that you are not prepared to give the boards and commission chairmen ...

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Would the honourable member place his question. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could ask a supplementary question of the Minister of Industry and Commerce, supplementary to the question that I asked him a few minutes ago as to whether the ... --(Interjection)--

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Minister of Labour on a point of order.

MR. PAULLEY: May I, Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, draw to your attention, Sir, and to honourable members, that as I understand the rules of this house, and the other jurisdictions as well, that it is improper to ask a supplementary question after there has been some intervening procedures, in order - imagine that, my honourable friend - in order that the records show precisely the question and supplementary question at the time. Now I would suggest to my honourable friend in order to have the record clear, rather than ask a supplementary question, that he ask a question, providing there has been some intervening questioning.

MR. SPEAKER: The point is well taken. Further to that, I may add that we are getting a certain amount of repetition. I am still allowing some leeway but I am well aware that the members do have the rules and regulations before them; they should consider them before they make their question. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I defer to the technical ruling raised by the House Leader. I used the terminology really for clarification, so the Minister of Industry and Commerce would know what I was talking about. Could I then ask the Minister of Industry and Commerce if in seeking the answer to the question from me, which he took as notice, fifteen minutes ago, having to do with the availability, or the continued publication of the pamphlet "Manitoba Incentives for Industry". If the answer to the question is yes, if the pamphlet is still being published, will he undertake to ...

MR. SPEAKER: Hypothetical - Order please. I am sure the honourable member can communicate his wish to the Honourable Minister. He is raising a hypothetical problem. The Honourable Member for Fort Garry.

MR. SHERMAN: I'll rephrase the question, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Industry and Commerce. If the pamphlet "Manitoba Incentives for Industry" is still being published, will he report to the House on the reasons for the difficulty of obtaining same?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Brandon West.

MR. MCGILL: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Honourable the First Minister with reference to his earlier statement about a flood forecast for the Red River Valley System. Would he undertake to provide a current forecast on the probable water levels in the upper Assiniboine Valley, during the spring run-off period.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Well, Mr. Speaker, the Acting Minister of Mines and Resources will undertake to bring the regular reports to the attention of the House as they become available.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Churchill.

MR. BEARD: I would like to direct a question to the First Minister. I wonder if he can advise the House whether the Minister will be taking advantage of the invitation of the Hudson Bay Route Association to attend their convention on April 10th?

MR. SCHREYER: The Member for Churchill, I am sure, is aware that the objectives of the Hudson Bay Route Association are very close, very close to the heart of those who form the government on this side and naturally, we would want to have someone represent the Crown at the next annual convention date. If at all possible it will be attempted and if the Member for Churchill intends to be present as well, so much the better.

ORDERS OF THE DAY - THRONE SPEECH DEBATE

MR. SPEAKER: On the proposed motion of the Honourable Member for St. Vital. The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, it always amazes me how the ride back home to the ranch can sooth one's ruffled feelings and feathers somewhat like the balm in Gilead and make it somewhat more difficult to proceed with in the same tenor that I left off with last evening. There are however, a number of points, not a number, just several points that I want to spend, not any great length but a few moments on to finish what I started last night.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday evening the Premier demonstrated just how easy it is to take a set of statistics and use them to your own ends. Now, Mr. Speaker, that shouldn't really surprise any of us in this House. It's a failing that we all succumb to from time to time; we all have prejudices in various directions, and nothing helps to buttress one's case, or cause, by so using figures that would seem to indicate, provide factual evidence and factual proof for the position that you are trying to put forward.

The Premier went to some length, Mr. Speaker, to indicate to us that as a matter of fact, we have nothing to concern us with respect to the tax problem here in Manitoba. He went on to some length, Mr. Speaker, to indicate to us that our taxes are low. Well, Mr. Speaker, just to show you to what ridiculous end one could take this argument, surely, if you applied the rate of our taxation to our taxes actually paid to the population of the peoples living in the country of Madagascar, our taxes probably would be five times their total income. On the other hand, if you applied our taxation to the people of California, it would represent a substantial decrease in taxation. If you took our taxes and applied them - I'm taking the actual tax dollars paid - and applied them to the people of Ontario, it would probably mean a decrease. If you applied our taxes that we are paying in terms of dollars, and applied them to the people of Newfoundland, it would mean a substantial increase. Mr. Speaker, the point that the premier was trying to bury, that I am sure most Manitobans will not allow him to bury, is the only question of taxes that matters, is that the people who pay them, and the incomes earned by those people who had to pay them, and the relevancy between those two points. And, Mr. Speaker, if there's a criticism to be made against the present government, if the government concerned itself with rising our incomes in this province as fast as he has the ability of rising our taxes, there probably would be no basic argument to be made.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think it would be a service well rendered if at least for the record's sake, we not allow ourselves to be befuddled by that otherwise eloquent clever, manipulation of tax figures. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that most Manitobans know precisely what they are being deducted from their pay cheques. They are alarmed at the rate of taxation. They are alarmed, they are concerned about the inability of this government to do anything with respect to their property taxation. The farmers are facing in our rural agricultural areas, a crisis situation with respect to property taxation and unless we make some efforts at curing that situation that brings on the need for these onerous taxes, the bit by bit shifting, the five million, the two million, the three million, insignificant as they are, are not going to get us out of this dilemma.

Mr. Speaker, I do want to reiterate again that I regret the tenor of the speech that the First Minister gave us last night. I suppose that comes from sitting too close to the Attorney-General, who certainly in his contribution in the matter of the Throne Speech debate probably provided us with a demonstration of bad taste, planned downturn in the economy and a few other things, that will highlight the Throne Speech.

(MR. ENNS cont'd)

Mr. Speaker, let me dwell for one moment on that contribution to the Throne Speech. As you will recall, Sir, he wanted us, and tried to identify us, and tried to single out that vicious class of people in our society, known as the rich. You know, this is a problem and obviously it is a problem in the eyes of the government, the eyes of the members of the treasury bench, we'd better identify the rich. Let's identify the rich so that we can make obscene phone calls to them or send them dirty letters or do something or other with them, if those are the public enemy No. 1, let's identify them. Surely we can't mean simply, you know, the rich that we can just name off on the fingers of our hands. He must be meaning somebody more than just the Jimmy Richardsons of this world or the Mrs. Eatons of this world. After all, there is not enough of them to count. Certainly not enough of them to count politically. By virtue of the reputation that we have in this house, it should indicate to you that there are not enough there to count politically in terms of determining or making determination of policy in this country. So let's talk. Let's talk now, Mr. Speaker, . . .

MR. SPEAKER: The First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Mr. Speaker, when the Honourable Member for Lakeside says that these people don't count politically, was he forgetting the fact that these are the people that account for perhaps more than 50 percent of the Tory campaign contributions?

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, I won't deal with that kind of retort. I will carry on with what I'm saying. But let's pursue this public enemy No. 1, the rich, and I would imagine maybe the Attorney-General has in mind somebody that maybe has worked his way through university, or maybe somebody that has at the same time developed a small business. He probably owns a house. He probably has a reasonable income, 12 or 10, or 15 thousand dollars. He probably also - maybe he has prudently invested some of his hard-earned monies in savings - maybe he owns some additional real estate and as a result of that has through some prudent advice, bought - which is certainly encouraged by all levels of government - invested in our own Canadian industry as through the stock market or otherwise, but whatever it may be, but through some investment has perhaps an additional five or six thousand dollars income. Is that the bogey man that we are trying to identify here as public enemy No. 1? And what if we have him identified, what are we supposed to do with him? Are we supposed to put some kind of a blue tag on him, a star on him, or on a shoulder patch on him, so that we can identify him on the streets in our society. Mr. Speaker, this is the kind of nonsense, divisive and sharp and ignorant nonsense that is being spouted from the members opposite, and if he fails to acknowledge and fails to appreciate that that is precisely what he's spouting, then he displays a degree of insensitivity that belies even his appearance from where I stand.

All right, Mr. Speaker, who are they? Who are we then concerned with? Who are we then talking about when the Attorney-General berates the rich in our society? I would ask him at some subsequent time to define that for us at the \$5,000 level; \$7,000 level; at the level of where the social security or the social assistance program leaves off. Does he say anything about that? The class enemy that this government chooses to fight with. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, this is the kind of contribution that we've had, not from the backbench but from the front bench of this government, from members of this government who should be through their decorum, through their words of wisdom, be leading us to greater heights in this debate, in this chamber, but who have sunk to content themselves with, you know, the kind of garbage that has come across from the members opposite, the kind of implied divisiveness that comes to us very plainly; the kind of divisiveness that obviously the First Minister encourages every time he particularly singles out a constituency in our province for contemptuous remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that the reason of course that the members of the front bench had little else to talk about was because the barren, empty document that represented the Throne Speech this time around, left them with nothing else to discuss; found the First Minister of this province on his first occasion where he could supplement and add to and expand onto what normally and traditionally is the relatively vague and bland document, Throne Speeches being what they are in the terminology and language that they are written, found himself with little enough to do but to dote on partisan criticisms of the speech delivered by the Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Speaker, not only did he content himself with that, but he also, he can't resist the aspersions that he casts on the absence of my leader, when he knows, and I think most every-one knows . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. I should like to suggest to the honourable member he is imputing and making statements which while I've been in the House I have not noted, and when he does that he also reflects on the Chair because that's one of the rules we do have that no member shall impute or cast aspersions on another member. The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, perhaps the word casting aspersions was a little harsh. What I meant was the -- but I do recall and I think it's recorded in the opening statements of the House, understandably the First Minister regretted the Leader of the Opposition's absence. It takes out a good deal of the sharpness of the debate if one's principal opponent is not there to hear the response. But in so doing he indicated passingly that other duties kept him from being physically present in the House and I think it's common knowledge the difficulties that my leader is having at this particular time and if it isn't, I should announce that at this particular time the only reason that the Leader of the Opposition was not present in the Chamber to vote vigorously in support of his own motion of non-confidence was the fact that he was hospitalized as of yesterday and unfortunately will be hospitalized perhaps for another further week or ten days at any rate.

So, Mr. Speaker, I don't know whether I can choose to continue at any greater length. I suggest that the government think seriously about some of the issues that I have raised with them. I suggest that the government think seriously about correcting a situation that if allowed to get out of hand will bring nothing of a constructive nature to our society; will only create and add to what in my mind is mythical in the first instance the themses and the usses, or the usses and the themses, or the those and the these. They are the ones that we have to blame ... --(Interjection)--

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: I'd like to ask the Honourable the Member for Lakeside why he accuses us on this side of using the mythical expression "they". Would the honourable member not agree that it is the former Leader of the Conservative Party John Diefenbaker that best epitomized the use of the term "they" "they", etc.?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Lakeside.

MR. ENNS: Mr. Speaker, you know, during the course of the First Minister's remarks he had some kind things to say about my former national leader, Mr. Diefenbaker. Unfortunately of course he never saw the wisdom, nor has he saw the light to have cast a ballot for him possibly, and that is his foreverending loss that he chose not to on an occasion presented to him, as to many other millions of Canadians, to so exercise you know the franchise that they have.

Well, Mr. Speaker, there are other members who have not had the opportunity of speaking for the first time or getting into the Throne Speech and I certainly want to allow them that privilege and I won't detain the House any longer on this matter. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that the very performance, the very performance of the First Minister last night indicates that this government has in fact run out of steam; has in fact run out of spirit, and has in fact run out of imagination. And the very performance of the First Minister last night substantiates the sensitivity that the First Minister and treasury bench members have when it's raised effectively by those of us on our side. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Gimli.

MR. JOHN C. GOTTFRIED (Gimli): Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for your recognition at this time and the opportunity of entering into the debate of the Speech from the Throne. I commend the mover and seconder, the Honourable Members from St. Vital and Ste. Rose, respectively, for their detailed and revealing outline of the very necessary though often contentious legislation passed by this government during the first three sessions. Surely it is most fitting that across the great arch of the large apse of the Chamber in which these deliberations took place should be inscribed the words of that well-known beatitude, "Blessed are they who suffer for justice sake". Or perhaps it would be more appropriate to say "who hunger and thirst for justice sake".

I would also like to pay personal tribute to the memory of the late Leonard Claydon whom I came to know as a sincere and dedicated servant to the people of his constituency.

I congratulate the Honourable Member from Logan on his appointment to the position of Deputy Speaker and would like also at this time to extend a warm welcome to our new member from Minnedosa.

(MR. GOTTFRIED cont'd)

Gimli constituency during the interval between this and the last session has continued to be the focal point of many of the thorny, contentious and controversial issues occupying the attention of this Legislature, not only because of its direct involvement with the Hydro issue, the Lake Winnipeg regulation, the Gimli Industrial Park and in particular, Saunders Aircraft and Alwest Marine, the Gimli lakefront development project and the actions of the Freshwater Fish Marketing Board, to name a few of the major concerns, but also because of the nature of its setting in the Interlake region; its vulnerability to any adverse agricultural welfare and educational policies. Our one great asset still remains the tremendous community spirit that prevails throughout my constituency giving hope that we will find our way out of the difficulties that have been plaguing this region for many years and that the Interlake will eventually become one of the choice areas in the province in which to take up residence.

Therefore, bearing in mind many of the concerns expressed to me by my constituents I would first like to voice some fears and hopes we have in the spheres of our agriculture and fishing industry. I place these two together because they both deal with the extraction of primary resources and for this reason I feel very strongly that those engaged in such fundamental and necessary tasks are deserving of a reasonable standard of living. But for many years in the past this has not been the case and I therefore suggest that the concept of guaranteed income levels should be applied particularly to those engaged in these industries. Agriculture is the single most important income producing element of the Interlake economy yet today we see many young farmers on the verge of bankruptcy because they have been encouraged to make huge loans by former federal and provincial agricultural experts with which to begin farming. Loans of 40 to 50 thousand dollars for land, and in some instances another 20 thousand for machinery have been taken, the theory being that with sufficient capital the farmer may so adjust the factors of production so as to yield him the greatest return. This is the policy in big business to maximize production to the point of diminishing returns. While I do not quarrel with this theory it postulates ideal marketing conditions and an expanding economy. But things are not going well.

Caught in the cost-price squeeze, diminishing markets, and poor marketing policies, the young farmers can barely make a living let alone pay some of the principal or even the interest on his loans. Yet strangely enough many of these young farmers see as their salvation the borrowing of even more money so as to make their operation more economically viable.

I suggest that economic theories designed for an expanding economy such as existed after World War II no longer apply. To encourage our young farmers to assume a heavy debt load when markets are receding and becoming more difficult to find, is foolhardy to say the least. A new economic theory has to be devised, more realistic and dealing with the situation as it exists today. I see this as including more government involvement in the marketing and storage of farm crops and livestock. We must not be led to cut production in a world that is desperately short of food. This to me would be morally wrong and I am pleased that our government is pursuing policies in this direction.

With the many small family farms existing in my constituency what I have stated becomes a matter of subsidizing, if necessary, a family's income to keep it on the farm rather than to bring it into the urban centres to go on welfare.

Similarly in the fishing industries, when of necessity the government places a quota on the amount of fish caught I say that that government should then also be concerned with the extra remuneration the fishermen ought to receive in order to maintain himself and his family in dignity.

And now I would like to make a few personal observations on the controversy surrounding the Lake Winnipeg regulations. While I recognize that the installation of a control serves both a hydro and a regulatory function to minimize shoreline erosion and result in other beneficial effects related to the ecology and the tourist industry, I would like to confine my remarks to the latter, mainly because the effects on hydro development have already been discussed by others in this Chamber. First I am sorry that something so beneficial to lakefront property owners and to the province in general has been turned into such a controversial issue and has become the subject of so much misleading and unwarranted criticism, seizing upon the extreme high level of 715 feet and magnifying every consequence that might result if maintained constantly at that level is as pointless as grasping the other extreme, a low of 715 feet above sea level, and speculating on the plight of a lakeshore cottage owner trudging through potholes and

(MR. GOTTFRIED cont'd) around huge boulders, across a 1/8 mile expanse of mosquito infested beach to reach the waters in time for his early morning dip. What would become of our tourist industry, or should we contemplate a return to the dry years of the 1930's when Lake Winnipeg could possibly become the dustbowl of the province.

Seriously though no one should doubt that the former damaging effects of the presence of high water on the lake will be diminished. With the addition of another outlet in the north along with a control mechanism the public can rest assured that no government would deliberately exercise its powers of control so as to contribute to greater shoreline erosion, ecological damage, and a decline in tourist trade. One has only to look at the erosion caused thus far by extreme high water levels combined with wind effect. I can recall a portion of lakeshore property north of Gimli that has long since been claimed by the lake, including a portion of a highway. I know of property owners ready to sell out not because of what we propose to do but because of what other governments have failed to do in the past.

Much has been made of the assumption that regulating the lake level between 715 and 711 feet above sea level will result in undue slush formation during the winter season and prevent the fishermen from doing an effective job. Fishermen I have spoken to inform me that this is not so. The level of the lake has little to do with the formation of slush ice conditions. Rather it is the amount of snow-fall during freeze up and during the winter months following. The weight of the snow above the ice creates the condition where ice will be depressed slightly thereby permitting the water to rise about the ice and form slush. The weight of the snow therefore, not the level of the water, is the deciding factor.

Moving on now to a matter that has continued to receive top priority in my constituency since this government assumed office is the emphasis on improving the quality of life for people in the Interlake region. To this end the announced plan of this government to provide some rural communities financial aid for installation of sewer and water is welcome news indeed for it will now be possible for these communities to take advantage of loans available for the improvement of housing and senior citizens' homes. I feel that the combined use of the present housing and water and sewer program will go a long way towards helping the Interlake to catch up with other parts of Manitoba in both the social and economic spheres. A major concern expressed by many farmers in the Gimli constituency is the heavy burden of education tax borne by their group as compared with that shouldered by our urban dwellers. While I note that our government will be effecting further tax shifts to ease this load, I wonder now if more attention should not be given to the question of direct federal grants in aid of elementary and secondary education. On what is now considered to be the optimum size farm enterprise of a section and a half of land, the education tax could run at approximately \$700 alone, depending on the school area in which it is located. This would certainly indicate that the Federal Government should become more directly involved, and this view was suggested time and again to the members of our Standing Committee on Agriculture.

In the federal budget estimates for 1971-72, that is in this booklet, direct grants in the aid of education were made in only two areas, a grant of \$20 million for post-secondary education and a further grant of \$11.1 million towards our technical, vocational, capital assistance—nothing in the way of a direct grant towards elementary and secondary education. Why do I request a direct grant when some assistance could be accepted as part of the package deal in our tax sharing agreements with the Federal Government? Well briefly it is this: I feel that unless a grant is specifically ear marked it is likely to be used in other areas. Let me illustrate. During the 1950's when the teachers salaries in the province were at a low, school boards reported time and again that they could not find the extra revenues so necessary to improve them, even though during these years the Federal government budgeted consistently for surpluses of \$400 million or more.

Extra grants from the Provincial Government did little to increase teachers' salaries for they simply became part of the general revenue to be disposed of as the board saw fit. Not until a teachers' salary grant, made on the basis of qualification and experience, was instituted by the province, did teachers receive any marked increase in remuneration. I feel that it is high time that the Federal Government assumed a greater measure of direct support in this most important aspect in the development of our society and the equalization of educational opportunity for all children across the land.

Tax shifts at the provincial level may be a necessary prerequisite. However, direct federal grants in aid is an ultimate necessity if we are to properly finance our elementary and secondary schools, we have got to start moving in that direction now. So let's work then to

(MR. GOTTFRIED cont'd) pave the way for eventual federal participation. And now to wind up my comments I would like to return to a contemplation of the Beatitude inscribed on the great arch of our chamber and call to mind a matter mentioned by me in one of my earlier replies to the Throne Speech. I refer to an article appearing on the editorial page of the Winnipeg Free Press in support of my request. With your indulgence I'll read it. This appeared in the Free Press about three weeks ago "Review Deserved. The Manitoba Teachers Society is again this year approaching the province on behalf of teachers who have lost pension benefits through war service. This matter has come up intermittently since 1960, and it is to be hoped that the government will respond more positively this time than in the past. The society's submission concerns five categories of persons now in the profession, who technically do not qualify for pension credits for war service but whose pensions are adversely effected by the Teachers Pension Act as it now stands.

"The request for a revision of the Act to cover this situation seems reasonable. A person should not suffer a penalty in pension credits because he or she spent time in military service. Most organizations, including government, have taken cognizance of this fact. To a considerable extent this has been true of the government's attitude towards teachers. Provision for pension credits has been made for most teachers who saw military service but there are a few whom the Act does not cover. It is these few, only 16 in number, with whom the Teachers' submission is concerned, but an inequity is an inequity regardless of the number involved. The matter deserves serious government review".

I therefore hope that remedial action will be taken during this session before it is too late for these sixteen people to enjoy the pension benefits to which they feel they are entitled as citizens who left their calling to serve their country.

In conclusion I would like to commend the Department of Industry and Commerce for its continued efforts to attract and retain industry in the Gimli area, particularly in the industrial park.

DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Emerson.

MR. GABRIEL GIRARD (Emerson): Mr. Speaker, I wish first of all to acknowledge in his absence, that Mr. Speaker has throughout the past session shown us his ability to control and direct our affairs to the House in a way that is certainly satisfactory to the members of the House and I wish to extend my congratulations along with other members.

I would also like to congratulate our good looking member from Minnedosa. For those who haven't had the chance maybe to judge the depth of this individual but only the sight, I could tell you that he is even more profound than he is good looking. And I understand also that after last night's birthday party that he has even matured and has improved his outlook on our business.

I would like also to congratulate the new ministers. I know that some of the new ministers no doubt think of the opposition as something to contend with but in truth we can say that we wish them well. I certainly do hope that they will enjoy the onerous responsibilities that are bestowed on them and that the fruits of their labours will be a satisfaction to them.

I want to single out, Mr. Speaker, a few of the new ministers, and may I just suggest that the Minister of Cultural Affairs, who has recently been named, will in fact, bring some solidarity to the Cabinet, although this has been said in the past with tongue in cheek. I expect it to be a truth. I am not necessarily sure that it is the result of his own solidarity but certainly by comparison, Mr. Speaker, I can look forward to the day when we can acknowledge that the Minister of Cultural Affairs has brought solidarity to a somewhat shattered Cabinet.

I can say, Mr. Speaker, in all honesty that I wish the Minister of Youth and Education well but I don't want him to get the impression by this that I have a great deal of confidence in him. On the other hand, I wish to acknowledge, Mr. Speaker, that as a teacher, and as the critic of his department, I do not have confidence in the Minister of Education.

As a matter of fact, may I even go further and suggest that I would not consider his application on my teaching staff. It might be regrettable to have to say this, Mr. Speaker, but I might as well be honest and truthful while I am at it.

To the Minister of Labour who is absent again I wish him well, although to him I might be an insignificant member, to me he is a giant to contend with, and I know that his contributions will be greatly appreciated from this side of the House.

Now also, Mr. Speaker, may I not forget to mention a few things with regard to our Premier. I have known the Premier as a student, and for many years, and I have had a great

(MR. GIRARD cont'd) deal of admiration for him and I wish he were here now because I would like to make these comments directly to him. But in his absence may I speak to the rest of his organization, the rest of his colleagues on the other side of the House and advise them that as far as I am concerned these gentlemen ought to be deeply concerned about the Minister, the Premier as he is now, the role he is playing and the future to come. And the reason I say this, Mr. Speaker, is that in all honesty, in all honesty, the honest members from that House will acknowledge that for a good number you wouldn't be sitting in this House had it not been for the popularity of your leader.

Now, if this is a fact, it is understandable, and we forgive you for it, Mr. Speaker. It is understandable that the quality cannot be the same and we acknowledge this and we sympathize with you but I would be even more concerned because I see the Premier now a little bit like Macbeth in the last chapters. You know, he started quite well. I believe that the Premier started quite well; he was absolutely credible; he appeared to be totally honest, and frankly, although I sat on this side of the House, I had some pride in my Premier. But lately I have developed the impression that very much like the Macbeth of the last chapters, the Premier is busy whipping his messenger boys who bring him bad news. And that to me represents one who is probably overcome with problems and worries - probably justified in being overcome by problems and worries - and I suggest to the people on that side of the House that you stop and think about this some day and rather than try to create more problems for him, help him out at least a bit.

It's unfortunate that the Premier is in a position that he has to whip the messenger boy rather than the people who provide him with the authentic news. I further sympathize with you, Mr. Premier, in that you have to re-arrange your Cabinet in such a way as to utilize the parts partly damaged, but the parts as you see them, and I agree with you in part at least when you re-arranged the Minister of Education's portfolio to form a triumvirate. I agree with you fully that you had really not much choice, regrettable as it might be. You had not much choice because of the material out of which you had to make your Cabinet. Now to pretend to the public that this is a move to enhance the communication that has to exist between the Minister of Universities and Colleges with that of Youth and Education and also with Health, will not stick, Mr. Minister. --(Interjection) -- Yes, let's deal with Ontario. There is a legitimate case to be made, there is a legitimate case to be made in Ontario and in Manitoba because we do want to enhance the communication. But in Manitoba, it is too obvious to believe that that is the only case, the real reason was the incompetency of two ministers and the competency of one, and mind you, Mr. Premier, I like yourself have utmost respect for the former Minister of Education, and I think your move was a wise one, but don't try and make us believe that it was a simple matter of enhancing the communication that should exist. It will not stick.

Mr. Speaker, having said this I don't want to belabour the fact. I am simply trying to be perfectly honest when I say this. It is my impression and the impression of many Manitobans. With regards to the funny tactics that are going on in this Legislature, with regards to the opposition being created within their own ranks of the government party, I accept that this might not be altogether detrimental, there might be some good features to have someone who has the conviction to stand up and question the front bench ministers - I don't really advocate a member saying that the ministers are for the most part, wasting time. However, Mr. Speaker, it is a little bit much to take when the former Minister of Mines and Resources says, "You know we have no opposition in the House and therefore we have got to do this ourselves." That is an overstatement if I have ever heard one, and I suggest that honesty would be much preferable to that kind of winded statement. A statement that can be associated with something like, "all our measures in the past have been successful, except three." Well now that kind of statement, Mr. Speaker, really doesn't stick with the public. The people of Manitoba are not quite that blind and consequently I don't think that the Member from Inkster was justified in his comments.

Now may I say something about Highways, I want to acknowledge that the former Minister of Highways has treated my constituency well, and I want it known that I appreciated very much the efforts he has made in that direction. I think he was honest, co-operative and considerate and I expect no less from the present Minister of Highways. I have known him for some time and I expect fully that he will continue to treat us well with consideration. I would like him to keep in mind that we have a few roads in our areas that are crying for attention, maybe just

(MR. GIRARD cont'd) to mention briefly the 201, the 200 and the 216 - and I am glad to see that he took that down as notes.

I want to point out to him also that we have a serious problem in the area of Dominion City when the road restrictions are on. I know that there is not much that can be done at this time. However, I would hope that the restrictions would be kept to a minimum, keeping in mind of course the maintenance of roads.

I would like to say a few things to the Honourable Attorney-General, while he is now in the Chamber. I have no great criticism with regards to the Attorney-General in himself. However, I do have some remarks that I want to address to him in the hope that he will carry them to the Liquor Commission, the Liquor Control Commission. I have been one who has advocated for some time that our liquor laws can certainly stand relaxation and I approve of the measures that have been taken recently --(Interjection)-- and quite a few, yes, quite a few, and quite a few with the support of the Member from Rupertsland and the Member from Emerson, quite a few. I approve of those measures and I would like to suggest that this is at this time the proper steps to take. I wish though to deplore the rather autocratic if not dictatorial attitude of the Liquor Commission in other respects. I think that in controlling, in controlling the outlets as they do, especially the hotels, they are demonstrating a rather incompetent and dictatorial attitude, especially when we consider the steps that were taken on the Main Street hotels last year. I'm glad to see that they had enough courtesy to recognize their error and withdraw as shortly after the fact as possible.

I would also like to point out there is a more important area to me especially, to me in the constituency of Emerson. When there is question of closing down a hotel that has operated for some 25 years or so because the Liquor Commission and the Liquor Control Board with their dictatorial powers can tell that man who operates the hotel, "you're premises are obsolete and we are closing it down and in March, 1973, you'd better get yourself another job because we're closing your doors". Now granted that the notice might be one year, it might be two years, and it might even be five, but rather than give notice that five years from now we're going to close your doors I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we consider the community as a whole and we can realize the kind of service that is now being given that community and if we close those doors, if we close those doors without having something to replace it, we are unjustified. --(Interjection) -- Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Attorney-General.

MR. MACKLING: I'd like to ask the honourable member while he's at that point whether or not he has determined if this is a change in policy on the part of the Liquor Control Commission, or whether it has been long-standing policy on the part of the Commission?

MR. GIRARD: Mr. Speaker, being a non-political animal I did not try to differentiate whether the policy suddenly changed or not. Had it been the policy in the past, I would have gladly said the same things because I think it's unreasonable. --(Interjection)-- I need not tell you that I didn't because I was not in the House, and I know that you are sorry that I wasn't but I can't do much about that. --(Interjection)-- I don't really care whether the policy has been changed or not, I call the policy an irresponsible one. If you're not going to consider the total necessities of that community and go to some locality and close those doors because it needs a new paint job or for some other reason it's obsolete. And I suggest to you that you consider the total needs of that community and until such time as you're prepared to replace that establishment, or someone is prepared to replace that establishment, I suggest that closing the doors is not the answer to the problem. Now I'll go further, Mr. Speaker, and suggest to you that if there is not a change in that particular case I plan to bring in during the estimates the letters written by this gentleman and the answers from the Commission, and I'd like to read them on record because I wish to elaborate why I don't agree with the policy as is. --(Interjection)-- Yes, I will.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable First Minister.

MR. SCHREYER: Is the Honourable Member for Emerson suggesting that Vita and Caliento and communities like that should have a lower standard with respect to outlets than say Carman, or Morris, or Portage la Prairie?

MR. GIRARD: No, not at all. But I'm suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that some outlet is higher than no outlet. --(Interjection) -- May I -- and I'll be glad to have his answer later on. May I ask the Premier the same kind of thing. Don't you agree that an outlet is higher in your terms than no outlet?

(MR. GIRARD cont'd)

Now with regards to the economic picture of the province and I label this very generally. I can't help but feel that I should make a comment with regards to what the people of Manitoba want is as far as I can understand.

And I'm a little concerned because we find the Premier right after the Throne Speech making a statement like you know this has been a real busy government, and I know we're tired and all this, but it's a real busy government because we have managed to pass through this Legislature some 300 measures. And I would suggest to the Premier that some day he goes through those 300 pieces of legislation and find out how many of those pieces of legislation are restrictive measures. What kind of society are we trying to create? What kind of liberty do we want to leave to the individuals of Manitoba? And I take no pride, no pride at all in having passed a great number of pieces of legislation if they are going to lead to a more restrictive kind of society. What we want is not big government, we want freedom. We don't want interventions; we don't want more laws unless they're absolutely essential; we want freedom, Mr. Speaker, and we're not getting it by getting more pieces of legislation through this House.

I have asked in the past that the Minister of Health and Social Development give us some idea of what kind of society we are trying to create, and I was glad to notice that the Free Press is probably inquiring about the same thing because they had an editorial that seemed to indicate that Manitoba might be going in the area that Sweden already is with regard to the matters of health services. I would appreciate very much if we could get from our Ministers the kinds of objectives they would like to create. I even would like that kind of thing to come from the Member from Crescentwood who speaks very fluently about total employment and such things. I am not closed minded about his theories; I would like to hear more about them; I'm not prepared to buy them at this time, but I would like him to project the kind of society in clear terms that he visualizes as being the ideal and who shares what kind of responsibility. With regards to the well-published aid to private schools measures, I don't wish to labour the point because I don't consider it the very important measure that people have seemed to indicate that it will be. It is not the kind of thing that ought to create the problems that it has created in the past because we are now a changed society whether we like it or not. I wish to advise the Minister from Inkster however, or the former Minister who represents Inkster, that I cannot understand his position and I do not accept that he was justified in resigning his position from the Cabinet on that particular issue. It might well be that I don't understand the total of his reasoning but I rather suspect, Sir, that it might well be, and I acknowledge that you are the most eloquent man in the House possibly, it might well be that your own eloquence convinced yourself rather than the reverse. You debate the matter so well that you have managed to convince yourself that there is really some argument there, and really I'm not in agreement with you. If it is a move, if it is a move, Mr. Speaker, to provide religious education in schools and in a doctrinaire way indoctrinate all the students in one particular faith or another, and I'd be in full agreement with you. But as one who knows a little bit about the private schools, at least some private schools, and who has lived through them, has visited even recently some of them, I would suggest that if you would get the impression or if you're trying to create the impression that these schools are spending a great deal of their time on indoctrination forgetting other matters of curriculum that are now existent, you're under the wrong impression, Sir. This is not going on at all. Now I would suggest that you look at the possibility of introducing some flexibility in our monolithic school system, as was indicated by the Member from Rupertsland, and if you evaluate the matter clearly I think that you might be willing to reconsider your position. Now -- and I'm wide open on the subject, Mr. Speaker. I wish to indicate that I have not made a decision on the matter and I'm anxiously waiting for the measures to be introduced.

I wish to say something more to my honourable friend the Minister of Youth and Education. I feel that although he doesn't stir a great deal of confidence in me, that he ought to take note of a certain number of problems that exist and that are becoming crucial with regards to our public schools system. The prime concern that I bear with regards to public school system, I have voiced in the past session, and that is the complete inequities that exist in the matter of financing our education in public schools this year. The system was equitable in 1966, not because it was brought about by the past government but it was one of the most equitable systems you can find even if you look at other provinces now. The matter that creates a problem was that the increases in cost which was to come out of -- in part at least -- out of government funds, out of the treasury, have not been brought forth.

(MR. GIRARD cont'd)

Coupled with that, Mr. Speaker, another insult -- to add insult to injury, another move was made by this government last year when they lowered the general mill rate by one mill. That, Mr. Speaker, although it's difficult to understand brings more inequality in our system of education, of financing the public schools. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that in three years that unless some change occurs in the Foundation Program there will be some school divisions in Manitoba that will declare themselves bankrupt, will be unable to finance, will be overspending more than they can hope to bring in revenue on the system of taxation that they have now. I am sorry to see that we have to appoint committees or commissions or whatever to look into this because we don't fully understand it ourselves. I would suggest that appointing committees and commissions is not really the answer, Mr. Speaker. If the Honourable Minister of Youth and Education now spoke at length about it to his superior, the Minister of Universities, I'm sure he would get the answers. Now I'm not convinced that the answers will be an impartial one because the past trend indicates that we favour lowering the general mill rate and increasing the inequity, but at least I'm sure he could provide you with fact and how the Foundation Program works. If you're really stuck, Mr. Speaker, I'll try to be of help should you find that some day during the summer months you want to talk the matter over.

Now just in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, there is one other problem that I would like to underline, and we often speak about it but we never do anything about it, and that is the problem of rural depopulation. You know, we say to the rural people, "We understand that you have problems: we understand that it's pretty hard going on the farm but don't worry because we'll give you a \$50.00 tax rebate on your school taxes." And when I ask the Minister how much of that \$50.00 is going to Winnipeg and how much outside of Winnipeg, he tells me it's going to take me two years to answer you that. So in two years we might find out how much of that \$50.00 rebate will go to those very hard-pressed rural people, and how much will go to the less hard-pressed urban people, because the plan after all was sold as one that will help the farmers as well as the homeowners. But we don't know how much is going where yet, Mr. Speaker -- in two years we might have some idea. I resent that kind of answer, Mr. Speaker. I thought it showed a very shallow kind of arrogance on the part of the Minister but I forgive him because he didn't understand why I was asking the question. --(Interjection)-- I didn't -- well if the answer is self-evident, Mr. Speaker, I don't have the depth to find those figures, and I'd be very appreciative if the Premier would kindly give me this kind of information as soon as possible because there are some people who are expecting me to provide them with this kind of answer and there's nothing I can do. --(Interjection)-- Yes, I imagine some day I'll learn but I doubt very much whether it would be from the Minister of Education.

Now we talk about rural depopulation, Mr. Speaker, but we do nothing about it. We don't look at the real problems. It's not only a problem of lack of revenue; it's not even especially a problem of lack of revenue. It's a problem of the inequality of our tax structure. If you take any business enterprise and you will tell him now you should locate in such and such, and a classic example I might give you right now in the area where I teach, Mr. Speaker, in Lorette, --(Interjection)-- yes, the area where I teach . . . we are now paying 35 mills of special levy; we are looking at 43 mills for next year of special levy. That is not counting the added levies for the general and for the business which will probably total up to some 75 - 80 mills on a business enterprise and now we're wondering how come it is we can't attract any industry. You know, we have the labour force here, but we can't attract any industry in that area. The answer lies in your tax structure, Mr. Speaker. I suppose that the Premier might be interested to know that the special levy in the area of Sprague last year was 77 mills of special levy. And we're going to try and induce industry and people to come and live to that area to be strangled by a tax structure that is providing no equality. It is not providing the kind of education that is offered elsewhere with one-third or less of the special tax levy. I approve very much of the new tax levy that was prepared for the City of Winnipeg last year by the Minister of Education then. It showed some depth of understanding: it --(Interjection)-- Yes, I did support it gladly, Mr. . . . I spoke, as a matter of fact I spoke in favour of it and the reason why I did was that I had the secret hope that some day this government might see the justice of extending that kind of thing throughout all the province rather than only Winnipeg, then we can say there is some equality.

I would very much appreciate if in the wisdom of that government you saw the necessity of bringing about more equality in our tax structure with regard to education especially and

(MR. GIRARD cont'd) look at the possibility of equalizing throughout Manitoba.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Osborne.

MR. IAN TURNBULL (Osborne): Mr. Speaker, the process of debate in this House involves most of us in debate and I think the Throne Speech debate is one where a member has difficulty in keeping himself apart from the debate and wishes to get in and I, Sir, stand now to make my contribution to the Throne Speech debate.

I hoped last night that I would be able to stay apart from the debate until I heard the member for Lakeside rise in his place and make some remarks which I thought were a little over-heated, but at the same time I felt that I would have to respond to them in some way. I thought it amusing, Mr. Speaker, to see the Member for Lakeside in the absence of his chosen leader of his party spring with alacrity to take his place as the Leader of the Opposition. An amusing spectacle, Mr. Speaker, because as he rose to speak, having gained recognition from you, Sir, he realized that there was only one thing missing about his performance and that was that there he was on his feet, all of the members were attentive, the press gallery was in its seats and he realized that he had forgotten his speech. And so, Mr. Speaker, he had to fall back on a device that hardly was becoming a member of this House for as long as he has been a member of this House. What he had to do, Mr. Speaker, was stand in his place and say that the member of our side - he spoke last night - had in some way lowered the level of the debate. Now, Mr. Speaker, it is ironic in my mind anyway that it should be the member for Lakeside who would make some comments about the lowering of the calibre of debate in this House, because we have all become accustomed to a standard of debate from him which could hardly be dignified with the phrase "the high calibre of debate".

What he is familiar with, or what his style presents to me, Mr. Speaker, is a style that really doesn't come to be recognized as a debate - what it is, I think, and it's been called this in the House, it's acting. And he came last night, Sir, to try to make some points as the surrogate Leader of the Opposition. And I was amazed, Mr. Speaker, because that person, that Member for Lakeside is the one who attacks not only members of this House in a most vicious and personal way; that person over there, Mr. Speaker, is the man who uses his elected office, who uses his elected office and the honour bestowed on him, to attack private citizens.

Now, Sir, I can recall so clearly when the matter of Lake Winnipeg regulation was being discussed in this House, that the Member for Lakeside stood in his place and said, Sir, that he would like to spit on private citizens. Now that, Sir, that, coming from the Member for Lakeside, is the kind of speech, the kind of calibre that I have come to expect from him, and I tell you, Sir, that he not only lessens the level of debate, lowers the level of debate in this House, but he lowers the level of the honour attached to being a member of the Legislative Assembly; and I think, Sir, that it is not only ironic, it was sad that he chose as his basis for speaking yesterday, that members of this House did not speak with the sincerity and with an honesty that was becoming an elected member.

I am glad that someone over there mentioned that his language too was not becoming, because as I recall coming here in 1969 for the first time, it was the Member for Lakeside, it was the Member for Lakeside who most frequently - and I think a record of Hansard will show this, a search of Hansard will show this - it was the Member for Lakeside who was most given to obscene language in this House, and I think that we should remember that, Mr. Speaker. Now what did we learn from the contribution of the Member for Lakeside? Well that just about finishes that topic, if we learned nothing perhaps I should leave it, but I can't, Mr. Speaker, because there was something we learned. Did we, Mr. Speaker, when he rose in his place, did we give him that attention that we did because we had respect for him as an administrator, a past administrator of government departments? No, Mr. Speaker, we did not give him attention for that reason. He had practically every department in the government, and as far as I can make out, Mr. Speaker, he made a mess of each one that he went to, so we didn't give him attention for that.

Did we give him attention last night, Mr. Speaker, for his intellectual capacity? I don't think so, Mr. Speaker, because surely if he had some intellectual capacity his contribution last night would have been greater than it was.

Well what, Mr. Speaker, did we give him attention for? What did the press give some attention to him for? It was, Mr. Speaker, his capacity for acting, that's why we gave him our attention. We like to be entertained occasionally and the Member for Lakeside provides

(MR. TURNBULL cont'd) that ingredient in this House. It has been said, Mr. Speaker, repeatedly by people in this House, that no one has more fun in the Legislative Assembly than the Member for Lakeside and with that, Mr. Speaker, I agree. He does have a great deal of fun but I ask you, Sir, was he sent here to have fun?

Now, there was another point that we could learn from the Member for Lakeside yesterday when he spoke, and he did make some contribution, - and what we learned of course, was his great - learned of, was his great ability to misrepresent the facts. Mr. Speaker, no one is more adroit than he in stating a particular point, which he knows apparently is not true and then, Sir, when it's drawn to his attention and it's not true, he apologizes to you, Sir, he apologizes to the House and sits down, having misled us for some time at least; and he did that last night, Mr. Speaker, by referring to various trips that members of the front bench had made to various places in the world and he tried, Sir, to attribute to them the ability to draw on public funds to go on these trips and, Sir, that was not the case. And so I think we have learned from his contribution last night, one, that he has great acting ability, that he has the propensity for absurd activity and that he has an ability to adroitly mislead the House. Well, Sir, I felt that I had to make these comments because when he made his great spitting speech a few years ago, I must admit that it was something that really appalled me. I couldn't believe, Mr. Speaker, I couldn't believe, Mr. Speaker, that a man of the reputation, of the family connections of the Member for Lakeside could possibly bring himself to stoop so low as to make those kinds of remarks in this House.

And now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to turn to something that I find a little more pleasant and that is, Sir, to congratulate you on your position as Speaker of this House. I know that as so recently shown to us as last night, I know, Sir, that you will have some difficulty in controlling in some way some of the members of this House, we do have a tendency to get overheated on certain issues especially when the Member for Lakeside speaks.

But I think, Sir, that this session you will have to be ever more careful of exercising that cool judgment for which you have become noted, because in this session, Mr. Speaker, we will be dealing with an issue which will raise the emotions of most members of the House, and that issue, Sir, is the one of Public Aid to Private Schools. A lot of members in this House take the position that aid to private schools is a moral issue - that it is either wrong or it is right to give aid to private schools. My position, Sir, is not one of morality. I cannot, I cannot, Sir, say that there is any moral obligation on my part to pay out of the public treasury monies to private and parochial schools. I don't think its a moral issue and I hope when the members get heated on this issue, which I hope they do not, but if they do, that you will remember that I at least will not try to present arguments on the basis of morality, of whether it's right or wrong. What I think, Sir, is that we should look at what method of education, what method of financing the public schools would be most beneficial for the students that are in the school system, be they public or private. If we can come up with a system of education and financing of schools which would result in an improvement in the level of education, which would result in schools and staff that are more tailored to the needs of the students in the schools, then, Sir, I think we have an issue which can be judged on its merits and not an issue which should be judged or could be judged on a moral basis. So when that issue is to be decided here, Sir, I hope that cool judgment will be exercised by you and, Sir, by your deputy the Honourable Member for Logan, because he too will be in the Chair and be hard pressed I think when this issue is discussed.

There is also another pleasant task that - several, actually - but another pleasant task that I should look to this afternoon, and that is to congratulate both the mover and the seconder of the speech in reply to the Speech from the Throne. I would like to take first of all time out, Mr. Speaker, to congratulate the Member for Ste. Rose. I thought that his contribution was one that I at least could be pleased with. He presented a point of view that I think members on this side would abide by. I must though say that I was a bit perturbed when he looked at press and asked them to be honest. I would never say that the press were not honest, Mr. Speaker, I know that everyone in this House and the press must be included I guess for this purpose - everyone here looks upon issues from their own particular experience, their own point of view, and the press I suppose have theirs, and if their point of view differs from mine that doesn't mean that they are being dishonest. I may disagree with them, but they are not being dishonest. So I would ask, Mr. Speaker, if I could through you, ask the Member for Ste. Rose if perhaps he could reconsider those remarks and remember that the poor press have to sit through these incredible debates and listen to the actor from Lakeside and others

(MR. TURNBULL cont'd) of us that speak.

The Member for St. Vital I must thank and congratulate for outlining the past programs of this government and I would like to turn now to some of them. It's often easy for members who are elected for a few years to forget why they entered public office and so it's refreshing to hear some of those reasons reiterated, Mr. Speaker, by one of my own party. I can remember so clearly, Mr. Speaker, in 1968 and 1969 listening to people who had attended the hearings on South Indian Lake, and I can recall vivid descriptions of the then Minister of Mines and Natural Resources whose speeches at that time, Mr. Speaker, were none too clear - at least his utterances were not understood by anyone who attended those meetings. And it seems, Mr. Speaker, that this Minister for Mines and Natural Resources who is now the Member for Lakeside, was asked at one of those hearings to come to the platform and express his point of view, give the government's position. And apparently, Mr. Speaker, the member was outlined in the light of the door at the back of the hall in which this hearing was being held and he was asked to come forward and present his views and he would not.

He was asked again and he would not and I often think, Mr. Speaker, that that refusal, and I wasn't there but this is the story that I heard - but that refusal epitomized the government of this province in the spring of 1969. They wouldn't say to the people what their programs were about South Indian Lake in a way that was clearly understood. They wouldn't re-examine South Indian Lake and that proposal to see what the costs and what the benefits were going to be. All they could do, Mr. Speaker, all they could do, Mr. Speaker, was try to ram that bill through this House, that's all. And I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that there were people in Osborne constituency who I was pleased to meet during the election who said to me "If that's the position of the previous administration, if that's the position of the Minister, the then Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, I want to go and work for you and for your election." And I was very happy, Mr. Speaker, very happy, Mr. Speaker, that there were on the front benches in the spring of 1969 men of such incompetence that I could pick up election voters just by going and knocking on their door.

There were also, Mr. Speaker, --(Interjection)-- there were also, Mr. Speaker, --(Interjection) -- there were also, Mr. Speaker, people - people who wanted individuals in the previous government to disclose what was going on at The Pas. And would the previous administration say anything about that, Mr. Speaker? No - they would only say that the Manitoba Development Fund as it was then called was a free agency, made its own decisions, was not influenced by the government. Well that, Mr. Speaker, must have been nothing but a pack of lies because we have seen in the inquiry that has been conducted in the last few months in this city that the then Conservative administration did indeed influence what the Manitoba Development Fund did. And there were, Mr. Speaker, other activities of the then Manitoba Development Fund that were not revealed to the public and in general, in general, Mr. Speaker, I think that many people in the spring of 1969 and before that got the opinion that the members of the Conservative front bench were so arrogant that they couldn't even bother to explain the programs of the government to the people of the province - and that, Mr. Speaker, was a feeling that I shared, it was a feeling that many of the people that I worked with shared and I am convinced, Mr. Speaker, that there are still people who think that those men over there feel that they need not communicate with the electorate.

Now, Mr. Speaker, - oh there were many many issues that brought members on this side into politics in 1969 because we did not enter politics for the reasons that many over there did - let's not forget, Mr. Speaker, that in 1969 the Conservatives were the government and anyone who ran for office on the Conservative ticket thought of himself as going right in to one of those lovely offices that the members of the Cabinet occupy. And we've seen examples over there, Mr. Speaker, of people running which I think -- and I think they were running to attain a Cabinet rank. We had one man run, he didn't say well the job isn't worth it, I'm going to quit, so he quit and the Member for St. Vital was elected in his place.

And we've seen another one, the past Leader of the Conservative Party. Why did he resign, Mr. Speaker? Did he resign because he was weary? Did he resign because he was - did he resign because he didn't have a Cabinet post? Did he resign because he lost the . . . ? Why did he resign, Mr. Speaker? I think because he didn't think being an MLA was really worth it - because what he wanted, what he wanted was a Cabinet position and if that wasn't the case, Mr. Speaker, then I suggest to you that the reason he was - the reason he resigned was because his own back benchers knifed him in the back and I think, Mr. Speaker, I think,

(MR. TURNBULL cont'd) Mr. Speaker, that that must be what happened because the poor fellow - and I admired him greatly - he was the one man in the opposition benches that spoke with sincerity. I couldn't agree less with what he said but he did speak with sincerity when he spoke, which wasn't often.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there are - there are, there have been a number of comparisons made over there to literary pieces, literary masterpieces. I was amazed, Mr. Speaker, at the references. Obviously these men over here are educated informed men, men of the world and sophisticated, knowledgeable in the arts, knowledgeable in literature. What were some of the comparisons made, Mr. Speaker? We had one reference made -- (Interjection) - A bunch of "farmers"? Well you said it, not I. There were references made over there, Mr. Speaker, to Shakespeare. The reference as I recall was that -- what was the reference? We were like Anthony in Cairo or Egypt rather dying, that was the reference as I recall. Well, Sir, I must remind the honourable members opposite of the reasons why Anthony was in Egypt. You know why Anthony was in Egypt? Because he wanted to get Brutus - and you know what Brutus was guilty of? Brutus was guilty of stabbing his leader and that's why Anthony was in Egypt.

Now, now there was another literary reference made, one reference was made to a play called "The Misfits" and I thought this was a most revealing comment that was made about this play, Mr. Speaker. Various members over here were compared to the characters in that play and the rest of the side, this side, were compared to the horses in that play and this was really amusing, Mr. Speaker, because the member who made that reference - we'll make it one very significant character in that play and I thought it was typical. I thought it epitomized the attitude of the members opposite that they did omit to mention this particular character because this character was a very silent man. He was always present, he was always neglected in that play but he was always there, he was always in need, he had nothing. That man, Sir, was an Indian. And I thought that that typified the attitude of the members opposite that they forgot all about the Indian who appeared in The Misfits and I thought it typified their attitude, Sir, that they made fun of the play, they made fun by omission of this Indian representing a great group of people, a great group of people and they just obliterated him from their memory and that, Sir, I think epitomizes their attitude towards many people in our province. And I hope, Sir, and I've seen this government bring into operation programs which were much needed to benefit the Indian people of this province and I hope, Sir, to see many more such programs and I hope the monies that are dedicated for the north will do much, much for those people who were so long ignored by the members that now occupy the opposition benches.

There are many other reasons, Mr. Speaker, why I entered politics and others on this side did. There was of course the question of medical care premiums, the medical care premiums that went on everybody regardless of income. The medical care premiums of \$104.00 a year I think it was, a little more, went on everybody, Mr. Speaker, including you know who in my constituency, went on everybody regardless of whether they were on old age pension, old age supplement or welfare, went on everybody. And those men there and I remember the Member for Rock Lake so well, Mr. Speaker, when I spoke in 1970 - those men there couldn't believe, Sir, that there were old age pensioners, old age pensioners who could not afford to pay that medical care premium and he stood in his place and asked me with incredulity in his voice, "Are there really such people in Osborne constituency?" Well I tell you yes there are, there are many old age pensioners in Osborne constituency and there are many who couldn't afford to pay that medical care premium and I say that it was a shame on the Conservative Government that they introduced that premium on everybody. Dr. Trueman had to pay \$104.00 so does the old age pensioner in Osborne and I say, Sir, that that was a shame, that was an incredible fallacy, Sir, and that was one of the reasons why I went into politics and I'm damn glad that I'm here to prevent them from occupying this seat.

There are many other programs, Mr. Speaker, that I could go into, programs that I thought needed to be brought about in this province and Autopac was one of them, Sir. Autopac was one of them and not even, you know, not even that fellow who was the President of Canadian Indemnity and who was the Western Director of the Insurance Bureau of Canada, one Harley Vannon was able to dissuade me when we went out together door to door in my constituency that there were people who suffered under that inequitable, unjust private automobile insurance. We went, Mr. Speaker, door to door. We didn't get very far because Mr. Vannon liked his beer apparently and my constituents are very friendly and one of them offered him -- offered us a

(MR. TURNBULL cont'd) . . . beer and I looked at him and he said thank you so we went in and sat down. We had a very pleasant time, very pleasant time but we didn't get very far in our survey. We didn't get to the people that I wanted to introduce him to, the people who'd been waiting 16 months for a settlement, the people who were paying \$300.00 and \$400.00 a year for auto insurance. We didn't get to those people. I wanted to. I won. Because I didn't detect in my constituency any great opposition to Autopac. It was divided, divided, 50-50, 50-50; and after the implementation of the program I would say it's about 75-25 in favour, 75 or 25 in favour. And by the time of the next election I hope that the majority of people will realize that Autopac is a good thing. I certainly hope so and I know many that now are benefiting from that particular program and they include all ranges of risk categories. Certainly the young drivers, the young married man with children who over 16 who are driving, over 16 and under 25 who are driving; the people who have been in automobile accidents in the past, they are benefiting by not having to pay those incredibly increased premiums -- (Interjection) -- Well there aren't very many farm trucks in my constituency. Even those people, even those people, even those people who are the best risk category, even those who are the best risk categories are not paying more. And I'm happy, Mr. Speaker, happy, Mr. Speaker, to be able to stand and say that I was glad to see Autopac introduced, it was one of those programs that I was involved in in politics in 1969. It's been introduced, it's been introduced, it's had teething problems, it's being implemented and I hope by next year it will prove to be of benefit to every Manitoban.

Now there are many programs, Mr. Speaker, that one could review. Many programs that have been introduced and were introduced because there were people on this side of the House that were willing to get into politics to see those programs introduced. But I shan't go into them all, Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to mention one that will be coming up in this session, namely a new labour code. I'll be very pleased to see a new labour code, Mr. Speaker, because I know from the fact of my review of my constituents' mail of going into my constituency and visiting people that there are many labouring men in this province in my constituency, Mr. Speaker, who will benefit from a new labour code. And while I haven't seen the bill yet I hope to see a code that will bring about a more equitable relationship between employers and employees and I don't think that even members opposite could oppose greater equity, indeed when you stood up and talked with greater equity. But what have the other members over there spoken of in the Throne Speech debate? Have they spoken of greater equity? I haven't heard, haven't heard of anything about greater equity from those members opposite. What I have heard, Mr. Speaker, what I have heard is reference to the most grandiose schemes, schemes as far as I can make out of taking natural gas from the Northwest Territories down through Manitoba right through Manitoba and into the United States. The old policy, Mr. Speaker, and I regret that it's the Conservative Party that's mentioning it, the old policy of continentalism, a Liberal plank really; the old policy of sell our natural resources to the United States get the little bit of money for that and export all the jobs and the secondary industries. Now really, Mr. Speaker, I can't believe that those hard headed businessmen over there and those practical farmers over there really accept such a program. Really they shouldn't accept such a program because the tradition of the Conservative Party and if they need me to tell them this I will, the tradition of the Conservative Party is one of economic nationalism, not of continentalism. Now where have they been? The Member for Morris surely realizes that. Surely he realizes that such a scheme of the export of gas from the Northwest Territories through Manitoba to the United States is contrary to everything that his party nationally has stood for, but I gather it doesn't bother them, Mr. Speaker.

What other plans, what other programs have I heard from members opposite during this Throne Speech? Can't recall anything, Mr. Speaker. I was on the Agricultural Committee, Mr. Speaker. We went around the province. I've been on it for two years now and on it solely to learn about agriculture and I hope I've learned something even from members opposite but I didn't learn, Mr. Speaker, I didn't learn, Mr. Speaker, what their agricultural policy was, yet I'm sure I heard the Leader of the Opposition rise in his place and say that there will be mention made of some agricultural policy. Didn't I hear that? I hope I did but I haven't heard anything about agricultural policy yet, Mr. Speaker, not yet. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that I will hear something about it before the Throne Speech is over: we've only got a few hours, they'll have to think a little bit, they won't be able to rely on their research assistants, all those people that the 96,000 a year Leader pays to them -- (Interjection) -- Isn't it 8,000 a year that

(MR. TURNBULL cont'd) your Leader gets? 8,000 a month rather? 8,000 a month for being Leader of the Party? 8,000 a month to pay research assistants to write speeches for the back benchers of the Conservative Party? No? I thought that was the case. I thought it was 96,000 a year, 60,000 for the Liberal Leader and 96,000 for the Conservative Leader. Well, Mr. Speaker, if that's not the case, Mr. Speaker, I hope they'll rise and refute that because it bothered me -- it bothered me, Mr. Speaker, that maybe agricultural policy of the Conservative Party was being drafted by research assistants to the Leader of the Opposition and that he was getting all this money to pay for them. If it's not the case, Mr. Speaker, I will, like the Member for Lakeside, withdraw the remark and I'll ask you to strike it from the record.

What are the platforms and policies of the Conservative Party of Manitoba, Mr. Speaker? I wait, Mr. Speaker -- in the rest of this debate, another hour this afternoon, couple of hours this evening, I wait for the members opposite to rise and tell me what they plan to do in agriculture; whether they're in favour of hog marketing commissions or not; whether they're in favour of commodity groups or not; whether they're in favour of changes in the Local Government Districts Act; whether they're in favour of reducing medical care premiums even further; whether they're in favour of abolishing welfare; what they're in favour of, Mr. Speaker. I want to hear what they're in favour of; I haven't heard it yet. I haven't heard it yet. But I dread to think what might happen over there if they became the government, if they became the government and oil was discovered in the Northwest Territories because you know what I think they might do, Mr. Speaker? I think they might pump the oil out of the Northwest Territories, pour it into the rivers, ship it into South Indian Lake, down the Nelson into Lake Winnipeg, into the Red River and into the Mississippi River and I think they would use the rivers and lakes of the province for that purpose, Mr. Speaker.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I haven't found -- (Interjection) -- when I'm finished. Mr. Speaker, tell them to sit down and not wave Stanfield's underwear at me. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, I have listened for many sessions in this House for the policies and programs of the members of the Opposition and I haven't yet heard them. But I want, Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of members, the new member, to point out what else can they do, Mr. Speaker, in the absence of policies and programs; and I want to point it out to the Member for Minnedosa because in his speech he indicated to me that here is a man, here is a man who approached politics in the same manner that I originally did. Here is a man that wanted to approach programs and policies with an open, a rational and honest mind.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member has five minutes.

MR. TURNBULL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And, Mr. Speaker, if that's the approach of the Member for Minnedosa then I say to you that it's about time that somebody over there took that approach. But what -- but what is the approach of his colleagues over there? Why have they put his name on a motion to get the names and the salaries of the members, the staff of the Planning and Priorities Committee of Cabinet? Why have they put his name on a motion to get the names and the salaries of the staff of the Management Committee of Cabinet? Did he ask them why they wanted him to introduce those motions? Did he ask his colleagues why there is this long motion asking for the names and the salaries, remunerations of all those who serve on boards and commissions? Well he maybe didn't ask them. Maybe it was discussed in their caucus and maybe it wasn't but I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that what they want that information for is to mount the kind of vicious and personal attack that we have seen them mount in this House many times before. In the absence of programs and policies what they do on that side of the House, on the Conservative side is attack personalities and we've seen them attack Cass-Beggs, a man, Sir, whose recommendations, whose qualifications and whose experience far exceed anything, anything, Sir, that that party could find to serve in the same capacity. So I must say to the Member from Minnedosa that I sympathize with his honest effort to bring about some rational approach to politics in this House but he will find when his colleagues in the opposition mount those personal attacks that it's impossible to maintain that kind of decorum and that kind of honesty and that kind of rationality that I entered politics for and I'm sure he did too.

Well, Sir, I've heard members opposite suggest that perhaps we should give them some idea of what our program is. I think they directed this to me personally, Sir, and so I'm going to tell them what I'm going to stay in politics for. There have been, Mr. Speaker, programs introduced by this government to reduce -- to have the effect of reducing -- the burden of school taxes that's imposed on property in the Province of Manitoba. And I, Sir, am going to stay in

(MR. TURNBULL cont'd) politics until I see school taxes on property reduced and reduced and reduced and to see the tax shift take place to some other form of taxation. Now, Sir, I can't comment on what it might be, I don't know. But to me, Sir, property tax is the most inequitable way of paying for schools and I want, Sir, I want, Sir, to see greater equity in taxation and I think that one way you can do that is to remove the school tax on property. Now, Sir, that's the reason I'm staying around here, Sir. I want to see greater equality, greater equity in taxation and I hope to stay here to see those programs achieved and passed by this government.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. FRANK JOHNSTON (Sturgeon Creek): Thank you . . . Oh, question. He wants to ask a question. -- (Interjection: Go ahead) --

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for recognizing me at this time and I if you would, Sir, excuse me for just about one minute from congratulating you in your position to suggest to the House that there's a rest station by the fourth hole of the Clear Lake Golf Course and I personally wouldn't recommend the last speaker to supervise the movements at that station. I have never and I hope I never will get up in this House, Sir -- and although I will take a crack at different members once in a while and hopefully very often, although I will try to be diplomatic with it and although I will try to give some of my philosophy while I will do it -- I hope, Sir, that I will never get up in this House and spend one-half of my forty minutes speaking criticizing another member and basing my whole speech on criticism of others even down to a previous Premier of this province. Well I don't know what you would call it but the tone was set last night and I guess everything comes from the top. The manager is the guy that sets the scene for the group so it often says what the manager is capable of passing on to his group. Mr. Speaker, you have often said, Sir, that you are the . . .

MR. SPEAKER: Matter of privilege. The Honourable Member for Osborne.

MR. TURNBULL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Member for Sturgeon Creek alleges that I criticized the former Leader of the Conservative Party and I did not, Sir. What I said was that I admired him more than anyone who sits there now.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I don't intend to get into it. He mentioned that the previous leader left because he didn't have a post in the Cabinet etc. and he didn't like sitting in the House.

Mr. Speaker, again I would start by saying that you have often said that the rules of this House are ours and it is your position to see that those rules are carried out and I would like to also say that we recognize that your job is very trying at times but I congratulate you very much on the job that you have been doing. I would also like to congratulate the Member from Logan who has been appointed the Deputy Speaker of this House and I'm certainly looking forward to the kind of fairness he has always displayed in the future. To the Ministers who have had new appointments or are not ministers any more or are ministers now I guess I can congratulate you whichever way you go because apparently it's of your own choice. Mr. Speaker, it's been said that the Member from St. Boniface has now joined the Socialist Party but I find that very hard to believe. I still think that the Member from St. Boniface is sincerely devoted to his own little party which is better pronounced "selfish". Mr. Speaker, I would also like to recognize my colleague from Minnedosa. I know that he has -- he's been congratulated and been recognized by this House every time he has -- by most people who have spoken and I think that after hearing him last Thursday everybody should know that or realize that he has a lot to contribute to the Province of Manitoba. Mr. Speaker, the Speech from the Throne which we certainly haven't heard anything of from the members of the other side and it really gives the impression that is very well known that when you have nothing to base your existence on the best thing to do is criticize somebody else. And that's really what the Speech from the Throne had, it had nothing to be based on, it left the party in power at the present time nothing to base itself on and I would like to also add that -- to the words of my leader who said they were tired, I think they were just a little bit quitters as well.

Mr. Speaker, the Speech from the Throne basically said that this government has gone too far too fast. They would not listen to anybody. The previous speaker just said "ramming bills through the House". My God, we saw bills rammed through this House at anywhere from 9 o'clock in the morning till 1 o'clock in the morning the last three sessions we've been here. We've seen them introduced at 1 o'clock and want to be put through by 3 o'clock and this government would listen to nobody with experience at any time and we told them as an Opposition, we

(MR. F. JOHNSTON cont'd) . . . said, "don't do it." -- (Interjection) -- "don't go," that's about it. But no they were going to do it and when we saw that we'd say well, well look if you do it this way it will be a little better, it won't harm the people so much. No way, they would still ram the bill through the House. And, Mr. Speaker, I think it's time now to tell a little story that you've all heard and I'm sure you've all heard it in this House and it's a story about a society in England called the Flat World Society -- you know, you know. The Flat World Society even after the rockets went round and round the earth were asked: "Is the world still flat?" and they stood up and said: "Yes, we believe it's still flat." And I'm sure the Member from Inkster will remember that story and I would only say to the Member for Inkster -- (Interjection) -- Yah, I couldn't really take the time to do it better -- I'm sure the Member from Inkster during the coming debate that everybody says we will have on education will be pointing to several of his group over there saying: "Did you know that there's a society in England saying the world is flat and I've tried to tell you but they won't believe it."

Mr. Speaker, I was a little remiss in not congratulating the seconder or the mover and the seconder today and I really delayed it a little bit. I had been sitting here listening to the last speaker expound the great things of the NDP government -- I was driving down the street in Regina about four weeks ago and on came the radio of my car the debate in the Saskatchewan Legislature, and the Member from Minnedosa was expounding the great virtues of the NDP government in Saskatchewan; he was saying what a wonderful job they'd done from the time they got into business and criticizing everybody other than the NDP Party in a viciously sarcastic way and I should say, Mr. Speaker, I'm sure that he sent the Minister from St. Vital his speech. Very appropriately enough when the man was finished speaking the radio announcer played a song called "Raindrops are Falling on My Head" and I sat there thinking, God, I've heard that song before because I've heard it for three years and basically it's -- the record is not changing, you have to criticize when you have nothing else to do, base your platform on.

And criticism, Mr. Speaker, of people in the Legislature when done by a Party I should say has to come from the coach or the manager. I used to wonder where the Member from Thompson got some of his statements, some of his mannerisms and you know I saw where they came from last night. I heard the First Minister call people asses, that the Conservatives who work for the government were hogs that were brought to the watering trough, I heard him call people a "shyster lawyer". On radio last Wednesday or whenever he was on when he wouldn't take calls from people I heard him say that my Leader would support a big lie. -- (Interjection) -- This is the person -- you see, there we have it -- this is the person who leads the party so that's basically all we can expect from the members.

A MEMBER: Leads the province, leads the province.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Well he's not going to change me, he's not going to change a lot of other people but the people will change him.

We just really now realize that that is where they get it from, it comes from the top. You know I am told that even his brother-in-law executive assistant was a man who stood in Gradview, Manitoba with a group throwing eggs, throwing eggs at a Federal Minister when he spoke there. -- (Interjection) -- With a group? -- (Interjection) -- He stood -- I didn't say he did. Mr. Speaker, I did not say he did -- stood with a group that was throwing eggs. Probably telling them to throw them harder. That's probably the way it went.

So again we get the whole program of where does it come from, it comes from the top. And people at the top who display that kind of leadership to the people around them are nothing but childish little babies that were put in the class of pony boys. Pony boys if you want to hear it again, small immature ridiculous people. But I don't say it that way nor will I ever. I'm not the leader.

Mr. Speaker, we have also been told that we have no program. Oh, and I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, I really meant to give my congratulations to the seconder which I didn't do and I waited till now because I wanted to be half way through my speech to assure him that I asked myself all the questions you would have liked me to ask myself before I got up to speak today, and I hope after listening to me you are quite satisfied.

Mr. Speaker, we have said -- they have said we have no program. The program that I have heard from the Member from St. George which really bothered me the most. All of the members have basically have got up and talked about what wonderful people they are, beating their chests and what have you, but the Member from St. George got up and started

(MR. F. JOHNSTON cont'd) to talk about marketing boards. And quite frankly he started to say what a wonderful thing they are and we've got to protect ourselves. He used the example of the turkey business and then he said also General Motors research a market -- I'd like to tell the member that if General Motors were making a Chevrolet the way they did ten years ago they wouldn't be selling one against the Opposition today and their biggest problem is how they can produce more efficiently to produce more cars, and any business meeting you sit down with . . . aggressive people say, "This year we want to expand our market by a few points not put it down." And when he used the turkey business of what he knew best he was basically saying -- you know, he knows the turkey business so I'll use the example of the turkey business and not the hot dog stand about the man who had a very successful hot dog stand on the corner and home came his son one time and said: "Dad, I know all about it, you're doing it all wrong, I'm now going to put the proper program in so that you can make more money." Five years later Dad came along and said: "Well you know we've been doing quite a few things but we're broke." And if he wants to continue on a marketing board program for the farmers of Manitoba, be my guest, go broke, but I'll be damned if this side of the House is going to let you take the rest of the farmers of this province with you.

Mr. Speaker, somewhere along the line this government has forgotten the history of Manitoba. I don't know whether it's because we've had a lot of new people come in in the past twenty-five years, or whether it's because people who have grown up here have found things so good that they have forgotten that the basic reason for Manitoba and its economic condition is the number one industry and that is agriculture. Now anybody who says that you can take that industry and you can put it in a position where we'll all be baking our own bread and killing our own cattle for ourselves, that's just about what he is saying with marketing boards. You just really from any point of view -- the Member from Morris has told you we have the cheapest commodity, we can produce food, we can produce quality and anybody wants that and this government wants to stop doing it, they want to cut it down instead of building it up. -- (Interjection) -- They want to -- I'll get to you -- they want to knock it down instead of building it up.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it really doesn't make any sense at all to have the Minister of Industry and Commerce who should be better known as Mr. Bubbly jumping around everywhere saying: "Come to Manitoba, start an industry, we'll put all the money in that you want, the government's got lots" -- you'd wonder why we want to get rid of the Development Corporation. We want to get rid of it because that much money in the hands of a bunch of Socialists is just ridiculous -- but he comes along, he comes along and he says, he says: "Come on to Manitoba, put your money, we'll give you all the money you want, build an industry and you're going to sell things." I'd like to know where in the devil they're going to sell them in their immediate market. If you can't make a buck in your own home market, get out of the business. And I'm going to tell you that right now: get out of the business if you can't make it at home -- and you tell me how businesses are going to survive in this province, how businesses are going to survive in this province, Mr. Speaker, when you are killing your number one industry -- when you have the railroads, you've got the meat packers, you've got farm tanks being manufactured by steel companies, you've got any number of supporting industries that are only here because you have your number one industry - agriculture. Now you turn around and you say the north, the Premier says the north, we're going to build the north. Sure we're going to build the north but not as fast as all that. It has to be built on a firm foundation. You're going to have to diversify and build up your other products - but let me tell you forget your old customer while you're doing it and you're dead, and that's what you're doing.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I will answer questions after. Forget your old customer and you're dead. This government says that the Federal Government is to blame for the farm policies of this province. Pass the buck again. You know, Mr. Speaker, that's the way the Premier has been running the province, basically on the basis of well they do it in Alberta and that's what so and so did in 19 something and you did it in some other time. Ask him a question and say: "Well what did you do then?" You know, they live in the past, they worry about what everybody else is doing except the Province of Manitoba, and if you take a look at the map they'd see we're unique and we have a unique situation in the Province of Manitoba and we know that we've got an agricultural belt that is not as big or a quarter as big as Saskatchewan probably that can produce a variety of foods damn near as well as the Holland Marsh, and it's not even being pushed or worked on by this government.

(MR. F. JOHNSTON cont'd)

In fact this government says to hell with the farmer. They have basically, they have basically said that the towns in this province can shrivel up and die and they said that Winnipeg can blow away with the wind if you don't -- if you keep on marketing boards. Now where is the sense of forgetting your number one industry. Where is it? Where is it? You cannot forget your number one industry, Mr. Speaker, and that's what this government has done. The only way you're going to build up the rest is start taking a look at your number one industry, your agricultural industry, get it out of the mess it is and go from there. But after that applause I must add because I wouldn't have anybody have the wrong impression, not with marketing boards.

Mr. Speaker, the next thing that we have that is a real problem, and we have a real problem. You know we have the Hydro situation which my colleague from Riel brought up. I listened intently to my colleague from Riel and what he basically said was if you're going to flood South Indian Lake anyway why not go another three feet or so, you'll have enough storage to supply the stations on the diversion and along the Nelson, you will have an income from it that will possibly bring you in money to lower Hydro rates in Manitoba and maybe even help pay for Lake Winnipeg when the time comes to do it, and you'll be able to accomplish all this for about fifty or sixty million dollars less than this government is spending right now. And nobody -- you know it seems reasonable to me that if I can produce money while I am building, it's a pretty good thing but you don't waste it. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am disappointed that these figures have not been brought out by the government, that the reports that established this are not brought out by the government -- and one more thing, I'm even more disturbed at the Manitoba Hydro. I sat at a luncheon last Wednesday in the St. James Chamber of Commerce; I watched a set of slides where nobody told anything but the truth, everything was gospel and they told them about Lake Winnipeg, how they were cutting the channels, everything that they were going to do in Lake Winnipeg. There was no mention of flooding South Indian Lake until somebody from the audience asked for it -- and you know here again we have the Manitoba Hydro, the Manitoba Hydro giving cheap, low public relations and I never used to expect that from them but we can expect anything from them when they've got the management they've got now. Again not telling the people all the facts and this was the government that was going to do it.

Mr. Speaker, in that little bunch of slides we even got down to the point where we saw water up to the tree line, one slide, and they said: "Do you want this?" And on the next picture they got a bunch of people bathing on the beach and said: "Do you want this?" You know, really, that is probably the worst bit of public relations and distortion of facts or keeping of facts from people that I've ever seen in my life.

Mr. Speaker, the department or the government in many cases has kept talking about parks and recreation and I'm not going to dwell on parks, Sir, I would just basically like to dwell a little on recreation. Recreation in the province as you go through the country and talk to people in the country, talk to people in the city, they are asking -- in fact they are nearly pleading for help with skating rinks, tennis courts, anything that they can have to make the human condition as this government continues to talk about better in Manitoba. And for three years we've had this government saying how much they're going to do with recreation in this province and recreation in this province to people who want to be able to skate, play tennis and soccer -- you know a soccer field is not that much, you know, you've got a couple of goal posts and a field -- who where \$10,000 or \$11,000 or \$12,000 would just mean the world to many communities -- could in a very easy way if they thought of it, and I wonder the Attorney-General didn't set up a revolving fund for recreation which could be continually added to each year and put out on priority basis to communities. Why hasn't it been done? You know people have their community clubs, you see skating rinks in the country that just cannot be fixed because the tax revenue is not there. They're falling down, the lights are even dangerous in many respects. In the City of St. James-Assiniboia we had the capital to go ahead and work on it -- they just can't collect that much money in many of your country points and we are neglecting that point of recreation. You're talking great big parks and I'm for them; you're talking all kinds of places for people to swim and enjoy sandy beaches etc., Sir, but you're not talking about the little boy and girl who wants to fancy skate, play hockey, play tennis, play soccer, yes, and even curl because it's not a very big program, not a very big program to work toward covered rinks in many areas, it's not that costly. But a revolving

(MR. F. JOHNSTON cont'd) fund for recreation would do more to help many people in these communities than anything and it has never even been brought forward. Every time we've talked parks and recreation what have we got. We get talk about parks. Recreation departments get -- you know one of the biggest I know of got \$1,200 a year from the government and we had to have an executive director to do that, Sir. That's what the government presently is giving to recreation.

Mr. Speaker, the Attorney-General really went on about taxes. The Member from Assiniboia reminded him that there's only a very small percentage make much over \$20,000. If the Minister of Finance can extract the amount of money he needs from that few people he's a magician and he can't do it. The only big taxpayer in this province or any other province is the middle guy, he's your biggest volume and he's your biggest taxpayer and this government tries to hide the fact that you're not extracting taxes from him. You know even in East St. Paul where the Premier lives, the insurance rate on their trucks have gone up over 75 percent and now it'll go on the mill rate. When they put in time and a half, double time and a half for holidays in this province, the St. James Civic Centre's cost to stay open for one day on a holiday is \$900.00 extra. That goes on the mill rate. Everything from licences, and this has been said before, have gone up in this province and this is what you call hidden tax. They have extracted more money out of the middle guy and at the same time saying we've lowered this, we've lowered that; in other words they pat him on the back one minute and kick him the next. But when they kick him they sneak up on him. Mr. Speaker, they extract this kind of money and they do it barefaced, smiling, etc.

I just said how the mill rate will add up, and boy when we get to the Unicity -- you know everybody's wandering around in the Unicity saying to themselves you know it seems to me the government said that they would pay two-thirds or have a formula worked out to pay for the increased costs for places like Fort Garry because of Unicity. -- (Interjection) -- That's what I said, Mr. Speaker, you didn't say it, you intimated it in the White Paper -- (Interjection) -- you intimated it in your White Paper the way I read it but it's not in the bill, and there's absolutely no formula at the present time as far as I know of to help the taxpayers in this province with their mill rate for those who will have to go up either from maybe from 52 to 70 and it could really happen. There's been nothing announced in this House and yet the White Paper kind of -- well, I'll even say kind of intimated -- in fact one person said to me it's in the bill. I said read the bill, it's not there. You're going to have more money extracted or taken from the people's pockets out of taxes by this government's legislation than anybody would ever know.

And you know that little guy in the letter that the Member from Morris wrote wasn't far wrong. You know everybody -- the government is walking around saying, oh, we didn't hurt you, but all of a sudden he hasn't got as much money in his pocket. All of a sudden -- you know what happens with all of these things -- on Sunday your services are closed because a man can't afford to stay open. There's no more people passing his door and you raised his costs, you raised his costs -- if he has to charge it, to stay open he has to raise the price of a coke or something of this nature. You know, Mr. Speaker, I haven't got it with me but on the menu of a hotel in Regina it says: "Because of the government legislation it is necessary to raise my prices on this food menu by 10 percent." And I'll tell you this, if more of the businessmen in this province would turn around and when like the gasoline companies that put so much for gasoline and so much for tax start telling the people what those guys are costing them instead of their good business practices we'd be a lot better off because you wouldn't go around adding taxes, you'd go around trying to lower them.

Mr. Speaker, you know they care so little that I'm sure that the lining on the inside of their pockets is oilcloth so they could steal soup. I brought that one all the way from St. Louis, I couldn't resist it about this government. And the Minister of Finance -- (Interjection) --

Mr. Speaker, now we've got what is called Autopac. They pretty near, you know -- oh, sorry, Mr. Speaker. I was going to say when I mentioned the Attorney-General about his taxes, etc. that he gave one of his better hell-damners; I didn't want that to go by because he did. I would like to say that as a constituent of mine he got up and yelled his bloody head off in the House and that's all he did. -- (Interjections) -- Well, look on his street I've got him beat, really.

Mr. Speaker, I would also mention Autopac again. The Premier last night he said, you know: "We've got seven advertising agencies." Good God, seven advertising agencies with the amount of advertising a monopoly company has done I'm surprised seven ever did it. And

(MR. F. JOHNSTON cont'd) the Premier gets up and says: "We've got seven advertising agencies." God, really, and he has the gall to say everything's all right. The Minister of Municipal Affairs is living in a theoretical dream. He's firmly convinced that as long as he keeps walking along on the water that everything will be all right. I'll tell you, I'll tell you that if I were to take him down the street and say to most people, as they did you know in Dauphin they introduced him as "the man who piloted Autopac through the Legislature." All three speeches, really, all three speeches. If it hadn't been for a few other front benchers there he'd never have made it. But here was the man that piloted Autopac through the Legislature. If I said that to the young guy that phoned me the other day and said I had to turn in my licence, it's costing me \$240, and he says you know when I first paid it, when I first paid it, it was \$206 - \$206. He said, then I got a notice before they'd send me my licence that I owed them another \$40, and he said then I told them I can't afford the \$240 and got told I'd get my money back in two months. You know, you'd get a punch in the nose from him.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Honourable Member has five minutes.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: I really can't understand why he thinks that this is a great popular thing in Manitoba, when people are paying more, people are having to go down to a place to get an evaluation - or you have an accident - claim centre. -- (Interjection) -- No, no. You know I'm a law-abiding citizen and if I had a way out of it, I would find a private enterpriser that would fix my car; and I might say I've only got the compulsory, I wouldn't give you ten more than I have to. And I paid it on time because I wouldn't give you ten cents more than I have to. -- (Interjection) -- That's right.

Mr. Speaker, you go down there and all of a sudden you get an evaluation, you see, and the guy that hits you didn't go the Police Department either, so you have to wait around till he's reported the accident and then you've got to go down there and spend probably a half a day or two hours. You know, you leave work, a guy punches a clock -- and they're open, mind you they're open until 8 o'clock at night but on Saturday and up till 8 o'clock at night they get time and a half in those centres, you see, that's why they work that long. They haven't got different people at nights than they have on Saturdays. It's time and a half for overtime in those centres and yet a guy's got to take a couple of hours off work to go down and get an evaluation, he's got to go to the Police Department, he's got to turn around and he's got to wait if the other guy doesn't report the accident. You know, Mr. Speaker, there are more cars wandering around with small dents on them, back ends pushed in, than you've ever seen in your life because these guys haven't been able to get service from this government.

This guy says it's going to be all right. Maybe he'll explain to me, maybe he'll explain to me why the Metro buses are driving around with yellow tabs on. Are they going to be pinched? Walk out the door tonight, you'll see a yellow tab on the Metro buses. I'll tell you, it is by rumor, but fairly good authority, that the Metropolitan Corporation offered this government \$120,000 this year for their insurance. -- (Interjection) -- Not yet, not yet they didn't. They said our accidents were \$115,000 last year. There isn't a body shop in this city that can fix our buses. What in the hell do we got to go to a body shop for? We fix all our own buses and that's our mechanical costs. We paid out \$115,000 last year, we'll give you \$120,000, and to this date this government hasn't said, you're not going to pay \$240,000, and if they make the Metro people pay that you are going to be raising that old mill rate again. And I really want to see what you'll do with the other people that have buses. I want to see what you'll do with the police cars that are costing high mill rates at the present time - school buses. But I just want to know, I want to know if you're going to make Metro pay \$240,000 when they've offered you \$120,000, they only paid out \$115,000 to fix their vehicles and others last year as a matter of fact and nobody else in this city can fix their buses. I'm really waiting for the answer to that one and I'm telling the Minister to look it up. And he says that Autopac is A-Okay. He says that Autopac is going to end up running smoothly. It's impossible. You can't run it.

You know, Mr. Speaker, here's another little beauty that I took up. "Integration of records between Autopac and the Motor Vehicle Licensing and Regulations Sections accounted in part for the increase of 108 civil servants in the Department of Highways." You know, I'd like to know where they're being charged to, and if they're being charged to the Department of Highways, I'm going to ask the Minister if they've done any work over in Autopac.

(MR. F. JOHNSTON cont'd)

You know you guys are playing around with the people's bucks as far as Autopac's concerned. You're shifting dollars here, there and everywhere. You've got the most beautiful offices in Winnipeg up in the Bank of Montreal - you know really, carpets - We used to stand there and you'd say, "monopolies don't have to advertise." You'd stand up and you'd say, "We don't need those beautiful offices." God, when I see your man on television, the head boy, it makes the Premier's office look a little bad. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member's time is up. The Honourable Member for Osborne.

MR. TURNBULL: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask the previous speaker a question. He mentioned a presentation by Manitoba Hydro at a Chamber of Commerce meeting and I was wondering if he'd give the name of the Manitoba Hydro official who made that presentation?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: Mr. Speaker, I don't have to give him anything. He's on the Hydro Board, Sir, he can find out the name, he can find out the man who was there; it was the St. James Chamber of Commerce meeting. I said the man told the truth but he didn't tell everything, and you can find out the name. They've been in Gimli, they've been all over the province telling the same lousy story.

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

MR. SIDNEY GREEN, Q. C. (Inkster): Mr. Speaker, I think the honourable member indicated during his speech that he would answer a question. He was talking about agriculture and he indicated that if you can't make it in the home market that you should get out. Would you tell that to the wheat farmer in Canada, that if he can't make money in the home market he should get out of the business?

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Sturgeon Creek.

MR. F. JOHNSTON: I'd like to put it in context if the member's trying to twist again. No, Mr. Speaker, I will answer the question. The member is very creditable in this House but in the past while he's twisted. The context is this. I, as a manufacturer's agent, wouldn't take on a line that I couldn't make go in my own home market. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for St. Matthews. The Honourable the House Leader.

MR. PAULLEY: You have recognized the Honourable Member for St. Matthews. I believe he wants to make a contribution to the debate. It is now 5:26 and I wonder if it would suit the convenience of the House for you, Sir, to call it 5:30 and allow the honourable member to start his speech at 8:00 o'clock. (Agreed)

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